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## EPN-repro2 memories

$\checkmark$ MU1 (EPN individual calibrations + IGS type mean) vs MU4 (IGS type mean)
$\checkmark$ Coordinate differences and the impact on:

- network alignment
- stability of the time series
- size of the jumps
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## Mismatch of coordinates

Horizontal offsets
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## Vertical offsets



## Reference stations - Alignment

$\checkmark 8$ of 46 reference stations are affected (valid for GPSWEEK 1768)

| Station | Offset [mm] |  |  | Station | Offset [mm] |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North | East | Up |  | North | East | Up |
| ANKR ${ }^{\text {TP }}$ | $0.4 \pm 0.2$ | $0.8 \pm 0.3$ | $2.0 \pm 0.5$ | NICO ${ }^{\text {L4 }}$ | $-0.1 \pm 0.3$ | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ | $-1.6 \pm 0.7$ |
| BUCULG | $1.7 \pm 0.3$ | $-1.3 \pm 0.2$ | $-0.8 \pm 0.5$ | RIGA ${ }^{\text {L4 }}$ | $1.1 \pm 0.3$ | $-0.2 \pm 0.4$ | $-0.5 \pm 0.7$ |
| HOFNL4 | $2.0 \pm 0.4$ | $-0.6 \pm 0.6$ | $-0.4 \pm 0.7$ | SOFI ${ }^{\text {L3 }}$ | $-1.9 \pm 0.3$ | $2.4 \pm 0.3$ | $-8.6 \pm 0.7$ |
| METS AS | $-2.0 \pm 0.3$ | $1.5 \pm 0.3$ | $0.0 \pm 0.6$ | WTZR ${ }^{\text {L3 }}$ | $0.4 \pm 0.3$ | $0.6 \pm 0.3$ | $2.5 \pm 0.5$ |

ASASH700936C_M NONE; LG LEIAT504GG LEIS; L3LEIAT25.R3 LEIT; L4 LEIAT25.R4 LEIT;TP TPSCR3_GGD CONE.

## Reference stations - Alignment

$\checkmark 8$ of 46 reference stations are affected (valid for GPSWEEK 1768)
$\checkmark$ No significant impact on frame realisation

$\checkmark 33$ jumps investigated (individual to individual vs type mean to type mean)


Individual


Type mean

|  | BUTE [Hungary]: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 201 |  |  |
|  | 072008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 201 |

## Jumps
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## Coordinates repeatability

$\checkmark$ A slight improvement [51\% (North) and 53\% (East) coordinate time series have smaller std.] in the horizontal components, if the individual calibrations are used.
$\checkmark$ Worse repeatability in Up component for $\mathbf{5 9 \%}$ analyzed antennas, if individual calibrations are used instead of IGS type mean.
$\checkmark$ No type-dependent effect.

|  | North | East | Up |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean improvement: | $0.9 \mathrm{~mm}(57)^{*}$ | $0.9 \mathrm{~mm}(59)$ | $2.4 \mathrm{~mm}(46)$ |
| Mean degradation: | $0.9 \mathrm{~mm}(54)$ | $0.9 \mathrm{~mm}(51)$ | $2.1 \mathrm{~mm}(65)$ |

## Summary

There is no clear indication that any ground antenna phase centre corrections is superior to the other.
> Statistically, individual calibrations slightly improve the horizontal part [in 55\%] and degrade the heights [in 63\%] in all three aspects [annual signal, repeatability, jumps].


