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## Objectives

Dlnvestigating the effect of using weighted coordinates in the transformation process.

DInvestigating the effect of using modified (improved) local coordinates instead of using the local (ESA) coordinates in the transformation process.

## Methodology

The computations are made in two groups:
$>$ Group 1:is specified for the comparison between using equal weight and using weighted coordinates in the transformation process.
Group 2:is specified for the investigation of using equal weighted coordinates, using improved coordinates, and using weighted coordinates in the transformation process.

## Case study

Data used

- The geodetic coordinates of 34 first order triangulation stations known in the Egyptian Datum, 26 of them belong to Network I with precision 1:100,000 and 8 of them belong to Network II with precision 1:50,000.
- 15 stations of 34 stations mentioned before belong to the High Accurate Reference Network (HARN) with precision 1:10,000,000.


## Case study

## -Data used

- Other 7 stations belong to the Egyptian Aviation project with precision 1:7000,000.
- The other 12 stations belong to the National Agricultural Cadastral Network (NACN) with precision 1:1000,000.
- The modified (improved) coordinates of 24 stations included in the above mentioned 34 stations known in the Egyptian datum.


## Case study

## Software

Customized software using VB.NET consists of two main modules :

1. Module for calculating 7 transformation parameters with their standard deviation for equal weight and weighted coordinates.


7 transformation parameters

## Case study

## Software

2. Module for interpolating coordinates using 7 transformation parameters.


## Case study

To achieve the first target :

- 5 solutions at this group has been done using $34,30,25,15$, and 10 stations consecutively.
- Local and WGS-84 coordinates of the mentioned 34 stations are used.
- Seven transformation parameters are computed with their standard deviations.
- The computations are done once with equal weight coordinates and once more using weighted coordinates.




Longitude residuals at Check points from group1 solutions, units in meters



## Case study 2

$\square$ To achieve the second target :

- 2 solutions at this group have been done using 24 and 19 stations consecutively.
- Local, Modified Local and WGS-84 coordinates of the mentioned 24 stations are used.
- The local datum coordinates are modified (improved) using the way explained in [Saad and Elsayed, 2005].


## Case study 2

- The improved coordinates are used with their corresponding WGS-84 coordinates to compute the transformation parameters.
- The parameters are used to transform the coordinates of the points.
- The transformed coordinates are Re-modified again to be back in ESA system of coordinates.
- Residuals at the stations are computed.
- 5 check points are used .


## Case study 2

- Seven transformation parameters are computed with their standard deviations.
- The computations are done firstly with equal weight coordinates, secondly with the modified coordinates, and thirdly using weighted coordinates.
- In three cases, the residuals at solution stations are computed.



## Results \& Analysis

Seven parameters from the three cases of solution 6, using all 24 points.

| Parameter | Using equal <br> weight coord. | Using equal weight - <br> modified coord. | Using weighted ESA <br> coord. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DX $(\mathrm{m})$ | $-62.543 \pm 92.78$ | $-93.127 \pm \mathbf{6 1 . 9 7}$ | $-62.561 \pm 0.02$ |
| DY $(\mathrm{m})$ | $167.819 \pm 123.76$ | $157.664 \pm 71.58$ | $168.112 \pm 0.02$ |
| DZ $(\mathrm{m})$ | $128.524 \pm 39.40$ | $115.449 \pm 40.39$ | $128.338 \pm 0.01$ |
| RX (sec) | $-1.394 \pm 7.418$ | $-2.414 \pm 1.143$ | $-1.404 \pm 3.770$ |
| RY (sec) | $-5.049 \pm 1.740$ | $-5.838 \pm 1.751$ | $-5.047 \pm 8.848$ |
| RZ (sec) | $10.400 \pm 3.836$ | $\mathbf{9 . 9 4 0} \pm \mathbf{2 . 5 9 9}$ | $10.406 \pm 1.946$ |
| S | $-6.3633 \pm 5.343$ | $-1.0440 \pm 4.703$ | $-6.3693 \pm 2.717$ |



## Results \& Analysis

Seven parameters from the three cases of solution 7, using 19 points

| Parameter | Using equal weights | Using equal weights - modified coord. | Using weighted ESA coord. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DX (m) | $89.076 \pm 76.47$ | $-118.743 \pm 76.08$ | $-88.832 \pm 0.02$ |
| DY (m) | $186.685 \pm 90.25$ | $175.863 \pm 89.79$ | $186.714 \pm 0.03$ |
| DZ (m) | $152.199 \pm 48.35$ | $138.827 \pm 48.11$ | $151.82 \pm 0.01$ |
| RX (sec) | $-1.296 \pm 1.453$ | $-2.329 \pm 1.446$ | $-1.305 \pm 2.21$ |
| RY (sec) | $-6.012 \pm 2.106$ | -6.787 $\pm 2.095$ | $-6.001 \pm 1.01$ |
| RZ (sec) | $11.280 \pm 3.256$ | $10.7774 \pm 3.240$ | $11.276 \pm 1.57$ |
| S | $-6.4099 \pm 5.848$ | $-1.1350 \pm 5.819$ | $-6.413 \pm 1.84$ |



## Results \& Analysis

Latitude and longitude residuals at 5 check points from solution 7 cases, , units in meters

|  | Using equal weight <br> coord. |  | Using equal weight - <br> modified coord |  | Using weighted ESA <br> coord. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pt | Lat res | Long res | Lat res | Long res | Lat res | Long res |
| S2 | 1.56 | 2.70 | 0.15 | 0.57 | 1.57 | 2.72 |
| R5 | 0.55 | -2.20 | 0.15 | -0.78 | 0.54 | -2.19 |
| B4 | 1.68 | 2.74 | 0.34 | 0.80 | 1.68 | 2.75 |
| X8 | 0.10 | 1.80 | -0.39 | 0.35 | 0.10 | 1.81 |
| B3 | -2.45 | -2.00 | -1.16 | -0.48 | -2.44 | -1.97 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mean | 1.27 | 2.29 | 0.43 | 0.60 | 1.26 | 2.29 |
| St Dv | 0.94 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 1.2 | 0.94 | 0.43 |

Latitude residuals at 5 check points from solution 7 cases, units in meters


Longitude residuals at 5 check points from solution 7 cases, units in meters


## Conclusion

$\square$ With respect to the first objective:
$\checkmark$ Using weights improved the precision of the transformation parameters and improved also the residuals of the solution points significantly.
$\checkmark \quad$ In the same time, using weights did not improve the residuals at the check points and the residuals at those check points were almost the same as in the case of using equal weighted coordinates.

## Conclusion

$\square$ With respect to the second objective:
$\checkmark$ The transformation process was done in more accurate atmosphere.
$\checkmark$ The obtained latitude residuals were one third their corresponding values in the case of using ESA coordinates.
$\checkmark \quad$ The obtained longitude residuals were one fourth their corresponding values in the case of using ESA coordinates.
$\checkmark$ This process is named here (remove - transform restore).

