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ABSTRACT
The proposed transformation of the global geoid model method for the determination of the local geoid model of Nigeria has only been applied in part of the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. To determine the consistency of the accuracy of the method for the intended purpose, there is a need to apply it in some other parts of the country. As a result, this study presents the verification of the consistency of the proposed transformation of global geoid method accuracy for local geoid model of Nigeria determination. DGNSS observations were carried out to obtain the coordinates of the used points. The processed global geographic coordinates were used with online software (GeoidEval) to obtain the EGM 08 geoid heights of the points. The global geographic coordinates, the global geoid heights of the points and the transformation parameters from WGS 84 to Minna datum were applied to obtain the transformed (local) geoid heights of the points using a Microsoft Excel program. The transformed geoid heights were compared with their corresponding geoid heights from the gravimetric-geometric local geoid model of the study area to obtain the model RMSE (accuracy). The obtained accuracy (2.0172 m) was compared with those of the gravimetric-geometric geoid model of the study area (0.675 m) and the transformation of global geoid heights when the method was applied in part of Abuja (0.0014 m). The comparison results showed the inconsistency of the accuracy of the proposed method. It is recommended that the method should not be applied for the intended purpose.
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INTRODUCTION
One of the most fundamental concepts in geodesy is the geoid, which is defined as an equipotential surface that coincides with the mean sea level (MSL) and extends below continents. It is the surface adopted in each country as a datum or reference for the vertical coordinate system. In Nigeria, various local geoid models have been determined in some parts of the country but there is still no unified geoid model which will serve as the vertical datum for the entire country. The Global Positioning System (GPS) which gives accurately three-dimensional coordinates of points on the earth surface does that by using a specified computational surface known as the ellipsoid. The heights determined by the GPS are geometric heights and do not have the physical meaning as they are not determined directly with respect to the geoid which is the datum for a vertical coordinate system. According to Moka et al (2017), today in Nigeria there is no acceptable geoid model a number of factors have led to the unacceptability of the results of geoid which include: inadequate data coverage, low accuracy of geoid model, etc. As a developing country, accurate height system which represents the form of the earth is an indispensable tool for all construction works for both near and offshore purposes. Moka et al (2017) further stated that the absence of a generally officially published geoid model has made it difficult, among other problems to create a connection between Land and Sea Datum which is analogous to Vertical datum in the US and Canada and Vertical Offshore Reference Frame (VORF) in the United Kingdom for seamless bathymetry in the near and offshore zone of our coastal waters (Moka et al, 2017). This has resulted in the adoption of different height systems that are incompatible with one another. Thus, the most geodetic, engineering and hydrographic applications are either referenced to the ellipsoid or other arbitrary height systems and all of these do not represent the actual form (geoid) of the earth over Nigeria (Moka et al, 2017).

The transformation of global geoid model to local which has to do with the transformation of global geoid heights to local has been proposed by Okeke and Nnam (2017) for the determination of the local geoid model of Nigeria. The method involves the application of the Kotsakis (2008) model for the transformation of global geoid heights to local geoid heights. This method has been applied in part of the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja by Okeke and Nnam (2017) with the use of the EGM2008 geoid heights and RMSE of 0.14 cm was obtained when compared with the existing geometric geoid model of the study area. Given that the proposed method will be applied to the entire country there is a need to verify the consistency, as well as the accuracy of the method in some other parts of the country. To do that, the method has to be applied for the determination of the local geoid model of an area or region and compared with the existing local geoid model of the area or region. Consequently, this paper verifies the consistency of the proposed transformation of the global geoid method for local geoid model of Nigeria determination.

Here, the proposed method was applied to determine the local geoid model of Benin City and the results were compared with those of the existing local geoid model of the study area (Benin City) which was determined with the gravimetric-geometric method by Oduyebo et al. (2019). Benin City was selected for this study for easy comparison as its local geoid model has already been determined.

