1	A global atmospheric electricity monitoring network for climate and geophysical
2	research
3	K.A. Nicoll <sup>1,2</sup> , R.G. Harrison <sup>1</sup> , V. Barta <sup>3</sup> , J.Bor <sup>3</sup> , R. Brugge <sup>1</sup> , A. Chillingarian <sup>4</sup> , J. Chum <sup>5</sup> , A. K.
4	Georgoulias <sup>6</sup> , A. Guha <sup>7</sup> , K. Kourtidis <sup>6</sup> , M. Kubicki <sup>8</sup> , E. Mareev <sup>9</sup> , J. Matthews <sup>10</sup> , H. Mkrtchyan <sup>4</sup> , A.
5	Odzimek <sup>8</sup> , JP. Raulin <sup>11</sup> , D. Robert <sup>12</sup> , H. G. Silva <sup>13</sup> , J. Tacza <sup>11</sup> , Y. Yair <sup>14</sup> , R. Yaniv <sup>15,16</sup>
6	
7	<sup>1</sup> Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK
8	<sup>2</sup> Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, University of Bath, Bath, UK
9	<sup>3</sup> Research Centre for Astronomy and Earth Sciences, GGI, Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
10	Sopron, Hungary
11	<sup>4</sup> Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia
12	<sup>5</sup> Institute of Atmospheric Physics CAS, Bocni II/1401, 14131 Prague 4, Czech Republic
13	<sup>6</sup> Department of Environmental Engineering, Democritus University of Thrace, Xanthi, Greece
14	<sup>7</sup> Tripura University, Tripura, India
15	<sup>8</sup> Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
16	<sup>9</sup> Institute of Applied Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Nizhny Novgorod, 603950 Russia
17	<sup>10</sup> School of Chemistry, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
18	<sup>11</sup> Center for Radio Astronomy and Astrophysics Mackenzie (CRAAM), Engineering School,
19	Presbyterian Mackenzie University, São Paulo, Brazil
20	<sup>12</sup> School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
21	<sup>13</sup> Renewable Energies Chair and Institute of Earth Sciences, University of Évora, Portugal.
22	<sup>14</sup> School of Sustainability, Interdisciplinary Centre Herzliya, Israel
23	<sup>15</sup> Department of Physics, Ariel University, Ariel, Israel
24	<sup>16</sup> Eastern R&D Center, Ariel, Israel
25	
26	

### 27 Abstract

28 The Global atmospheric Electric Circuit (GEC) is a fundamental coupling network of the climate 29 system connecting electrically disturbed weather regions with fair weather regions across the planet. The GEC sustains the fair weather electric field (or potential gradient, PG) which is 30 31 present globally and can be measured routinely at the surface using durable instrumentation 32 such as modern electric field mills, which are now widely deployed internationally. In contrast to 33 lightning or magnetic fields, fair weather PG cannot be measured remotely. Despite the 34 existence of many PG datasets (both contemporary and historical), few attempts have been 35 made to coordinate and integrate these fragmented surface measurements within a global 36 framework. Such a synthesis is important elvinin order to fully study major influences on the 37 GEC such as climate variations and space weather effects, as well as more local atmospheric 38 electrical processes such as cloud electrification, lightning initiation, and dust and aerosol 39 charging.

40

41 The GloCAEM (Global Coordination of Atmospheric Electricity Measurements) project has 42 brought together experts in atmospheric electricity to make the first steps towards an effective 43 global network for atmospheric electricity monitoring, which will provide data in near real time. 44 Data from all sites are available in identically-formatted files, at both one second and one minute 45 temporal resolution, along with meteorological data (wherever available) for ease of 46 interpretation of electrical measurements. This work describes the details of the GloCAEM 47 database and presents what is likely to be the largest single analysis of PG data performed from 48 multiple datasets at geographically distinct locations. Analysis of the diurnal variation in PG from all 17 GloCAEM sites demonstrates that the majority of sites show two daily maxima, 49 50 characteristic of local influences on the PG, such as the sunrise effect. Data analysis methods 51 to minimise such effects are presented and recommendations provided on the most suitable 52 GloCAEM sites for the study of various scientific phenomena. The use of the dataset for a 53 further understanding of the GEC is also demonstrated, in particular for more detailed 54 characterization of day-to-day global circuit variability. Such coordinated effort enables deeper insight into PG phenomenology which goes beyond single-location PG measurements, 55 providing a simple measurement of global thunderstorm variability on a day-to-day timescale. 56 57 The creation of the GloCAEM database is likely to enable much more effective study of 58 atmospheric electricity variables than has ever been possible before, which will improve our 59 understanding of the role of atmospheric electricity in the complex processes underlying 60 weather and climate.

#### 62 **1.** Introduction

63 Earth's electrical environment has been studied since the 1750s, but its more recently-64 appreciated connections to clouds (Tinsley et al, 2007, Nicoll and Harrison, 2016) and climate (Price, 1993; Rycroft et al, 2000; Williams, 1992; Williams, 2005) have highlighted some 65 66 incompleteness in understanding of atmospheric electricity in the climate system. It is well established that Earth has a "Global atmospheric Electric Circuit" (GEC), through which charge 67 68 separation in thunderstorms sustains large scale current flow around the planet (Wilson, 1921; 69 Williams, 2009). The GEC sustains the fair weather (FW) electric field (or potential gradient, 70 PG, as it is also known<sup>1</sup>), which is present globally in regions which are not strongly electrically 71 disturbed by weather or aerosol. In such conditions, the PG can be related to the local electrical 72 conductivity of air,  $\sigma$ , through Ohm's Law:

73

$$PG = -\frac{J_c}{\sigma} \tag{1}$$

74 where  $J_c$  is the air-Earth conduction current which flows vertically from the ionosphere to Earth's 75 surface. Provided no local charge separation processes are active, J<sub>c</sub> can be considered constant, hence the PG is inversely proportional to  $\sigma$ , and any phenomena (such as 76 77 meteorological processes like fog or aerosol pollution) which perturb  $\sigma$  will also affect the PG. 78 PG can be measured routinely using well-established electric field mill instrumentation (e.g. 79 Nicoll 2012). Measurements of PG can contribute to our understanding of how thunderstorms 80 and the global atmospheric electrical system may be varying within our changing climate, which 81 are difficult to assess by global lightning networks because they are not stable with time. PG 82 measurements are also useful in understanding some of the fundamental processes occurring 83 inside thunderstorms which are only just starting to be understood such as high energy particle 84 emissions related to thunderstorm ground enhancements (TGEs) and terrestrial gamma ray 85 flashes (TGFs) (e.g. Chilingarian et al, 2015; Chilingarian, 2018). However, in order that truly

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> By convention, PG is the negative of the electric field. Hence, in fair weather, when the atmospheric electric field is negative, the PG is therefore positive.

global signals are considered in understanding the processes within the global circuit, many
validating measurements must be made simultaneously at different locations around the world.

88

89 Beyond thunderstorms, another area of current research in atmospheric electricity is the role 90 that atmospheric electricity plays in modulating cloud properties and therefore its indirect effects 91 through clouds on the Earth's radiative balance. Recent evidence demonstrates that all 92 persistent extensive layer clouds are electrically charged at their upper and lower boundaries, 93 which theory indicates can influence cloud microphysical processes (Nicoll and Harrison, 2016). 94 Since layer clouds are common globally, electrical effects on cloud microphysics may therefore 95 always be contributing some of the underlying variability in cloud properties. One of the most 96 uncertain elements is the effect of space weather influences on atmospheric electricity, through 97 lower atmosphere changes in cosmic ray ionisation from solar flares and energetic particle 98 events. Recent work (e.g. Michnowski, 1998; Harrison et al, 2013; Smirnov, 2014) has reported 99 effects of space weather influences on the PG at individual sites, but in order to identify and 100 understand global effects, simultaneous measurements are required at multiple locations.

101

102 Despite the central role of lightning as a weather hazard and the potentially widespread 103 importance of charge for many atmospheric processes involving particles and droplets, research 104 is hampered by the fragmented nature of surface atmospheric electricity measurements, making 105 anything other than local studies in fortuitous FW conditions difficult. In contrast to detection of 106 global lightning using satellite-carried instruments and ground-based radio networks, fair 107 weather PG cannot be measured by remote sensing and no similar extensive measurement 108 networks exist for its study. This has been a major limitation on research into FW atmospheric 109 electricity. Some valuable regional PG monitoring networks have however been established, 110 such as at NASA Kennedy Space Centre (e.g. Krider, 1989; Lucas et al, 2017); in the Russian 111 Federation (Shvarts et al, 2008) and in South America (AFINSA) (Raulin et al, 2014; Tacza et

112 al, 2014), but these cover only a small part of Earth's surface. Archiving of historical atmospheric electrical data has also been achieved by the ATMEL2007A database (Tammet, 113 114 2009) which compiled a large number of hourly datasets from Russia and Europe. These 115 valuable datasets are now historical, as data is only most recently available up to 2006. There is 116 now an opportunity to widen the geographical coverage of available PG measurements as many 117 researchers worldwide currently make high temporal resolution measurements of the FW PG 118 routinely, which is neither coordinated nor exploited. The UK-led GloCAEM (Global Coordination 119 of Atmospheric Electricity) project has brought these experts together to make the first steps 120 towards an effective global network for FW atmospheric electricity monitoring, with publicly 121 available data and in near real time. Another novel aspect of the GloCAEM dataset is the 122 availability of meteorological data alongside the PG measurements. The meteorological 123 information is, firstly, central in independently determining the existence of fair weather 124 conditions (due to the substantial influence of non-fair weather meteorological phenomena on the PG), which are required to study global and space weather influences on the PG, and, 125 126 secondly useful in allowing study of the effect of variations in local meteorology on the electrical 127 environment. The use of identical format files for each GloCAEM measurement site makes data 128 analysis, in particular comparison of data from all the sites, very straightforward, which is a key 129 aspect of the project in driving research in atmospheric electricity forward.

