



WROCŁAW UNIVERSITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND LIFE SCIENCES

Modeling range corrections from SLR residuals to active Low Earth Orbiters – insights from study based on over 10 satellites and 20 years of data

Dariusz Strugarek, Krzysztof Sośnica



Institute of Geodesy and Geoinformatics, UPWr, Wrocław, Poland

active Low Earth Orbiters (LEOs)

- variety of mission objectives: gravity field, altimetry, magnetic field, temperature, wind speed, Earth's core dynamics, Earth's surface mapping (DEM)
- different altitudes (260-1500 km), shapes, payload, orbit
- space geodetic techniques co-location: GNSS, SLR, DORIS
- current main contribution of SLR to LEOs: validation of precise orbit (POD) products derived by GNSS/DORIS
- satellite specific modeling requirements (mass change, LRA offsets/orientation)







Motivation

- 1) Most of normal points (NPs) provided by ILRS consider active Low Earth Orbiters (e.g. Swarm, GRACE, Sentinel-3 missions)
- 2) ILRS does not provide official range correction products for LEOs
- 3) Different approaches for modeling of systematic errors in SLR-based validation of LEO precise orbit products
- 4) Update of products (ITRF2020, CM corrections, DHF, POD of LEOs)

Overview of approaches for bias handling in active LEO orbit validation

- 1) correction types: range biases // time biases // troposphere biases // other
- 2) type: station-satellite // station-satellite_group
- 3) scheme: SLR-based validation of LEO orbits // SLR(SLR+GNSS)-based POD of LEOs // in pre-processing and added as a priori
- 4) time resolutions: daily // weekly // monthly // yearly
- 5) **number of parameters:** only range biases // range biases + station coordinates // together with other parameters
- 6) grouping of stations for analysis: high-performing(core) stations // all stations // detector-depending groups // clustering of stations
- 7) + different outlier rejection, elevation angle threshholds

For details please see, e.g.: Arnold et al. 2019; Calliess et al. 2024; Exertier et al. 2017, 2018; Montenbruck et al. 2018; Li et al. 2023, 2024; van den IJssel et al. 2015; Saquet et al. 2024; Strugarek et al. 2019, 2021, 2022; Zajdel et al. 2023; Zhang et al. 2021; GMV reports;

ILRS recommendations for satellites other than LAGEOS/Etalon

1) DataHandlingFile(DHF)240213:

If an ITRF2020/SLRF2020 user performs POD on any satellites other than for LAGEOS 1/2 and Etalon 1/2 for which we have specific Model Bias values, a **station-specific range bias must be pre-applied, calculated as the mean of the two biases for the LAGEOS and LAGEOS-2 satellites**. This bias should be used only as an a priori value since additional satellite-specific errors might still be present (e.g. CoM errors, LRA offset/orientation errors).

2) M. Bloßfeld et al. (EGU, 2024):

- ITRF2020: use PSD and periodic corrections (CM),
- use of CoM corrections and the most recent DHF
- apply long term LA-1 mean range bias (pragmatic approach) or
- mean LA-1/2 long term-RBs as a priori and estimate (mean long-term) RBs

Range bias (RB) corrections from DHF240213



Mean RBs LAG1 and LAG2 [mm]

RB difference between LAG1 and LAG2 [mm]



+MODEL/RANGE_BIAS section only

Data and processing solutions

12 LEO satellites: GRACE-A/B/FO1/FO2, Swarm-A/B/C, CHAMP, TanDEM-X, TerraSAR-X, Sentinel-3A/B

GNSS POD products provided by IFG University of Graz - Reduced-dynamic solution based on the raw observation approach (details: Suesser-Rechberger B, et al. 2022) S3A/B orbits provided by TU DELFT, ESA – Reduced-dynamic solution (details: van den IJssel J, et al. 2015)

SLR data: Normal Points (crd ,.npt , .np2), station satellite info, processing models provided by ILRS, **(CDDIS, EDC TUM)** ITRF2020 + PSD + CM, satellite CoM, LRA models

SLR orbit validation of LEOs with RB modeling (all/high performing stations)



Suesser-Rechberger, et al.(2022). Improved precise kinematic LEO orbits based on the raw observation approach. Adv in Space Res, 69(10), 3559-3570. van den IJssel J, et al. (2015) Precise science orbits for the Swarm satellite constellation. Adv Space Res 56(6):1042–1055.

