26th EVGA Meeting 2023

P Bad Kötzting, Germany

Comparison between VLBI and other space geodetic techniques for determining Earth orientation parameters

Arnab Laha¹*, Johannes Böhm², Sigrid Böhm², Hana Krásná², B. Nagarajan¹, Onkar Dikshit¹ ¹ Geoinformatics, Dept. of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India ² Department of Geodesy and Geoinformation, TU Wien, Austria

Introduction

Earth Orientation Parameters (EOP) are required for the accurate transformation between celestial and terrestrial reference frame, and VLBI is the only space geodetic technique capable of providing the full set of EOP.



- Between legacy (SX) and VGOS antennas, VGOS have more observations and smaller post fit residuals¹, and will have high accuracy observations². Does it improve the accuracy for EOP estimation?
- When estimating EOP, stable positions of the stations and sources are included in the respective datum³. How and which stations effect the EOP after removing from terrestrial datum?

Result and Discussion

1. Comparison of SX and VGOS sessions



Fig 1. Distribution of VGOS network (2017 - 2022). SX sessions contain network with more than 15 stations, situated all over the Earth.



The distribution of VGOS is larger than that of SX sessions, which reflects that the epoch wise difference between VGOS sessions and IERS is larger in most of the sessions (Fig 2). This can be due to few and inhomogeneous distribution of VGOS network (Fig 1). While comparing $\Delta UT1$ (Fig 3a), it can be inferred that WRMS for VGOS is slightly higher (~2µs) due to absence of stations in southern hemisphere (SH). CPO (dX and dY) shows better accuracy for SX sessions by $\sim 40\mu$ as (dX) and $\sim 90\mu$ as (dY) (Fig 3b), because of availability of more sources in SH. PM (x_p and y_p) shows mixed accuracy when compared to IERS and IGS (Fig 3b and 3c). y_p shows better accuracy in VGOS sessions by ~20µas (IERS), while x_p shows better accuracy in SX sessions by ~70µas (IERS). In summary, despite of less and heterogeneous distribution of VGOS stations, VGOS sessions provide comparatively good accuracy.

2. Effect of datum constraint



Removing Kokee (Kk) has a greater impact on EOP followed by removing Sejong (Kv) & Wettzell (Wz) (Fig 5); due to availability of other stations near Wz and Kv. However, removing these stations from datum affects E-W baseline, resulting in more variation in x_p (Fig 5b & 5e) than y_p (Fig 5c & 5f). Despite Wz having more sessions than Kv, WM with respect to IERS shows similar value (Table 1). Conversely, CPO remains unaffected.

Fig 4. Distribution of VLBI stations (red), whereas black represent the stations removed one at a time from datum. Numbers denote the participation in sessions (2001 – 2022).



Table 1. WM (µas) between IERS and datum estimates. Blue and gray represent highest and lowest value, respectively.

Fig 5. Comparison of standard timeseries with datum estimates.

References

- 1. Glomsda et al., 2023. Comparison of simultaneous VGOS and legacy VLBI sessions. IVS 2022 General Meeting Proceedings.
- 2. Niell et al., 2018. Demonstration of a broadband very long baseline interferometer system: a new instrument for high-precision space geodesy. Radio Science, 53(10), pp.1269-1291.
- 3. Raposo-Pulido et al., 2016. Impact of Celestial Datum Definition on EOP Estimation and CRF Orientation in the Global VLBI Session IYA09. Proceedings of the IAG Scientific Assembly.



Acknowledgement

I extend my heartfelt appreciation to the research team from TU Wien for giving necessary research insights. I am thankful to OeAD, Austria, for providing me monetary support through Ernst Mach Grant to pursue research at TU Wien. I express my gratitude to NCG, IITK, for valuable support. Last, I am grateful to all the supervisors for continous encouragement.