The Study Area
According to Oduyebo et al. (2019), Benin City is the capital of Edo State in Southern Nigeria. It is a City approximately 40 kilometres north of the Benin River. The City is also linked by roads to Asaba, Sapele, Silukor, Okene, and Ubiaja.
and is served by air and the Niger River delta ports of Koko and Sapele (Oduyebo et al., 2019). The City is made up of three Local Government Areas, Oredo LGA, Ikpoba Okha LGA and Egor LGA. It has a total population of 1,782,000 according to the 2021 NPC projection. It covers a total area of about 1,204 km². Benin City is bounded by UTM zone 31 coordinates 660000 mN and 712500 mN, and 770000 mE and 815000 mE (Oduyebo et al., 2019). Figures 1a and b show the maps of the study area.

Kotsakis Model for Transformation of Global Geoid Height to Local

The model for the transformation of global geoid heights to local as given by Kotsakis (2008) is

\[ N' - N = \Delta N(t_x) + \Delta N(t_y) + \Delta N(t_z) + \Delta N(\varepsilon_x) + \Delta N(\varepsilon_y) + \Delta N(\delta N) + \Delta N(\delta f') \]

Where,

\[ \Delta N(t_x) = t_x \cos \varphi \cos \lambda \]

\[ \Delta N(t_y) = t_y \cos \varphi \sin \lambda \]

\[ \Delta N(t_z) = t_z \sin \varphi \]

\[ \Delta N(\varepsilon_x) = -\varepsilon_x N e^2 \sin \varphi \cos \varphi \sin \lambda \]

\[ \Delta N(\varepsilon_y) = \varepsilon_y N e^2 \sin \varphi \cos \varphi \cos \lambda \]

\[ \Delta N(\delta N) = (a W + N) \delta N \]

\[ \Delta N(\delta f) = -W \delta f \]

\[ \Delta N(\delta f') = \frac{a(1 - f)}{W} \sin^2 \varphi \delta f' \]

\[ W = \sqrt{1 - e^2 \sin^2 \varphi} \]

The quantities \( \delta a = a' - a \) and \( \delta f = f' - f \) correspond to the difference in the numerical values for the semi-major axis and the flattening of the reference ellipsoid, as these are used in the respective reference frames, GRF1 and GRF2 (Kotsakis, 2008).

Transformation Parameters between WGS 84 and Minna Datums

The transformation parameters from WGS 84 to Minna datum as given by Okeke (2014) and Okeke et al (2017) are:

**Transformation Parameters from WGS 84 to Minna Datum**

| Parameter | Value |
|-----------|-------|
| Tx        | 93.809786 m ± 0.375857310 m |
| Ty        | 89.748672 m ± 0.375857310 m |
| Tz        | -118.83766 m ± 0.375857310 m |
\[ \alpha = 0.000010827829 \pm 0.0000010311322 \]
\[ \beta = 0.0000018504213 \pm 0.0000015709539 \]
\[ \gamma = 0.000002194542 \pm 0.0000013005997 \]
\[ S = 0.99999393 \pm 0.0000010048219 \]

**Properties of the WGS 84 and Clarke 1880 Ellipsoids**

The equatorial radius (\(a\)) and the flattening (\(f\)) of the WGS 84 and the Clarke 1880 ellipsoids are respectively 6378137 m and 1/298.257223563, and 6378249.145 m and 1/293.465 (Eteje et al., 2019).

**EGM08 Geoid Height**

The earth gravity model EGM08 developed and released by the National Geospatial Intelligent Agency is a significant achievement in global field mapping (Lyszkowicz, 2009). This gravitational model is complete to spherical harmonic degree and order 2159 and contains additional coefficients extending to degree 2190 and order 2159 (Abdelrahim, 2013). Computing the geoid undulation values are realized with respect to WGS 84 ellipsoid (Idrizi, 2013).

