Geophysical Research Abstracts Vol. 21, EGU2019-12109, 2019 EGU General Assembly 2019 © Author(s) 2019. CC Attribution 4.0 license.



## Seis: overview, deployment and first science on the ground

Philippe Lognonné (1), William B. Banerdt (2), W.Tom Pike (3), Domenico Giardini (4), Don Banfield (5), Ulrich Christensen (6), Marco Bierwirth (6), Simon Calcutt (7), John Clinton (4), Sharon Kedar (2), Raphael Garcia (8), Sebastien de Raucourt (1), Ken Hurst (2), Taichi Kawamura (1), David Mimoun (8), Mark Panning (2), Aymeric Spiga (9), Peter Zweifel (4), Eric Beucler (10), Nicolas Verdier (11), and the SEIS commissioning team

(1) Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris-Sorbonne Paris Cité, Université Paris Diderot (UMR 7154 CNRS), Planetology et Space Science Team, 35 Rue Hélène Brion, Paris, 75013, France (lognonne@ipgp.fr,deraucourt@ipgp.fr,kawamura@ipgp.fr),
(2) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109, United States of America.
(william.b.banerdt@jpl.nasa.gov, sharon.kedar@jpl.nasa.gov, kenneth.j.hurst@jpl.nasa.gov, mark.p.panning@jpl.nasa.gov),
(3) Imperial College London, Faculty of Engineering, Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, London, United Kingdom (w.t.pike@imperial.ac.uk)., (4) Institut of Geophysics, ETHZ, Sonneggstrasse 5, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland
(domenico.giardini@erdw.ethz.ch,jclinton@sed.ethz.ch,pzweifel@retired.ethz.ch), (5) Cornell Center for Astrophysics and Planetary Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, United States of America (banfield@astro.cornell.edu), (6) Max Planck Institute for Solar System Research, Department of Planets and Comets, Göttingen, Germany

(christensen@mps.mpg.de,bierwirthm@mps.mpg.de), (7) University of Oxford, Atmospheric, Oceanic, & Planetary Physics, University of Oxford, Clarendon Laboratory, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom (calcutt@atm.ox.ac.uk), (8) 8ISAE-SUPAERO, Toulouse University, 10 Avenue E. Belin, 31400 Toulouse, France

(Raphael.GARCIA@isae-supaero.fr,david.mimoun@isae-supaero.fr), (9) Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique, Sorbonne Université - CNRS, Tour 45/55, 4 Place Jussieu, 75005, Paris (aymeric.spiga@lmd.jussieu.fr), (10) LPG Nantes, UMR6112, CNRS-Université de Nantes, 2 rue de la Houssinière, BP 92208, 44322 Nantes cedex 3, France (eric.beucler@univ-nantes.fr), (11) Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales, 18 av Edouard Belin, 31401 TOULOUSE Cedex 9, France (nicolas.verdier@cnes.fr)

The InSight mission landed on Mars on 11/26/2018. This is the first planetary mission deploying a complete geophysical observatory on another body than Earth after the Apollo Lunar Surface Experiments Package (ALSEP) deployed on the Moon during the Apollo program. It will provide the first ground truth constraints on interior structure of the planet. The Seismic Experiment for Interior Structure (SEIS) is one of the three primary scientific investigations, the two other ones being the Heat Flow and Physical Properties Package (HP3) and the Rotation and Interior Structure Experiment (RISE). SEIS is completed by the APSS experiment (InSight Auxiliary Payload Suite), one of which goal is to document the atmospheric source of seismic noise and signals. After a brief description of the SEIS experiment, we report the deployment process, including the evolution of the SEIS noise from on the deck measurements (with only SPs) toward on the ground (with both VBBs and SPs), without and finally with wind shield.

We compare these noise levels to those obtained on Earth during tests, to those recorded on the Moon and to those predicted prior the landing. In all configurations, we identify the contribution of the lander noise and finally discuss what might remain in term of micro-seismic background, i.e. uncoherent seismic waves background.

As proposed by several studies made prior the landing, atmospheric seismic signals on the ground are expected from turbulence in the planetary boundary layer or from dust devils, at both long period and short period. We expect also local time variation of the seismic noise as a consequence of weather activity as well as possible micro-seismic noise associated to trapped surface or body waves in the subsurface low velocity channel. We challenge these predictions with the data and discuss the events and spectrum identified with both the SEIS and APSS data. We finally compare them with modeling made with different subsurface structure.