GPT2: An improved model for tropospheric slant delays in VLBI and GNSS analysis
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Abstract—GPT2 is an improved empirical model for the determination of tropospheric delays to be used in high-precision global analyses of space geodetic observations at microwave frequencies, such as Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) and Very Long Baseline Interferometry (VLBI). It provides pressure, temperature, temperature lapse rate, water vapor pressure values, as well as hydrostatic and wet mapping functions coefficients. The underlying horizontal resolution is 5 degrees, and the parameters contain annual and semiannual variations. We show results of geodetic VLBI which demonstrate the improvement with GPT2 compared to earlier empirical models for the tropospheric delays. Future extensions of GPT2 will contain an improved parameterization for the calculation of zenith wet delays.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Tropospheric delay modeling is the major error source in the analysis of observations from space geodetic techniques, such as Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) or geodetic Very Long Baseline Interferometry (VLBI). For global applications aiming at highest precision, such as geodynamical studies (cf. Tesmer et al., 2011 [12]) or reference frame solutions (cf. Tesmer et al., 2007 [11]), tropospheric delays $\Delta L$ are usually modeled as sum of hydrostatic and wet delays (see Equation 1). Herein, the zenith hydrostatic delays $\Delta L^z_h$ are very accurately determined from pressure values at the site applying the model by Saastamoinen (1972 [10]) as refined by Davis et al. (1985 [5]). Those values are then mapped down to the elevation of the observation with the hydrostatic mapping function $mf_h(e)$. On the other hand, the zenith wet delays $\Delta L^z_w$ are estimated, e.g. as piecewise linear offsets every 30 minutes, with the wet mapping functions $mf_w(e)$ as partial derivatives.
\[ \Delta L = \Delta L_h^e \cdot m f_h(e) + \Delta L_w^e \cdot m f_w(e) \]  

The Conventions of the International Earth Rotation and Reference Systems Service 2010 (IERS Conventions 2010; Petit and Luzum, 2010 [8]) and their electronic updates recommend using pressure values recorded at the sites and the Vienna Mapping Functions 1 (VMF1; Böhm et al., 2006a [1]). If those values are not available, the analyst is advised to apply the empirical model GPT2 (Lagler et al., 2013 [7]) or the earlier Global Pressure and Temperature model (GPT; Böhm et al., 2007 [3]) and the Global Mapping Functions (GMF; Böhm et al., 2006b [2]).

In Section II we review some properties of GPT2. We discuss its application in VLBI analysis in Section III and finally provide an outlook in Section IV, describing the potential application of GPT2 for navigation purposes.

II. PROPERTIES OF GPT2

The development and validation of GPT2 as well as the comparison with GPT/GMF have been described in detail by Lagler et al. (2013 [7]). The output parameters of GPT2 are pressure, temperature, temperature lapse rate, water vapor pressure, as well as hydrostatic and wet mapping function coefficients. These mapping function coefficients have to be used with VMF1 subroutines. GPT2 is an empirical (blind) model based on grids with a horizontal resolution of 5 degrees, and every parameter is represented by annual and semiannual amplitudes and phases. In earlier models like GPT, GMF, or the ESA blind model (Krüger et al., 2004), there is no semiannual term and with GPT and GMF the phase of the annual term is fixed to January 28. For example, Figures 1 and 2 show the amplitudes of the annual pressure variations and the month of the annual pressure maximum. It is interesting to note that the largest annual pressure variations occur in Asia. However, the corresponding maxima and minima are not always clearly allocated to the end of January or July. Similar plots are provided for the temperature (Figures 3 and 4) and the specific humidity (Figures 5 and 6) where the distribution of amplitudes and phases is less varied but follows a clear annual pattern.
Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF). We find a good agreement of all three models. We can also note that the additional semiannual term and the flexible phase of the annual variation support an even better agreement of GPT2 with VMF1. Of course – as GPT/GMF and GPT2 are blind models – they cannot account for the daily and weekly variations as available with the VMF1.

III. APPLICATION IN VLBI ANALYSIS

We ran three global VLBI solutions with all observations from 1984.0 to 2012.5 using the Vienna VLBI Software (VieVS; Böhm et al., 2012 [4]). We applied VMF1 with pressure values recorded at the sites, GPT/GMF, and GPT2 for the three solutions. We followed the IERS Conventions 2010 (Petit and Luzum, 2010 [8]), apart from the fact that we also applied non-tidal atmospheric loading corrections as provided by the NASA Goddard Group (Petrov and Boy, 2004 [9]). This procedure is important for studies of tropospheric delay models, because otherwise there would be a destructive effect between zenith hydrostatic delays and atmospheric loading (Tregoning and Herring, 2006 [13]). We determined the annual and semiannual station height differences of the solutions with GPT/GMF and GPT2 with respect to the solution with VMF1 and local pressure values. We found an average improvement of 40% for the annual and the semiannual height differences (see Figure 10) with GPT2 compared to GPT/GMF.
In future, water vapor lapse rate and mean temperature should also be added as output parameters, because then more sophisticated models could be applied for the zenith wet delays (see Krüger et al., 2004 [6]). For the sake of improved zenith wet delays, we probably have to use a higher grid resolution than 5 degrees.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) for funding projects GGOS Atmosphere (P20902-N10) and Integrated VLBI (P23143-N21).

REFERENCES


