

SINES

**Splinter session III – Precision Orbit Determination** 

### **Jason-1 and Jason-2 POD Status**

A. Couhert, L. Cerri, F. Mercier, S. Houry

September 28, 2012

Ocean Surface Topography Science Team Meeting Venice-Lido, Italy



- Comparisons with External Orbits
- Performance of the Tracking Systems
- Quantifying and Characterizing GDR-D Orbit Error
- Time-Varying Gravity Field Effects on Jason's Orbit





#### RMS of radial orbit differences relative to the Jason-2 GDR-D solution



Jason-2 cycles

- GDR-D higher (w.r.t. the 2011 preliminary GDR-D solution) relative weight of GPS measurements explains the better agreement with the JPL orbit (~6 mm)
- Radial RMS differences slightly increased after cycle 100 w.r.t. the GSFC orbit?



 The mean radial differences between the GDR-D solution and the GSFC orbit shows ~6 mm East – West patterns, typical of gravity field modeling differences







Coes

#### Mean of Z orbit differences relative to the Jason-2 GDR-D solution



The GDR-D solution compares well w.r.t GSFC and JPL orbits





#### Mean of cross-track differences relative to the Jason-2 GDR-D solution



 Less than 5-mm 120-day signal in the cross-track mean differences w.r.t. the GSFC and JPL orbits





#### Comparisons with External Orbits 120-day Geographically Correlated Radial Signal



#### Typical signature of SRP model differences



- Halving (1 cm to 5 mm) of the previous OSTST meeting 120-day signal between the GSFC orbit and the GDR-D solution
- Similar geographical distribution of these 120-day patterns in the GSFC and JPL orbits when compared to the GDR-D solution





#### Mean of along-track differences relative to the Jason-2 GDR-D solution



7-mm along-track bias after the cycles 50 between the GDR-D solution and the JPL orbit







### RMS of GPS phase post-fit residuals for the Jason-2 GDR-D solution 6.5 6.0



- GPS phase residuals degrades after the cycles 50:
  - » Increasing number of measurements
  - » Longer mean track length
  - » Current pre-processing is not tuned for half-cycle slips removal

Performance of the Tracking Systems GPS Phase Residual Degradation Impact on the Orbit

## Jason-2 DORIS-based orbit differences relative to its GPS-only solution counterpart

- No conclusive sign of degradation due to this effect on the radial component of the GPS orbit
- The along-track bias observed between the GDR-D solution and the JPL orbit seems to be correlated with this degradation



OSTM JASON





Ccnes

# RMS of DORIS\* post-fit residuals (10-seconds phase increments) for the Jason-1 and Jason-2 GDR-D solutions

\*Worst 6 stations removed (ADFB, ARFB, CIDB, SYPB, YEMB, GR3B)





# RMS of DORIS\* post-fit residuals (10-seconds phase increments) for the Jason-1 and Jason-2 GDR-D solutions

\*Worst 6 stations removed (ADFB, ARFB, CIDB, SYPB, YEMB, GR3B)

 Stronger SAA effect on DORIS residuals since Jason-1 orbit change: SAA corrective model problem?

DORIS SAA beacons residuals:

 The Jason-1 DORIS residuals keep increasing on the SAA beacons





#### Performance of the Tracking Systems Historically Well Performing SLR Stations



SLR reference stations (7080 Mcdo, 7090Yarr, 7105Wash, 7810Zimm, 7839Graz, 7840Hers, 7941Mate) residuals on independent Jason-2 GPS-derived orbits (all elevations)

JPL GPS-based reduced dynamic orbit:

<u>CNES GPS-based</u> <u>dynamic solution:</u>

 Visible Mount Stromlo degradation over the last year





#### Quantifying and Characterizing GDR-D Orbit Error SLR Validation



High elevation (above 70 degrees) SLR core network residuals on Jason-1 and Jason-2 GDR-D solutions

- High elevation SLR residuals reflects the radial orbit accuracy
- ~1-cm radial orbits accuracy for Jason-1 and Jason-2





### **Quantifying and Characterizing GDR-D Orbit Error** Along-track 1-cpr Empirical Accelerations

OSTMOJASON





Altimeter crossover gain (positive values) per cycle of the different Jason-2 orbits with respect to the GDR-D solution



The crossover statistics evaluate relative performance of each orbit solution
The reduced dynamic solution performs slightly better than the dynamic orbits



# RMS of radial differences between the GDR-D solution and GDR-D orbits using the 10-day series of GRACE-derived gravity field



 The gravity mean model (used in the GDR-D solution) is consistent with subcm radial orbit accuracy, even out of the adjustment period of the mean model (before 2003 - after 2010)



### Geographically correlated radial difference drifts between the Jason-2 GDR-D solution and the GSFC/JPL orbits



 ~2 mm/y East – West patterns common to the GSFC and JPL orbits w.r.t. the GDR-D solution, to be closely monitored







#### ~3-mm type of signature observed between the GDR-D solution and the GSFC and JPL orbits





## RMS of radial orbit differences relative to the Jason-2 GDR-D orbits using the 10-day series of GRACE-derived gravity field



 The 10-day series tend to reduce the RMS radial discrepancies between the GDR-D solution and the GSFC orbit





- Overall ~1 cm stable Jason-1 and Jason-2 radial orbit accuracy
- Including GRACE-derived drifts in the TVG model (GDR-D standard update) provides a significant improvement in the orbit accuracy...
- ... although this mean model is still lacking for some portion of the gravity signal contained in the 10-day series of GRACE-derived field (but are not available for operational orbit production...)
- Necessary to carefully handle SAA effect on Jason-1
- Jason-2 GPS phase half-cycle slips









### **Backup Slides**







Cones

#### RMS of radial orbit differences relative to the GDR-D\* solution







Cones

#### 120-day geographically correlated radial signal

Jason-2 GDR - GSFC LD TST1110 radial differences, cycles 1-105







#### Amplitude of Cos (nm/s<sup>2</sup>) Jason-2 -8 Amplitude of Sin (nm/s<sup>2</sup>) Jason-2 -4 Date (year)

Amplitude estimated 1-cpr empirical accelerations cross-track

26 OSTST Meeting, Venice, September 28, 2012, Couhert et al.

ecnes