130

This paper describes the properties of the GloCAEM database, as well as presents a summary of some of the initial analysis performed with the dataset. This focuses on the application of the data to Global Electric Circuit research, but also provides advice on choice of the best GloCAEM sites at which to study a variety of different atmospheric and geophysical processes related to atmospheric electricity.

136

### 137 2. The GloCAEM dataset

#### 138 **2.1 Overview**

The GloCAEM dataset so far contains PG and meteorological data from 12 different 139 international institutions and 17 different locations worldwide. It is stored at the UK Centre for 140 141 Environmental Data Analysis (CEDA), which is a Data Repository funded by several of the UK 142 research councils (http://www.ceda.ac.uk/). CEDA provides secure and long term storage of 143 datasets for atmospheric research for the academic community. The GloCAEM dataset will 144 therefore become publicly available (with users registering for a username and password 145 through CEDA) for research use when the period of data checking is completed, with the 146 functional launch expected to be from summer 2019. Some key details of the GloCAEM dataset 147 functionality are listed below:

- 148
- Data values are provided in as close to real time as possible (at sites where internet and
  FTP are available),

151 - Data files are provided as daily files, at two different time resolutions: 1 second and
152 1 minute averages,

Data files of 1 second resolution contain only PG data; 1 minute files contain PG and
 meteorological data at the same temporal resolution (where available)

155 - Downloadable site information and instrument information files are provided for each

156 location at the project website (https://glocaem.wordpress.com/introduction/project-

157 partners-and-measurement-sites/).

158

The use of daily data files allows the user to choose whether to download only a few files if analysing one specific event, or the entire dataset. The GloCAEM sites are essentially a virtual network in that the network has not specifically been created to provide new sites for PG measurements – rather it collates data from existing measurement sites and converts them into a common format which is accessible to the wider research community. Presently the GloCAEM dataset focuses on recent data, and many of the measurement sites are relatively new with only a few years of data so far; however data are available back to 2005 for some sites.

167

### 168 2.2 Parameters measured

In terms of atmospheric electricity parameters, the GloCAEM dataset focuses principally on 169 170 measurements of PG as this is the most commonly measured quantity due to the relatively large 171 number of commercially-available sensors. The PG is present globally and is typically ~100V/m 172 in clear air during fair weather conditions at sea level, with larger values in polluted and non fair 173 weather conditions. PG is influenced by many factors including local meteorological influences, 174 dust and aerosol concentrations (e.g. Yair et al, 2016), global thunderstorm activity through the 175 GEC (e.g. Rycroft et al, 2000), space weather events (e.g. Marcz 1997; Harrison et al, 2013; De 176 et al, 2013) and changes in the ionisation rate from radon (e.g. Lopes et al, 2015), cosmic ray 177 changes (Mateev and Vellinov, 1992), and artificial ionisation sources (e.g. Takeda et al, 2011; 178 Fews et al, 2002; Matthews et al, 2010), and changes in local site characteristics such as 179 variable electrical shielding effects of surrounding trees (Williams et al 2005) or buildings. Biotic 180 factors, such as vegetation and animal activity have thus far not been considered, yet have 181 been recognised to also affect local PG measurements. At any site the dominant changes in 182 the PG are likely to arise from local meteorological changes; therefore, it is important to 183 understand how various phenomena such as the local wind regime, rainfall, cloud, fog and 184 aerosol influence the measurement of PG (e.g. Deshpande and Kamra, 2001; Minamoto and 185 Kadokura, 2011; Bin et al, 2012; Harrison and Nicoll, 2018; Gurmani et al, 2018). Consequently 186 the GloCAEM dataset provides meteorological measurements in the form of: pressure, 187 temperature, relative humidity (RH), wind direction, wind speed, rainfall, global solar irradiance, 188 diffuse solar irradiance, visibility, sunshine duration and cloud base height. Although these 189 measurements are not available at every site, they are provided wherever and whenever 190 possible. The inclusion of a number of solar radiation and cloud measurements is to enable 191 different criteria to be explored in identifying fair weather conditions, since this aspect of data 192 selection (Harrison and Nicoll, 2018) is key for GEC studies. The GloCAEM dataset also allows 193 the study of different types of phenomena which cause perturbations in PG (such as 194 precipitation effects), which, for the purpose of GEC studies, can be averaged out; regular 195 systematic variations, however, must be dealt with in other ways. Aerosol-related effects on PG 196 can be both transient (e.g. short timescale effects from space weather), and systematic (e.g. the 197 sunrise effect, differences between weekdays and weekends, seasonal effects). These are 198 discussed more fully in section 3.2.

199

# 200 2.3 Instrumentation

201 The PG has historically been measured by a number of different methods. These have included 202 potential probes, in which the potential on a conductor equalises with the potential of the 203 surrounding air and any subsequent changes in potential on the probe follow variations in PG 204 (e.g. Chalmers, 1967). Burning fuses, water droppers or radioactive probes have been 205 implemented to increase the conductivity of the air surrounding the probe to allow faster 206 equalisation rates (Israel, 1970). This technique is still employed at several of the GloCAEM 207 measurement stations, including Swider, Poland and Nagycenk, Hungary (Marcz et al, 2001), 208 where long time series of measurements are available. One of the main limitations of the 209 potential probe method is its slow time response, which is typically on the order of tens of 210 seconds depending on the method of equalisation employed. An alternative method is to use an 211 electric field mill, which allows much faster measurements (up to around 100Hz), and versions 212 which are robust to all meteorological conditions are available. An electric field mill typically 213 consists of a horizontal electrode, which is alternately exposed and shielded from the 214 atmospheric electric field. As the electrode is exposed to the electric field, a charge is induced 215 on the electrode, the magnitude of which is proportional to the field (e.g. Chubb, 2010; chapter 6

216 in MacGorman and Rust, 1998). This is measured with an electrometer, and phase sensitive 217 detection. Figure 1 shows some of the electric field mill sensors used at the various GloCAEM 218 sites. Technical details of the sensors are described fully as separate metafiles on the 219 GloCAEM project website (https://glocaem.wordpress.com/introduction/project-partners-and-220 measurement-sites/). This file also includes information on the height of the field mill sensors 221 above ground (which typically varies between 1 m and 3 m between sites). A full list of the 222 various field mill types used at the GloCAEM sites is given in table 1. It should be noted that 223 even though potential probe measurements are in use at some of the GloCAEM sites, only the 224 digitised PG measurements from field mills are currently included in the database.

225

226 PG measurements are recorded at a variety of sampling rates at the different GloCAEM sites 227 (from 2 Hz to 25 Hz), therefore to ensure consistency between sites, GloCAEM data have been 228 processed to report data at 1 second and 1 minute averages, in different data files. The 229 provision of data with different temporal resolution is intended to allow easier analysis of 230 phenomena which occur on a variety of timescales, without always having to download vast 231 amounts of data. It is important to point out that the absolute value of PG measured by a field 232 mill is affected both by calibration of the sensor and the physical environment surrounding the 233 sensor. Metal masts or guy lines distort the electric field, modifying the PG which is measured. 234 Thus, for PG measurements from different sites to be comparable, they must be standardised to 235 an open situation (such as flush with the ground surface, or compared with measurements from 236 a horizontal passive wire antenna), to remove the distorting effects. See e.g. Appendix in 237 Harrison and Nicoll, 2018 for more details. Field mill calibrations and site correction factors (to 238 account for the distortion of the electric field around the field mill mounting mast or nearby 239 buildings, are applied to data from some of the GloCAEM sites. Details of correction factors and 240 calibrations against other sensors are provided in the metafiles on the GloCAEM project website 241 (https://glocaem.wordpress.com/introduction/project-partners-and-measurement-sites/). Since not all PG measurements in the GloCAEM database have been corrected for site distortion factors, it is generally not meaningful to compare absolute PG measurements between all the different sites. PG values with respect to the mean value at each site are therefore often discussed throughout this paper to address this issue.

