



ITRF2014P EVALUATION REVIEW:

■ ITRS Presentation on ITRF2014P (ZA)

- Periodic signals and PSD have been filtered-out during the development of the new ITRF, before recovering the site positions and velocities. PSD is a mathematical model, using two types of functions. **The parametric function was computed using GPS data and then applied to all other techniques.** Arequipa for SLR doesn't fit perfectly in the Up component. Some examples of PSD application are shown. The WRMS of the fit residuals between SLR and ITRF2014P are 0.7, 0.7, and 0.4 cm in ENU. There is still disagreement between the SLR and VLBI scales. For T_Y and the scale, the discontinuity in 2010 is negligible and the full time series will be considered. A dedicate IERS technical note will be issued with the comparison with DGFI's and JPL's combinations with the same input from the four techniques. The technique center contributions will be included in the Technical Note. In any case, the ITRF from IGN once finalized, will be the official ITRF2014. The JPL and DGFI combinations should be ready soon, Altamimi will contact them again.

■ ASI – AC/CC

- The new ITRF2014P has been evaluated in terms of formal correctness, discontinuities and comparison with the ILRS-A time series. The SINEX file with ITRF2014P and the discontinuity file are formally correct and usable; the Post Seismic Deformation model source code and input file are easy to use and integrated into the processing chain. There are some discontinuities needing further investigation for a set of stations that were presented and discussed.
The ILRS-A time series has been compared with ITRF2014P: the 3D WRMS of the coordinate residuals is close to 5 mm and similar to the value obtained using SLRF2008. The Helmert parameters time series computed roto-translating ILRS-A to ITRF2014P is very close to the one using ITRF2008(SLRF2008). The discontinuity in 2010 for T_Y and the scale is a bit smaller.
The ASI time series using ITRF2014P, analyzing the data from 2009 to 2014 is ready and will be used in the test combination. At the moment being, only ASI, DGFI and ESA submitted the time series obtained with ITRF2014P as a priori, PSD model included.

■ JCET – AC/CC

There was no presentation from JCET on ITRF2014P as the PSD model was not completely implemented yet in the processing chain. The linear model of ITRF2014P was successfully used to generate new station time series, awaiting the application of the additional PSD corrections for the few sites that require them in order to proceed with the generation of the 2009-2014 time series for the evaluation process.

The JCET SP3C orbital product chain was re-energized and started submitting weekly products to the PP subdirectory at the DCs. A comparison of one week's product file to those submitted by the other ACs shows agreement comparable to that between the rest of the ACs.

■ AC Reports

- BKG: the PSD model is not implemented and it will take time.
- DGFI: processing of LAGEOS arcs with fixed ITRF2014P coordinates. Orbit fit for 40 weeks similar to SLRF2008 but slightly worse with ITRF2014, possibly a problem with the rotation from UEN to XYZ of the PSD model in the southern hemisphere sites.
- ESA: activity on ITRF2014P evaluation and implementation of the PSD model. Data from 1993 to 2015 have been reprocessed with and without the application of the PSD model: 2 stations (7403 and 7405) show worse residuals when using the PSD model. Some improvements adding station weights, handling of data issues based on input SINEX. Need to add some missing stations in the internal database. S/W modification needed for the Mean Pole handling in an automatic way. ESA is increasing its effort in SLR data analysis.
- GFZ: the ITRF2014 contribution has been reprocessed with ITRF2014P instead of SLRF2008, but without application of the PSD model. The implementation of the PSD model is not going to happen before Christmas.
- GRGS: analysis of the impact of the PSD model on the orbits.
- NSGF: test for ITRF2014P. The 2009-2014 time series has been computed, no problem found except for 7810. The problem will be fixed soon and the series re-delivered. The gravity field estimation is now implemented in SATAN. Translations between using ILRS R_B and all R_B are shown.

Orbital Product Finalization and Release (PP):

ASI CC reports on test combinations and comparisons. The S/W for the orbit combination is completed and tested using the available solutions. All the Analysis Centers are now regularly submitting the solutions except GRGS. The SP3C evaluation for LAGEOS and Etalon has been made on the orbits from 20 June to 29 September 2015. The differences in terms of radial, cross and along track of the ACs with respect to the combined orbit show expected values: the mean differences are at millimeter level with a few exceptions, the scatter in the radial component is around 5-6 mm while the scatter in cross and along track is higher, a couple of centimetres.

The routine delivery of the combined orbits is expected in January 2016.

