



Customer	: ESRIN	Document Ref	: IDEAS+-SER-OQC-REP-2071
Contract No	: 4000111304/14/I-AM	Issue Date	: 12 August 2015
WP No	: 6110	Issue	: 1.0



## IDEAS+ Swarm Weekly Report 2015/31: 2015/07/27 - 2015/08/02

**Abstract** : This is the **Instrument Data quality Evaluation and Analysis Service Plus** (IDEAS+) Swarm Weekly report on Swarm products quality, covering the period from 27 July to 02 August 2015.

**Author** : \_\_\_\_\_ **Approval** : \_\_\_\_\_  
Igino Coco, Jan Miedzik and Lidia Saavedra de Miguel  
Enkelejda Qamili on behalf of IDEAS+ Science and Ops.  
Swarm IDEAS+ Team Coordinator

**Distribution** : ESA/ESRIN EOP-GMQ  
ESA/ESRIN EOP-GM Swarm MM  
IDEAS+ Leadership Team  
IDEAS+ subcontractors  
ESA/ESTEC Swarm PLSO  
ESA/ESOC Swarm FOS

**Copyright © 2015 Telespazio VEGA UK Ltd**

*All rights reserved.*

*No part of this work may be disclosed to any third party translated reproduced copied or disseminated in any form or by any means except as defined in the contract or with the written permission of Telespazio Vega UK Ltd.*

**Telespazio VEGA UK Ltd**  
350 Capability Green, Luton, Bedfordshire, LU1 3LU, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 (0) 1582 399 000 Fax: +44 (0) 1582 728 686  
[www.telespazio-vega.com](http://www.telespazio-vega.com)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.1 Current Operational configuration of monitored data:.....	6
1.2 Reference documents.....	6
<b>2. SUMMARY OF THE OBSERVATIONS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
2.1 General status of Swarm instruments and Level 1B products quality.....	8
2.2 Plan for operational processor updates.....	8
2.3 Quality Working Group and Cal/Val Coordination.....	8
2.4 Summary of observations for 2015, Week 31 (27/07 - 02/08).....	8
<b>3. ROUTINE QUALITY CONTROL</b> .....	<b>10</b>
3.1 Gaps analysis.....	10
3.2 Orbit and Attitude Products.....	10
3.2.1 Position Statistics.....	10
3.2.2 Attitude observations.....	17
3.3 Magnetic Products.....	17
3.3.1 ASM-VFM difference statistics.....	18
3.3.2 ASM Instrument parameters: quartz frequency and ASM temperature (ASMAVEC_0).....	19
3.3.3 VFM Instrument parameters: VFM temperatures (MAG_CA).....	19
3.3.4 Magnetic time series visual inspection.....	19
3.3.5 ASM-VFM anomaly.....	22
3.3.6 TCF.VFM monitoring.....	23
3.3.7 Summary of TCF behaviour for the three S/C.....	26
3.3.8 $B_{NEC}$ vs Chaos4plus model residuals.....	27
<b>4. ON-DEMAND ANALYSIS</b> .....	<b>31</b>



*This page intentionally left blank.*



## **AMENDMENT POLICY**

This document shall be amended by releasing a new edition of the document in its entirety. The Amendment Record Sheet below records the history and issue status of this document.

### **AMENDMENT RECORD SHEET**

<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>REASON</b>
1.0	12 Aug 2015	First issue



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document refers to the activities carried out in the framework of the Sensor Performance, Products and Algorithms (SPPA) Office [RD.1], and as such it reports on work related to:

- Algorithms and Processors Development, Maintenance and Evolution: these include all algorithm and software evolution and maintenance aspects for the different components, for both the Operational processors (OP) and Prototypes processors (PP) of L1 and L2 chains.
- Performance Assessment: these include all Quality Control activities (on-line and offline, systematic or on-demand), for the applicable product levels.
- System Calibration: these include the activities related to calibration, from sensor to system level. They also include aspects like cross calibration and handling of external calibration sources.
- Product validation: these include definition and maintenance of product validation plans.
- End-to-end Sensor Dataset Performance: these include activities related to the organisation and coordination of Quality Working Groups and all aspects of the Experimental platform. It also covers the product baseline, coordination and handling of external communities, and all aspects of ADF handling (both for the operational processors and for the prototypes).

