

Instantaneous Relative Positioning of Multiple GNSS Receivers

Lydia Drabsch BE (Hons 1)

A thesis submitted in fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Mechatronics (Space) Engineering/Bachelor of Science



School of Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering
The University of Sydney

June 2017

Declaration

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma of the University or other institute of higher learning, except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text.

Lydia Drabsch

8 June 2017

Abstract

Abstract text goes here...

If you’ve just opened up this template, you should check out [Chapter 1](#) for a quick introduction. Note also that hyperlinks are rendered in colour for convenience during editing—see `../LaTeX/packages.tex`. Note also that there is a simple way to change all of the coloured hyperlinks to black in `../LaTeX/packages.tex`—look for `\usepackage{colorlinks}`.

This paragraph is coloured in “highlightcolour”, defined in `../LaTeX/commands.tex`. To get rid of all highlighting in the document you can just redefine highlightcolour—see `\definecolor{highlightcolor}` in `../LaTeX/commands.tex`. Also have a look at `\definecolor{todocolour}` and `\definecolor{TODOcolour}` in the same file.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipisicing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipisicing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of a great many of my work colleagues, family and friends . . .

You could dedicate the thesis to someone, or write something poignant. . .

*Hydrogen, in sufficient quantity and given enough time,
will end up writing, reviewing and hopefully citing this thesis.*

Contents

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Declaration | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Contents | v |
| List of Figures | viii |
| List of Tables | ix |
| List of Algorithms | x |
| List of Theorems | xi |
| Nomenclature | xii |
| Glossary | xiii |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background and Motivation | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem Summary | 1 |
| 1.3 Principle Contributions | 1 |
| 1.4 Outline | 1 |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| 2 | Literature Review | 2 |
| 2.1 | Position Requirements | 2 |
| 2.2 | Relative Positioning Technology | 2 |
| 2.3 | GNSS Operational Components | 3 |
| 2.3.1 | Space Segment | 3 |
| 2.3.2 | User Segment | 3 |
| 2.3.3 | Control Segment | 3 |
| 2.4 | GNSS Satellite Signals | 3 |
| 2.5 | The GNSS concept | 4 |
| 2.5.1 | 2D case | 4 |
| 2.5.2 | 3D case | 4 |
| 2.6 | GNSS Error Sources | 5 |
| 2.6.1 | Clock Errors | 5 |
| 2.6.2 | Receiver Noise | 5 |
| 2.6.3 | Ephemeris Errors | 5 |
| 2.6.4 | Atmospheric Effects | 5 |
| 2.6.5 | Mutlipath Interference | 6 |
| 2.6.6 | Sagnac Effect | 6 |
| 2.6.7 | Electrical Interference | 6 |
| 2.6.8 | GNSS Error Summary | 6 |
| 2.7 | Multiple Receivers | 6 |
| 2.8 | Current GNSS algorithms | 6 |
| 2.8.1 | Standard Positioning Service | 6 |
| 2.8.2 | Differential GPS | 6 |
| 2.8.3 | WAAS DGPS | 7 |
| 2.8.4 | SBAS ? | 7 |
| 2.8.5 | Real Time Kinematic | 7 |
| 2.8.6 | Post Processing Algorithm | 7 |
| 2.8.7 | Single Frequency Precise Point Positioning (SF-PPP) | 7 |
| 2.8.8 | Duel-Epoch, Double-Differencing Model | 8 |
| 2.8.9 | Summary of Algorithms ? | 9 |
| 2.9 | Proposed Planar Intersection Algorithm | 9 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3 | Example Chapter on ‘Perception’ Stuff | 12 |
| 3.1 | Planar Intersection Algorithm | 12 |
| 3.1.1 | Assumptions | 13 |
| 3.1.2 | Algorithm | 14 |
| 3.2 | Summary | 20 |
| 4 | Experiments That Prove Things | 21 |
| 4.1 | Method | 21 |
| 4.1.1 | Creating a Simulation | 21 |
| 4.1.2 | Evaluation | 23 |
| 4.2 | Evaluation | 25 |
| 5 | Conclusion | 27 |
| | List of References | 28 |
| A | An Example Appendix | 30 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 2.1 | 2D representation | 10 |
| 2.2 | | 11 |
| 3.1 | text | 16 |
| 3.2 | Find position f_{ω}^s on the plane | 19 |
| 4.1 | Geometric Dilution of Precision | 24 |
| 4.2 | text | 26 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 2.1 | Error Components and Potential Improvements for SF-PPP | 7 |
| 4.1 | Ephemeris data for GPS constellation | 22 |
| 4.2 | Magnitude of simulated errors | 22 |

List of Algorithms

List of Theorems

Nomenclature

List of Symbols

| | |
|-----|----------------------|
| v | Variable Name, units |
|-----|----------------------|

List of Acronyms

Glossary

L^AT_EXplugin: A L^AT_EXpackage.