Revision of analysis procedures and modeling standards:

- We need to plan how we will migrate the current operational series to a design like the one used during our ITRF2014 reprocessing effort. The weekly gravity input will be ready by the beginning of next year and distributed by Pavlis (AI). We (JCET) are in the process of developing a mechanism that would provide the ACs with gravitational coefficients for the lowest degrees as a substitute to the series provided by CSR for the reanalysis (since we will need these on an operational basis and CSR makes them available with a ~1-month latency). Once we include the estimation of low degree harmonics in our operational products, this will be a trivial step.
Pavlis will send the page where the mean pole is published (AI). It is updated yearly (early-on in each year) and has the forecast values for the coming year. The switch will be done together with the use of ITRF2014, probably at the beginning of 2016.
- Develop quick response for improved new station positions needed by QC ACs (AI 14)
DGFI will deliver these coordinates to the QC centers (computed by some of the ACs within the AWG) within a couple of weeks from the initial submission of data, and refine the coordinates after 2-3 months of accumulated data: The final coordinates will be delivered for the routine product. We requested from the GB to allow keep incoming stations “on probation” (e.g. data in quarantine), until the refined coordinates are established.
- Data Handling file: CL (AI) will review the historic biases and the biases from ECP, comparing them with the Data Handling file entries.

Routine estimation of systematic errors for all sites (PP):

The goal will be the timely delivery of long-term estimates of systematics for all the stations. A plan will be prepared by NSGF and DGFI by the end of November 2015 (GA & HM AI), the ACs solutions will be delivered by January 2016. Open points:

- Discuss a priori constraints level for estimated errors
- Adopt an official product format (single s/c estimates, combined, etc.)
- Combination process for such estimates and development of an open data-base accessible by stations, researchers, public, etc.

Revisit NT Atm. Loading & Gravity implementation as an internal PP:

Not discussed because this Pilot Project has now a lower priority (to be done after all other PPs)

Estimation of low-degree SH of the gravity field (PP):

- All the ACs are now ready to support this product.
- CC will prepare their S/W to combine them. We need to decide whether to publish in a separate SINEX file for gravity or put it into the SSC/EOP file (?)
- Decide on the test-period for a PP comparing results to independently developed series (e.g. the CSR series used in our ITRF2014 re-analysis);
- Since this capability will be required for the optimal incorporation of the LARES data into our operational products, this PP needs to be completed before, or in tandem with that of the addition of LARES to our target list;

Inclusion of LARES in our operational product development (PP):

DGFI, GFZ and JCET already analysed LARES data. GRGS made some tests, some weeks analysed. NSGF used LARES only for generating predictions.

G. Appleby will provide the CoM correction in the s/w distributed through ILRS **(GA AI)**

PP will be planned at the next AWG meeting.

Other topics, next meeting...

Next AWG meeting: One day or half a day meeting. The date will be decided depending on the EGU schedule (usually available in February each year).



AWG List of attendees, AWG @ Matera 2015, Saturday, October 24

CHECK ✓	Last name	First name	Institution	e-mail
✓	Altamimi	Zuheir	Institut Geographique National, ENSG/LAREG, France	zuheir.altamimi@ign.fr
✓	Appleby	Graham	NERC SGF, UK	gapp@nerc.ac.uk
	Arnold	David	SAO, USA	david-arnold@earthlink.net
	Biancale	Richard	CNES, FR	richard.biancale@cnes.fr
✓	Bianco	Giuseppe	Agenzia Spaziale Italiana	giuseppe.bianco@asi.it
	Bloßfeld	Mathis	Deutsches Geodätisches Forschungsinstitut, Germany	blossfeld@dgfi.badw.de
	Bondarenko	Yuri	IAA RAS, RF	bondarenko@ipa.nw.ru
	Botha	Roelf	HartRAO, South Africa	roelf@hartrao.ac.za
	Bruni	Sara	Univ. of Bologna, IT	Sara.Bruni4@unibo.it
	Choliy	Vasyl	Kiev University, Ukraine	charlie@univ.kiev.ua
	Clarke	Bart	NASA/Honeywell Technology Solutions, USA	Christopher.Clarke@honeywell.com
	Combrick	Ludwig	HartRAO, South Africa	ludwig@hartrao.ac.za
	Dach	Rolf	AIUB, University of Bern, Switzerland	rolf.dach@aiub.unibe.ch
✓	Deleflie	Florent	GRGS/ IMCCE / Paris Observatory, FR	Florent.Deleflie@imcce.fr
	Dell'Agnello	Simone	INFN/LNF, Italy	Simone.DellAgnello@Inf.infn.it
	Donovan	Howard	NASA/Honeywell Technology Solutions, USA	julie.horvath@honeywell.com
	Dunn	Peter	Sigma Space, USA	peter.dunn@sigmaspace.com
	Evans	Keith	Joint Center for Earth Systems Technology, Univ. of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA	evans@umbc.edu
	Exertier	Pierre	OCA-GRGS, France	Pierre.Exertier@obs-azur.fr
	Fausk	Ingrid	Kartverket, NO	ingrid.fausk@kartverket.no
✓	Flohrer	Claudia	ESOC/ESA	claudia.flohrer@esa.int
	Francou	Gerard	Observatoire de Paris, FR	Gerard.Francou@obspm.fr
	Gayazov	Iskander	IAA RAS, RF	Gayazov@ipa.nw.ru
	Glotov	Vladimir	IAC PNT, RF	vladimir.glotov@glonass-iac.ru
	Govind	Ramesh	Univ. of Cape Town, SA	ramesh.govind@uct.ac.za
✓	Griffiths	Jake	NRL, USA	Jake.Griffiths@nrl.navy.mil
	Hoffman	Evan	GFZ, Germany	evan.hoffman@gfz-potsdam.de
✓	Horvath	Julie	NASA/Honeywell Technology Solutions, USA	julie.horvath@honeywell.com
	Ignatenko	Igor	VNIIFTRI, RF	igig@vniiftri.ru
✓	Kim	Young-Rok	KASI, Korea	yrockkim@kasi.re.kr
	König	Daniel	Joint Center for Earth Systems Technology, Univ. of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA	dkonig@umbc.edu
	König	Rolf	GFZ, Germany	KoenigR@gfz-potsdam.de
✓	Kuzmicz-Cieslak	Magdalena	Joint Center for Earth Systems Technology, Univ. of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA	magdak@umbc.edu
✓	Kuznetsova	Iva	VNIIFTRI, RF	igig@vniiftri.ru

