GOCE – Validation of last days' orbits with kinematic PPP

H. Bock, A. Jäggi, U. Meyer

Astronomical Institute, University of Bern, Switzerland

G1.3

EGU General Assembly 2014

27 April –2 May 2014

Vienna, Austria

Background and Motivation

- The first ESA Earth Explorer core mission GOCE ended officially on 21 October 2013, because the satellite ran out of fuel.

- Three weeks later, on 11 November 2013, the satellite re-entered the Earth's atmosphere near the Falkland Islands in the South Atlantic.

- GPS-based orbit determination was possible until few hours before re-entry.

Copyright: Bill Chater

Astronomical Institute University of Bern **AIUB**

Background and Motivation

GOCE orbit height derived from GPS

- Last available GPS measurements: **10 November, 17:15:20 UTC**

Astronomical Institute University of Bern   **AIUB**

Background and Motivation

- In the frame of the European GOCE Gravity Consortium (EGG-C) AIUB was responsible for the generation of the GOCE Precise Science Orbit (PSO) product.

- The PSO product consists of a reduced-dynamic and a kinematic orbit (comparable to a kinematic PPP of a ground station).

- Internal validation: Orbit overlap analysis and differences between reduced-dynamic and kinematic orbits for consistency checks.

- External validation: Satellite Laser Ranging (SLR) measurements.

- Reduced-dynamic orbits were generated with the same orbit parameterization for the entire mission.

Two main questions for this study:

- Can the kinematic orbits/PPP be used for validation, because SLR measurements are no longer available (only three passes)?

- Is the orbit parameterization of the reduced-dynamic orbit still reasonable for the last three weeks of GOCE?

Astronomical Institute University of Bern   **AIUB**

# Differences red.–dyn. ⇔ kinematic orbits

radial

Differences between reduced-dynamic and kinematic orbit

- show consistency between the two orbit types and

- reveal data problems and gaps in the kinematic orbit

out-of-plane

Hours

29 December 2009

Astronomical Institute University of Bern **AIUB**

# Differences red.–dyn. ⇔ kinematic orbits

- End of 2012 the data quality is worse than end of 2009

- Kinematic orbit shows more "outliers" and systematic effects

- It should, however, be possible to validate the reduced-dynamic orbit modeling

**28 December 2012** and **29 December 2009**

Astronomical Institute University of Bern

AIUB

GOCE internal orbit validation

RMS of differences between red.-dyn. and kinematic orbits for official mission

Bock et al. (2014)

- Larger RMS values for the last three weeks probably reveal that the parameterization of the reduced-dynamic orbit is not ideal at all

Differences red.–dyn. ⇔ kinematic orbits

radial

along-track

- Large once-per-revolution signal in radial and along-track component shows that the orbit parameterization is not ideal for the reduced-dynamic orbit

Original solution; 31 October 2013

Astronomical Institute University of Bern **AIUB**

Reduced-dynamic orbit determination

- 30 h processing batches (not for the last 10 days), 10 s sampling, undifferenced processing, ionosphere-free linear combination, CODE Final GNSS orbits and clocks (5 s) and Earth Rotation Parameters

- Orbit models and parameterization:
  - EIGEN5S 120x120, FES2004 50x50 (fixed by GOCE Standards)
  - Six initial orbital elements
  - Three constant accelerations in radial, along-track, out-of-plane
  - 6-min piece-wise constant accelerations in radial, along-track, out-of-plane ($2*10^{-8}$ m/s^2)

- Test solutions with weaker constraints:
  - 2.5 x $2*10^{-8}$ m/s^2
  - 5 x
  - 10 x
  - 25 x
  - 50 x

Astronomical Institute University of Bern

AIUB

Solutions with weaker constraints

3D RMS of differences between red.-dyn. and kinematic orbits


- Test solutions with weaker constraints show better consistency with kinematic orbits.

- Differences between 5x and 50x weaker constraints are marginal.

- Except the very last days, these solutions are acceptable.

Astronomical Institute University of Bern

AIUB

Differences red.–dyn. ⇔ kinematic orbits

- Large once-per-revolution signal is very much reduced

Original solution and 10x weaker constraints; 31 October 2013

Astronomical Institute University of Bern

**AIUB**

Differences red.–dyn. ⇔ kinematic orbits

- Orbit modeling and data screening for the very last hours need further investigations

- The GPS data quality at this stage of the mission (150 – 130 km altitude) is still surprisingly good!!!

10x weaker constraints; 10 November 2013

Astronomical Institute University of Bern **AIUB**

Improved background modeling

- In order to improve the background models the gravity field model EIGEN5S 120x120 is replaced by GOCO03S 200x200 for the first 11 days of the decay phase.

- Test solutions with original and weaker constraints are repeated.

- No or only small improvements with respect to the old solutions can be noticed with the better gravity field model.

Astronomical Institute University of Bern

AIUB

Summary

- Can the kinematic orbits be used for validation? => Yes, except that the very last hours/days are difficult because of data screening problems leading to larger data gaps.

- Is the orbit parameterization of the reduced-dynamic orbit still reasonable for the last three weeks of GOCE? => No, the constraints are too tight; 10x weaker constraints are reasonable.

- First updates in the background modeling of the reduced-dynamic orbit determination did not improve the results of the reduced-dynamic orbits.

Further work:

- Detailed check of background modeling and sampling of piece-wise constant accelerations.

- Improve data screening procedure for the very last days/hours.

- Comparison with and possibly use of accelerometer data in the reduced-dynamic orbit determination (as long as they are available).

Astronomical Institute University of Bern *AIUB*