Earthscope's Plate Boundary Observatory (PBO) use of IGS products.

Thomas Herring, Michael Floyd, Robert King, MIT, Cambridge, MA Timothy Melbourne, Walter Szeliga, Central Washington University, Ellensburg, WA Mark Murray, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, NM, David Phillips, Christine Puskas, , UNAVCO, Inc. Boulder, Boulder, CO

Overview

- Review of US Plate Boundary Observatory (PBO) processing as part of the NSF Geodesy Advancing Geosciences and EarthScope (GAGE) facility
- Processing methods:
 - New Mexico Tech (NMT): GAMIT double difference processing
 - Central Washington University (CWU): GIPSY Precise Point Positioning
- Impacts of scale changes
- Future use of additional IGS products
- Processing details in Herring et al., Plate Boundary Observatory and Related Networks: GPS Data Analysis Methods and Geodetic Products, (2016) *Rev. Geophys.*, 54, doi:10.1002/2016RG000529.

GAGE/PBO Processing

- Time tables of results:
 - Rapid solutions: latency 1 day
 - Final solutions (used IGS final orbits) 2-3 weeks
 - Supplemental runs at 12 and 24 weeks to add stations missed in finals
 - Reprocessing runs. Next will start soon for ITRF2014/IGS14
- Products: All available through UNAVCO http/ftp/php and web services (soon)
 - Time series: North America "Fixed" and IGS08
 - Secular velocity fields (released monthly based on time series analyses).
 - SINEX files: Full covariance files
 - Event files for earthquakes
 - Atmospheric delay estimates, phase RMS scatters and other quality metrics

Tools

http://www.unavco.org/software/visualization/GPS-Velocity-Viewer/GPS-Velocity-Viewer.html

GPS Velocity Viewer



Characterization of non-secular variations



One method of characterizing non-secular motions: Horizontal position variations parameterized as a random walk.

Plot of log of value in mm²/yr Standard deviation over a decade: Dark blues: 0.3 mm Light greens: 3 mm Browns: 4.5 mm Pinks: 30 mm

Each sites needs careful examination to assess nature of signal

Statistics computed with annual and in some cases post-seismic log terms estimated







Differences between NMT and CWU

- NMT uses a double difference network processing; CWU uses a precise point positioning (PPP) approach.
- The difference makes a major difference in use of IGS products.
- NMT: Uses all IGS products (next slide)
- CWU: Use no IGS products because scale from previous ITRF realization is inherited in current realization through the clocks. Clocks need to be consistently re-computed by (in this case) JPL.

Products used by NMT

- Orbits (SP3 files, refitted to Bern ECOM model due to interpolation edges)
- TEC models for higher order ionospheric models). Not always available, default back to JPL
- Differential code biases (DCB) for ambiguity resolution.
 Wide-lane-ambiguity files from JPL used by CWU.
- ANTEX files (both NMT and CWU)
- ITRF results (NAM08 currently) to be mapped to PBO system.
- No loading files used to stay consistent with IGS

PPP versus Network solutions

- We examine the analysis of the UNAVCO GAGE network (~1800 stations across North America which includes 1100 Plate boundary observatory (PBO) stations).
- Precise point positioning (PPP) processes each station separately and no station-station correlations are computed. Network solutions estimate satellite clocks and the uncertainty on the satellite clocks correlates the errors in the position estimates.
- The correlations in the network solutions leads to scale estimates from combined PPP and network solutions to be dominated by the PPP solution.

Typical Reference Frame Sites and GAGE Network



Scale estimates (converted to height changes) from NMT and CWU GAGE analyses



The network solution (NMT) has larger scatter than the PPP solution (CWU).

The combination of network and PPP solutions is dominated by the PPP solution (blue and black are almost identical).

Differences between the combined and the induvial solutions show small differences to PPP (purple) and large differences to network (orange).

Estimates of scale (dH) from PBO and Global IGS network



Red line shows scale estimate from GLOBAL IGS network

Black line shows PBO estimates (dominated by PPP solution) realized with regional frame definition.

Annual signal seen is global IGS scale is control by Northern hemisphere. Some part of the "annual" scale may be artifacts of satellite antenna location errors.

P113: Example of effects of scale treatment



Lower two curves (NA12 results from University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and PBO with scale estimates) show much smaller annuals signals.

Height correlation matrices



Image of height correlation matrix from regional and regional and global. Note color difference. Some of the structure due to sub-networks used to construct full network solution. Need for IGS combined SINEX file although these results generated with MIT global SINEX files.

Example row of correlation matrix



Impact of correlations:

Standard deviation of mean of N stations (large N)

$$\sigma_{mean} \approx \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{N}(1+N\rho)}$$

sites, Regional average 6% correlation increases sigma of mean by factor of 6; Added global 2% correlation increases sigma by 3.5. Consistent with scale estimate +0 06 nnh

11	±0.00 ppb
Regional	±0.24 ppb
Regional+Global	±0.15 ppb

Impact of adding stations from global solution



Adding stations from global network gives greater weight to network solution (black line) although PPP with no correlations still (red line) still has higher weight.



Main peak is dominated by annual period for both PBO and Global. Harmonics are not so clear (next figure).



PBO solution is combination of GIPSY and GAMIT processing. Blend of harmonics of annual and dracontic varies

Summary

- Review of US Plate Boundary Observatory (PBO) processing as part of the NSF Geodesy Advancing Geosciences and EarthScope (GAGE) facilty
- Processing methods:
 - New Mexico Tech (NMT): GAMIT double difference processing
 - Central Washington University (CWU): GIPSY Precise Point Positioning: Needs ITRF specific results. Clocks from repro convey the scale in the earlier ITRF.
- Impacts of scale changes: Regional effect and impact on doubledifference introduction on global processing.
 - Importantly this is just the stations in the regional network not the whole world. Use of IGS combined SINEX files in addition to orbits etc.
- Processing details in Herring et al., Plate Boundary Observatory and Related Networks: GPS Data Analysis Methods and Geodetic Products, (2016) *Rev. Geophys.*, 54, doi:10.1002/2016RG000529.