IGS WORKSHOP 2017 | PARIS



Reconciling GRACE derived loading deformation with GNSS station position time series

K.Chanard, P. Rebischung, L. Fleitout, L. Métivier, X. Collilieux & Z. Altamimi



Site positions at continuous GNSS station *LHAZ*, Tibet



Site positions at continuous GNSS station *LHAZ*, Tibet



Measurement discontinuities Irregularities (ex: equipment replacement) (Co-seismic) **Quasi-linear displacements Tectonics** Post-glacial rebound LHAZ Tibet N S India Nepal Eurasia Moho MHT India

Site positions at continuous GNSS station *LHAZ*, Tibet



ITRF2008

Measurement discontinuities

 Irregularities (ex: equipment replacement) (Co-seismic)

Quasi-linear displacements

- Tectonics
 - Post-glacial rebound





NON-LINEAR DEFORMATION IN TIME

- Seasonal loading (continental hydrology, atmospheric and non-tidal oceanic loads)
 - (Postseismic deformation)
 - (Transient deformation)

Modeling Seasonal Deformation



Physical Model

- 1. Hypothesis: Rheological model for Earth
- 2. Convolve seasonal load with Green functions associated to Earth model

Water density Green's functions = f(Earth model)

$$U_i(M,t) = \rho \int_S h(m,t)G_i(M-m)dm$$

$$\downarrow$$
East, North, Vertical
displacements Equivalent water
height from GRACE

Datasets - Degree-1 - Earth rheology



GRACE — Seasonal Equivalent Water Height 2002-2012



http://grgs.obs-mip.fr/grace/

GNSS - IGS REPRO 2 RESIDUALS



(http://acc.igs.org/reprocess2.html)

Loading models VS GNSS observations

- Global seasonal signals in GNSS time series are related to satellite derived hydrology (Van Dam et al., 2001; Davis et al. 2004)
- Horizontal Vertical 70' 75' 95" 100' 105" 110" 90' 88° 92° 78° 86° 90° 80° 82° 84° 30" 30" 30° 30° 25* 25" 0 28° 28 20" 20" 15* 15" 26* GPS 26* **GPS** data derived data GRACE model 10" 10" 1cm 5mm derived 24 24° model 82° 92° 80° 84° 86° 88° 90° 78° cm/ (Fu et al., 2013) 75' 80" 110 70' 85' 90' 95" 100 105"
- Numbers of models: difficulty to predict horizontal components

• Empirical estimates overlooking spatio-temporal complexity of seasonal signals

OUTLINE

1. Predict seasonal horizontal and vertical displacements



Datasets - Degree-1 - Earth rheology

GRACE-derived model VS GNSS: Degree-1 deformation and reference frame issue

- GRACE does not capture degree-1 spherical harmonics loads, contrary to GNSS
- Degree-1 loading induces:
 - Geocenter Motion (translation CM-CF)
 - Deformation field of the Earth surface
- To insure comparison, degree-1 contributions are added using coefficients from *Swenson et al. (2008)*





Season 2

Season 1



Elastic (PREM) & Seasonal Load (GRACE + Deg1-Swenson)

LHAZ



IGS WORKSHOP 2017 | PARIS

Elastic (PREM) & Seasonal Load (GRACE + Deg1-Swenson)



IGS WORKSHOP 2017 | PARIS

WRMS Obs. - Elastic & GRACE + Deg1-Swenson



GRACE-derived model VS GNSS: Degree-1 deformation and reference frame issue

 To insure comparison, degree-1 contributions are added using coefficients from Swenson et al. (2008)

derived from comparing GNSS-GRACE derived model with no degree-1

Deformation field

$$dE(\omega, l, m) = \frac{1}{\rho_E} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \sum_{\psi=C}^{S} \frac{3\ell_1(\omega)}{2l+1} \frac{1}{\cos\phi} \sigma_{l,m}^{\psi}(\omega) \frac{\partial Y_{l,m}^{\psi}}{\partial\lambda}(\phi, \lambda)$$
$$dN(\omega, l, m) = \frac{1}{\rho_E} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \sum_{\psi=C}^{S} \frac{3\ell_1(\omega)}{2l+1} \sigma_{l,m}^{\psi}(\omega) \frac{\partial Y_{l,m}^{\psi}}{\partial\phi}(\phi, \lambda)$$
$$dU(\omega, l, m) = \frac{1}{\rho_E} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \sum_{\psi=C}^{S} \frac{3\hbar_1(\omega)}{2l+1} \sigma_{l,m}^{\psi}(\omega) \frac{\partial Y_{l,m}^{\psi}}{\partial\lambda}(\phi, \lambda)$$

Degree-1

Linear combination of:

- 1 Translation on horizontal components
- 1 Translation on the vertical component

(prevents the deg-1 horizontal deformation to be biased by unmodelled vertical signals (thermal expansion, etc.))





Season 2

Elastic (PREM) & Seasonal Load (GRACE + Deg1-Estimated)

LHAZ



Elastic (PREM) & Seasonal Load (GRACE + Deg1-Estimated)





(annual amplitude: Tx=2.3mm,Ty=2.6mm,Tz=4.5mm)

OUTLINE

2. Use seasonal deformation to infer Earth rheological properties



Viscoelasticity in the asthenosphere (70-270km)?



Constraints on the asthenosphere transient viscosity

- Burger rheology in the asthenosphere derived from postseismic studies
- Compatible with seasonal deformation?









Constraints on the asthenosphere transient viscosity



• Transient Viscosities lower than 5.10^{17} Pa.s Shear modulus smaller than $\mu/5$

are not compatible with seasonal observations

- Other mechanisms may play a role when low transient viscosities are required to explain observations
- Transposable to longer periods of loading, constraining larger viscosities

Phase transformations in the mantle transition zone (400-660km)

Influence of seasonal surface loading in the Earth mantle:



Unconstrained reactions kinetics between seismic waves and postglacial rebound

Constraints on Phase transformations in the mantle transition zone

- Incompressibility \mathcal{K} is frequency dependent
- Phase transformations in the mantle are divariant At thermodynamic equilibrium:

$$\kappa_0 = \rho \frac{\Delta P}{\Delta \rho}$$

• Modeling phase transformations:





Best fitting model for completion of 22% of total reaction, kinetics ~ 250 days



IGS WORKSHOP 2017 | PARIS

Best fitting model for completion of 22% of total reaction, kinetics ~ 250 days



IGS WORKSHOP 2017 | PARIS

WRMS Obs. - Phase transitions



Conclusions

Pattern of Mw>7 deep earthquakes (>70km) from 1900 to present



(Zhan & Shearer, 2015)

- Seasonal *horizontal* and vertical displacements are indeed related to surface hydrology
- GRACE can be used to accurately model seasonal deformation providing that degree-1 loads coefficients are re-estimated
- Seasonal deformation may provide insights on the Earth rheology:
 - lower bound on asthenospheric transient viscosities,
 - partial occurrence of mantle phase transitions at an annual time scale