

## **GOCE/GRACE GGM evaluation over Attica and Thessaloniki, Greece and local geoid modelling in support of height unification**

Vassilios D. Andritsanos<sup>a</sup>, Vassilios N. Grigoriadis<sup>b</sup>, Georgios S. Vergos<sup>b,\*</sup>,  
Vassilios Pagounis<sup>a</sup>, Ilias N. Tziavos<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Civil Engineering and Surveying & Geoinformatics Engineering,  
Technological Educational Institute of Athens, Athens, Greece

<sup>b</sup> Department of Geodesy and Surveying, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki,  
Greece

\* Corresponding author: vergos@topo.auth.gr, +302310994366

**Abstract:** Within the frame of the “Elevation” project, supported by the action “Archimedes III – Funding of research groups in T.E.I.”, co-financed by the E.U. and Greek national funds, an extensive evaluation of the latest GOCE, GOCE/GRACE and combined Global Geopotential Models (GGM) has been carried out. The evaluation was performed using a set of collocated GPS and levelling BMs covering the regions of Attica and Thessaloniki. To this extent, the latest satellite-only and combined GOCE/GRACE GGMs were evaluated to conclude on the possible improvement brought by GOCE, given the two main methodologies used for the GGM development (DIR and TIM) and the latest releases of GOCE data (Release 5). For these GGMs, local height transformation parameters have been determined, employing low and higher order parametric models, in order to accommodate surveying and engineering applications. Moreover, local geoid models have been determined for the two study areas through the well-known Multiple-Input Multiple-Output System Theory (MIMOST) method, by utilizing GOCE GGMs and the local GPS/levelling data. The so-determined geoid models are validated against the set of available GPS/levelling BMs and conclusions are drawn with respect to the improvement brought by GOCE in resolving, with higher accuracy, the lower and medium band of the gravity field spectrum.

**Keywords:** Geopotential Models, Geoid Modelling, Height Unification, Thessaloniki, Attika

### **1. Introduction**

The advent of Global Positioning System (GPS) technology provided a powerful tool for the accurate estimation of height information. Nowadays, cm-level accuracy may be achieved using geodetic GPS receivers and differential measurement techniques even for baseline lengths of some hundreds of kilometers. The development of national continuously operating reference station networks for Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) measurements contribute to the stability and accuracy of the final solutions (Seeber, 2003; Fotiou and Pikridas, 2012). Nevertheless, the use of GNSS for estimating the vertical position can only provide pure geometric information, i.e., ellipsoidal (or geometric) heights. The ellipsoidal height refers to the distance between the measurement point and a mathematical model that approximates the Earth’s shape and therefore lacks a physical meaning which is needed in technical infrastructure works. In order to obtain a physically meaningful height, like for example the orthometric height, it is necessary to combine the ellipsoidal heights with geoid heights. Geoid heights (or undulations) refer to the geoid, an equipotential surface that approximates the mean sea surface and relates the geometrical to

the physical shape of the Earth. Gravity field modelling, a special discipline of Physical Geodesy, may be used for the accurate estimation of the geoid that will provide the connection of the GNSS measured heights to orthometric ones.

Different regional and local geoid solutions have been provided for the wider Hellenic area during the last two decades (e.g., Andritsanos et al. 2000; Andritsanos et al. 2004; Vergos et al. 2004, Grigoriadis 2009). Recently, the tremendous development of GNSS along with improved geoid solutions have led to the determination of highly accurate orthometric heights. The geoid models used may be derived nowadays from gravity data obtained from satellite gravity missions, e.g., the CHAMP, GRACE and GOCE satellites. The accuracies obtained cover a wide spectrum of geodetic applications and meet today's requirements for a large number of scientific works and projects related not only to geodesy, but also to other branches of the geosciences, such as oceanography, marine geophysics and geology, geodynamics, etc. The above mentioned orthometric height determination cannot replace, at least until now, the classical spirit levelling, since it is not possible yet to obtain first order accuracies. However, lower order accuracies, which are very satisfactory for a large number of geodetic and engineering applications, may be obtained through the combination of ellipsoidal heights from GNSS measurements and geoid heights computed from satellite derived geoid models. Therefore, these orthometric heights may replace the costly and time consuming geometric levelling. This is very important in areas with topographic peculiarities, where the ellipsoidal heights of GNSS can be determined with an accuracy close to some mm over distances of several km. Based on the same methodology as before, accurate relative heights can be computed by the same or slightly better accuracies, taking into account the accuracies of the local/regional geoid models used in the computations. The accuracies achieved for the relative geometric heights, and consequently orthometric heights, can reach the level of 2-5 mm over distances of several km. In order to obtain relative geoid heights with the same accuracies as before, it is necessary to use a high degree and order geopotential model. The use of such a model, truncated at a specific degree, introduces errors in the computations related to the long-wavelengths of the gravity field spectrum. Additional errors may be introduced in the computations by inconsistencies between the reference systems of gravity anomalies and GPS heights. In order to eliminate these types of errors, it is possible to compute parametric models through a least squares fitting procedure in order to minimize the differences between the gravimetric geoid heights and the corresponding GPS/levelling heights.