246

## 247 2.4 Measurement sites

248 At present the GloCAEM dataset comprises PG data from seventeen different locations ranging 249 from Poland in the north to Antarctica in the south. Figure 2 shows a map of the various 250 measurement sites which include ten different countries and four continents. Table 1 provides a 251 detailed description of the measurement sites in the GloCAEM dataset, and as with the 252 instrumentation information, the specifics of each site are included as a separate metafile on the 253 GloCAEM project website (https://glocaem.wordpress.com/introduction/project-partners-and-254 measurement-sites/). The sites include flat terrain in rural locations, mountainous regions, ice 255 shelves, deserts and rooftop locations in city centres. Whilst traditionally many of these site 256 locations would be avoided for atmospheric electricity research, the aim of GloCAEM is to 257 provide access to data for a wide range of related research purposes. For example: although 258 the PG may be enhanced as a result of the distortion caused by mountains, measurements in 259 such locations can provide information about boundary/exchange layer transitions (as well as in 260 cloud measurements) as these sites often move in and out of such layers as their altitude varies 261 (e.g. Israel, 1957; Kamogawa et al, 2015; Yaniv et al, 2017). PG measurements in city centre 262 locations can provide information on aerosol and pollution transport (e.g. Silva et al, 2016) and 263 desert measurements can provide valuable insights into dust electrification processes (e.g. Yair et al, 2016; Yaniv et al, 2016; Esposito et al, 2016; Katz et al 2018). 264

265

Although the type of surface and surrounding orography influences the PG measurement, so too does its geographical location in terms of the typical meteorological conditions that the site 268 experiences. Figures 3 and 4 show an example of differences in site climatology between 269 Graciosa, Azores - an island location in the North Atlantic Ocean - and Panská Ves - a 270 continental location in the Czech Republic. Although the median values of PG at both locations 271 for the year of 2016 are similar (80V/m at Graciosa, 49 V/m at Panská Ves<sup>2</sup>) the difference in 272 variability, and the range of PG values (from Figure 4) is obvious. This is mostly due to 273 climatological differences (in particular rainfall) between the two mid-latitude sites. This is 274 particularly true in the summer months, when Panská Ves experiences a relatively large number 275 of convective events compared to Graciosa, which causes large variability in the PG. It therefore 276 follows that Panská Ves is a better site for the study of convective activity, but Graciosa is likely 277 to be more suited to fair weather measurements which is required for study of the GEC. Greater 278 variability is expected in the Panská Ves data due to aerosol/conductivity variations that are 279 inherent at inland continental stations compared to the relatively clean oceanic air at the island 280 location of Graciosa. Thus the inclusion of different types of measurement locations in the 281 GloCAEM dataset will allow the study of many different types of phenomena of both local and 282 global origins.

283

284

3.

#### Analysis of GloCAEM PG data

285 3.1 Diurnal variations at GloCAEM sites

One of the key parameters in global atmospheric electricity research is the diurnal variation in PG on fair weather (FW) days. This is due to the fact that, in the absence of local influences, the diurnal variation in PG is known to follow closely the diurnal variation in global thunderstorm and shower cloud area, which together are understood to drive the global circuit. This result was first established by Mauchly, (1921; 1923) and Whipple (1929) using the pioneering measurements of the *Carnegie* research ship (e.g. Harrison, 2013). The characteristic shape of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> It should be noted that a site correction factor has only been applied to the data from Panská Ves and not Graciosa therefore the absolute values of PG are not directly comparable between the two sites.

292 this variation found by the Carnegie scientists, with a principal minimum around 03 UT and 293 principal maximum around 19 UT, is known as the Carnegie curve. Measurement sites which 294 exhibit a daily PG variation which is very similar to the Carnegie curve are often said to be 295 globally representative and hence, in principle can provide a method of monitoring the global 296 variation of the GEC from a single site measurement<sup>3</sup>. Analysis of the diurnal variation in PG 297 conditions has been performed for all of the GloCAEM sites. Since meteorological data is so far 298 available at only some of the GloCAEM sites - and hence true FW conditions cannot be 299 explicitly identified - the PG is selected for non-disturbed conditions on the basis of the PG 300 values only. This is based on the fact that non fair weather conditions (such as rainfall and high 301 winds) tend to produce large (as well as negative values of PG) (e.g. Bennett and Harrison, 302 2007). This approach may also remove situations in which the conductivity is low (e.g. during 303 high aerosol concentration events), which will produce abnormally large PG values, which would 304 not be detected by selection of meteorological conditions alone. Thus, what are considered 305 non-disturbed values of PG are selected individually for each site by only considering positive 306 PG values in the inner 80% of the distribution of PG values. This approach ensures that any 307 outliers in the PG distribution are removed from further analysis.

308

Figure 5 shows the percentage of non-disturbed periods (in black) for 9 of the GloCAEM sites for each month of 2016. As expected, there is a large range between sites in the proportion of non-disturbed values. For example, the maximum percentage of non-disturbed PG values in any one month is 92% for Evora (EVO) (Oct 2016), whilst the minimum occurs for Xanthi (XAN) at only 14% (March 2016). For the 5 sites with no missing data in 2016, Graciosa (GRA) has the highest proportion (78%) of non-disturbed periods during the year, with Studenec (STU) (33%) the least. There is also a seasonal effect evident at some sites, for example at Reading

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Here we regard the "Carnegie curve" as the harmonic description of the undisturbed day PG data during Cruise 7 of the Carnegie provided by the Carnegie Institution (and re-analysed by Harrison 2013). Other secondary sources (e.g. Israel (1970)) differ slightly.

(RDG) and Swider (SWI), which are both mid-latitude sites and subject to an increased number of non-fair weather conditions during winter months than summer. Such information can be used to assess the most suitable GloCAEM sites for GEC studies, as well as what time of year (if any) analysis should be focused on to increase the proportionality of non-disturbed data available.

321

322 The average diurnal variation for non-disturbed values of PG during 2016 is shown for 15 of the 323 GloCAEM sites in Figure 6, alongside the Carnegie curve (red dashed line). Sites are combined 324 according to whether their diurnal variation in PG contains a single maximum, similar to the 325 Carnegie Curve, or two maxima (as assessed by eye). Because many of the sites are not 326 absolutely calibrated, comparison of absolute PG values cannot be undertaken: instead, the 327 sites' data are given as the percentage of the PG with respect to the median value for each site. 328 Median PG values before and after non-disturbed selection are shown in Table 2. Five of the 329 GloCAEM sites are shown to have a single maximum; however, the remaining ten sites 330 demonstrate evidence of substantial local effects (particularly following sunrise), with a double 331 peak in PG evident. This is to be expected as the majority of sites are continental and relatively 332 close to major population centres where aerosol pollution is abundant and responds to 333 atmospheric mixing. This so called "sunrise effect" has been observed at a variety of locations 334 (e.g. Marshall et al, 1996) and is generally thought to be related to mixing of the near-surface 335 electrode layer (which is an accumulation of positive charge next to the negatively charged 336 Earth's surface). At the majority of sites with two daily maxima, the first maximum is 337 proportionally smaller than the second, with the exception of Xanthi, Greece, where the morning 338 maximum is 30% larger than the evening one (Kastelis & Kourtidis, 2016). Such local 339 influences complicate any potential GEC analysis, but PG measurements from such sites will 340 provide valuable information on pollution and aerosol content of air and methods of minimising 341 the effects of such aerosols are discussed in section 3.2.

343 Of the sites which exhibit a single maximum, three of these are in mountainous locations with 344 altitudes above 2000 m. Although such sites may be subject to Austausch effects around 345 sunrise which can cause anomalously high values of PG due to turbulent and convective mixing 346 (e.g. Israel, 1957; Marshall et al., 1999; Yaniv et al, 2017), their high altitudes mean that they 347 are often above the polluted boundary layer and so can more readily detect GEC signals, 348 although this is not always the case. The presence of a Carnegie-like oscillation at Graciosa 349 (Azores); and Halley (Antarctica) is also not surprising as these are both relatively "clean" sites, 350 as Graciosa is located on a small island in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean, and Halley is on the 351 Brunt Ice Shelf. One explanation for the differences in the timings of the peak in the curve in 352 Figure 6 (a) may be related to the latitudinal and longitudinal distribution of the various 353 GloCAEM sites, where proximity to the major thunderstorm regions of the Americas, and the 354 African and Asian continents may influence the shape of the diurnal variation (e.g. Kamra et al, 355 1994). It should, however, be noted that there is disagreement in the literature as to whether or 356 not this phenomena occurs (particularly in regard to theoretical model results), and if so on what 357 time scale effects are evident.

358

359 Although there is considerable spread in the times of the maxima of the diurnal curves, the 360 minima in Figure 6 (regardless of whether the sites have single or double maxima) are generally 361 consistent at around 03-05 UT, similar to the Carnegie curve. Figure 7 demonstrates this by showing the difference between the PG and Carnegie curve as a function of universal time (UT) 362 363 for sites with similar latitudes (and therefore similar times of day). The GloCAEM dataset therefore supports the idea that the early morning UT hours are well suited to detecting global 364 365 circuit signals (as, e.g. suggested by Märcz, 1997), and even sites which demonstrate 366 considerable local influences during the day such as Xanthi should therefore not be discounted 367 from such analysis. In general, the time period from 21-06 local time (LT) is when local sources of variability are less dominant and is therefore when the most globally representative times will
 occur at the different GloCAEM sites.

370

### 371 3.2 Influence of pollution

372 The double maxima behaviour in the diurnal variation of PG in Figure 6 (b) is indicative of local 373 influences on PG and is typically related to anthropogenic pollution and seasonal effects. 374 Sources of particulate pollution can include local traffic, domestic heating, cooking or industry. Even in Antarctica, which is typically a "clean" environment, diesel generators used to power 375 376 scientific bases can be a source of significant aerosol. The increased aerosol typically acts to 377 reduce the electrical conductivity, causing an associated increase in PG as expected from 378 Ohm's Law when J<sub>c</sub> is constant. The additional peak in the diurnal PG curve often appears 379 around sunrise, when the planetary boundary layer (PBL) is shallow (typically less than 1km) 380 and pollution sources from traffic and domestic heating and cooking are substantial. Previous work (e.g. Sheftel et al 1994; Israelsson, & Tammet, 2001; Silva et al, 2014) has noted a 381 382 difference in PG between weekdays and weekends when traffic levels and industrial pollution 383 sources are often decreased. Such analysis can be applied to the GloCAEM sites to investigate 384 the effects of anthropogenic pollution at some of the sites which display a double diurnal 385 variation. Figure 8 shows boxplots of non-disturbed PG on weekdays (Monday to Friday) and 386 weekends (Saturday and Sunday) for Reading, Evora, Tripura and Xanthi (which all have 387 double maxima in their diurnal curves) using data from 2016. Typically, the weekday PG is larger than that at weekends, for example, by up to 9% at Tripura, but only 2% at Evora. All 388 389 differences between weekday and weekend PG are statistically significant at the 5% level, with 390 the exception of Evora. The 5% increase in Reading PG during weekdays can be attributed to 391 increased pollution since Latha and Highwood (2006) reported a clear decrease in PM10 concentration during weekends compared to weekdays at Reading (17 µg m<sup>-3</sup> during weekdays 392 393 and 15 µg m<sup>-3</sup> during weekends). They also noted an increase in PM10 through Monday to Thursday, and decrease from Friday to Sunday, which also demonstrates that pollution dispersal timescales will also play an important role in controlling PG. Although such a difference between weekday and weekend PG supports the concept that a site may be affected by anthropogenic pollution, further investigation is required to properly characterize this contribution.