According to Idrizi (2013), harmonic synthesis software provided by NGA applies a constant, zero-degree term of -41 cm to all geoid undulations computed using EGM2008 with the height anomaly to geoid undulation correction model. Idrizi (2013) further posited that all the pre-computed geoid undulations include this constant zero-degree term. This term converts geoid undulations that are fundamentally referenced to an ideal mean-earth ellipsoid into undulations that are referenced to WGS 84. The value of -41 cm derives from a mean-earth ellipsoid WGS84 (Idrizi, 2013). This new model makes possible with high spatial sampling resolution computation of mean gravity anomalies, geoid ellipsoid separations and other characteristics of gravity field for the entire globe (Lyszkowicz, 2009).

**Gravimetric-Geometric Geoid Model of Benin City**

The gravimetric-geometric geoid model of Benin City was determined using the combination of the gravimetrically and geometrically obtained data. The realization, as well as the determination of the model, is detailed in Odueybo et al. (2019). In Odueybo et al. (2019), three gravimetric-geometric geoid models were determined and the one with the highest accuracy (third-degree gravimetric-geometric geoid model with RMSE of 0.6746 m among the three models was recommended for application in Benin City.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Data Acquisition**

The coordinates, as well as the positions and the ellipsoidal heights of the points used in the study, were obtained from Differential Global Navigation Satellite System (DGNSS) (See Figures 2 and 3). The observation was carried out using CHC 900 dual-frequency GNSS receivers.

**Data Processing**

The observations were respectively downloaded and processed with HcLoader and Compass post-processing software (See Figure 4). The geographic coordinates of the points were processed in the WGS 84 datum. It was done to enable the global positions of the points used to obtain the global geoid heights of the points from EGM 08 using the GeoidEval online software (See Figure 5) to be obtained.
Figure 4: Processing of the GNSS Data Using Compass Software

Figure 5: Computation of the Global Geoid Heights of the Points Using GeoidEval Software

The local geoid heights of the points were computed with the properties of the WGS 84 and the Clarke 1880 ellipsoids, the transformation parameters, the global geographic coordinates and the EGM 08 geoid heights of the points using the transformation method, as well as equation (1). The computation was done using a Microsoft Excel program developed in the study (See Figure 6).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the comparison between the gravimetric-geometric model geoid heights and the global geopotential model (EGM08) local geoid heights of the points. It was done to determine the agreement of the transformation geoid model with the gravimetric-geometric geoid model of the study area. The closer the Root Mean Squares (RMS) error obtained from the comparison of the local geoid heights of the points from the gravimetric-geometric geoid model with their corresponding local geoid heights from the transformation of global geoid height to local method using the global geopotential model (EGM08), the more the agreement between the two local geoid models. From Table 1, it is seen that the accuracy, as well as the RMS error of the transformation geoid model, is 2.0172 m while that of the gravimetric-geometric geoid model determined by Oduneyebo et al. (2019), is 0.675 m. This implies that the two geoid models are not in agreement. The RMS error of the transformation method when it was applied in part of the Federal Capital Territory is 0.0014 m. Comparing this with the RMS error of the transformation method applied in this study implies that the accuracy of the proposed method for the determination of the local geoid model of Nigeria is not consistent in every part of the country. Thus, it cannot be applied for the proposed purpose.
### Table 1: Comparison between the Gravimetric-Geometric Geoid Heights and the Transformed EGM08, Local Geoid Heights