This weekly report constitutes a work in progress throughout the mission life time, and new parts and complements will be added while the consolidation of knowledge on Swarm data and instruments will progress.

Section 2.1 always gives an overview of the general quality status of the mission instruments and products, while the main observations of the week are summarized in Section 2.1.

The document also includes information on data quality for the three Swarm spacecraft, inferred from automated HTML quality reports which are produced on daily basis for each product. Please contact the IDEAS+ Swarm team if interested in accessing the reports via web or FTP (all details about interfaces and folder structure available on [RD.2]). Such quality reports represent the core of the Routine Quality Control (Chapter 3). A description of the implemented quality checks is given in [RD.3], and references therein.

Basing on specific findings of the routine quality control, or on-demand from other entities (i.e. Swarm PDGS, FOS, Mission Management, Post-Launch Support Office, Expert Support Laboratories, Quality Working Groups, user community), anomalies can be triggered and preliminary characterisations and investigations of such anomalies are given in Chapter 4. The anomalies documented in the Weekly Reports are tracked in the following way:

1. If triggered by ESA Eohelp or within the Service: IDEAS+ action and ticketing system (<http://requests-sppa.serco.it/RT3/index.html> ).
2. If triggered by IDEAS+ Swarm team or other entities:
  - 2a. If the observation/analysis leads to an anomaly to be addressed to the processor provider (GMV): SPR on EO ARTS (<https://arts.eo.esa.int> ), **SWL1L2DB** project;
  - 2b. If the observation/analysis does not lead to an anomaly or the investigation shall be escalated to other entities (PLSO/industry, ESL, PDGS): Action tracked on EO ARTS, **SW-IDEAS** project, then addressed to the proper tracking system if needed (e.g. JIRA for ESLs, SW-CP-AR project on EO ARTS for PDGS).

Information on Level 1B Swarm products can be found in [RD.4].



## 1.1 Current Operational configuration of monitored data:

- Processors Version: L1BOP 3.16, L2-Cat2 1.12.p1
- L0 input products baseline: 02
- L1B baseline: MAGNET and PLASMA 04, ORBATT and ACCELE 03 (for definitions and description of the data baseline concept see <https://earth.esa.int/web/guest/missions/esa-operational-eo-missions/swarm/data-access/product-baseline-definition> )
- Level 2 – Cat 2 baseline: 01
- Input auxiliary files baseline: CCDB 0009, ADF 0101
- MPPF-CVQ v.2.14.00

## 1.2 Reference documents

The following is a list of documents with a direct bearing on the content of this report. Where referenced in the text, these are identified as RD.n, where 'n' is the number in the list below:

- [RD.1] Sensor Performance, Products and Algorithms (SPPA), PGSI-GSOP-EOPG-TN-05-0025. Version 2.3.
- [RD.2] Swarm PDGS External DMC Interface Control Document, SW-ID-DS-GS-0001, Issue 3.2.
- [RD.3] Swarm MPPF-CVQ Monitoring Baseline Document, ST-ESA-SWARM-MBD-0001, Issue 1.7.
- [RD.4] Swarm Level 1B Product Definition, SW-RS-DSC-SY-0007, Issue 5.13.
- [RD.5] Swarm IDEAS Configuration Management Plan, IDEAS-SER-MGT-PLN-1081 v0.14.
- [RD.6] Swarm Quality Control Project Plan, IDEAS-SER-MGT-PLN-1071
- [RD.7] SW\_L1BOP\_status\_20141124\_MoM
- [RD.8] Planned Updates for Level 1b, SW-PL-DTU-GS-008, Rev: 1dC.
- [RD.9] IDEAS+ Swarm Weekly Report: 25/08/2014 – 31/08/2014, IDEAS+-SER-OQC-REP-2071\_SPPA\_SwarmWeeklyReport\_20140825\_20140831.pdf (ref. for SWL1L2DB-9)
- [RD.10] IDEAS+ Swarm Weekly Report: 29/09/2014 – 05/10/2014, IDEAS+-SER-OQC-REP-2071\_SPPA\_SwarmWeeklyReport\_20140929\_20141005.pdf (ref. for SW-IDEAS-34)
- [RD.11] IDEAS+ Swarm Weekly Report: 06/10/2014 – 12/10/2014, IDEAS+-SER-OQC-REP-2071\_SPPA\_SwarmWeeklyReport\_20141006\_20141012.pdf (ref. for SW-IDEAS-36)
- [RD.12] IDEAS+ Swarm Weekly Report: 20/10/2014 – 26/10/2014, IDEAS+-SER-OQC-REP-2071\_SPPA\_SwarmWeeklyReport\_20141020\_20141026.pdf (ref. for SW-IDEAS-40, GPS sync loss)
- [RD.13] IDEAS+ Swarm Weekly Report: 15/09/2014 – 21/09/2014, IDEAS+-SER-OQC-REP-2071\_SPPA\_SwarmWeeklyReport\_20140915\_20140921.pdf (ref. for SW-IDEAS-27)
- [RD.14] Swarm L1B 03.15 Validation Report, OSMV-OPMT-SRCP-RP-15-3385, Issue 1.3.
- [RD.15] IDEAS+ Swarm Weekly Report: 23/03/2015 – 29/03/2015, IDEAS+-SER-OQC-REP-2071\_SPPA\_SwarmWeeklyReport\_201513\_20150323\_20150329.pdf.
- [RD.16] SWARM Weekly Operations Report #76, SW-RP-ESC-FS-6172