Term: This term means stuff.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

1.2 Problem Summary

1.3 Principle Contributions

1.4 Outline

epoch synchronisation followed by two fold optimisation process
need instantaneous relative positioning with minimal calibration or setup of external hardware

Instantaneous Relative displacement/position between GNSS receivers.

Simulation case studies are presented to validate the mathematical models.

The algorithm presented is designed to replace current methods.

With a local reference point with a well known global location, the relative position of the other receivers

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Position Requirements

- how/why to use position for applications
- absolute vs relative
- why use relative positioning
- knowing where you are positioned is important for data gathering, motion detecting and tracking, path planning
- formation flying, drones

2.2 Relative Positioning Technology

- line of sight methods
 - pre-setup requirements
 - long calibration setup?
-
- last one being GNSS

2.3 GNSS Operational Components

2.3.1 Space Segment

- current GNSS: explain GPS, GLONASS, galileo, chinese one constellations and how it works - what orbits are they in and why?: altitude inbetween the two radiation belts?

2.3.2 User Segment

- typical accuracy for civilian accessible gps
- military has more precise stuff
- lower cost receivers have only one frequency band, error in timing

Unfortunately, low cost GNSS receivers rarely provide official access to the GNSS raw data. Previous studies have used customised bluetooth headsets or customised android platform mobile phones to investigate algorithms on low-cost GNSS receivers. More expensive receivers do allow raw data to be utilised, however they also provide other mechanisms such as dual frequencies and more accurate clocks, rendering the new algorithm **obscure**. The mindset of **crowd-sourcing*/customising/flexible technology* is changing the way manufacturers build GNSS receivers. The new Android OS platform Nougat 7.0 provides the developer raw GNSS data at the software level.

2.3.3 Control Segment

2.4 GNSS Satellite Signals

There are two sets of signals that are sent from every satellite, the pseudorandom binary sequence (PRN code) and the navigation message.

The PRN code is intentionally complex to know which cycle is being received

L1 frequency of 1575.42 Mhz - code phase Course Acquisition (C/A) code is transmitted on the L1 frequency as 1.023 MHz signal using a bi-phase shift keying modulation technique. Navigation message sent at 50 bits per second

However the receiver does not know which cycle in the PRN code it is looking at.

To resolve this ambiguity (how many 1 ms) requires decoding of the data message and analysing the pattern of bits.

https://ocw.mit.edu/courses/earth-atmospheric-and-planetary-sciences/12-540-principles-of-the-global-positioning-system-spring-2012/lecture-notes/MIT12_540S12_lec7.pdf

- civilian GNSS using dual frequency, send CDMA, how decryption works
- what is pseudorange?
- what is carrier phase
- clock bias

2.5 The GNSS concept

The base concept behind identifying the position of something using GNSS is remarkably simple. Satellite W sends out a radio signal at time X and its position Y which the user received at time Z. The time difference is used to calculate the distance from the satellite's position. With this information from multiple satellites, the position of the user is triangulated.

- timing comparison between satellite and receiver to find pseudorange - ECEF frame of reference

2.5.1 2D case

2.5.2 3D case

- NLLS solve spheres - need 4 satellites minimum -

2.6 GNSS Error Sources

- how large

2.6.1 Clock Errors

- timing of received signal because of low cost clock on receiver.

2.6.2 Receiver Noise

- antenna phase

2.6.3 Ephemeris Errors

- satellite position is approximated
- due to gravity effects of other gravitational sources/ non-spherical earth/ what model is used?
- how long is the ephemeris data accurate for?
- actual location of satellite, where it thinks it is based on a prediction model so its not 100% correct. what uncertainty in this location therefore vector is there?

2.6.4 Atmospheric Effects

- ionosphere and troposphere refraction - speed of propagation changes which alters the time of flight

http://www.trimble.com/gps_tutorial/howgps-error.aspx

The distance from a satellite to a user is calculated by the time difference when the radio signal was sent and when it was received. However, the speed of light is reduced when in the atmosphere compared to that in space.

The ionosphere is the upper layer of the atmosphere ranging from 50 to 500 km

2.6.5 Mutlipath Interference

2.6.6 Sagnac Effect

2.6.7 Electrical Interference

- space weather
- jamming?