With the GOCE mission having reached its end in late 2013, the unprecedented contribution of the first mission to carry-on gradiometric observations in space was and is still being evaluated. GOCE contributed significantly not only in the field of geodesy, where its impact on gravity field and geoid modelling was long expected, but to oceanography, geophysics and even time-variable gravity field modelling. Its contribution to geodesy has been predominant, since GOCE provided improved representations of the Earth's gravity field especially in the long-to-medium and medium wavelengths of the spectrum. In the pure geodetic context, the contribution of GOCE is viewed in the improved representation of the Earth's gravity field functionals and especially gravity anomalies and geoid heights. These improvements are commonly assessed by examining differences obtained with external validation datasets, such as geoid heights derived from GPS/levelling measurements (Andritsanos et al., 2014; Vergos et al., 2014; Tziavos et al., 2015) on trigonometric benchmarks (BMs), or with the aid of a very high-degree Global Geopotential Model (GGM)

from the pre-GOCE era, i.e., EGM2008 (Pavlis et al., 2012). The latter model is very useful for such GOCE GGM validation experiments since it offers an independent source of information that is not included in the development of the GOCE-derived GGMs. Moreover, GOCE data are now commonly used for the determination of the zero-level geopotential value towards the unification of Local Vertical Datums (LVD) to a global one (Gruber et al., 2012; Hayden et al., 2012; Vergos et al., 2014; Grigoriadis et al., 2014; Tocho and Vergos, in press).

The first part of the study is devoted to the evaluation of the 5th release of GOCE GGMs and the combined EIGEN-6C4 model. A combination procedure with the signal of EGM08 is used in order to consider the improvement in the low frequency part of the gravity signal spectrum caused by the incorporation of GOCE data. The second part is devoted to the determination of a combined GGM/GPS/levelling geoid using Multiple Input Multiple Output Systems Theory (MIMOST) (Sideris, 1996; Andritsanos and Tziavos, 2000). The final combined geoid solution may be used directly as it contains information from GGM and GPS/leveling.

## **2. Available data and Models**

### **2.1. GPS/levelling data**

In the present study, 230 geoid height values from GPS/levelling measurements were used out of which 103 are within the area of Attica and the remaining 127 are within the area of Thessaloniki. The point values refer to benchmarks of the national trigonometric network of Greece and their distribution for the two study areas, Attica and Thessaloniki, is shown in Figure 1. The values for the orthometric heights are the ones provided by the Hellenic Military Geographic Service, while the values for the ellipsoidal heights (GPS data) were measured during the “Elevation” project (Anastasiou et al., 2013). The GPS measurements were carried out using Leica SR520 and Topcon HiperPro receivers with an occupation time of at least 60 minutes per benchmark, an observation logging rate of 15 seconds and an elevation mask of 10°. The GPS data processing was carried out with Leica’s LGO software and Bernese, while the strategy was based on a two-step approach. First the GPS baselines have been reduced building double-differences, relative to two HEPOS (Gianniou, 2008) permanent stations, to achieve fixed solutions for the carried phase ambiguities. Then a least-squares adjustment of the GPS vectors was carried out to estimate the final BM coordinates. This is a completely independent set of GPS/Levelling observations than the HEPOS-based GPS/Levelling database used during the latest GGM evaluation over Greece (see e.g., Vergos et al., 2014; Tziavos et al., in press) and therefore the results acquired will provide a new independent look on the GOCE GGM performance. The main difference of this new dataset is that longer GPS observations (larger than two hours compared to one hour) have been carried out, while spirit levelling campaigns between the BMs, wherever possible due to the distance limitations, were performed to validate the available orthometric heights. These GPS/leveling data have already been used for the evaluation of the complete set of GOCE, GOCE/GRACE and combined GGMs in Vergos et al. (2015), where the superior performance of the latest DIR-R5 and TIM-R5 GGMs has been shown (see Figure 2, *ibid.*).




Figure 1. Distribution of the available geoid height values from GPS/levelling data for the two study areas (left: Attica, right: Thessaloniki).

## 2.2. Geoid heights from Geopotential Models

For the computation of geoid heights, the latest, till today, TIM and DIR model releases were used along with EGM08 and EIGEN6C4. Information pertaining to their maximum spherical harmonic degree of expansion and the source of data used for deriving them are provided in Table 1. Following a spectral analysis and the evaluation results given by Vergos et al. (2014) and Tziavos et al. (2015), two more models were also used in the computations. These two models were produced after combining the TIM (up to degree 140) with EIGEN08 and DIR (up to degree 140) with EIGEN08 as well. The derivation of geoid undulations ( $N_i$ ) were computed in a tide-free system using the *harm\_synth* software (Pavlis et al., 2012), according to the following formula (Heiskanen and Moritz 1967, Eqs. 8.100):

$$N_i = \zeta_i + \frac{\Delta g_B}{\bar{\gamma}} H_i, \quad (1)$$

where, for the  $i$ th benchmark,  $\Delta g_B$  is the Bouguer gravity anomaly,  $H_i$  is the orthometric height,  $\bar{\gamma}$  is the mean normal gravity along the plumb line between the ellipsoid and the telluroid and  $\zeta_i$  is the height anomaly computed as follows:

$$\zeta_i = \frac{GM_0}{\gamma r} \sum_{m=0}^{n_{max}} \left(\frac{\alpha}{r}\right)^n \sum_{m=0}^n (\overline{\Delta C_{nm}} \cos m\lambda + \overline{\Delta S_{nm}} \sin m\lambda) \bar{P}_{nm}(\cos \theta). \quad (2)$$

In the previous equation,  $n_{max}$  is the maximum degree of expansion of the GGM,  $GM_0$  is the geocentric gravitational constant,  $\gamma$  is the normal gravity,  $\overline{\Delta C_{nm}}$  and  $\overline{\Delta S_{nm}}$  are the differences between the fully normalized potential coefficients and those implied by the reference equipotential ellipsoid,  $\bar{P}_{nm}$  are the fully normalized associated Legendre functions,  $\alpha$  is a scaling factor associated with  $\overline{\Delta C_{nm}}$  and  $\overline{\Delta S_{nm}}$ , and  $r, \theta, \lambda$  are the polar coordinates of the benchmark.