- [RD.17] Olsen, N., H. Luhr, C.C. Finlay, T.J. Sabaka, I. Michaelis, J. Rauberg and L. Tøffner-Clausen, The CHAOS-4 geomagnetic field model, *Geophys. J. Int.* 197, 815–827, 2014
- [RD.18] IDEAS+-SER-IPF-PLN-2272, Swarm Level 1B Operational Processor Verification Plan, IDEAS+-SER-IPF-PLN-2272\_L1BOP\_316\_v1.5\_final.pdf



## 2. SUMMARY OF THE OBSERVATIONS

### 2.1 General status of Swarm instruments and Level 1B products quality

Nothing to report

### 2.2 Plan for operational processor updates

**L1B:** The assessment of L1BOP data quality is on-going. The PDGS team is performing the first tests with the L1BOP v03.16.p1.

An issue have been found in the EFlx\_PL\_1B data produced with the L1BOP 03.16 from 18/07/2015 on. These data have the variables "Latitude", "Longitude" and "Radius" set to zero. The problem was reported to GMV that will have to, as soon as possible, prepare and deliver a patch.

**L2-Cat2:** the PDGS team have completed the execution of the all the tests. All the data have been provided to the ESLs for the validation.

**CVQ:** The new version of the quality control tool (CVQ 02.14.01) has been tested and now is ready to be installed on the operational platform. Soon a full assessment of all the products produced with the L1BOP 03.16 will be performed.

### 2.3 Quality Working Group and Cal/Val Coordination

Coordination is in place for organizing the 6<sup>th</sup> Swarm Data Quality Workshop in Paris (hosted by IPGP) in late September 2015.

Following the QWG recommendations in Potsdam and the scientists need in view of the IUGG conference in June, the preliminary plasma dataset has been released early February 2015.

DTU/ESL shared the final set of corrected data on early April. These corrected data also contain the dB\_sun correction, providing the users the possibility to access to uncorrected data.

The Task Force meeting was held on 2-3 July in Airbus. During this meeting the following decisions have been taken:

1. A "S-N" dependency of the dBy component on S/C C has to be tested with  $B_{ASM}$
2. A seasonal effect shall be studied by all parties
3. It shall be considered, if the similarities between the three satellites can be caused by processing rather than by the physical disturbance
4. The Lesur/Toffner model should be restricted to focus only on the Zenith / /Bottom disturbance
5. Brain storm on the root cause of the Zenith/Bottom disturbance – can only be carried out by the system design experts

### 2.4 Summary of observations for 2015, Week 31 (27/07 - 02/08)

During the monitored week the following events have been found and investigated:





- **Some features observed in the MOD-NAV difference:** we observe at times deviations from the average values lasting several minutes (SW-IDEAS-34).
- **One event of attitude rejection** of 14 sec is observed for S/C B (28/07) due to anomalous STR reboot over the South Atlantic Anomaly (SW-IDEAS-80).



