Geophysical Research Abstracts, Vol. 8, 05076, 2006
SRef-ID: 1607-7962/gra/EGU06-A-05076

Analysis of CEGRN 2005 as the eighth of CERGOP observing campaigns

J. Hefty (1), L. Gerhatova, (1), M. Becker (2), R. Drescher (2), A. Caporali (3), Gy. Grenerczy (4), G. Stangl (5), C. Haslinger (6), S. Krauss, (6), T. Liwosz (7), R. Kratochvil (8)

(1) Department of Theoretical Geodesy, Slovak University of Technology, Bratislava, Slovakia (jan.hefty@stuba.sk), (2) The Institute of Physical Geodesy, Darmstadt University of Technology, Darmstadt, Germany, (3) Department of Geology, Palaeontology and Geophysics, University of Padova, Padova, Italy, (4) FOMI Satellite Geodetic Observatory, Penc, Hungary, (5) Federal Office of Metrology and Surveying, Graz, Austria, (6) Space Research Institute Graz, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Graz, Austria, (7) Institute of Geodesy and Geodetical Astronomy. Warsaw University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland (8) Research Institute of Geodesy, Topography and Cartography, Zdiby, Czech Republic

The latest observing campaign of Central Europe Geodynamics Regional Network (CEGRN) was performed in June 2005. It is independently processed by 6 analysis centres from following institutions: Darmstadt University of Technology (TUD), FOMI Satellite Geodetic Observatory (FOMI), Geodetic Observatory Pecny (GOP), Observatory Lusbuehel Graz (OLG), Slovak University of Technology (SUT) and Warsaw University of Technology (WUT). Observation data from 96 stations, which were prepared by OLG are analysed by the Bernese GPS software with a strategy similar to that used for the previous CEGRN campaigns observed in 1994 - 2003. The 2005 campaign solution includes 75 officially adopted CEGRN stations, 5 additional IGS are added for the linkage to ITRF. A set of 16 candidate sites with the potential of becoming new CEGRN stations is included in addition to the processing. A combination of all submitted solutions is performed at SUT and the official CEGRN 2005 solution is produced. Individual analysis centres solutions are mutually compared and outliers are checked. The combined product from 2005 is confronted to the coordinates from the seven previous CEGRN campaigns and the stability and consistency of the monitored stations is examined. Finally, for some CEGRN sites with long observation history the comparison with ITRF and ETRF coordinates is performed.