Table 1. GGMs used for evaluation.

| Model     | $n_{\max}$ | Data                         | Reference              |
|-----------|------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| DIR-R5    | 300        | S(GOCE, GRACE, LAGEOS)       | Bruinsma et al, 2013   |
| TIM-R5    | 280        | S(GOCE)                      | Brockmann et al., 2014 |
| EGM08     | 2190       | S(GRACE), G, A               | Pavlis et al., 2012    |
| EIGEN-6C4 | 1420       | S(GOCE, GRACE, LAGEOS), G, A | Förste et al, 2014     |

Data: S = Satellite Tracking Data, G = Gravity Data, A = Altimetry Data

GRACE (Gravity Recovery And Climate Experiment), CHAMP (CHAllenging Mini-satellite Payload), GOCE (Gravity field and steady state Ocean Circulation Explorer), LAGEOS (Laser GEodynamics Satellite)

### 3. Evaluation of geoid heights derived from Global Geopotential Models

Based on the available GPS/levelling data, an external validation of selected GGMs was carried out for the two study areas. The validation involved the assessment of both absolute and relative differences between the geoid heights derived from the GGMs and those from GPS/levelling by applying also a least-squares fitting procedure for adjusting the computed absolute differences to various parametric models. A detailed description of the methodology followed is provided next.

#### 3.1. Methodology

The first step in the evaluation of geoid heights derived from GGMs ( $N_i^{GGM}$ ) was the computation of their differences with those provided from GPS/levelling measurements ( $N_i^{GPS/lev}$ ). The absolute differences for each benchmark ( $\Delta N_i^{abs}$ ) were computed according to the following equation

$$\Delta N_i^{abs} = N_i^{GPS/lev} - N_i^{GGM} - N_i^0, \quad (3)$$

where  $N_i^0$  is the contribution of the zero-degree harmonic to the GGM geoid undulations with respect to a specific reference ellipsoid.  $N_i^0$  may be computed using the following formula

$$N_i^0 = \frac{GM - GM_0}{R_E \gamma_i} - \frac{W_0 - U_0}{\gamma_i}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\gamma_i$  is the normal gravity computed on the reference ellipsoid according to the closed formula of Somigliana and  $R_E$  is the mean radius of the Earth. The term  $GM$  corresponds to the geocentric gravitational constant of the geoid while  $GM_0$  to that of the reference ellipsoid.  $W_0$  and  $U_0$  are the gravity potential of the geoid and ellipsoid of reference, respectively.

In the next step, different parametric models were used for determining corrector surfaces for the computed differences  $\Delta N_i^{abs}$ . The determination was carried out following a least-squares fitting procedure for estimating the coefficients of the parametric models. The corresponding system of equations may be written in matrix notation as

$$L = A^T x + v, \quad (4)$$

where  $L$  is the vector of observations containing the differences  $\Delta N_i^{abs}$ ,  $A$  is the design matrix,  $x$  the vector of unknown coefficients of the parametric model and  $v$  the vector of the residual errors. A total of six parametric models were used in the computation for each area. These models are: (A) the four-parameter similarity transformation model, (B) the five-parameter similarity transformation model, (C) a model dependent on orthometric and geoid heights, (D) a model dependent only on orthometric heights, (E) a model dependent only on geoid heights and (F) a third order polynomial model. The parametric models are presented by the following equations (Fotopoulos, 2003; Kotsakis and Katsambalos, 2010):

$$A: \alpha_i^T x = x_0 + x_1 \cos \varphi_i \cos \lambda_i + x_2 \cos \varphi_i \sin \lambda_i + x_3 \sin \varphi_i \quad (5)$$

$$B: \alpha_i^T x = x_0 + x_1 \cos \varphi_i \cos \lambda_i + x_2 \cos \varphi_i \sin \lambda_i + x_3 \sin \varphi_i + x_4 \sin^2 \varphi_i \quad (6)$$

$$C: \alpha_i^T x = \mu + \delta s_H H_i + \delta s_N N_i \quad (7)$$

$$D: \alpha_i^T x = \mu + \delta s_H H_i \quad (8)$$

$$E: \alpha_i^T x = \mu + \delta s_N N_i \quad (9)$$

$$F: \alpha_i^T x = \sum_{m=0}^2 \sum_{n=0}^2 x_{(3m+n)} (\varphi_i - \varphi_0)^n (\lambda_i - \lambda_0)^m \cos^m \varphi_i \quad (10)$$

where  $x_l \{l:0,...,8\}$ ,  $\delta s_H$  and  $\delta s_N$  are the model coefficients,  $\varphi_i$  and  $\lambda_i$  denote the geographical latitude and longitude, respectively, and  $\varphi_0$  and  $\lambda_0$  are the corresponding mean geodetic latitude and longitude of the study area.

The last step involved the computation of the relative geoid height differences, between the GGM geoid models and the heights obtained from GPS/levelling, for different pairs of benchmarks ( $i, j$ ) based on the following equation

$$\Delta N_{ij} = (N_j^{GGM} - N_i^{GGM}) - (N_j^{GPS/lev} - N_i^{GPS/lev}). \quad (11)$$

These differences were then used in the computation of the relative accuracy by the following equation:

$$a_r = \frac{\Delta N_{ij}}{S_{ij}} [ppm], \quad (12)$$

where  $S_{ij}$  is the spherical distance between benchmarks  $i$  and  $j$ . The spherical distance may be computed using the formula

$$S_{ij} = R_E \arccos(\sin \varphi_i \sin \varphi_j + \cos \varphi_i \cos \varphi_j \cos(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)). \quad (13)$$

### 3.2. Results and discussion

Following the methodology presented in the previous section, the absolute differences between the geoid heights and the GPS/levelling benchmarks were computed for each test area. The statistical values of the differences (before fit) are provided in Table 2. From the

results shown, it is observed that the differences in Thessaloniki are larger than the ones observed in Attica in terms of standard deviation, mean value and range. A possible explanation for these differences is directly related to the vertical network of Greece. The benchmarks for the area of Attica are close to the reference point of the Greek vertical datum, i.e., the tide gauge station at Piraeus port. On the other hand, the benchmarks located in the area of Thessaloniki lie approximately more than 300 km away from the reference point and a common adjustment of the Greek vertical network has never been carried out so far (Tziavos et al., 2012). Therefore, the differences found may be first attributed to inconsistencies of the Greek vertical datum while it is also possible that the models do not represent sufficiently the gravity field in the area of Thessaloniki.