399

400 Air pollution often exhibits an annual cycle with maxima in winter and minima in summer due to 401 the annual variation in emissions (e.g. more use of domestic heating in winter and, in urban areas, less traffic during holiday periods). The variation in convection and PBL height 402 403 throughout the seasons (which controls the distribution of aerosol particles near the surface) 404 also determines the magnitude of the effect of pollution on PG. Figure 9(a) shows the monthly 405 mean values of PG for Reading for weekends and weekdays. There is a clear seasonal cycle 406 with increased PG in winter (months 12 to 2) versus summer (months 5 to 8), which is most 407 pronounced in the weekday PG. This is likely to be related to traffic and regional industrial 408 production being at its greatest during weekdays, and coinciding with shallow boundary layer 409 depths during the winter months. The maximum of PG in the winter months at Reading follows 410 a similar winter maximum to that reported by Everett (1868) using instrumentation installed at 411 Kew, London, by Lord Kelvin.. Contrasting this with PG data from Graciosa<sup>4</sup> (Figure 9 (b)), 412 which is a primarily clean air site (Lopes et al, 2017), both weekday and weekend PG values 413 maximize during the summer months. Measurements of aerosol optical depth at Graciosa 414 (Logan et al, 2014, not shown here) show a maximum aerosol number concentration (for 3-10 415 µm particles) during winter and spring, which is generally related to high wind speeds which generate sea spray (this is the only substantial source of aerosol particles at Graciosa during 416 417 these months (Logan et al, 2014)). This seasonal dependence is opposite to the seasonal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> No site correction factor has been applied to the Graciosa PG data therefore it is not meaningful to compare the absolute value of PG to other sites.

variation in PG, suggesting a negligible effect of the sea spray on the PG. This, and the fact
that the seasonal variability in the GEC predicts a NH summer maximum in PG, as is evident at
Graciosa, supports the interpretation of Graciosa as a clean air site and more suitable for GEC
measurements than urban locations.

422

423 Despite a number of the GloCAEM sites being influenced by local pollution it is possible to 424 select periods of the year when local influences are minimized. Figure 10 shows the diurnal 425 variation in PG at Reading for both winter and summer months, compared with the Carnegie 426 diurnal variation in PG. During the winter months, there is a single maximum (~15 UT), whereas 427 during the summer, a double maxima is present (at 06 and 19 UT), which is characteristic of the 428 mean diurnal variation at Reading when the average is taken over the whole year. As is also 429 demonstrated in Figure 9(a), the magnitude of the PG during the winter months is larger than in 430 the summer, consistent with Everett (1868) - most likely due to the increase in aerosol 431 emissions from domestic heating and trapping of this aerosol by a shallow PBL. The reduced 432 variability in PBL height during winter (due to diminished convection) therefore leads to more 433 quiescent meteorological conditions which results in a more stable diurnal variation in PG, and 434 the disappearance of the morning maximum peak. It therefore follows that many of the 435 GIOCAEM sites which are affected by local sources of variability will inevitably have periods 436 (such as during the winter months) which are less dominated by local effects and are therefore 437 more globally representative. This was demonstrated by Harrison et al (2011) who, using data 438 from December months when more quiescent conditions prevailed, detected a GEC response to 439 the El Nino-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) in PG data from Shetland, UK.

440

## 441 **3.3 Average diurnal behaviour across multiple sites**

There is considerable interest in whether a global PG dataset can provide information on daily variability within the global circuit (and therefore a proxy for global electrified clouds), which is 444 generally not possible by using PG from one site due to interference from local sources of 445 variability. This has been suggested to have potential applications for simple monitoring of 446 global temperatures due to the dependence of the GEC on surface temperature and global 447 thunderstorm activity (e.g. Price, 1993).

448

449 To investigate this, Figure 11 shows (in black) the variation in PG on two individual days 450 averaged into hourly values across six of the GloCAEM sites, compared with the Carnegie 451 curve (in red). Only sites with more than 10 months of data for 2016, and which exhibit 452 Carnegie-like curves on at least one individual day, are considered for this analysis. Even so, 453 the averaging approach should act to minimise any local influences on PG such as fluctuations 454 in aerosol concentration. There is clear similarity between the heavily averaged Carnegie curve 455 and the daily averages across the GloCAEM sites, particularly in the timings of the maxima. 456 The differences evident in the GloCAEM curves between Figure 11 (a) and (b) also warrant 457 further investigation into the source of the much lower PG values in Figure 11(b) (possibly due 458 to a decrease in global thunderstorm activity) that day, as well as the detection of the secondary 459 peak at 0900UT which is normally due to thunderstorm activity in Asia (potentially due to 460 increased activity in this area on this day). Curves possessing a similar shape to the Carnegie 461 curve, with a minimum in the early morning hours and single maximum around 19 UT (assessed 462 by eye), were observable on ~ 25% of days in 2016 using this averaging method. This is a 463 substantial increase in the number of days from any single site in the GloCAEM database. This 464 therefore demonstrates that averaging across multiple sites may well improve the statistics of 465 observing Carnegie-Ilike signals on a day-to-day basis.

466

### 467 3.4 Seasonal variations in PG at GloCAEM sites

468 Establishing the exact nature of the seasonality in the GEC has not been a simple task due to 469 interference of local influences on PG which, themselves have their own seasonal variations

470 (e.g. boundary layer heights and aerosol concentrations) (Adlerman and Williams, 1996; 471 Williams, 2009). The few fair weather PG measurements from the Carnegie during the northern 472 hemisphere summer months on its main cruise (e.g. Harrison 2013), as well as the 473 geographically varying Carnegie PG measurements have also added to the complexity as 474 proximity to major thunderstorm regions (e.g. Kamra et al, 1994), and their seasonal variation 475 may be an additional factor. It has therefore required measurements from clean air sites such 476 as Antarctica (e.g. Burns et al, 1995; 2005; 2012; 2017) to confirm that the GEC has a northern 477 hemisphere (NH) summer maxima, in agreement with the summer maxima in global lightning 478 activity.

479

480 PG measurements from Amundsen-Scott South Pole station (Reddell et al, 2004), Vostok 481 (Burns et al, 2005), and Concordia, all in Antarctica, have proved invaluable in establishing the 482 seasonal variation in the GEC, but maintaining PG instrumentation in such harsh polar 483 environments makes long term measurements difficult. To investigate the suitability of current GloCAEM sites for seasonal GEC monitoring, Figure 12 shows seasonally averaged values of 484 485 the diurnal variation in non-disturbed PG at three of the GloCAEM sites which exhibit single 486 peaks in their diurnal PG curves - Graciosa, Halley and CAS2. Although typically only two 487 years of data are included for each site, which is not ideal for seasonal studies, differences can 488 be seen in the shape of the curves between seasons and times of the maxima and minima. The 489 existence of a small peak around 06-09 UT is evident at Halley (which varies seasonally), but 490 not at Graciosa or CAS2 which exhibit pronounced minima at this time. This is particularly 491 prevalent at CAS2, and may be attributed to the lack of influence of the Asian thunderstorm 492 generator (due to the large distances involved between Asia and Argentina), which typically 493 maximises around 06-09 UT (Tacza et al, 2014). It should also be noted that Halley and CAS2 494 are southern hemisphere sites, and CAS2 in particular is likely to be influenced by the nearby 495 South American thunderstorm generator region, which has a maximum thunderstorm output in 496 DJF (southern hemisphere summer), which may lead to the highest maxima in PG (128% with 497 respect to the mean) being observed in this season. The high latitude of Halley also suggests 498 that the PG there may be subject to additional variations present on a diurnal scale, caused by 499 the ionospheric interaction with the solar wind (known as cross-polar cap variations (e.g. 500 Weimer, 1996)). This additional diurnal variation would be superposed with the GEC variation, 501 and is known to lead to differences in the timing of minima and maxima at certain Antarctic sites 502 (e.g. Vostok and South Pole station (Burns et al, 2012)). The westward Antarctic location of 503 Halley, on the Brunt Ice Shelf, means that such effects are likely to be small, and only likely an 504 issue during disturbed solar periods, but a full analysis of the Halley data is required to remove 505 such effects.

