



NLS
FINNISH GEOSPATIAL
RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FGI

Quick and dirty to NKG2020 transformation

Pasi Häkli



pasi.hakli@nls.fi

NKG WGRF meeting, Reykjavik, Iceland, March 13-14, 2024



Background

- Glacial Isostatic Adjustment (GIA) causes **intraplate deformations in the Nordic and Baltic countries**
 - Up to 1cm/yr in vertical and a few mm/yr in horizontal (see ETRF2014 velocities from EPN_ETRF2014_C2235 in the top figure)
- ETRS89 as a plate-fixed frame minimizes time-variability of coordinates via standardized **EUREF transformation**
 - It considers only the rigid Eurasian plate motion but not any intra- or interplate deformations → **residuals may reach a few dm** (see ITRF2014@2023.0 -> Nat. ETRFy in the bottom figure)
 - Intraplate corrections not recommended (based on ETRS89 definition) but recognized necessary for some cases
- GIA has been one of the most important study subjects for the **Nordic Geodetic Commission (NKG)**, e.g.:
 - Several land uplift models and **NKG transformation approach**




NKG transformation

- **Storing of geodata:** national, static reference frame (Nordic-Baltic region: [ETRS89 realizations](#))
- **Positioning (coordinates):** most accurate, global, dynamic reference frame (**ITRFyy**)
- **Transformation** considers crustal motions between these two reference frames ("two-frame approach", "semi-dynamic RF"):
 - Basis: EUREF transformation
 - **Deformation model:** intraplate corrections
 - **National transformation parameters:** differences btw pan-European and national realizations


→ Accurate link between global (ITRFyy) and Nordic-Baltic (ETRFyy) reference frames

- E.g. for reference frame maintenance and monitoring
- Released versions: [NKG2008](#), [NKG2020](#)




NKG2008 transformation

- Released in 2016
 - <https://doi.org/10.1515/jogs-2016-0001>




NKG2020 transformation

- Released in 2021
 - Uncertainty estimates and documentation in 2023
 - Same methodology but all data updated:
 - **ITRFyy coordinates**: ITRF2014(2015.0) from **NKG Repro1**
 - **National ETRFyy coordinates**: revised and even some updated realizations
 - **Deformation model**: **NKG_RF17vel**
 - **National transformations**:
 - New Helmert parameters: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden
 - New method: **correction grid** for Norway
- Major update
- Supersedes NKG2008 transformation



NKG2020 uncertainty

- Helmert **transformation residuals** (and coordinate differences after correction grid)
 - A few mm accuracy (uncertainty) for most countries
 - Gives a picture of the expected uncertainty level but **valid only for the coordinates used to determine the transformation parameters**
- NKG2020 transformation has several steps that contain their uncertainties
 - Part of the steps time-dependent → also **NKG2020 uncertainty time-dependent**
 - Uncertainty can be **divided into constant and time-dependent parts**
- Uncertainty can be estimated in several ways, here **empirical approach** selected
 - Estimated with different data sets



NKG2020 uncertainty: constant part

- **Constant part of the uncertainty** estimated with four data sets:
 - NKG Repro1_upd2020, EPN_IGb14_C2220, ITRF2020, IGS20 (not shown due to only a few common stations)
 - Epoch: 2015.0 (same as for parameter estimation)
 - Reference frame: ITRF2014 (IGb14), ITRF2020 (+IGS20)
- **Accuracy:** approximately same level for all solutions and compared to the residuals
 - **Constant part** (overall, for comparison purposes): **1.7mm, 1.8mm, 3.6mm** for N, E, U respectively
- NKG2020 transformation **works also for ITRF2020 with the same accuracy**




Table 6. NKG Repro1 upd2020: IGb14@2015.0, EPN_IGb14_C2220: IGb14@2015.0 and ITRF2020@2015.0 transformed to national ETRS89 realizations. rms of coordinate differences. * Norway w/ correction grid

rms	NKG Repro1 upd2020: IGb14@2015.0				EPN_IGb14_C2220: IGb14@2015.0				ITRF2020@2015.0			
Country	n	dN [mm]	dE [mm]	dU [mm]	n	dN [mm]	dE [mm]	dU [mm]	n	dN [mm]	dE [mm]	dU [mm]
DK	10	0.84	1.94	5.45	3	0.51	1.71	3.21	5	1.19	2.06	2.77
EE	25	1.89	2.10	2.10	4	3.01	2.93	2.54	1	2.50	2.50	0.00
FI	46	1.05	1.34	3.53	19	0.64	0.40	1.36	3	1.18	1.09	2.81
LV	6	0.96	3.29	2.38	1	5.10	2.60	25.20	0			
LT	29	3.56	4.21	9.39	1	6.50	2.30	36.10	1	6.70	1.30	41.50
NO*	35	2.01	1.39	3.35	5	2.49	2.87	2.59	6	2.88	2.75	3.30
SE	67	1.17	1.18	2.67	30	1.26	1.44	2.49	21	1.39	1.19	3.26
Total	222	1.69	1.78	3.59	64	1.47	1.59	2.41	39	1.79	1.84	3.31

NKG2020 uncertainty: time-dependent part

- Time-dependent part of the uncertainty evaluated with **position time series**: [NKG Repr01_upd2020](#)
 - Length of time series: 3.3-23.5 years, average: 13 years
 - Data cleaned: same discontinuities and data rejections as for NKG Repr01_upd2020, number of solutions in TS: 1-6
 - Daily ITRF2014 coordinates **transformed with NKG2020 transformation** and compared to national ETRS89 coordinates → residual time series
- Residual time series analyzed with Hector
- **Time-dependency (overall, rms): 0.1, 0.1, 0.3 mm/yr** for N, E, U respectively
 - These values suggest a few millimeter stability over 10 years that can be considered very good result




Figure 12. Example of the residual time series and velocities for SUN0 station in Sweden.