### 3. ROUTINE QUALITY CONTROL

#### 3.1 Gaps analysis

- No data generated for SC Bravo for day 27/07. For details see SW-CP-AR-348;
- Gap in attitude observed on 28<sup>th</sup> July at 10:46:16 for S/C B due to anomalous STR reboot when crossing the South Atlantic Anomaly (SW-IDEAS-80).

#### 3.2 Orbit and Attitude Products

In Table 1 are listed events that have to be reported.

**Table 1:** List of events related to attitude and orbit products to be reported in the monitoring for 2015, Week 31: 27/07 - 02/08.

Observation ID	Description	Affected parameter	Sect. of Obs. Description	Sect. of Obs. Analysis
SW-IDEAS-34	OBS_ROUTINE: spiky features observed in the NAV-MOD difference	Orbits (position and velocity)	3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.2.1.3	[RD.10]
SW-IDEAS-80	OBS_ROUTINE: 2015, week 31 (27/7-02/08), STR S/C A out of range.	STRAATT_1B STRASCI_1A	3.2.2	3.2.2

The relevant parameters that have been monitored are:

- Position difference between calculated Medium Accuracy orbits (**MODx\_SC\_1B**) and on-board solution (**GPSxNAV\_0**). Threshold values for such differences have not been assessed yet: we have just monitored the average values and maximum variations around the week, and reported in tables in the sections below, along with some example from the HTML daily reports. For the time being we evaluated an anomaly should be raised if one (or more) of the following conditions occurs:
  - o The **average difference** on a given day exceeds the position accuracy requirement for the mission (1.5 m),
  - o The variability around the average is quite high: **standard deviation** threshold has been arbitrarily chosen to be twice the position accuracy requirement for the mission (2-sigma = 3 m).
  - o At least 4-5 spikes are observed on a given day, exceeding +/- 50 m.
- Visual inspection of Star Tracker characterisation flags (**STRxATT\_1B**)
- Deviation of the quaternion norm from unity (deviation threshold = +/- 10<sup>-9</sup>)
- Visual inspection of Euler Angles derived from quaternions.

##### 3.2.1 Position Statistics

In Table 2, one can see the statistics of the differences between MOD and on-board solution positions for S/C A, B and C respectively. In the third column the maximum differences (maximum negative and maximum positive) are reported. The maximum standard deviation is in the fourth column. Maxima, minima and standard deviations



usually refer to the Z component which is often the most disturbed; in case another component is most affected, it will be specified in parentheses.


**Table 2:** Swarm A, B and C, difference between MOD and on-board solution positions. If not specified maximum difference and maximum standard deviation refers to the Z axis.

Swarm A, 27/07 - 02/08, Position difference					
Day	Average difference (m)	Maximum difference (m)		Maximum standard deviation (m)	Notes
27/07	0.11	-6.2	6	1.26	
28/07	0.13	-6.9	11.2	1.49	SW-IDEAS-34 [RD.10]
29/07	0.14	-7.1	6.5	1.18	
30/07	0.04	-5.3	6.6	1.13	
31/07	0.22	-5.7 (X)	6.4	1.14	
01/08	0.07	-7.6	9.9	1.43	SW-IDEAS-34 [RD.10]
02/08	0.07	-6.2	7	1.34	
Swarm B, 27/07 - 02/08, Position difference					
Day	Average difference (m)	Maximum difference (m)		Maximum standard deviation (m)	Notes
27/07					SW-CP-AR-348
28/07	0.22	-7.6 (X)	9.4	1.52	
29/07	0.15	-6.8 (X)	6.5	1.14	
30/07	0.12	-7.5	6.4	1.18	
31/07	0.16	-6.1	6.9	1.2	
01/08	0.16	-10.3	9	1.52	SW-IDEAS-34 [RD.10]
02/08	0.08	-6.1	9	1.38	
Swarm C, 27/07 - 02/08, Position difference					
Day	Average difference (m)	Maximum difference (m)		Maximum standard deviation (m)	Notes
27/07	0.11	-9.6 (X)	7.6	1.24	
28/07	0.12	-7.2	9.3	1.43	SW-IDEAS-34 [RD.10]
29/07	0.12	-5.4	7.7	1.1	
30/07	0.06	-5.5	5.8	1.1	
31/07	0.21	-7.8	6.6 (X)	1.11	
01/08	0.05	-8	9.4	1.41	SW-IDEAS-34 [RD.10]
02/08	0.07	-7	5.6	1.3	