506

507 Figure 13 investigates the variations in the timing of the maxima and minima in the diurnal 508 variations of PG for each of the three GloCAEM sites as a function of season and compares 509 them with the timings of the PG maxima observed by the Carnegie (data from Harrison, 2013) and at Vostok (data from Burns et al, 2005). As is seen, for the timing of the maxima, the 510 511 Carnegie and Vostok timings show an increase from NH winter through to summer, with 512 maximum in the summer months (JJA), which results from a summer maximum in global 513 thunderstorm activity in the NH. The three GloCAEM sites show a similar increasing trend from NH winter, but display a maximum in spring (MAM). There may be several explanations for this 514 515 including a lack of data (typically less than 2 years of measurements for each site) and the 516 proximity of sites to major regions of thunderstorms and electrified shower clouds, which may 517 dominate over global influences at certain times of the year. In terms of the timing of the minimum, all sites (with the exception of CAS2, which does not have a dominant minimum in 518 DJF) show the same trend with a spring maximum. The better agreement between sites in 519 520 terms of the trend in the time of the minimum is likely related to the fact that there is less 521 influence of local variability on the PG during the early morning hours (as demonstrated in Figure 7). It is evident therefore that although some of the GloCAEM sites show promise forGEC monitoring, more data are required to fully assess their suitability.

524

### 525 4. Discussion and future directions

526 The GLOCAEM network aims to archive PG data generated from a variety of measurement 527 types and locations around the globe, which can be utilized to study different scientific 528 phenomena related to atmospheric electricity. Table 3 summarises some of these phenomena and provides initial recommendations of the GloCAEM sites most suited for such analysis. The 529 530 most widely studied topic in fair weather atmospheric electricity has historically been that of the 531 GEC, which typically requires long time series of PG measurements in fair weather conditions, in 532 unpolluted locations. Although several of the GLOCAEM sites promise to be suitable for such 533 studies, detailed analysis is yet to be undertaken, providing further insight into the data available, 534 its analysis and its future reporting. Measurement of the GEC from surface PG measurements is 535 difficult because of local influences such as aerosol variations. Despite the continental nature of 536 most of the GIoCAEM sites, this paper has however demonstrated that even sites which are 537 subject to variable influences from e.g. local sources of aerosol, can demonstrate some global 538 representability with careful selection of data. This includes restricting data seasonally (e.g. winter periods which show less atmospheric mixing), using weekend data only (less sources of 539 540 anthropogenic pollution), and focusing on periods of the day which are subject to less local 541 influences, such as 2100-0600 LT. The ability to monitor the daily GEC variability through the 542 diurnal variation in PG on individual days is highly desirable, because of its relationship with 543 global temperature changes (e.g. Williams, 1992; 1994). The GloCAEM database thus provides the opportunity to fully test whether averaging many simultaneous PG measurements from 544 545 around the globe (as in Figure 11) can provide a more robust determination of the GEC on daily 546 timescales than from any one site, which will only encounter FW conditions intermittently.

547

548 Although at the moment GloCAEM archives only PG data, the format of the data files has been 549 created such that inclusion of other atmospheric electricity variables such as air-Earth 550 conduction current  $(J_c)$  and conductivity  $(\sigma)$  measurements can be included in the future. In 551 order to more completely represent the GEC, a similar network of  $\sigma$  and J<sub>c</sub> sensors will be 552 required, but the difficulties associated with automating measuring these parameters robustly 553 has prevented this so far. Scope also exists for the inclusion of historical datasets, and the 554 global coverage of sites is expected to be extended in 2019 with the inclusion of further PG 555 datasets.

556

## 557 **5.** Summary

This paper summarises the features of a new dataset for global PG measurements, GloCAEM, 558 559 encompassing four continents and 17 different measurement sites. The work presented is very 560 likely to be one of the largest single analysis of global PG data using multiple datasets 561 simultaneously, which demonstrates the usefulness of a dataset with identical data formatting 562 for each site. The variety of different site locations and characteristics contained within the 563 GloCAEM database now means that a number of scientific problems related to atmospheric 564 electricity can be more easily investigated, these include GEC studies, ENSO and climate 565 effects, space weather influences on atmospheric electricity, charging of dust, snow, fog, cloud 566 and aerosols, interactions between PG and biological activity, and turbulent transport of space 567 charge to name a few, and recommendations are given here on the sites most suitable for such analysis. Of the preliminary GEC analysis performed, the GloCAEM dataset is demonstrated to 568 569 contain several sites which show promise for the study of the GEC (primarily Graciosa (Azores), 570 Halley (Antarctica) and CAS (Argentina)). The averaging of PG during non-disturbed conditions 571 from a number of GloCAEM sites on a daily basis is also demonstrated to produce globally 572 representative signals, potentially leading to the ability to study day to day variations in the 573 GEC, which has so far proved difficult from a single site. The creation of the GloCAEM database therefore represents a major step forward in the synthesis which has previously limitedatmospheric electricity research, yet provides access to central elements of the climate system.

### 578 Acknowledgements

579 The authors would like to thank all of the GloCAEM project partners and their colleagues who 580 have provided data for the database (list of names is found at: 581 https://glocaem.wordpress.com/introduction/project-partners-and-measurement-sites/). Wendy 582 Garland at CEDA has been key to the design and implementation of the GloCAEM database. 583 This work is funded by a NERC International Opportunities Fund grant NE/N013689/1 to KAN. 584 KAN also acknowledges a NERC Independent Research Fellowship (NE/L011514/1 and 585 NE/L011514/2). The authors also wish to acknowledge EU COST action CA15211 Atmospheric 586 Electricity Network: coupling with the Earth system, climate and biological systems. The 587 GIoCAEM data catalogue can be found at: 588 http://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk/uuid/bffd0262439a4ecb8fadf0134c4a4a41. The contribution of 589 J. Bór was supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary-590 NKFIH, project ID K115836. J.-P. Raulin and J. Tacza acknowledge the support of CAPES 591 and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Air Force Material Command, USAF under 592 Award No. FA9550-16-1-0072. 593

594

596 <b>Lable captio</b>	ns
-------------------------	----

598Table 1. Details of the GloCAEM measurement sites and electric field mill instrumentation

599 deployed.

600

Table 2. Details of PG characteristics for the 17 GloCAEM sites for 2016 (except CGR which only has PG values for 2017). Values are calculated from 10 minute averages and FW PG values are selected as those between 0 V/m and 80% of the total PG distribution.

604

- Table 3. Recommendations of GloCAEM sites most suited to the study of a variety of scientific
- 606 phenomena in atmospheric electricity research.

608	Figure Captions
609	
610	Figure 1. Example of different types of electric field mill sensors used in the GloCAEM network.
611	(a) JCI 131F field mill (Chilworth UK) at Graciosa, Azores; (b) CS110 field mill (Campbell
612	Scientific) at the Wise Observatory, Mitzpe Ramon, Israel; (c) EFM 100 field mill (Boltek) at
613	Nagycenk, Hungary.
614	
615	Figure 2. Site locations within the GloCAEM dataset.
616	
617	Figure 3. Time series of PG values during 2016 at (a) Graciosa, Azores, (b) Panská Ves, Czech
618	Republic. Data are 10 minute mean values and the y axis has been restricted to $\pm$ 2000 V/m
619	on both plots.
620	
621	Figure 4. Comparison of PG histograms for (a) Graciosa, Azores; and (b) Panská Ves, Czech
622	Republic, (for 10 minute mean values and plotted within a range of $\pm 500$ V/m).
623	
624	Figure 5. Strip chart of percentage of non-disturbed PG values for each month for GloCAEM
625	sites with more than 10 months of data in 2016 (using 10 minute mean values of PG). Black
626	shows percentage of non-disturbed PG, grey disturbed PG, and red denotes no data available
627	during that time period. Percentages are given with respect to total data available for that
628	month at a specific site. Site abbreviation codes are given in Table 1.
629	
630	Figure 6. Mean undisturbed diurnal variation in PG for 2016 for (a) GloCAEM sites with a single
631	peak in the diurnal curve and (b) double peak, plotted as a percentage of the median PG for
632	each site. Data are selected for non-disturbed conditions using only positive PG values and PG
633	values less than the 80 <sup>th</sup> decile of the distribution for each individual site (using 10 min average

values), with a smoothing spline applied. (a) Carnegie (red), Graciosa (purple), Halley (orange),
CAS2 (M) (blue), Mt Hermon (M) (black), Aragats (M) (grey) (b) Carnegie (red), Studenec
(black), Reading (blue), Panská Ves (purple), Xanthi (grey), Tripura (cyan), Swider (orange),
Evora (pink), Bristol Langford (green), Mitzpe Ramon (grey dashed), Nagycenk (blue dashed).
(M) indicates mountainous sites.

639

Figure 7. Boxplot of difference between non-disturbed diurnal average PG and Carnegie PG during 2016 (expressed as a percentage difference) for Reading, Bristol Langford, Mitzpe Ramon, Xanthi, Evora, Swider, Nagycenk, Studenec and Panská Ves, as a function of time of day. Only sites which are in similar latitudinal regions are included, and mountain sites are also excluded due to Austausch effects. The edges and line in the centre of each box show the upper and lower quartiles, and the median and whiskers extend to 1.5 times the interquartile range. Individual points represent outliers.

647

Figure 8. Boxplots of non-disturbed 10 minute mean PG values on weekdays (Monday to Friday) and weekends (Saturday and Sunday) using data from 2016. Measurements sites are (a) Reading, (b) Evora, (c) Tripura, (d) Xanthi. The upper and lower box boundaries and central horizontal show the upper and lower quartiles, and the median respectively. Notches around the median indicate the 95% confidence limits, with median and p-values shown on the plot. Outliers are not shown.