| Point  | Gravimetric-Geometric Geoid Heights (m) (A) | Transformed EGM08 Geoid Heights (m) (B) | Diff. b/w A & B (m) | Diff. b/w A & B Squared (m²) |
|--------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| XSU92  | 2.086                                       | 0.3180                                 | 3.1257              | 3.1257                      |
| RR01   | 2.420                                       | 0.3624                                 | 4.2338              | 4.2338                      |
| SR01   | 1.588                                       | 0.1663                                 | 2.0213              | 2.0213                      |
| SR02   | 1.978                                       | 0.0811                                 | 3.5984              | 3.5984                      |
| SR04   | 2.520                                       | -0.0963                                | 6.8448              | 6.8448                      |
| SR05   | 2.802                                       | -0.2845                                | 9.5267              | 9.5267                      |
| SR06   | 3.266                                       | -0.3349                                | 12.9667             | 12.9667                     |
| XSU100 | 2.098                                       | 0.0444                                 | 4.2171              | 4.2171                      |
| AR01   | 0.685                                       | 0.3399                                 | 0.1191              | 0.1191                      |
| AR02   | 0.720                                       | 0.3075                                 | 0.1702              | 0.1702                      |
| AR03   | 1.436                                       | 0.2146                                 | 1.4918              | 1.4918                      |
| AR04   | 1.439                                       | 0.1932                                 | 1.5521              | 1.5521                      |
| UU01   | 4.658                                       | 0.9586                                 | 3.6984              | 3.6984                      |
| UU02   | 3.498                                       | 0.8172                                 | 2.6806              | 2.6806                      |
| UU03   | 1.981                                       | 0.6410                                 | 1.3401              | 1.3401                      |
| UU04   | 1.276                                       | 0.5155                                 | 0.7505              | 0.7505                      |
| UU05   | 1.346                                       | 0.4380                                 | 0.8830              | 0.8830                      |
| UU06   | 1.489                                       | 0.3497                                 | 1.1402              | 1.1402                      |
| UU07   | 1.329                                       | 0.2977                                 | 1.0312              | 1.0312                      |
| UU08   | 1.263                                       | 0.2735                                 | 0.9886              | 0.9886                      |
| AD01   | 2.986                                       | 0.4225                                 | 12.7154             | 12.7154                     |
| AD02   | 4.019                                       | 0.4531                                 | 15.5858             | 15.5858                     |
| AD03   | 4.420                                       | 0.4721                                 | 0.9555              | 0.9555                      |
| AK01   | 1.376                                       | 0.3985                                 | 1.1067              | 1.1067                      |
| AK02   | 1.473                                       | 0.4210                                 | 3.4017              | 3.4017                      |
| AK03   | 2.252                                       | 0.4076                                 | 7.4971              | 7.4971                      |
| AK04   | 3.101                                       | 0.3629                                 | 13.2487             | 13.2487                     |
| MR01   | 1.300                                       | 0.3141                                 | 0.7772              | 0.7772                      |
| MR02   | 1.488                                       | 0.4973                                 | 0.9816              | 0.9816                      |
| MR03   | 1.614                                       | 0.5597                                 | 1.1116              | 1.1116                      |
| MR04   | 4.037                                       | 0.5626                                 | 12.0715             | 12.0715                     |
| MR05   | 4.313                                       | 0.5164                                 | 14.4145             | 14.4145                     |
| SK01   | 1.500                                       | 0.2793                                 | 1.4902              | 1.4902                      |
| SK02   | 2.035                                       | 0.1866                                 | 3.4166              | 3.4166                      |
| SK03   | 2.379                                       | 0.1084                                 | 5.1556              | 5.1556                      |
| EKS    | 0.665                                       | 0.4142                                 | 0.0544              | 0.0544                      |
| SLK0   | 0.668                                       | 0.4646                                 | 0.0482              | 0.0482                      |
| SLK01  | 0.781                                       | 0.5198                                 | 0.5089              | 0.5089                      |
| SLK02  | 1.326                                       | 0.6127                                 | 0.1062              | 0.1062                      |
| SLK03  | 1.736                                       | 0.6764                                 | 1.1227              | 1.1227                      |
| SLK04  | 2.688                                       | 0.7884                                 | 3.6083              | 3.6083                      |
| SLK05  | 3.357                                       | 0.8819                                 | 6.1261              | 6.1261                      |
VERIFICATION OF THE... Oduyebo, Ono and Eteje

| EK01  | 0.078 | 0.4159 | 0.1142 | 0.1142 |
|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| EK02  | 0.983 | 0.4289 | 0.3070 | 0.3070 |
| EK03  | 1.729 | 0.3861 | 1.8035 | 1.8035 |
| EK04  | 2.001 | 0.3261 | 2.8053 | 2.8053 |
| EK05  | 2.516 | 0.2838 | 4.9827 | 4.9827 |
| AIRPORT | 0.578 | 0.3160 | 0.0687 | 0.0687 |