### 3.2.1.1 Swarm A

Below are shown example plots of MOD-NAV differences taken: at the beginning of the week (27/07, Figure 1) in the middle (30/07, Figure 2) and at the end (02/08, Figure 3). From top to bottom the plots show of MOD-NAV differences in ITFR reference frame: on X, Y and Z axis respectively. The difference between both solutions is given in [m].



**Figure 1:** Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C A, 27/07. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis




Figure 2: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C A, 30/07. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis




Figure 3: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C A, 02/08. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis

### 3.2.1.2 Swarm B

Below are shown example plots of MOD-NAV differences taken: at the beginning of the week (28/07, Figure 4), in the middle (30/07, Figure 5), and at end of the week (02/08, Figure 6). From top to bottom the plots show of MOD-NAV differences in ITRF reference



frame: on X, Y and Z axis respectively. The difference between both solutions is given in [m].




Figure 4: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C B, 28/07. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis




Figure 5: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C B, 30/07. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis




Figure 6: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C B, 02/08. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis

### 3.2.1.3 Swarm C

Below are shown example plots of MOD-NAV differences taken: at the beginning of the week (27/07, Figure 7), in the middle (30/07, Figure 8) and at the end (02/08, Figure 9). From top to bottom the plots show of MOD-NAV differences in ITFR reference frame: on X, Y and Z axis respectively. The difference between both solutions is given in [m].




Figure 7: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C C, 27/07. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis




Figure 8: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C C, 30/07. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis






Figure 9: Difference MOD-GPSNAV, S/C C, 02/08. From top to bottom: X, Y and Z axis

### 3.2.2 Attitude observations

#### 3.2.2.1 Swarm A

SW-IDEAS-80: We observe an interval of rejected attitudes for S/C A on 28/07 (Flags\_q=255). The reason for such rejection is described in Section 3.1 (details in Table 3).

Table 3 Attitudes out-of-range on S/C A, week 31.

Start time	Stop time	Value	Length
28 JUL 2015 10:46:16	28 JUL 2015 10:46:29	255	14

#### 3.2.2.2 Swarm B

No data for day 27/07. For details see SW-CP-AR-348.

#### 3.2.2.3 Swarm C

Nothing to report.

### 3.3 Magnetic Products

For the magnetic products the weekly monitoring consists in:

- TCF.VFM parameters monitoring (VFM calibration parameters): series of biases, scales, non-orthogonality factors and RMS. **This check is performed on monthly basis.**



- ASM instrument monitoring: quartz frequency and ASM temperature
- VFM instrument monitoring: temperatures
- Visual inspection of daily time series of magnetic field intensity F, **B<sub>NEC</sub>** and **B<sub>VFM</sub>**. Looking for gaps (or zero values in case of **MAGx\_LR\_1B** products), out-of-threshold values (i.e. exceeding +/- 60000 nT), and other strange features.
- Monitoring of the **ASM-VFM known anomaly**: visual inspection of  $|B_{NEC}| - F$  and recording of daily maximum variations. If +/- 5 nT are exceeded on a given day, an alert is raised.
- Comparison of magnetic data (B\_NEC) with a model (Chaos4plus).

### 3.3.1 ASM-VFM difference statistics

In Table 4, one can see the statistics of the differences between magnetic field absolute value measured by ASM and by VFM. In the second and third column are reported the maximum and minimum differences respectively. The maximum standard deviation is reported in the fourth column while the mean value is shown in the last column.

**Table 4** Swarm A and B, difference between magnetic field absolute value measured by ASM and by VFM ( $F_{ASM} - |B_{VFM}|$ ).