654

Figure 9. Median monthly variation in non-disturbed PG for weekday (grey) and weekend
(black) PG (calculated from 10 minute mean PG values). (a) Reading (using data from 2010 to
2018) and (b) Graciosa (using data from 2015 to September 2017).

658

Figure 10. Mean undisturbed diurnal variation in PG for Reading during (a) winter (December,
January, February – DJF) and (b) summer (June, July, August – JJA) in black. PG data is
averaged from 10 minute mean values and covers 2010-1018. Red shows the annual average
Carnegie variation in PG.

663

Figure 11. Diurnal variation in PG on individual days (a) 20<sup>th</sup> April 2016 and (b) 15<sup>th</sup> May 2016, averaged from the sites at Reading, Graciosa, Evora, CAS2, Nagycenk, Panská Ves (black, with a cubic smoothing spline applied, with smoothing parameter of 0.4). Only non-disturbed values of PG are included and values are first normalised individually with respect to the median for each site and then averaged together (using the median value). Averages are hourly averages taken from 1 minute PG data. The red line is the normalised Carnegie PG.

670

Figure 12. Mean diurnal variation in non-disturbed PG as a function of season at the most globally representative GloCAEM sites of Graciosa (data from 2015 to Sept 2017), Halley (data from 2015 to 2017) and CAS2 (Argentina) (data from 2016 to 2018). (a) December, January, February (DJF), (b) March, April May (MAM), (c) June, July, August (JJA) and (d) September, October, November (SON). The time of the PG maximum at each site is shown by the vertical dashed lines. Curves are computed from 10 minute mean values.

677

Figure 13. Time of the (a) maximum and (b) minimum in diurnal variation in non-disturbed PG as a function of season from various sites including the Carnegie, Vostok Antarctica; and the GloCAEM sites of Graciosa (data from 2015 to Sept 2017), Halley (data from 2015 to 2017) and CAS2 (Argentina) (data from 2016 to 2018). Carnegie data is obtained from Harrison (2013) and Vostok data from Burns et al (2005). Vostok has more data points than the other sites as seasonal PG averages are reported over 2 month periods (Burns et al, 2005), unlike the other sites where averages are calculated over 3 month periods. 685 References 686 687 Adlerman, E.J., Williams, E.R., 1996. Seasonal variation of the global electrical circuit. J. 688 Geophys. Res. 101 (D23), 29679-29688. 689 690 Bennett, A.J., Harrison, R.G., 2007. Atmospheric electricity in different weather conditions. 691 Weather, 62(10), 277-283. 692 693 Berliński, J., Pankanin, G., Kubicki, M, 2007. Large scale monitoring of troposphere electric 694 field. Proceedings of the 13-th ICAE, Beijing, China, 1, 124-126. 695 696 Bin, X., Hua, H., Xiao-Yan, Y. Ye-Guang, B., Qing-Hua, L., 2012, The study of meteorological 697 effects and time variations of the fair weather atmospheric electric field near ground in YBJ, 698 Tibet, Acta Phys. Sin, 61(17), 175203, doi:10.7498/aps.61.175203 699 700 701 Burns, G. B., Hesse, M. H., Parcell, S. K., Malachowski, S., & Cole, K. D., 1995, The geoelectric 702 field at Davis station, Antarctica. Journal of Atmospheric and Terrestrial Physics, 57(14), 1783-703 1797. 704 705 Burns, G. B., Frank-Kamenetsky, A. V., Troshichev, O. A., Bering, E.A., Reddell, B. D., 2005. 706 Interannual consistency of bi-monthly differences in diurnal variations of the ground-level, 707 vertical electric field. J.Geophys. Res., (D10) 110. 708 709 Burns, G. B., Tinsley, B. A., Frank-Kamenetsky, A. V., Troshichev, O. A., French, W. J. R., &

710 Klekociuk, A. R., 2012, Monthly diurnal global atmospheric circuit estimates derived from Vostok

- electric field measurements adjusted for local meteorological and solar wind influences. Journal
  of the Atmospheric Sciences, 69(6), 2061-2082.
- 713
- 714 Burns, G. B., Frank-Kamenetsky, A. V., Tinsley, B. A., French, W. J. R., Grigioni, P.,
- 715 Camporeale, G., & Bering, E. A., 2017, Atmospheric global circuit variations from Vostok and
- 716 Concordia electric field measurements. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 74(3), 783-800.
- 717
- 718 Chalmers, J.A., 1967. Atmospheric Electricity. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Pergamon press, Oxford, UK.
- 719
- Chilingarian, A., Chilingaryan, S., & Reymers, A., 2015. Atmospheric discharges and particle
  fluxes. J.Geophys. Res.Space Physics, 120 (7), 5845-5853.
- 722
- Chilingarian, A., 2018, Long lasting low energy thunderstorm ground enhancements and
  possible Rn-222 daughter isotopes contamination, Physical Review D, 98, 022007.
- 725
- 726 Chubb J., 2010. An introduction to electrostatic measurements. Nova Science Publishers, New727 York
- 728

De, S.S., Bandyopadhyay, B., Paul, S., Haldar, D.K., Bose, M., Kala, D., & Guha, G., 2013,
Atmospheric electric potential gradient at Kolkata during solar eclipse of 22 July 2009, Indian
Journal of Radio & Space Physics, 42, 251-258.

- 732
- Deshpande, C.G., Kamra, A.K., 2001. Diurnal variations of the atmospheric electric field and
  conductivity at Maitri, Antarctica. J.Geophys. Res. Atmospheres 106 (D13) 14207-14218.

- F., Molinaro, R., Popa, C. I., Molfese, C., Cozzolino, F., Marty, L., et al., 2016. The
  role of the atmospheric electric field in the dust lifting process. Geophysical Research Letters,
  43(10), 5501-5508.
- 739
- 740 Everett, J. D. (1868). XI. Results of observations of atmospheric electricity at Kew Observatory,
- and at King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, *158*, 347-361.
- 743
- Fews, A.P., Wilding,R.J., Keitch, P.A., Holden, N.K., Henshaw, D.L., 2002. Modification of
  atmospheric DC fields by space charge from high-voltage power lines. Atmospheric Research
  63, 271–289, doi:10.1016/S0169-8095(02)00041-8
- 747
- Gurmani, S.F., Ahmad, N., Tacza, J., Iqbal, T., 2018. First seasonal and annual variations of
  atmospheric electric field at a subtropical station in Islamabad, Pakistan. Journal of Atmospheric
  and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 179, 441-449. DOI: 10.1016/j.jastp.2018.09.011
- 751
- Harrison, R.G., Joshi, M., & Pascoe, K., 2011. Inferring convective responses to El Niño with
  atmospheric electricity measurements at Shetland. Environmental Research Letters, 6(4),
  044028.
- 755
- Harrison, R.G., 2013. The Carnegie curve. Surveys in Geophysics, 34(2), 209-232.
- 757
- Harrison, R.G., Nicoll, K.A., McWilliams, K.A., 2013. Space weather driven changes in lower
  atmosphere phenomena. Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 98, 22-30.
- 760

761	Harrison, R.G., Nicoll, K.A., 2018. Fair weather criteria for atmospheric electricity
762	measurements, Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, in press.
763	
764	Israël, H. 1957. Atmospheric electric and meteorological investigations in high mountain ranges.
765	Alpen-Programm 1954-57, Final Report to Contract No. AF 61, 514-640.
766	
767	Israël, H. 1970. Atmospheric Electricity. (2 volumes), Israel Program for Scientific Translations,
768	Jerusalem.
769	
770	Israelsson, S., Tammet, H., 2001. Variation of fair weather atmospheric electricity at Marsta
771	Observatory, Sweden, 1993–1998. Journal of atmospheric and solar-terrestrial physics, 63(16),
772	1693-1703.
773	
774	Kamogawa, M., Suzuki, Y., Sakai, R., Fujiwara, H., Torii, T., Kakinami, Y., et al., 2015. Diurnal
775	variation of atmospheric electric field at the summit of Mount Fuji, Japan, distinctly different from
776	the Carnegie curve in the summertime. Geophysical Research Letters, 42(8), 3019-3023.
777	
778	Kamra, A. K., Deshpande, C. G., & Gopalakrishnan, V., 1994. Challenge to the assumption of
779	the unitary diurnal variation of the atmospheric electric field based on observations in the Indian
780	Ocean, Bay of Bengal, and Arabian Sea. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 99
781	(D10), 21043-21050.
782	
783	Kastelis, N., Kourtidis, K., 2016. Characteristics of the atmospheric electric field and correlation
784	with CO2 at a rural site in southern Balkans. Earth, Planets and Space, 68(1), 3.
785	

Katz, S., Yair, Y., Price, C., Yaniv, R., Silber, I., Lynn, B., & Ziv, B., 2018. Electrical properties of
the 8–12th September, 2015 massive dust outbreak over the Levant. Atmospheric Research,
201, 218-225.

789

Kelvin, Lord., 1860. Atmospheric Electricity, Royal Institution Lecture, Papers on Electrostaticsand Magnetism, 208-226

792

Krider, E. P., 1989. Electric field changes and cloud electrical structure. Journal of Geophysical
Research: Atmospheres, 94(D11), 13145-13149.

795

Latha, K. M., Highwood, E. J., 2006. Studies on particulate matter (PM10) and its precursors
over urban environment of Reading, UK. Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative
Transfer, 101(2), 367-379.

