Geophysical Research Abstracts Vol. 20, EGU2018-14639, 2018 EGU General Assembly 2018 © Author(s) 2018. CC Attribution 4.0 license.



## How important is the site distribution for a GNSS water vapour tomography using a Compressive Sensing solution?

Marion Heublein, Bastian Erdnüß, Patrick Eric Bradley, and Stefan Hinz Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institute of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Karlsruhe, Germany (marion.heublein@kit.edu)

## Motivation:

An accurate knowledge of the 3D distribution of water vapor in the atmosphere is a key element for weather forecasting and climate research. In addition, a precise determination of water vapor is also required for accurate positioning and deformation monitoring using Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) and Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR). Several approaches for 3D tomographic water vapor reconstruction from GNSS-based Slant Wet Delay (SWD) estimates exist. However, the accuracy of the tomographic solution largely depends on the observing geometry related to the orbits and to the GNSS site distribution. Therefore, the performance of different site distributions is tested in this study.

## Goal of this work:

In this work, we analyze the performance of different site distributions for reconstructing neutrospheric refractivity from GNSS SWD estimates using a Compressive Sensing (CS) approach. In particular, we focus on the question in how far the horizontal site distributions should differ in different latitudes.

## Approach:

For three  $100 \times 100 \ \mathrm{km}^2$  large test regions at the equator, in mid latitudes, and in high latitudes, a large number of observing geometry settings is defined. These settings result from the combination of i) many samples of the real GNSS orbit geometry with ii) different site numbers, and iii) different distributions of these sites within the study areas. Evaluation metrics that mathematically describe the site distributions are defined (e.g., site density and standard deviation of the site density in longitude and in latitude, number of visible satellites, percentage of ground voxels in which no GNSS site is situated). From this large number of observing geometry settings,  $100 \times 100 \times 100$