Swarm A, 27/07 - 02/08, ASM-VFM difference				
Day	Max (nT)	Min (nT)	Standard deviation (m)	Mean
27/07	1.8E+00	-7.1E-01	2.4E-01	1.7E-01
28/07	1.2E+00	-9.9E-01	2.6E-01	1.8E-01
29/07	9.4E-01	-1.2E+00	3.2E-01	1.7E-01
30/07	1.0E+00	-1.1E+00	2.9E-01	1.9E-01
31/07	1.2E+00	-1.1E+00	3.3E-01	1.8E-01
01/08	-8.5E-01	2.4E+00	2.9E-01	2.0E-01
02/08	8.2E-01	-1.7E+00	3.3E-01	-1.8E-01
Swarm B, 27/07 - 02/08, ASM-VFM difference				
Day	Max (nT)	Min (nT)	Standard deviation (m)	Mean
27/07	No data due to failure during processing – details in SW-CP-AR-348			
28/07	8.1E-01	-6.1E-01	2.5E-01	7.6E-02
29/07	7.9E-01	-6.5E-01	2.5E-01	7.1E-02
30/07	1.0E+00	-7.1E-01	2.5E-01	6.7E-02
31/07	7.6E+00	-8.7E-01	2.5E-01	5.2E-02
01/08	4.7E+00	1.0E+00	2.4E-01	6.2E-02
02/08	1.0E+00	-7.5E-01	2.4E-01	-5.1E-02



### 3.3.2 ASM Instrument parameters: quartz frequency and ASM temperature (ASMAVEC\_0)

For S/C Alpha and Bravo the temperature and quartz frequency behaved as expected.

### 3.3.3 VFM Instrument parameters: VFM temperatures (MAG\_CA)


The VFM instrument parameters important for monitoring the instrument health are the VFM sensor temperatures: T\_CDC, T\_CSC and T\_EU.

For S/C Alpha and Bravo for reported period the temperatures behaved as expected.

### 3.3.4 Magnetic time series visual inspection

#### 3.3.4.1 Swarm A


An example of representative magnetic field time series for S/C A (02/08) can be seen in Figure 10 below.



**Figure 10:** Time series of the geomagnetic field, for 02/08, S/C A. From top to bottom: magnetic field components in NEC reference frame, magnetic field components in the VFM reference frame, magnetic field intensity (F) from ASM, and location of gaps (if any).

#### 3.3.4.2 Swarm B


An example of representative magnetic field time series for S/C B (02/08) can be seen in Figure 11 below.



**Figure 11:** Time series of the geomagnetic field for 02/08, S/C B. From top to bottom: magnetic field components in NEC reference frame, magnetic field components in the VFM reference frame, magnetic field intensity (F) from ASM, and location of gaps (if any).

### 3.3.4.3 Swarm C

An example of magnetic field time series for S/C C (02/08) can be seen in Figure 12.



**Figure 12:** Time series of the geomagnetic field for 02/08, S/C C. From top to bottom: magnetic field components in NEC reference frame, magnetic field components in the VFM reference frame, magnetic field intensity (F) from ASM (no data here because ASM it is off) and location of gaps.



### 3.3.5 ASM-VFM anomaly

**General observation:** the difference between  $F\_ASM$  and  $|B\_VFM|$  remains at low level with only a few significant spikes exceeding 2nT.

#### 3.3.5.1 Swarm A

The daily peak-to-peak difference around the week stays within  $[-1; 1]$  nT with a few spikes not exceeding 2nT. Below two example plots of such differences for the days: 27/07 (Figure 13), and 02/08 (Figure 14).




Figure 13: ASM-VFM residuals for S/C A, 27/07.




Figure 14: ASM-VFM residuals for S/C A, 02/08.

#### 3.3.5.2 Swarm B

The daily peak-to-peak difference around the week is, on average:  $[-1; 1]$  nT, with a few spikes not exceeding 1 nT and two spikes of 5 and 7 nT on 01/08 and 02/08. Below two example plots of such differences: 28/07 (Figure 15), and 02/08 (Figure 16).




Figure 15: ASM-VFM residuals for S/C B, 28/07.




Figure 16: ASM-VFM residuals for S/C B, 02/08.



### 3.3.5.3 Swarm C

No data because ASM is switched off.

