

# GOCE gravity gradients for a new Austrian Geoid solution -

A status report



Daniel Rieser, Christian Pock, Torsten Mayer-Guerr Institute of Theoretical Geodesy and Satellite Geodesy TU Graz

5<sup>th</sup> GOCE User Workshop 2014

Paris, 27.11.2014



#### Content

- Introduction / Motivation
- Methods
  - Remove-Compute-Restore
- Data
  - Terrestrial data
  - GOCE gravity gradients
- Results and validation with GPS/Leveling
- Summary and conclusion





#### Introduction

#### State-of-the-art Austrian Geoid solution

- Based on Least Squares Collocation (LSC)
  - 14000 gravity stations
  - 670 deflections
  - 170 precise GPS/Leveling stations
  - EIGEN-GL04S to D/O 70
- Shortcomings
  - Inconsistencies between gravimetric
     Geoid and GPS/Leveling
  - Official solution forced to match GPS/Leveling stations







#### Introduction

Current research project GARFIELD

(Geoid for Austria – Regional gravity FIELD improved)



- Aims:
  - Optimum combination of global and terrestrial data
  - Use of more (all) available input data
  - Consistent Remove/Restore concept
  - Avoid a correction surface
  - Revised GPS/Leveling points for validation only



#### Introduction

- Two strategies
  - Gauß-Markov model parametrized with Radial Basis Functions (RBF)
  - Least Squares Collocation (LSC)

Prediction  

$$s = C_{sl} \left( C_{ll} + C_{nn} \right)^{-1} l$$

• Aim of this study:



Can GOCE gravity gradients support the gravimetric solution?



#### **Methods**

#### *Remove-Compute-Restore*

Long-wavelength effects  $\rightarrow$  GOCO03s  $\rightarrow$  to which degree/order? ullet





# Methods

#### Remove-Compute-Restore

- Short-wavelength effects → topographic reduction
  - Prism formula
  - Input DTM 173x195 [m]
- Double consideration topographic reduction / GOCO03s
  - SHC analysis of topographic effect
  - Add back to D/O 120
- Use GOCO03s instead of normal gravity
  - GOCO03s geoid is reference surface





### Methods

#### Remove-Compute-Restore

- Isostatic compensation
  - Airy-Heiskanen model based on DTM with density contrast  $\Delta \rho = 350 \text{ kg/m}^3$ , T = 30 km
  - D/O 121 to 720 subtracted







Data - terrestrial

#### Reduced terrestrial data

• 22841 gravity stations (subset of available data)



$\Delta \mathbf{g}_{red}$	[mGal]
min	-60.2
max	45.0
rms	16.5



#### GOCE gravity gradients

- Level 2 products
  - EGG\_NOM\_2 gradients (in GRF)
  - SST\_PSO\_orbits
  - Quaternions
- Preprocessing due to
  - − Errors in  $V_{xy}$  and  $V_{yz}$ → only use main diagonal in GRF
  - Colored noise on measurements

$$\nabla V = \begin{pmatrix} V_{xx} & V_{xy} & V_{xz} \\ V_{xy} & V_{yy} & V_{yz} \\ V_{xz} & V_{yz} & V_{zz} \end{pmatrix}$$



















12



#### Reduced GOCE gravity gradients

- Topographic / isostatic effect from d/o 121 to 360 subtracted lacksquare
- 2804 (x 3) stations (2 months, 5s sampling)



Vzz <sub>red</sub>	[mE]
min	-28.9
max	31.5
rms	7.4



#### Data - covariance function

#### Covariance function (CF) modeling

• Adapted Tscherning-Rapp Model Covariance Function (MCF)

$$C = \sum_{n=2}^{N_{EGM}} \left(\frac{R_b^2}{rr'}\right)^{n+1} \epsilon_n P_n(\cos\psi) + \sum_{n=N_{EGM}+1}^{N_{max}} \left(\frac{R_b^2}{rr'}\right)^{n+1} k_n P_n(\cos\psi)$$
  
GOC003s error degree variances  

$$\epsilon_n = \sum_m \left(\sigma_{c_{nm}}^2 + \sigma_{s_{nm}}^2\right)$$
  
Fitted degree variances  

$$k_n = \frac{A}{(n-1)(n-2)(n+B)}$$

 Fit A, R<sub>b</sub> and B to Empirical Covariance Function (ECF) of reduced gravity data



#### Data - covariance function

#### Covariance function (CF) modeling

• Adapted Tscherning-Rapp Model Covariance Function (MCF)



Paris, 27.11.2014



[cm]

 $\sigma_{N}$ 

#### **Results and validation**

#### Solution with terrestrial data only

• 22841 gravity stations ( $\sigma = 1 \text{ mGal}$ )





#### Solution with terrestrial and GOCE gradient data combined





### 192 precise GPS/Leveling stations from BEV

Accuracy 2-3 cm (?)

Rieser et al.

Absolute Geoid heights





#### Validation with GPS/Leveling - terrestrial data only



Geoid height differences



#### Solution with terrestrial and GOCE gradient data combined



Geoid height differences



# terrestrial only

N	[cm]
min	-18.0
max	10.7
rms	6.5

# combined

Ν	[cm]
min	-13.6
max	9.5
rms	5.1





#### Summary and conclusions

- Incorporating GOCE gradients can improve gravimetric solution
  - proper preprocessing steps necessary
  - covariance function should cover all data types

- Compared to a RBF solution, LSC has high computational costs
  - dimension of  $C_{ll}$  number observations
  - currently, LSC resolution is limited to  $N_{max}$ =2160
- There are still rather high deviations from GPS/Leveling stations
  - strongly correlated with topography



# Outlook / further work

- Achieve better consistency in topographic/isostatic reduction between gradients and terrestrial data
- Improve topographic reduction with density information
- Improve terrestrial data weighting
- Include more data





# Thank you for your attention!

#### Daniel Rieser, Christian Pock, Torsten Mayer-Gürr



Institute of Theoretical Geodesy and Satellite Geodesy TU Graz



This work was accomplished in the frame of the project GARFIELD (Geoid for Austria – Regional gravity FIELD improved) funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P 25222-N29



Der Wissenschaftsfonds.