Table 2. Statistics of geoid height differences between GPS/levelling geoid heights and GGMs geoid heights before and after the least-squares fit with parametric models for the areas of Attica and Thessaloniki.

| Geoid Model                          | Parametric Model | Attica   |         |           |             | Thessaloniki |         |           |             |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------|--------------|---------|-----------|-------------|
|                                      |                  | mean [m] | std [m] | range [m] | $R_{adj}^2$ | mean [m]     | std [m] | range [m] | $R_{adj}^2$ |
| DIR-R5<br>max deg:<br>140            | Before Fit       | -0.575   | 0.334   | 1.476     | -           | -0.765       | 0.447   | 2.241     | -           |
|                                      | Model A          | 0.008    | 0.177   | 0.819     | 0.727       | 0.066        | 0.243   | 1.354     | 0.691       |
|                                      | Model B          | 0.000    | 0.173   | 0.823     | 0.744       | 0.000        | 0.239   | 1.338     | 0.723       |
|                                      | Model C          | 0.000    | 0.250   | 1.097     | 0.452       | 0.000        | 0.314   | 1.616     | 0.513       |
|                                      | Model D          | 0.000    | 0.333   | 1.437     | 0.018       | 0.000        | 0.331   | 1.746     | 0.456       |
|                                      | Model E          | 0.000    | 0.286   | 1.388     | 0.278       | 0.000        | 0.445   | 2.201     | 0.017       |
|                                      | Model F          | 0.000    | 0.122   | 0.524     | 0.878       | 0.000        | 0.180   | 1.088     | 0.849       |
| DIR-R5<br>max deg:<br>300            | Before Fit       | -0.262   | 0.187   | 0.887     | -           | -0.528       | 0.472   | 2.396     | -           |
|                                      | Model A          | 0.003    | 0.160   | 0.803     | 0.284       | 0.045        | 0.259   | 1.405     | 0.697       |
|                                      | Model B          | 0.000    | 0.160   | 0.801     | 0.292       | 0.000        | 0.259   | 1.399     | 0.710       |
|                                      | Model C          | 0.000    | 0.171   | 0.766     | 0.175       | 0.000        | 0.339   | 1.764     | 0.494       |
|                                      | Model D          | 0.000    | 0.184   | 0.840     | 0.044       | 0.000        | 0.364   | 1.999     | 0.411       |
|                                      | Model E          | 0.000    | 0.181   | 0.774     | 0.068       | 0.000        | 0.466   | 2.303     | 0.032       |
|                                      | Model F          | 0.000    | 0.115   | 0.538     | 0.648       | 0.000        | 0.180   | 1.088     | 0.864       |
| DIR-R5<br>max deg:<br>140 +<br>EGM08 | Before Fit       | -0.406   | 0.080   | 0.514     | -           | -0.488       | 0.160   | 1.014     | -           |
|                                      | Model A          | 0.005    | 0.080   | 0.516     | 0.027       | 0.042        | 0.153   | 0.772     | 0.044       |
|                                      | Model B          | 0.000    | 0.079   | 0.507     | 0.065       | 0.000        | 0.153   | 0.774     | 0.120       |
|                                      | Model C          | 0.000    | 0.078   | 0.508     | 0.072       | 0.000        | 0.138   | 0.719     | 0.269       |
|                                      | Model D          | 0.000    | 0.078   | 0.517     | 0.056       | 0.000        | 0.138   | 0.731     | 0.260       |
|                                      | Model E          | 0.000    | 0.080   | 0.514     | 0.010       | 0.000        | 0.151   | 0.723     | 0.116       |
|                                      | Model F          | 0.000    | 0.072   | 0.397     | 0.255       | 0.000        | 0.141   | 0.738     | 0.269       |
| TIM-R5<br>max deg:<br>140            | Before Fit       | -0.563   | 0.336   | 1.535     | -           | -0.768       | 0.449   | 2.250     | -           |
|                                      | Model A          | 0.007    | 0.177   | 0.819     | 0.729       | 0.066        | 0.243   | 1.354     | 0.694       |
|                                      | Model B          | 0.000    | 0.173   | 0.823     | 0.746       | 0.000        | 0.239   | 1.338     | 0.726       |
|                                      | Model C          | 0.000    | 0.250   | 1.097     | 0.456       | 0.000        | 0.316   | 1.622     | 0.514       |
|                                      | Model D          | 0.000    | 0.335   | 1.446     | 0.016       | 0.000        | 0.333   | 1.757     | 0.455       |
|                                      | Model E          | 0.000    | 0.285   | 1.383     | 0.286       | 0.000        | 0.447   | 2.205     | 0.018       |
|                                      | Model F          | 0.000    | 0.122   | 0.524     | 0.879       | 0.000        | 0.180   | 1.088     | 0.850       |
| TIM-R5                               | Before Fit       | -0.293   | 0.202   | 0.989     | -           | -0.671       | 0.446   | 2.253     | -           |