### 3.3.6 TCF.VFM monitoring

The monitoring of the TCF.VFM calibration parameters have been performed till 17 July 2015, that corresponds to the last day of data processed with operations processor v03.15. With the deployment in operation of the new processor (v03.16), the calibration parameters for the vector measurements are replaced by the co-estimated correction parameters and then corrected for  $dB_{Sun}$ .

#### 3.3.6.1 Swarm A

In the following plots one can see the three groups of TCF VFM calibration parameters for Swarm A, for the period from 01 to 17 July 2015: Biases (Figure 17), Scales (Figure 18) and Non-orthogonalities (Figure 19). Each group is actually a three-component vector in the compact detector coil frame. The bias, scale and the non-orthogonality components are rather constant throughout this period. A slightly increasing trend is observed only on the X scale component (Figure 18).




Figure 17: TCF.VFM Biases for S/C A from 01 to 17 July 2015.




Figure 18: TCF.VFM Scale for S/C A from 01 to 17 July 2015.




Figure 19: TCF.VFM non orthogonalities for S/C A from 01 to 17 July 2015.

### 3.3.6.2 Swarm B

In the following plots one can see the three groups of TCF VFM calibration parameters for Swarm B, for the period from 01 to 17 July 2015: Biases (Figure 20), Scales (Figure 21) and Non-orthogonalities (Figure 22). Each group is actually a three-component vector in the compact detector coil frame. The biases and non-orthogonalities are rather constant throughout the month. The X scale component shows a rapid decreasing trend while the Z scale component has had an increasing trend (Figure 21).






Figure 20: TCF.VFM Biases for S/C B from 01 to 17 July 2015.




Figure 21: TCF.VFM Scale for S/C B from 01 to 17 July 2015.




Figure 22: TCF.VFM Non orthogonalities for S/C B from 01 to 17 July 2015.

### 3.3.6.3 Swarm C

No data because ASM is still switched off

### 3.3.7 Summary of TCF behaviour for the three S/C

An important parameter which characterizes the quality of the TCF calculation is the weighted Root Mean Square (RMS) value of the residuals after the estimation. Figure 23 summarizes the RMS behaviour for all S/C during July 2015 (Red = S/C A, blue = S/C B). An increase of about 100 % is observed for S/C B.




Figure 23: Weighted RMS (nT) of the residuals after the TCF estimation, all S/C, from 01 to 17 July 2015.



### 3.3.8 B<sub>NEC</sub> vs Chaos4plus model residuals

Figure 24, Figure 26 and Figure 28 show field residuals  $\Delta B = B_{NEC} - B_{Chaos}$  (all versus co-latitude in degrees), from top to bottom: 1)  $B_r$ , 2)  $B_\theta$  and 3)  $B_\phi$ .

As a general feature one can see the field residuals to be steady and usually below 50 nT at low and middle latitudes, up to  $|55| - |60|$  degrees; then the residual increases at high latitudes because the Chaos model does not take into account the contribution from the external field ([RD.17]).

Figure 25, Figure 27 and Figure 29 shows, from top to bottom, the time series of: (1-2-3) residuals of  $B_{NEC} - B_{CHAOS}$  by components, related to Swarm Alpha, Bravo and Charlie respectively,

The component most affected by residual spikes and variations is  $B_\theta_{NEC}$ , i.e. the component which shows the variations of the field wrt to co-latitude. At high latitudes, the order of magnitude of the variability is about  $\pm 200$  nT.

#### 3.3.8.1 Swarm A




Figure 24: Swarm A day 27/07  $B_{NEC} - B_{Chaos}$  vs colatitude.




Figure 25: Swarm A day 27/07: time series of B\_NEC – B\_Chao residuals.

### 3.3.8.2 Swarm B




Figure 26: Swarm B day 28/07 B\_NEC - B\_Chao difference vs colatitude.




Figure 27: Swarm B day 28/07 time series of  $B_{NEC}$  –  $B_{Chaos}$  residuals.

### 3.3.8.3 Swarm C




Figure 28: Swarm C day 27/07  $B_{NEC}$  -  $B_{Chaos}$  difference vs colatitude.




Figure 29: Swarm C day 27/07 time series of  $B_{NEC} - B_{Chaos}$  residuals.



#### **4. ON-DEMAND ANALYSIS**

Nothing to report.



End of Document