Mean of Differences = 1.6882 m
RMS Error of Transformation Model = SQRT of Average = 2.0172 m
RMS Error of Gravimetric-Geometric Model = 0.6746 m
RMS Error of Transformation Model as obtained by Okeke and Nnam (2017) = 0.0014 m

Figures 7 and 8 respectively present the contour maps of the gravimetric-geometric geoid model and that of the transformation geoid model. It was done to present graphically and compare the shapes of the two local geoid models (gravimetric-geometric and transformation geoid models) of the study area. It can be seen from Figures 7 and 8 that the contour maps of the two local geoid models of the study area are not identical. It is as a result of the low accuracy (2.0172 m) of the transformation geoid model.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Having verified the consistency of the accuracy of the proposed transformation method of local geoid model determination for local geoid model of Nigeria, the following conclusion and recommendation were made: The study has shown disagreement in shape and accuracy between the local gravimetric-geometric and the transformation methods geoid models of the study area. The obtained results also revealed the inconsistency of the proposed method accuracy for the determination of the local geoid model of Nigeria. Since the accuracy of the proposed method is not consistent in various parts of the country, it is recommended that it should not be applied for the intended purpose.

REFERENCES

Abdelrahim E. M. A. ((2013). Geoid Undulations of Sudan using Orthometric Heights Compared with the EGM96 and EGM2008. International Journal of Advanced Research in IT and Engineering, 2(11), 43-53.

Eteje, S. O., Oduyebo, O. F. and Oluyori, P. D. (2019). Procedure for Coordinates Conversion between NTM and UTM Systems in Minna Datum Using AllTrans and Columbus Software. International Journal of Scientific Research in Science and Technology, 6(5), 128-143. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32628/IJSRST196517.

Idrizi, B. M. (2013). Developing Model for Utilization of Global Earth Gravimetical Models in Macedonian Territory.
Kotsakis, C. (2008). Transforming Ellipsoidal Heights and Geoid Undulations between Different Geodetic Reference Frames. *Journal of Geodesy*, 82(4), 249-260.

Lyszkowicz, A. (2009). Assessment of Accuracy of EGM08 Model over the Area of Poland. *Technical Sciences*, 12, 118-134.

Moka, E. C., Jackson, K. P. and Hart, L. (2017): Local Geoid Determination for Nigeria by the Transformation of Global Geoid Model. *Nigerian Journal of Geodesy*, 1(1), 66-80.

Oduyebo, O. F., Ono, M. N. and Eteje, S. O. (2019). Comparison of Three Gravimetric-Geometric Geoid Models for Best Local Geoid Model of Benin City, Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science (IJAERS)*, 6(6), 261-272. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijaers.612.23.

Oduyebo, O. F., Ono, M. N. and Eteje, S. O. (2019): Practical Local Geoid Modelling of Benin City, Nigeria from Gravimetric Observations Using the Modified Stokes Integral. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management and Science (IJAEMS)*, 5(12), 608-617. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/iijaems.512.1.

Okeke, F. I. (2014): Assessment of the Capabilities of the National Transformation Version 2 (Ntv2) Model for the Nigerian Datum Transformation. National Union of Planetary and Radio Sciences (NUPRS) Conference.

Okeke, F. I. and Nnam, V. (2017): Local Geoid Determination for Nigeria by the Transformation of Global Geoid Model. *Nigerian Journal of Geodesy*, 1(1), 147-157.

Okeke, F. I., Moka, E. C., Uzodinma, V. N. and Ono, M. N. (2017): The Determination of Datum Transformation Parameters for Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Geodesy*, 1(1), 49-64.