|                                                           |            |        |       |       |       |        |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>max deg:</i><br>280                                    | Model A    | 0.004  | 0.160 | 0.805 | 0.394 | 0.058  | 0.258 | 1.404 | 0.656 |
|                                                           | Model B    | 0.000  | 0.159 | 0.796 | 0.407 | 0.000  | 0.258 | 1.403 | 0.675 |
|                                                           | Model C    | 0.000  | 0.182 | 0.805 | 0.205 | 0.000  | 0.322 | 1.753 | 0.486 |
|                                                           | Model D    | 0.000  | 0.200 | 0.903 | 0.033 | 0.000  | 0.333 | 1.891 | 0.447 |
|                                                           | Model E    | 0.000  | 0.192 | 0.818 | 0.103 | 0.000  | 0.445 | 2.228 | 0.010 |
|                                                           | Model F    | 0.000  | 0.116 | 0.543 | 0.698 | 0.000  | 0.180 | 1.095 | 0.847 |
| <i>TIM-R5</i><br><i>max deg:</i><br>140 +<br><i>EGM08</i> | Before Fit | -0.394 | 0.080 | 0.776 | -     | -0.491 | 0.160 | 0.731 | -     |
|                                                           | Model A    | 0.005  | 0.080 | 0.517 | 0.029 | 0.042  | 0.153 | 0.771 | 0.047 |
|                                                           | Model B    | 0.000  | 0.079 | 0.508 | 0.067 | 0.000  | 0.153 | 0.774 | 0.124 |
|                                                           | Model C    | 0.000  | 0.079 | 0.512 | 0.065 | 0.000  | 0.138 | 0.715 | 0.275 |
|                                                           | Model D    | 0.000  | 0.079 | 0.524 | 0.044 | 0.000  | 0.138 | 0.729 | 0.266 |
|                                                           | Model E    | 0.000  | 0.080 | 0.517 | 0.011 | 0.000  | 0.151 | 0.718 | 0.118 |
|                                                           | Model F    | 0.000  | 0.072 | 0.397 | 0.258 | 0.000  | 0.141 | 0.738 | 0.272 |
| <i>EIGEN6C4</i>                                           | Before Fit | -0.317 | 0.083 | 0.548 | -     | -0.513 | 0.153 | 0.730 | -     |
|                                                           | Model A    | 0.004  | 0.080 | 0.522 | 0.095 | 0.044  | 0.149 | 0.774 | 0.005 |
|                                                           | Model B    | 0.000  | 0.079 | 0.512 | 0.135 | 0.000  | 0.149 | 0.774 | 0.084 |
|                                                           | Model C    | 0.000  | 0.080 | 0.515 | 0.110 | 0.000  | 0.138 | 0.749 | 0.201 |
|                                                           | Model D    | 0.000  | 0.083 | 0.549 | 0.010 | 0.000  | 0.138 | 0.744 | 0.193 |
|                                                           | Model E    | 0.000  | 0.080 | 0.517 | 0.087 | 0.000  | 0.147 | 0.755 | 0.090 |
|                                                           | Model F    | 0.000  | 0.072 | 0.400 | 0.324 | 0.000  | 0.138 | 0.740 | 0.247 |

A least-squares adjustment procedure was then carried out using the six parametric models described in the previous section for the geoid models examined in our study. The statistical results of the absolute differences after the fitting procedure are given in Table 2, while a sample visual representation of the differences is illustrated in Figure 2 for the area of Attica and for the TIM-R5 (max degree 140) geoid model. By examining the statistical results, all the parametric models present a consistent behavior for the two study areas apart from models D and E. Although the performance of models D and E is not adequate for both areas, considering the adjusted coefficient of determination  $R_{adj}^2$ , they reveal a difference on the dependence to the geoid and orthometric heights for the two areas. As previously described, model D is an orthometric height dependent model while model E is a geoid height dependent model. The better performance of model E for the area of Thessaloniki designates that the orthometric heights, for this area, have errors that may be partly absorbed by the parametric model. On the contrary, model D is unable to reduce any discrepancies that are based on geoid heights. For Attica, the results present an opposite behavior. Model D is unable to improve further the results while model E leads to a small improvement. This remark supports the previously given conclusion that the large differences between the statistics for the two areas may be attributed to problems in the Greek vertical network.

By further examining the results of Table 2, the third order polynomial model (model F) seems to provide the best fitting results for both test areas (see for example Figure 2). In the case where the two GOCE-based models DIR-R5 and TIM-R5 are combined with EGM08, the parametric models provide an improvement to the results of approximately 1 cm for Attika in terms of standard deviation and 2 cm for Thessaloniki. In Figure 3 indicative plots are shown for the estimated corrector surfaces for the area of Attica using a third order

polynomial parametric model (model F). The corrector surfaces for model F depict a south-west to north-east trend, while for the area of Thessaloniki no such trend is detected.




Figure 2. Absolute differences between geoid heights from the TIM-R5 (max degree 140) geoid model and the GPS/levelling geoid heights in the area of Attica after the least-squares fit to different parametric models. The red line represents the standard error while the type of the model used is noted on the upper right corner of each diagram.

In Figure 4 the spatial distribution of the differences between geoid heights from the combined TIM-R5 model (max degree 140) and EGM08 and the GPS/levelling data is presented. The differences shown are the ones obtained after the fit to a third order

polynomial model (Model F). For the area of Attica, the fit to Model F removes the previously described south-west to north-east trend, while for both areas no spatial pattern for the differences is detected. The absence of a spatial pattern for the differences observed in the area of Thessaloniki along with the previous results leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to further investigate the differences by re-measuring parts of the Greek vertical network.