Data and processing solutions

12 LEO satellites: GRACE-A/B/FO1/FO2, Swarm-A/B/C, CHAMP, TanDEM-X, TerraSAR-X, Sentinel-3A/B

GNSS POD products provided by IFG University of Graz - Reduced-dynamic solution based on the raw observation approach (details: Suesser-Rechberger B, et al. 2022) S3A/B orbits provided by TU DELFT, ESA – Reduced-dynamic solution (details: van den IJssel J, et al. 2015)

SLR data: Normal Points (crd ,.npt , .np2), station satellite info, processing models provided by ILRS, **(CDDIS, EDC TUM)** ITRF2020 + PSD + CM, satellite CoM, LRA models

SLR orbit validation of LEOs with bias modeling (all/high performing stations)

Tested solutions – residual analysis:

- (0) no modeling of RB
- (1) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)
- (2) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)+ est. daily RB = est. daily RB
- (3) a priori 30-day mean RB per station_LEO_group



(0) Unmodeled residuals

- Period 2002.0-2023.1
- 12 satellites, all stations
- SLR residuals of GNSS POD products
- ~4 000 000 NPs

Offset of residuals at range of +/- 0-6 mm, st.dev of 17-25 **mm** (all stations)



(0) Unmodeled residuals

12 satellites, highperforming stations (12): 7090, 7105, 7501, 7810, 7825, 7827, 7839, 7840, 7841, 7941, 7119, 8834

Offset of residuals at range of +/- 0-6 mm, st.dev. 10-17mm

St. dev lower by 1-7 mm!



(1) a priori mean RBs from LAG1/2 (DHF)

12 satellites, all stations

Offsets of residuals at range of +/- 0-7 mm, st.dev 17-28mm

St. dev. increased by a few **mm!** for most of satellites (slighly reduced by 1-3 mm only for S3B, GRB, TDX) w.r.t (0)



(2) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)+est. daily RB = <u>est. daily RB</u>



Identical solutions, and estimated range biases – identical validation results

(2) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)+est. daily RB = est. daily RB

Mean RBs LAG1 and LAG2 [mm]



GRACE-B daily RBs [mm]



(2) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)+est. daily RB = est. daily RB

12 satellites, all stations

St. dev residuals at range of 10-19mm

St. dev. reduced by 2-7 mm and no offset! w.r.t (0)



(2) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)+est. daily RB = <u>est. daily RB</u>

12 satellites, highperforming stations (12): 7090, 7105, 7501, 7810, 7825, 7827, 7839, 7840, 7841, 7941, 7119, 8834

St. dev residuals at range of 7-10 mm (GR,SWM,S3)

St. dev. reduced by 2-5 mm and no offset! w.r.t the same group and (0) SLR residuals (mean+st.dev) [mm]



(3) a priori 30-day mean RB per station per 12LEOs group

Mean RBs LAG1 and LAG2 [mm]







+MODEL/RANGE_BIAS section only

(3) a priori 30-day mean rbias per station per 12LEOs group

12 satellites, all stations

St. dev. increased by a few mm (~2-5mm)! w.r.t (0)

More sat. groups needed? **To long period for RBs?**



Summary and insights

23 RD INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON LASER RANGING (IWLR) Oct.20~26, 2024 Kunming, China

(1) Daily station-satellite RBs reduce offsets, as well as st.dev. of SLR residuals by
2-7mm to the level of 7-10mm (GR, Swm, S3), but large no. of parameters
(2) No need of a priori values. A priori mean RB of LAG1/2 (DHF) + daily est. RB = daily est. RB. Identical effect on SLR validation
(3) 30-day mean RBs station-LEO or a priori mean RBs of LAG1/2 (DHF) are insufficient – decreased consistency between SLR and POD products
(4) More tests: retroreflector dependent groups / 7-day period / more LEOs Same or different scheme for determination of parameters?

23 RD INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON LASER RANGING (IWLR) Oct.20~26, 2024 Kunming, China





IGiG

WROCŁAW UNIVERSITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND LIFE SCIENCES

Institute of Geodesy and Geoinformatics, UPWr, Wrocław Poland

Thank you for your attention!

dariusz.strugarek@upwr.edu.pl

The study is supported by the National Science Centre, Poland Grant UMO-2022/45/N/ST10/02221. The ILRS is acknowledged for providing SLR Data. TUG and ESA are acknowledged for providing GNSS LEO POD products. Many thanks to Filip Gałdyn (UPWr) for sharing his computing resources

Bibliography

(1) Bloßfeld, M., et al. (2024) Application of ITRS 2020 realizations for the SLR-based POD of selected geodetic and Earth-observing satellites, EGU General Assembly 2024, Vienna, Austria, 14–19 Apr 2024, EGU24-5385,

(2) ILRS_Data_Handling_File_2024.02.13.snx, https://edc.dgfi.tum.de/en/ilrs-ac/

(3) Montenbruck O, Hackel S, van den IJssel J, Arnold D (2018) Reduced dynamic and kinematic precise orbit determination for the Swarm mission from 4 years of GPS tracking. GPS Solut 22:79.

(4) Arnold D, Montenbruck O, Hackel S, Sośnica K (2019) Satellite laser ranging to low Earth orbiters: orbit and network validation. J Geod 93(11):2315–2334.
(5) Strugarek D et al. (2021) Detector-specific issues in Satellite Laser Ranging to Swarm-A/B/C satellites. Measurement 182:109786.