Conclusions

- NKG2020 transformation supersedes previous version NKG2008.
- **NKG2020 transformation serves as a link between ITRFyy and Nordic-Baltic ETRFyy realizations at a few millimeter-level, also over time.**
 - Overall, we found the empirical accuracy (uncertainty at epoch 2015.0): 1.7 mm +/- 0.1 mm/yr, 1.8 mm +/- 0.1 mm/yr and 3.6 mm +/- 0.3 mm/yr in North, East and Up components, respectively (1σ).
 - As a result, the accuracy degrades only a few millimeters in 10 years.
 - NKG2020 transformation was also shown to operate equally with the recently released ITRF2020.
- NKG2020 has been implemented in PROJ and in the future into EPSG and ISO registries
- Full documentation available: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jogs-2022-0155>



NLS
FINNISH GEOSPATIAL
RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FGI

DynPos


(**Dyn**amic coordinates in FINPOS
positioning service)

Pasi Häkli, Topi Rikkinen, Marko Ollikainen and Simo
Marila



DynPos project

- A short pilot project carried out in 2020
- [FINPOS](#) is the **positioning service** of the NLS.
- FINPOS (like most of the positioning services) operates with official **static** EUREF-FIN coordinates that cannot account for the crustal motions and therefore **become** more and more **inaccurate** in time
- **Purpose** of the DynPos project **was to study if the FINPOS positioning service can:**
 1. **be set up to operate in a dynamic reference frame,**
 2. **provide user positions in dynamic and semi-dynamic reference frames,**
 3. **and if these improve the accuracy of the service**



DynPos: methods

- Investigation of settings for positioning service software (GNSSMART) for the use with dynamic coordinates
 - Only GNSSMART 1 tested due to short project
 - Two servers in parallel:
 - Production service: static EUREF-FIN coordinates (internal deformation corrections to stations)
 - Research service: ITRF2014 coordinates, velocities and transformations
- Necessary data:
 - Dynamic **ITRF2014 coordinates** for FinnRef stations at epoch 2015.0 (NKG Repro1)
 - **Station velocities** (ITRF2014), with which GNSSMART can determine coordinates at the observation (current) epoch
 - **ITRF2014 reference coordinates for the mean epoch 2020.75 of the test**
 - Semi-dynamic coordinates using GNTRSRVR transformation module and associated parameter file (system import format, sif)
 - Transformations according to the **NKG2008 transformation** (NKG2020 not yet available at the time):
 - Helmert parameters
 - Crustal motion corrections from NKG_RF03vel model
 - Transformations sent via RTCM 3.2, message types 1021 and 1023

DynPos: methods


- Positioning service tested in a dynamic (DRF), semi-dynamic (semi-DRF) and static (SRF) reference frame with real-time VRS measurements
 - Test performed at two CORS stations (not included in the FINPOS service)
 - CORS data splitted to two GNSS receivers (same data) but corrected with different corrections from the positioning service (different mountpoints) → two of the above (DRF/semi-DRF/SRF) could be compared at the same time
 - Position time series, couple of days of data, new initialisation every minute
 - Positioning results compared to reference coordinates
 - DRF: ITRF2014(2020.75)
 - semi-DRF and SRF: EUREF-FIN

DynPos: results


Accuracies (see figures):

1. **Dynamic ITRF2014@2020.75**
 2. **Semi-dynamic EUREF-FIN**
(ITRF2014@2020.75 + NKG transformation → EUREF-FIN)
 3. **Static EUREF-FIN**, (without transformation; from "production" service, software defines coordinate corrections)
- Based on short tests accuracies approximately the same with all three methods
 - Horizontal: ~1cm
 - Vertical: ~2cm

DRF vs. semi-DRF



static vs. semi-DRF



DynPos: conclusions

- **It is possible to set up FINPOS service to operate and provide positions in a global dynamic and semi-dynamic reference frames**
 - Enables user positioning in a global reference frame, e.g. for aviation and maritime applications.
 - Enables implementation of a semi-dynamic reference frame (=NKG transformation)
- **Accuracies approx. same** with three methods, thus alternative methods provide same accuracies as the current production service
 - But **NKG transformation approach more correct and transparent** compared to the current method (where the software defines the corrections itself: "black box")
- Short test/project, therefore **results preliminary** and based on older version of the positioning service software, further tests needed:
 - Approach for GNSMART2 software
 - More testing needed with different RTK rovers, deeper analysis, etc

Knowing the Earth – Securing the future