	Lamb	Doug	Harris Corp., USA	Doug.Lamb@harris.com
	Lemoine	Frank	NASA/Goddard	Frank.G.Lemoine@nasa.gov
✓	Lucchesi	David	IAP/INAF & INFN, Italy	david.lucchesi@iaps.inaf.it
✓	Luceri	Cinzia	e-GEOS, Italy	cinzia.luceri@e-geos.it
	Ma	Chopo	NASA/Goddard, USA	Chopo.Ma@nasa.gov
✓	Maier	Andrea	AIUB, University of Bern, Switzerland	andrea.maier@aiub.unibe.ch
	Malkin	Zinovy	Pulkovo Observatory, RF	malkin@gao.spb.ru
✓	Mareyen	Maria	Bundesamt für Kartografie und Geodäsie, Germany	maria.mareyen@bkg.bund.de
	Martini	Manuele	LNF – INFN, Italy	Manuele.martini@Inf.infn.it
✓	McCormick	David	NASA/GSFC, USA	david.r.mccormick@nasa.gov
✓	Mueller	Horst	Deutsches Geodätisches Forschungsinstitut, Germany	horst.mueller@tum.de
	Mueller	Juergen	Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany	mueller@ife.uni-hannover.de
✓	Noll	Carey	NASA/Goddard, USA	Carey.Noll@nasa.gov
	Otsubo	Toshimichi	Hitotsubashi Univ., Japan	t.otsubo@r.hit-u.ac.jp
	Pace	Gilda	e-GEOS, Italy	brigida.pace@e-geos.it
✓	Park	Eunseo	KASI, Korea	skel93@kasi.re.kr
	Pasynkov	Vladimir	OJC"RPC"PSI", RF	Pasynkov_vv@mail.ru
✓	Pavlis	Erricos	Joint Center for Earth Systems Technology, Univ. of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA	epavlis@umbc.edu
✓	Pearlman	Mike	CfA, SAO, USA	mpearlman@cfa.harvard.edu
✓	Pucacco	Giuseppe	Uni. Tor Vergata & INFN, Italy	pucacco@roma2.infn.it
	Reinquin	Franck	CNES, France	Franck.Reinquin@cnes.fr
	Ricklefs	Randall	The University of Texas at Austin, USA	ricklefs@csr.utexas.edu
	Ries	John	The University of Texas at Austin, USA	ries@csr.utexas.edu
✓	Rodriguez	Jose	NERC SGF, UK	josrod@nerc.ac.uk
	Roggenbuck	Ole	Bundesamt für Kartografie und Geodäsie, Germany	Ole.roggenbuck@bkg.bund.de
	Schönnemann	Erik	ESOC/ESA	Erik.Schoennemann@esa.int
	Schwatke	Christian	Deutsches Geodätisches Forschungsinstitut, Germany	Schwatke@dgfi.badw.de
	Searle	Antony	GSD/NRCAn	asearle@nrcan.gc.ca
	Smith	Reed	NRL, USA	Reed.smith@nrl.navy.mil
✓	Sośnica	Krzysztof	WUELS, Poland	krzysztof.sosnica@igig.up.wroc.pl
	Springer	Tim	ESOC/ESA	Tim.Springer@esa.int
✓	Stevenson	Kate	Harris Corp., USA	Katherine.Stevenson@eharris.com
	Svehla	Drazen	ETH, Switzerland	?
	Tcyba	Efim	FSUE VNIIFTRI, RF	Tcyba.e.n@mail.ru
✓	Thaller	Daniela	Bundesamt für Kartografie und Geodäsie, Germany	Daniela.Thaller@bkg.bund.de
	Torrence	Mark	SGT/NASA Goddard, USA	Mark.H.Torrence@nasa.gov
✓	Varghese	Thomas	Cybioms, USA	tvarghes@cybioms.com
✓	Vei	Margarita	GFZ, Germany	vei@gfz-potsdam.de

