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## Summary

1. Since October 2013, All DORIS data (1993-2013) reprocessed with a series of updates to gscwd20.
2. The new series (gscwd23) includes implementation of recommendations from the AWG meeting Toulouse (April 2013), implementation of the IERS 2010 standards; Application of the DORIS antennae phase laws; Application of a GSFC-derived model of time-variable gravity (1993-2013) on a week-by-week basis..,
3. New baseline series: gscwd23. Supercedes all previous series. Delivered to CDDIS and IGN data centers on Sept. 30, 2013. (See DORISReport 3536; Jan. 16, 2014).
4. gscwd24. A series to augment gscwd23: Includes Jason-1 data (Nov. 2004 - July 2008); HY2A data (Nov 2011 - Dec 2013).

## Significant Changes wrt. ITRF2008

1. Explicit modeling of the pole according to the IERS standards 2010, (Petit and Luzum, 2010; Table 7.7, pp. 115.)

- Cubic model to 2010; Linear model afterwards.

2. C21, S21 is fully compatible with this pole model and uses long-term model based on standard values of C20, C22, S22. (equation 6.5 IERS standards 2010, pp. 81).

## Significant Changes wrt. ITRF2008

3. New a priori DORIS station set (DPOD2008v1.12). Brings in data from newer stations towards the end of the series.
4. Explicitly deleted in POD computations those stations with < 250 observations/week. (In gscwd18, these stations were deleted at the normal equation stage).
5. A DORIS timing bias model was added for TOPEX/Poseidon, based on SLR/DORIS solutions.
6. Use quaternions from E.J.O. Schrama to model attitude of Cryosat-2.

## Significant Changes wrt. ITRF2008

7. More frequent cd adjustments as per recommendations of Laurent Soudarin; This affected the lower satellites: SPOT-2,3,4,5; Envisat, Cryosat-2.
8. "Newly ascertained" Pitch changes in Solar array of SPOT-5 (after March 2012).
9. Many (beaucoup) week-by-week arc setup cleanups to avoid lengthy periods with no data in beginning, end or middle of arcs.

## Significant Changes wrt. ITRF2008

10. In weekly normal equations, satellite contributions had the following NEQ scale factors:

| TOPEX | 9.68980 |
| :--- | :---: |
| SPOT-2 | 11.5398 |
| SPOT-3 | 10.2811 |
| SPOT-4 | 11.8906 |
| SPOT-5 | 13.5913 |
| ENVISAT | 9.99860 |
| CRYOSAT2 | 12.7550 |
| JASON-2 | 17.6356 |

These scale factors are wrt. the GEODYN POD data weight of 2 $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{s}$, and as a result the effective data weight in the weekly solutions is closer to the intrinsic RMS of fit, by satellite, allowing for some residual systematic error.
$\rightarrow$ This should be noticeable in the std deviations in the STCD plots for this series.

## Significant Changes wrt. ITRF2008

11. Use SPOT-5 SAA Corrected DORIS data (2006-2013.0). (Data for 2013/SPOT-5 not yet processed; waiting for data).

## GSC wd23 Processing Summary

| Satellite | Narcs | avg obs/arc | avg/arcl | avg WRMS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | (days) | (mm/s) |
| SPOT-2 | 968 | 24854 | 5.93 | 0.4755 |
| SPOT-3 | 165 | 26128 | 5.77 | 0.5000 |
| TOPEX | 668 | 36596 | 6.37 | 0.5163 |
| SPOT-4 | 923 | 28824 | 5.92 | 0.4728 |
| SPOT-5 | 663 | 52955 | 6.34 | 0.4067 |
| Envisat | 557 | 39353 | 5.22 | 0.4912 |
| Jason-1 | 188 | 74954 | 6.63 | 0.3239 |
| Jason-2 | 294 | 112070 | 6.59 | 0.3767 |
| Cryosat2 | 236 | 50860 | 5.46 | 0.4105 |
| HY2A | 137 | 56990 | 5.41 | 0.3880 |