799

Logan, T., Xi, B., Dong, X., 2014. Aerosol properties and their influences on marine boundary layer cloud condensation nuclei at the ARM mobile facility over the Azores. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 119(8), 4859-4872.

803

Lopes, F., Silva, H.G., Bárias, S., Barbosa, S.M., 2015. Preliminary results on soil-emitted gamma radiation and its relation with the local atmospheric electric field at Amieira (Portugal), Journal of Physics: Conference Series 646, 012015, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/646/1/012015

807

Lopes, F.M., Silva, H.G., Bennett, A.J., & Reis, A. H. (2017). Global Electric Circuit research at
Graciosa Island (ENA-ARM facility): First year of measurements and ENSO influences. Journal
of Electrostatics, 87, 203-211.

811

812	Lucas, G.M., Th	ayer, J.P., Do	eierling, W.,	2017. S	statistical	analysis	of spatial	and tempor	al
813	variations in atm	nospheric ele	ectric fields	from a	regional	array of	field mills	s. Journal	of
814	Geophysical Res	earch: Atmosp	pheres, 122(2	?), 1158- <sup>-</sup>	1174.				

- 815
- MacGorman D.R., Rust W.D., 1998. The electrical nature of storms. Oxford University Press,New York
- 818
- Märcz, F., 1997, Short-term changes in atmospheric electricity associated with Forbush
  decreases, Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics , 59 (9), 975-982
- 821

Märcz, F., Horváth, J., Bencze, P., Sátori, G., Bór, J., 2001. Simultaneous measurements of the
atmospheric electric potential gradient at nagycenk observatory by means of two individual
equipments, Acta Geodaetica et Geophysica Hungarica, 36 (3), 269-278

- 825
- Marshall, T. C., Rust, W. D., Stolzenburg, M., Roeder, W. P., & Krehbiel, P. R., 1999, A study
  of enhanced fair-weather electric fields occurring soon after sunrise. Journal of Geophysical
  Research: Atmospheres, 104(D20), 24455-24469.
- 829
- Mateev, L.N., Vellinov P.I., 1992, Cosmic ray variations effects on the parameters of the global
  atmospheric electrical circuit, Advances in Space Research, 12 (10), 353-356.
- 832
- Matthews, J.C., Ward, J.P., Keitch, P.A., Henshaw, D.L., 2010. Corona ion induced atmospheric
  potential gradient perturbations near high voltage power lines, Atmospheric Environment, 44
  (39), 5093-5100, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.09.007

- Mauchly S.J., 1921, Note on the diurnal variation of the atmospheric electric potential gradient.
  Phys Rev, 18:161–162
- 839
- 840 Mauchly S.J., 1923, On the diurnal variation of the potential gradient of atmospheric electricity.
- 841 Terr Magn, 28:61–81
- Minamoto, Y., Kadokura A., 2011, Extracting fair-weather data from atmospheric electric-field observations at Syowa Station, Antarctica, Polar Science, 5, (3), 313-318.
- 844
- Michnowski, S. , 1998, Solar wind influences on atmospheric electricity variables in polar
  regions. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *103*(D12), 13939-13948.
- 847
- Nicoll, K.A., Measurements of atmospheric electricity aloft, 2012. Surveys in Geophysics, 33, 5,
  991-1057
- 850
- Nicoll, K.A., Harrison, R.G., 2016. Stratiform cloud electrification: comparison of theory with
  multiple in-cloud measurements Q. J. R. Meteor. Soc. 142, 700, 2679-2691. DOI:
  10.1002/qj.2858

- Nicoll, K.A., Harrison, R.G., 2014. Detection of lower tropospheric responses to solar energetic
  particles at mid-latitudes, Physical Review Letters, 112, 225001.
- 857
- Price, C., 1993. Global surface temperatures and the atmospheric electrical circuit. Geophysical
  Research Letters, 20(13), 1363-1366.

- 861 Raulin, J. P., Tacza, J., Macotela, E., Fernandez, G., 2014. A new South America electric field
- 862 monitor network. Sun Geosphere, 9(1-2), 111-114.

- Reddell, B. D., Benbrook, J. R., Bering, E. A., Cleary, E. N., Few, A. A., 2004. Seasonal
  variations of atmospheric electricity measured at Amundsen Scott South Pole Station. Journal
  of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 109 (A9).
- 867
- Rycroft,M.J., Israelsson,S., Price, C., 2000. The global atmospheric electric circuit, solar activity
  and climate change, Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 62, 1563-1576.

870

- Sheftel, V. M., Chernyshev, A. K., Chernysheva, S. P., 1994. Air conductivity and atmospheric
  electric field as an indicator of anthropogenic atmospheric pollution. Journal of Geophysical
  Research: Atmospheres, 99(D5), 10793-10795.
- 874
- 875 Popov I.B., Shvarts Ya.M., Sokolenko L., 2008. Atmospheric electricity measurements on a 876 ground meteorological network of Federal Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring 877 Service (Roshydromet). TECO-2008 - WMO Technical Conference on Meteorological and 878 Environmental Instruments and Methods of Observation, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation, 879 27-29 November 2008. accessible at 880 https://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/www/IMOP/publications/IOM-96 TECO-881 2008/P1(50) Shvarts Russian Federation.pdf.
- 882

Silva, H.G., Conceição, R., Melgão, M., Nicoll, K., Mendes, P. B., Tlemçani, M., et al., 2014.
Atmospheric electric field measurements in urban environment and the pollutant aerosol weekly
dependence. Environmental Research Letters, 9(11), 114025.

Silva, H, Conceição, R, Khan, A, Matthews, J, Wright, M, Collares-Pereira, M & Shallcross, D,
2016. Atmospheric electricity as a proxy for air quality: Relationship between potential gradient
and pollutant gases in an urban environment. Journal of Electrostatics, 84., 32-41.

890

- Smirnov, S., 2014. Reaction of electric and meteorological states of the near-ground
  atmosphere during a geomagnetic storm on 5 April 2010. Earth, Planets and Space, 66(1), 154.
- Tacza, J., Raulin, J. P., Macotela, E., Norabuena, E., Fernandez, G., Correia, E., et al., 2014. A
  new South American network to study the atmospheric electric field and its variations related to
  geophysical phenomena. Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 120, 70-79.

897

Takeda, M., Yamauchi, M., Makino, M., & Owada T., 2011. Initial effect of the Fukushima
accident on atmospheric electricity. Geophysical Research Letters 38, L15811,
doi:10.1029/2011GL048511.

901

902 Tammet, H., 2009. A joint dataset of fair-weather atmospheric electricity. Atmospheric
903 Research, 91(2), 194-200.

904

Tinsley, B. A., Burns, G. B., & Zhou, L., 2007. The role of the global electric circuit in solar and
internal forcing of clouds and climate. Advances in Space Research, 40(7), 1126-1139.

907

Vergeiner, I., 1972. Comments on: On fine structure and control of vertical aerosol exchange
between 700 m and 3000 m by R. Reiter, R. Sládkovič, and W. Carnuth. Archiv für
Meteorologie, Geophysik und Bioklimatologie, Serie A, 21(1), 123-126.

911

912	Weimer, D. R., 1996. A flexible, IMF dependent model of high-latitude electric potentials having
913	"space weather" applications. Geophysical Research Letters, 23(18), 2549-2552.
914	
915	Whipple F.J.W., 1929. On the association of the diurnal variation of the electric potential
916	gradient in fine weather with the distribution of thunderstorms over the globe. Q. J. R. Meteorol.
917	Soc. 55, 351–361
918	
919	Williams, E.R., 1992. The Schumann resonance: A global tropical thermometer. Science,
920	256(5060), 1184-1187.
921	
922	Williams, E. R., 1994, Global circuit response to seasonal variations in global surface air
923	temperature. Monthly Weather Review, 122(8), 1917-1929.
924	
925	Williams, E.R., 2005. Lightning and climate: A review. Atmospheric Research, 76(1-4), 272-287.
926	
927	Williams, E R, 2009. The global electrical circuit: A review, Atmospheric Research, 91(2-4),
928	140–152, doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2008.05.018.
929	
930	Williams, E., Markson, R., Heckman, S., 2005, Shielding effects of trees on the measurement of
931	the Earth's electric field: implications for secular variations of the global electrical circuit.
932	Geophys. Res. Lett. 32, L19810.
933	
934	Wilson, C.T.R., 1921. Investigations on lightning discharges and on the electric field of
935	thunderstorms, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London, Ser. A, 221, 73-115,
936	doi:10.1098/rsta.1921.0003.