Next, the relative accuracy was estimated for the relative differences computed after the least-squares fit to the parametric models. The relative accuracy for the area of Thessaloniki varies between 12 and 16 ppm for baselines 10 to 20 km long, while for the area of Attica the corresponding range is from 9 to 6 ppm. An indicative plot of the relative accuracy with respect to the baseline length is provided in Figure 5 for the benchmarks in Attica and for the TIM-R5 model (maximum degree 140 and 280), its combination with EGM08 and EIGEN6C4 after a third-order polynomial fit. In the two test areas the GOCE-based models present a rapid decrease in the relative accuracy for baselines shorter than 60 to 70 km long with respect to the combination model (GOCE-based and EGM08) and EIGEN6C4. This may be attributed to the lack of surface gravity data in the GOCE-based models. When comparing though the full spectrum GOCE-based model with the one up to degree 140, we observe only a slight improvement of 1 ppm for baselines shorter than 30 km. On the other hand, the relative accuracy of the combination model and of EIGEN6C4 present a rapid decrease for baselines of less than 30 km length. Similarly, the same results for the relative accuracy are obtained for both DIR-R5 and its combination with EGM08.




Figure 3. Corrector surface computed for the area of Attica using a third order polynomial parametric model (model F) for the differences between geoid heights from GPS/levelling and the geoid models:

- a) TIM-R5 (max degree 140), b) TIM-R5 (max degree 280), c) combination of  
TIM-R5 (max degree 140) and EGM08 and d) EIGEN6C4.




Figure 4. Spatial distribution of the absolute differences between geoid heights from the combined TIM-R5 (max degree 140) and EGM08 geoid model and the GPS/levelling geoid heights after the least-squares fit to the third order polynomial parametric model (model F) for Attika (top) and Thessaloniki (bottom).

#### 4. Input-Output geoid models

The Input-Output System Theory (IOST) method is primarily based on the spectral combination of heterogeneous data taking into account their statistical properties and approximating the Power Spectral Density (PSD) functions of the signals and their errors. These methods can handle heterogeneous data given on the same grid and propagate data errors into the results (see, Bendat and Piersol, 1986; Sideris, 1996). The systems theory solution is based on the assumption that both the input signals and their errors are stochastic variables. Additionally, PSD functions of both signals and their errors are known and the solution depends on the ratio of the error PSD and the signal PSD. In the case that the inputs are correlated, the systems theory solution is formally equivalent to the classical Least Squares Collocation (LSC) approach or to its stepwise alternative (Sideris, 1996; Sansò and Sideris 1997). The generalization of the IOST to the Multiple Input- Multiple Output System Theory (MIMOST) for geodetically oriented applications was proposed by Andritsanos and Tziavos (2000). Extensive derivations of the output signals and their accuracy estimations both with numerical tests on the determination of gravity field observables in land and sea areas are given by Andritsanos et al. (2000, 2001).




Figure 5. Relative accuracy with respect to baseline length for the area of Attika after the least-squares fitting using a third order polynomial parametric model (model F) for the differences corresponding to the geoid models: a) TIM-R5 (max degree 140), b) TIM-R5 (max degree 280), c) combination of TIM-R5 (max degree 140) with EGM08 and d) EIGEN6C4.

In this study a Multiple Input-Multiple Output System (MIMOS) is proposed, where the input measurements as well as the input and output signals are different geoid observables. More specifically, as is depicted in Figure 6, the input geoid signals contain information derived from the best GGMs combination of section 3.2., i.e. the contribution of GOCE DIR (r5) model until degree 140 and the residual signal of EGM08, in addition to geoid heights derived from GPS/levelling.




Figure 6. Schematic representation of the input – output system used in the computations of the combined geoid.

The optimal transfer function of the system  $\hat{H}_0$  is computed by the application of a minimization criterion of the output error PSD. The optimal transfer function of the specific MIMOST is given in matrix form:

$$\hat{H}_0 = P_{xy}(P_{yy} + P_{mm})^{-1} = P_{xy}P_{y_0y_0}^{-1}. \quad (15)$$

The final combined solution and the estimation of the error PSD and 2D covariance function is:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}_0 &= \hat{H}_0 Y_0 = H_{xy}(P_{y_0y_0} - P_{mm})P_{y_0y_0}^{-1} Y_0 \\ P_{\hat{e}\hat{e}} &= [H_{xy}(P_{y_0y_0} - P_{mm}) - \hat{H}_0 P_{y_0y_0}] (H_{xy}^{*T} - \hat{H}_0^{*T}) + \hat{H}_0 P_{mm} H_{xy}^{*T} \\ C_{\hat{e}\hat{e}} &= F^{-1}\{P_{\hat{e}\hat{e}}\} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

More on the notations of equations (15) and (16) as well as the use of MIMOST in Geodesy can be found in Andritsanos et al. (2000).

The final combined MIMOST estimated geoid models for Attica and Thessaloniki are presented in Figure 7. The latter geoid solutions contain information from both the modified GOCE-DIR5 GGM as well as the GPS/levelling signal (see also Figure 6). The combination of both signals is based on the minimization criterion of the output error and due to this fact the sensitivity of MIMOST to the input noise is minimal (Andritsanos and Tziavos, 2012).

The computed MIMOST combined geoid heights were then compared to the GPS/levelling derived geoid heights. In Table 3 are provided the statistical values of the differences between the geoid heights obtained from GPS/levelling and the corresponding geoid heights from a) the synthetic DIR-R5-EGM08 geoid model and b) the MIMOST solution. By examining the results of Table 3, the differences with the MIMOST solution present an improvement of 1.3 cm in Attica and 3.5 cm in Thessaloniki in terms of standard deviation with respect to those with the DIR-R5-EGM08 model. Additionally, the range of the differences has also been reduced by 10 cm in Attica and 44 cm in the region of Thessaloniki.