## GSC wd23 Radiation Pressure Models

| Satellite | Model Applied \& Source |
| :--- | :--- |
| SPOT-2 | GSFC-derived macromodel. Retuned. |
| SPOT-3 | GSFC-derived macromodel. Retuned. |
| TOPEX | Marshall \& Luthcke, 1994; Marshall et al., 1995; Antreasian <br> and Rosborough 1992. |
| SPOT-4 | CNES-derived. Tuned for ITRF2008. Le Bail et al. 2010 |
| SPOT-5 | CNES-derived. Tuned for ITRF2008. Le Bail et al. 2010 <br> Change in pitch of solar array modelled explicitly after 2008. <br> Envisat |
| UCL. Sibthorpe, 2006. |  |
| Jason-1 | UCL. Cr=1.00. Ziebart et al. 2005. |
| Cryosat2 | CNES-derived. Cr=0.945. |
| HY2A | CNES, 7plate macromodel. Untuned. |


| Test | Nplate <br> s | UCL model applied | Along-track OPR Ampl$\left(1 \times 10^{-9} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ |  | Cross-track OPR Amplitude$\left(1 \times 10^{-9} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ |  | Cr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Satellite |  |  | Avg. | Median | Avg | Median |  |
| A priori (from itrf2008) | 10 | Y | 10.29 | 9.98 | 2.573 | 2.204 | 1.00 |
| mod (UCL itrf2008) | 10 | Y | 1.517 | 1.418 | 1.980 | 1.661 | 1.00 |
| mod_noucl | 10 | N | 0.897 | 0.847 | 2.160 | 1.859 | 1.00 |
| Ucltst1* | 10 | Y | 1.096 | 1.032 | 1.946 | 1.629 | 1.00 |
| Ucltst1_cr* | 10 | Y | 1.076 | 1.007 | 1.945 | 1.622 | 1.00417 |
| cnesmod | 8 | Y | 1.571 | 1.475 | 1.958 | 1.633 | 1.00 |
| cnesmod_noucl | 8 | N | 1.337 | 1.265 | 2.119 | 1.796 | 1.00 |

Conclusions: (1) 10 -plate macromodel (includes SAR-array) slightly lower opr 'residuals' than 8-plate (CNES) model; (2) UCL-model improves after application of correction in surface area for thermal re-radiation of solar array.

## GSC wd23 Empirical OPR Summary

 (over time span of data)| Satellite | Along-track (nm/s**2) |  | Cross track (nm/s**2) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mean | Median | Mean | Median |
| SPOT-2 | 1.94 | 1.91 | 3.45 | 2.99 |
| SPOT-3 | 0.72 | 0.66 | 2.31 | 2.03 |
| TOPEX | 0.77 | 0.54 | 4.31 | 3.63 |
| SPOT-4 | 1.12 | 0.80 | 3.65 | 4.24 |
| SPOT-5 | 1.20 | 0.66 | 1.48 | 1.32 |
| Envisat | 1.49 | 1.34 | 1.87 | 1.55 |
| Jason-1 | 1.53 | 1.28 | 2.37 | 2.70 |
| Jason-2 | 1.37 | 1.22 | 3.03 | 2.96 |
| Cryosat2 | 3.07 | 2.47 | 3.21 | 2.13 |
| HY2A | 4.53 | 2.70 | 4.11 | 2.34 |

## HY-2A gscwd23 OPR History

```
- Along-track Hy2a
- Cross-track Hy2aA
```



## Cryosat2 gscwd23 OPR History

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Along-track C2 } \\ \text { : } & \text { Cross-track C2 }\end{array}$


## SPOT-5 gscwd23 OPR History

: Along-track S5


## Envisat gscwd23 OPR History
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Envisat Acceleration Amplitudes


## Scale of new solution, wd23 vs wd20



## WRMS of wd23 vs wd20.



## Tx for wd23 \& wd20



## Next steps

1. Review any anomalies detected by Combination Center.
2. Check macromodel implemented for HY-2A.