938	Yair, Y., Katz, S., Yaniv, R., Ziv, B., Price, C., 2016. An electrified dust storm over the Negev
939	desert, Israel. Atmospheric Research, 181, 63-71.
940	
941	Yaniv, R., Yair Y., Price, C., Katz, S., 2016. Local and global impacts on the fair weather
942	electric field in Israel. Atmospheric Research, 172-173, 119-125.
943	
944	Yaniv, R., Yair, Y., Price, C., Mkrtchyan, H., Lynn, B., Reymers, A., 2017. Ground-based
945	measurements of the vertical E-field in mountainous regions and the "Austausch" effect.
946	Atmospheric Research, 189, 127-133.
947	
948	
949	



Graciosa, AzoresWise Observatory, IsraelNagycenk, Hungary950<br/>951<br/>952Figure 1. Example of some of the different types of electric field mill sensors used in the953GloCAEM network. (a) JCI 131F field mill (Chilworth UK) at Graciosa, Azores; (b) CS110 field954mill (Campbell Scientific) at the Wise Observatory, Mitzpe Ramon, Israel; (c) EFM 100 field mill955(Boltek) at Nagycenk, Hungary.956<br/>957<br/>958<br/>959959



961962 Figure 2. Map of measurement locations within the GloCAEM dataset.

Institute	Site	Site abbreviation	Country	Site type	PG instrument	Coordinates and altitude a.s.l
University of Reading	University of Reading	RDG	UK	Urban, grassy	JCI 131 Chilworth	51.44°N, 0.94°W 66 m
University of Reading	Halley research station	HAL	Antarctica	Ice shelf	JCI 131 Chilworth	75.58°S, 26.66°W 30 m
University of Bristol	At-Bristol Science Centre	BRISCI	UK	Urban ( on 15m rooftop)	JCI 131F Chilworth	51.45°N, 2.60°W 45 m
University of Bristol	Langford School of Veterinary Sciences	BRILANG	UK	Rural, grassy	JCI 131F Chilworth	51.35°N, 2.78°W 23 m
Interdisciplinary Centre (IDC) Herzliya	Mount Hermon cosmic ray station	HER	Israel	Mountainous	Campbell CS110	33.30°N, 35.78°E 2050 m
Interdisciplinary Centre (IDC) Herzliya	Wise Astronomical Observatory, Mitzpe Ramon	RAM	Israel	Rural, desert	Campbell CS110	30.58°N, 34.75°E 875 m
Demokritus University of Thrace	Duth, Xanthi	XAN	Greece	Rural, grassy	Campbell CS110	41.15°N, 24.92°E 75 m
University of Evora	University of Evora	EVO	Portugal	Urban, grassy	JCI 141F Chilworth	38.57° N, 7.90° W 270 m
University of Evora	Graciosa, Azores	GRA	Portugal	Island, rural, grassy	JCI 131F Chilworth	39.09°N, 28.03°W 31 m
Yerevan Physics Institue	Aragats Space Environmental Center	ARA	Armenia	Mountainous (on 10 m rooftop)	Boltek EFM100	40.47°N, 44.18°E 3200 m
Polish Academy of Sciences	Swider Geophysical Observatory	SWI	Poland	Rural, grassy	Berlinski et al., ICAE, 2007	52.12°N, 21.24°E 96 m
Hungarian Academy of Sciences	MTA CSFK GGI Szechenyi Istvan Geophysical Observatory, Nagycenk	NCK	Hungary	Rural, grassy	Boltek EFM100	47.63°N, 16.72°E 153 m
Tripura University	Tripura University	TRI	India	Rural, grassy (on 14 m rooftop)	Boltek EFM100	23.76°N, 91.26°E 43 m
Academy of Sciences of Czech Republic	Studenec,	STU	Czech Republic	Rural, grassy	Boltek EFM100	50.26°N, 12.52°E 712 m
Academy of Sciences of Czech Republic	Panska Ves	PAN	Czech Republic	Rural, grassy	Boltek EFM100	50.53°N, 14.57°E 315 m
Complejo Astronómico El Leoncito	Complejo Astronómico El Leoncito, San Juan	CAS2	Argentina	Mountainous	Boltek EFM100	31.8°S, 69.29°W 2483 m
Paraíba State University	Paraíba State University, Paraíba	CGR	Brazil	Scrubland (on 15 m rooftop)	Boltek EFM100	7.21°S, 35.92°W 550 m

963 964 Table 1. Details of the GloCAEM measurement sites and electric field mill instrumentation

965 deployed.





Figure 3. Time series of PG values during 2016 at (a) Graciosa, Azores, (b) Panská Ves, Czech

968 Republic. Data are 10 minute mean values and the y axis has been restricted to +/- 2000 V/m

969 on both plots.









Figure 5. Strip chart of percentage of non-disturbed PG values for each month for GloCAEM
sites with more than 10 months of data in 2016 (using 10 minute mean values of PG). Black
shows percentage of non-disturbed PG, grey disturbed PG, and red denotes no data available
during that time period. Percentages are given with respect to total data available for that
month at a specific site. Site abbreviation codes are given in Table 1.







Site	Site abbreviation	All PG median (V/m)	All PG standard deviation (V/m)	Non-disturbed PG median (V/m)	Type of PG diurnal cycle	Number complete months of data
University of Reading	RDG	85	85	80	Double	12
Halley research station	HAL	69	272	65	Single	10
At-Bristol Science Centre	BRISCI	216	521	205	Insufficient data	7
Langford School of Veterinary Sciences	BRILANG	20	81	21	Double	8
Mount Hermon cosmic ray station	HER	245	558	233	Single (Mountain)	7
Wise Astronomical Observatory, Mitzpe Ramon	RAM	186	222	179	Double	8
Duth, Xanthi	XAN	68	520	63	Double	10
University of Evora	EVO	67	1203	64	Double	11
Graciosa	GRA	81	249	75	Single	12
Aragats Space Environmental Center	ARA	111	1367	115	Single (Mountain)	12
Swider Geophysical Observatory	SWI	273	431	259	Double	11
MTA CSFK GGI Szechenyi Istvan Geophysical Observatory, Nagycenk	NCK	167	652	154	Double	9
Tripura University	TRI	30	101	29	Double	9
Studenec	STU	48	96	44	Double	12
Panska Ves	PAN	49	311	53	Double	11
CAS2	CAS2	431	1359	404	Single (Mountain)	11
CGR	CGR	195	336	184	Single	12 (for 2017)

1001 1002 Table 2. Details of PG properties for the 17 GloCAEM sites for 2016 (except CGR which only has PG values for 2017). Values are calculated from 10 minute averages and FW PG is 1003 1004 selected on the basis of between 0 V/m and 80% of the total PG distribution.





Figure 7. Boxplot of difference between non-disturbed diurnal average PG and Carnegie PG during 2016 (expressed as a percentage difference) for Reading, Bristol Langford, Mitzpe Ramon, Xanthi, Evora, Swider, Nagycenk, Studenec and Panska Ves, as a function of time of day. Only sites which are in similar latitudinal regions are included, and mountain sites are also excluded due to Austausch effects. The edges and line in the centre of each box show the upper and lower quartiles, and the median and whiskers extend to 1.5 times the interquartile range. Individual points represent outliers.





Figure 8. Boxplots of non-disturbed 10 minute mean PG values on weekdays (Monday to Friday) and weekends (Saturday and Sunday) using data from 2016. Measurements sites are (a) Reading, (b) Evora, (c) Tripura, (d) Xanthi. The upper and lower box boundaries and central horizontal show the upper and lower quartiles, and the median respectively. Notches around the median indicate the 95% confidence limits, with median and p-values shown on the plot. Outliers are not shown.

1025



Figure 9. Median monthly variation in non-disturbed PG for weekday (grey) and weekend (black) PG (calculated from 10 minute mean PG values). (a) Reading (using data from 2010 to 2018) and (b) Graciosa (using data from 2015 to September 2017).





Figure 10. Mean undisturbed diurnal variation in PG for Reading during (a) winter (December,
January, February – DJF) and (b) summer (June, July, August – JJA) in black. PG data is
averaged from 10 minute mean values and covers 2010-1018. Red shows the annual average
Carnegie variation in PG.



Hour (UT) Hour (UT) Figure 11. Diurnal variation in PG on individual days (a) 20<sup>th</sup> April 2016 and (b) 15<sup>th</sup> May 2016, averaged from the sites at Reading, Graciosa, Evora, CAS2, Nagycenk, Panská Ves (black, with a cubic smoothing spline applied, with smoothing parameter of 0.4). Only non-disturbed values of PG are included and values are first normalised individually with respect to the median for each site and then averaged together (using the median value). Averages are hourly averages taken from 1 minute PG data. The red line is the normalised Carnegie PG.

1064

1065



Figure 12. Mean diurnal variation in non-disturbed PG as a function of season at the most
globally representative GloCAEM sites of Graciosa (data from 2015 to Sept 2017), Halley (data
from 2015 to 2017) and CAS2 (Argentina) (data from 2016 to 2018). (a) December, January,
February (DJF), (b) March, April May (MAM), (c) June, July, August (JJA) and (d) September,
October, November (SON). The time of the PG maximum at each site is shown by the vertical
dashed lines. Curves are computed from 10 minute mean values.



Figure 13. Time of the (a) maximum and (b) minimum in diurnal variation in non-disturbed PG as a function of season from various sites including the Carnegie, Vostok Antarctica; and the GloCAEM sites of Graciosa (data from 2015 to Sept 2017), Halley (data from 2015 to 2017) and CAS2 (Argentina) (data from 2016 to 2018). Carnegie data is obtained from Harrison (2013) and Vostok data from Burns et al (2005). Vostok has more data points than the other sites as seasonal PG averages are reported over 2 month periods (Burns et al, 2005), unlike the other sites where averages are calculated over 3 month periods.

Scientific Phenomenon	Best site for analysis
Global electric circuit	Graciosa, Halley, CAS2
El Nino (ENSO)	Graciosa
Thunderstorm electrification	Aragats
Stratiform cloud electrification	Reading, Swider
Aerosol and pollution	Reading, Tripura, Xanthi
Dust electrification	Mitzpe Ramon
Snow electrification	Halley, Mt Hermon, Aragats
Earthquakes	Evora, Xanthi
Austausch/boundary layer transition	Mt Hermon, Aragats

- 1102 Table 3. Recommendations of GloCAEM sites most suited to the study of a variety of scientific
- 1103 phenomena in atmospheric electricity research.