In Figure 8, the distribution of the GPS/levelling in Attica and Thessaloniki is depicted as well as the differences between GPS/levelling geoid and MIMOST geoid heights. Considering Figures 4 and 5 one can identify the previously described improvement in the geoid height differences using the MIMOST geoid solution for both study areas.

The extensive evaluation of the latest GOCE, GOCE/GRACE and combined GGMs have been carried out using GPS/levelling benchmarks at two regions, one in Central (Attica) and another in Northern (Thessaloniki) Greece. Local parametric models have been tested in order to remove the inherent datum inconsistencies, between the ellipsoidal, orthometric and geoid heights. Six parametric models have been selected and the GGMs signals has been used to its maximum power, as well as to lower degrees given the truncation of the spherical harmonic expansion. The GOCE/GRACE GGMs signal has been filled-in with EGM08 up to its maximum degree and order of expansion, representing the high frequency content of the gravity field spectrum. The 5<sup>th</sup> release of GOCE models estimated by the Direct as well as the Time-Wise approach and filled by EGM08 signal outperformed any other case, in terms of the standard deviation and the range of the differences at GPS benchmarks. A third order polynomial improved the results of the differences by 1 cm in the Attica and 2 cm in the Thessaloniki area, in terms of standard deviation. The truncation to degree 140 was selected based on various tests and previous studies. The 5th release of GOCE data showed an

improvement at the low frequency band of the gravity spectrum when compared with GPS/levelling data at benchmarks. This improvement can be identified considering the statistics of the differences even before any parametric model application. The latter EIGEN-6C4 GGM gave slightly worse statistics (3 mm in terms of std of the differences) than the synthetic GOCE(140)+EGM08 model.




Figure 7. Combined MIMOST estimated geoid for Attica (top) and Thessaloniki (bottom).




Figure 8. Distribution of the GPS/levelling data for Attica (top) and Thessaloniki (bottom). The colored values depict differences between geoid heights from combined MIMOST solution and those derived from GPS/levelling data.

Table 3. Statistics of geoid height differences for the areas of Attica and Thessaloniki between GPS/levelling geoid heights and a) GGMs geoid heights and b) combined MIMOST geoid heights.

| Area         | $N_{\text{GPS/lev.}} - N_{\text{DIR-R5(140)} + \text{EGM08}}$ |         |           | $N_{\text{GPS/lev.}} - N_{\text{comb}}$ |         |           |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------------------------|---------|-----------|
|              | mean [m]                                                      | std [m] | range [m] | mean [m]                                | std [m] | range [m] |
| Attica       | -0.406                                                        | 0.080   | 0.514     | -0.572                                  | 0.067   | 0.412     |
| Thessaloniki | -0.488                                                        | 0.160   | 1.014     | -0.659                                  | 0.125   | 0.632     |

## 5. Conclusions

The incorporation of GPS/levelling signal to the final combined geoid is feasible through MIMOST. A combined GPS/levelling/GGM geoid model using the geoid information from GOCE DIR-R5 to a degree 140 and EGM08 residual signal has been estimated. The combined geoid contains a minimal effect of datum inconsistencies, since the coupling of GGM and GPS/levelling geoid heights is based on a specific minimization criterion. The comparisons showed an improvement of 1.3 cm in Attica and 3.5 cm in Thessaloniki in terms of the standard deviation of the differences before any fit. An even greater improvement was observed in the range of the differences: 10 cm in Attica and 44 cm in Thessaloniki region.

## Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the funding provided for this work, in the frame of the “Elevation” project, by the E.U. (European Social Fund) and Hellenic national funds under the Operational Program “Education and Lifelong Learning 2007 – 2013”, action “Archimedes III – Funding of research groups in T.E.I.”.

## References

- Anastasiou D, Gaifillia D, Katsadourou A, Kolyvaki E, Papanikolaou X, Gianniou M, Vergos GS, Pagounis V (2013) First validation of the Hellenic vertical datum as a prerequisite for the efficient disaster and resources management: the “Elevation” project. FIG Commission 3 “Spatial Information, Informal Development, Property and Housing”, December 11-12, Athens, Greece.
- Andritsanos VD and Tziavos IN (2000) Estimation of gravity field parameters by a multiple input/output system. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*, 25(A): 39 – 46.
- Andritsanos V. D., Sideris M. G., Tziavos I. N., 2000, A survey of gravity field modelling applications of the Input-Output system Theory (IOST). *International Geoid Service Bulletin*, Volume 10: 1-17.
- Andritsanos V. D., Fotiou A., Paschalaki E., Pikridas C., Rossikopoulos D., Tziavos I. N., 2000, Local Geoid Computation and Evaluation. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*, Volume 25, Issue 1: 63-69.
- Andritsanos V. D., Sideris M. G., Tziavos I. N., 2001, Quasi-stationery Sea Surface topography estimation by the multiple Input-Output method. *Journal of Geodesy*, Volume 75: 216-226.
- Andritsanos V. D., Fotopoulos G., Fotiou A., Pikridas C., Rossikopoulos D., Tziavos I. N., 2004, New local geoid model for Northern Greece. In proceedings of INGE0 2004 - 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference on Engineering Surveying, FIG Regional Central and Eastern European Conference. Bratislava, Slovakia 11 - 13 November.
- Andritsanos V. D., Tziavos I. N., 2012, A Sensitivity Analysis in Spectral Gravity Field Modeling Using Systems Theory. In: Kenyon S, Pacino M-C, Marti U (eds) *Geodesy for Planet Earth*, International Association of Geodesy Symposia Volume 136, Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 411-418.
- Andritsanos V. D., Vergos G. S., Grigoriadis V. N., Pagounis V., Tziavos I. N., 2014, Spectral characteristics of the Hellenic vertical network - Validation over Central and Northern Greece using GOCE/GRACE global geopotential models. Presented at the 2014 EGU General Assembly, Session G4.2 “Satellite Gravimetry: GRACE, GOCE and Future Gravity Missions”, April 27th - May 2nd, Vienna, Austria.