(6) Strugarek D., Sośnica K., Arnold D., Jäggi A., Zajdel R., Bury G. (2022) Satellite laser ranging to GNSS-based Swarm orbits with handling of systematic errors GPS Solutions, Vol. 26 No. 104, pp. 1-14

(7) van den IJssel J, Encarnação J, Doornbos E, Visser P (2015) Precise science orbits for the Swarm satellite constellation. Adv Space Res 56(6):1042–1055. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1016/j. asr. 2015. 06. 002

(8) Zajdel, R. et al. (2023) Combination and SLR validation of IGS Repro3 orbits for ITRF2020. J Geod 97, 87. DOI:10.1007/s00190-023-01777-3

(9) E. Saquet, A. Couhert, H. Peter, et al. Millimeter accuracy SLR bias determination using independent multi-LEO DORIS and GPS-based precise orbits Adv. Space Res., 73 (1) (2024), pp. 304-316

(10) Strugarek D., Sośnica K., Jäggi A. (2019) Characteristics of GOCE orbits based on Satellite Laser Ranging, Advances in Space Research, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 417-431

(11) Li, X., Fu, Y., Zhang, K. et al. Improving multiple LEO combination for SLR-based geodetic parameters determination using variance component estimation. J Geod 98, 71 (2024)

(12) Li, X.; Liu, C.; Yuan, Y.; Zhang, K. Current Status and Challenges of BDS Satellite Precise Orbit Products: From a View of Independent SLR Validation. Remote Sens. 2023, 15, 2782

(13) Zhang, K., Li, X., Wu, J., Yuan, Y., Li, X., Zhang, X., & Zhang, W. (2021). Precise orbit determination for LEO satellites with ambiguity resolution: Improvement and comparison. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 126, e2021JB022491

(14) Suesser-Rechberger, et al..(2022). Improved precise kinematic LEO orbits based on the raw observation approach. Advances in Space Research, 69(10), 3559-3570.

(15) Exertier, P. et al. (2017). Time biases in laser ranging observations: a concerning issue of space geodesy. Adv. Space Res. 60(5), 948–968.

(16) Exertier, P., et al. (2018) Time and laser ranging: a window of opportunity for geodesy, navigation, and metology. J. Geod...

(17) Mayer-Guerr, T., et al. (2021). GROOPS: A software toolkit for gravity field recovery and GNSS processing. Computers & Geosciences, 104864.

(18) Dach, R., Lutz, S., Walser, P., & Fridez, P. (2015). Bernese GNSS Software Version 5.2. User manual. University of Bern, Bern Open Publishing.

Future plans

23 RD INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON LASER RANGING (IWLR) Oct.20~26, 2024 Kunming, China

- include more LEOs in the processing, e.g. Sentinel-6, Jason-1/2/3, (calculations for Sentinels-3 – updated POD products from TUG)
- 2) compare results with solutions based on other POD products, e.g. ESA
- 3) retroreflector dependent analysis on range corrections
- 4) extend period of analysis, resolving data gaps

Range bias corrections from DHF240213



Mean range bias LAG1 and LAG2 [mm]



Mean range bias Eta1 and Eta2 [mm]

Yarragadee (7090), Greenbelt (7105), Haleakala (7119), Hartebeesthoek (7501), Zimmerwald (7810), Graz (7839), Herstmonceux (7840), Potsdam (7841), Matera (7941), Wettzell (8834). Wettzell (7827) Mt Stromlo (7825)

Kunming (7819),(7820)

KUNMING station (7819, 7820)



Methods of reducing systematic effects in SLR residuals



• **Range biases** (constant corrections to modeled ranges):

- from each satellite pass analysis to spherical satellites (Otsubo et al. 2019)
- weekly station and station-satellite dependent to LAGEOS-1/2 (Appleby et al. 2016, Luceri et al.. 2019, Rodriguez et al. 2019)
- 1-year station dependent to LEOs with station coordinate corrections (Arnold et al. 2019) / orbit offsets / time biases (Arnold et al. 2022)
- 1-year station-satellite dependent to GNSS (Bury et al. 2021)
- **Troposphere delay** (zenith angle dependent corrections):
- 10-day tropospheric biases for LAGEOS-1/2 (Drożdżewski et al. 2021)
- tropospheric biases with N and E horizontal gradients (Drożdżewski et al. 2019)
- tropospheric bias (estimated using partial derivatives of the dry part of the Global Mapping Function, Böhm et al. 2006)

Absolute maximum of the residuals	0.15	m
Maximum overall sigma	20.0	mm
Multiplication factor for overall sigma	2.5	

(4) troposphere bias (zenit correction)

12 satellites, all stations

St. dev residuals at range of 10-19mm

St. dev. reduced by 2-7 mm and no offset! w.r.t (0)



(4) troposphere bias (up correction)

12 satellites, highperforming stations (12): 7090, 7105, 7501, 7810, 7825, 7827, 7839, 7840, 7841, 7941, 7119, 8834

St. dev residuals at range of 7-10 mm

St. dev. reduced by 2-5 mm and no offset! w.r.t the same group and (0)

> SLR residuals (mean+st.dev) [mm]



Range bias corrections from 30 day mean





(2) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)+est. daily RB = <u>est. daily RB</u>





(2) a priori mean RB from LAG1/2 (DHF)+est. daily RB = <u>est. daily RB</u>

Mean RBs LAG1 and LAG2 [mm]