- Bendat J. S., Piersol A. G., 1986, Random data – Analysis and measurements procedures. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Brockmann J. M., Zehentner N., Höck E., Pail R., Loth I., Mayer-Gürr T., Schuh W. D., 2014, EGM\_TIM\_RL05: An independent geoid with centimeter accuracy purely based on the GOCE mission. *Geophysical Research Letters*, Volume 41, Issue 22: 8089-8099.
- Bruinsma S. L., Förste C., Abrikosov O., Marty J. C., Rio M. H., Mulet S., Bonvalot S., 2013, The new ESA satellite-only gravity field model via the direct approach. *Geophysical Research Letters*, Volume 40: 3607-3612.
- Förste C., Bruinsma S. L., Abrikosov O., Lemoine J. M., Schaller T., Götze H. J., Ebbing J., Marty J. C., Flechtner F., Balmino G., Biancale R., 2014, EIGEN-6C4 The latest combined global gravity field model including GOCE data up to degree and order 2190 of GFZ Potsdam and GRGS Toulouse. Presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> GOCE User Workshop, Paris, 25-28 November.
- Fotiou A., Pikridas C., 2012, GPS and Geodetic Applications, Ziti Editions, Thessaloniki.
- Fotopoulos G., 2003, An analysis on the optimal combination of geoid, orthometric and ellipsoidal height data. UCGE Rep Nr 20185, Calgary AB, Canada.
- Heiskanen W. A., Moritz H., 1967, Physical Geodesy, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco.
- Gianniou, M. (2008): "HEPOS: Designing and Implementing an RTK Network", *Geoinformatics*, January/February 2008, pp. 10 - 13.
- Grigoriadis V. N., 2009, Geodetic and geophysical approach of the earth's gravity field and applications in the Hellenic area, PhD Dissertation, Department of Geodesy & Surveying, School of Rural and Surveying Engineering, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Grigoriadis V. N., Kotsakis C., Tziavos I. N., Vergos G. S., 2014, Estimation of the geopotential value  $W_0$  for the local vertical datum of continental Greece using EGM08 and GPS/leveling data. In: Marti U (ed) Gravity, Geoid and Height Systems, International Association of Geodesy Symposia Volume 141, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, pp. 249-255.
- Kotsakis C., Katsambalos K., 2010, Quality analysis of global geopotential models at 1542 GPS/Levelling benchmarks over the Hellenic mainland. *Survey Review*, Volume 42, Issue 318: 327-344.
- Pavlis N., Holmes S., Kenyon S., Factor J., 2012, The Development and Evaluation of the Earth Gravitational Model 2008 (EGM2008). *Journal of Geophysical Research*, Volume 117.
- Sansò F., Sideris M. G., 1997, On the similarities and differences between systems theory and least-squares collocation in physical geodesy. *Bollettino di Geodesia e Scienze Affini*, Volume 2: 174-206.
- Seeber G., 2003, Satellite geodesy: foundations, methods and applications, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Sideris M. G., 1996, On the use of heterogeneous noisy data in spectral gravity field modelling methods. *Journal of Geodesy*, Volume 70, Issue 8: 470-479.
- Tocho C., Vergos G., Pacino M., 2014, Evaluation of the latest GOCE/GRACE derived Global Geopotential Models over Argentina with collocated GPS/Levelling observations. In: Marti U (ed) Gravity, Geoid and Height Systems, International Association of Geodesy Symposia Volume 141, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, pp: 75-83.

- Tziavos I. N., Vergos G. S., Grigoriadis V. N., Andritsanos V. D., 2012, Adjustment of collocated GPS, geoid and orthometric height observations in Greece. Geoid or orthometric height improvement? In: Kenyon S, Pacino M-C, Marti U (eds) *Geodesy for Planet Earth*, International Association of Geodesy Symposia Volume 136, Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York, pp. 481-488.
- Tziavos I. N., Vergos G. S., Grigoriadis V. N., Tzanou E. A., Natsiopoulou D. A., 2015, Validation of GOCE/GRACE satellite only and combined global geopotential models over Greece, in the frame of the GOCESeaComb Project. Accepted for Publication to the IAG Scientific Assembly 2013, International Association of Geodesy Symposia Vol. 143, Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Vergos G. S., Tziavos I. N., Andritsanos V. D., 2004, Gravity Data Base Generation and Geoid Model Estimation Using Heterogeneous Data. In: Jekeli C, Bastos L, Fernandes J (Eds.), *IAG Symposia, Volume 129, Gravity, Geoid and Space Missions-GGSM2004*, Springer, pp. 155-160.
- Vergos G., Grigoriadis V., Tziavos I., Kotsakis C., 2014, Evaluation of GOCE/GRACE Global Geopotential Models over Greece with collocated GPS/Levelling observations and local gravity data. In: Marti U (ed) *Gravity, Geoid and Height Systems*, International Association of Geodesy Symposia Volume 141, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, pp: 85-92.
- Vergos G. S., Andritsanos V. D., Grigoriadis V. N., Pagounis V., Tziavos I. N., 2015, Evaluation of GOCE/GRACE GGMs over Attika and Thessaloniki, Greece, and Wo determination for height system unification. *International Association of Geodesy Symposia Volume 145*, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, New York.