2.6.8 GNSS Error Summary

2.7 Multiple Receivers

- problems arising with multiple receivers -

2.8 Current GNSS algorithms

- just reference implementation papers? - algorithms to make it more accurate
 - use for motion tracking
 - performance vs cost trade off
- (<http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au/document/7530542/>)

2.8.1 Standard Positioning Service

- single frequency and multi frequency to remove atmospheric affects

2.8.2 Differential GPS

- explain what it is
- what setup is required

Table 2.1 – Error Components and Potential Improvements for SF-PPP

| Error component | Potential Improvement |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Ionosphere: Klobuchar model | 7 m |
| Troposphere: Saastamoinen model | 2.5 m |
| Ephemeris data | 1 m |
| Satellite clock drift | 1.5 m |
| Differential code bias | 50 cm |
| Phase windup: rotation of the antenna | dm |
| Sagnac effect | 30 m |
| ROA: satellite orbit correction | up to 10 cm |
| Relativistic clock correction | up to 21 m |
| Moon-Earth interaction | 5cm (Hor) and 30 cm (Ver) |

- abs vs rel
- degree of accuracy

2.8.3 WAAS DGPS

2.8.4 SBAS ?

2.8.5 Real Time Kinematic

2.8.6 Post Processing Algorithm

2.8.7 Single Frequency Precise Point Positioning (SF-PPP)

Rademakers [how to say reference?](#) at University of Delft in the Netherlands developed a solution for finding the absolute position in open areas to a horizontal accuracy of 0.5 m. It uses a single frequency, single antenna low cost GPS receiver by connecting to the internet and using real time information to model all errors. The errors they corrected with the potential improvements are outlined in Table [2.1](#).

2.8.8 Duel-Epoch, Double-Differencing Model

In the paper by the Institute of Software Integrated Systems, Vanderbilt University called *High-Accuracy Differential Tracking of Low-Cost GPS Receivers*, Hedgecock and party developed a new algorithm for relative motion tracking for multiple receivers. They used low cost GPS receivers with access to raw measurement data to produce centimeter-scale tracking accuracy. Each receiver was shared the whole networks data and ran the localisation algorithm independently to avoid having a single point of failure.

The algorithm uses the change in carrier phase through time of each receiver to estimate the change in relative ranges between a satellite and two receivers. It does not require a reference satellite, a reference node or an integer ambiguity solution. It does require the clock bias for each receiver at each point in time as solved for by non-linear least squares for the absolute position before running the algorithm itself. To reiterate, it does not directly solve for the relative position but the relative motion. However, neither of the initial positions of the receivers need to be precisely known in order for the relative motion to be accurate. Due to the time dependency, consistent satellite locks of at least four satellites are required, otherwise reinitialisation must occur. The calculated change was projected onto the unit direction vector from receiver to satellite. The system of these tracking equations was solved via least squares optimisation.

It uses the assumption that all satellites in the constellation are such a great distance from the surface of the Earth that the unit vector from both receivers are parallel to each individual satellite, as long as it is in the same geographical region. How far apart the receivers can be for this assumption to hold was not stated.

- how many receivers?
- why and how it aligns epoch

- uses difference in time for a single receiver to find change in motion.
- have this one last as it is the most similar
- needs instantaneous relative distance for first point, to speed up processing and make the first few time steps more accurate, also when locking onto new satellites

2.8.9 Summary of Algorithms ?


- dynamic tracking (need temporal measurements) vs static measurement - no temporal
- post processing vs pre-processing vs realtime
- ground structure vs free standing
- absolute vs relative
- accuracy (how much)
- computation time/space required
- what error is each method removing
- what piece of data it needs (if raw)
- calibration required
- robustness -> if a satellite goes out of view does it need to re-calibrate? passing information between receivers-> is one a reference? single point of failure

2.9 Proposed Planar Intersection Algorithm

Following the literature, the two main options for increasing the accuracy is extensive modelling of the errors, or some type of differencing algorithm. Error modelling requires external hardware, internet connection and extra computation time which increases the budget requirements. Whereas

This new algorithm is derived from taking the difference in pseudorange between multiple receivers from one satellite and expressing the distances as planes.

With multiple satellites in view, the intersection of planes for a particular receiver is the position of the receiver.


Figure 2.1 – 2D representation

With this strategy, some of the errors that plague the absolute position are negated for the relative position.

$$\rho_i = \rho_n - cb_\omega + c(T_s + I_s + \nu_s + b_s) \quad (2.1)$$

where ρ_n is the real range with the following sources of error; b_ω is the receiver clock bias, T_s is the tropospheric error, I_s is the ionospheric error, ν_s is the relativistic error and b_s is the satellite clock bias.

Figure 2.2



Chapter 3

Example Chapter on ‘Perception’ Stuff

3.1 Planar Intersection Algorithm

- assume satellite is at infinity for comparing difference in pseudorange for a particular reference satellite.
- use all satellites as reference satellite - no single point of failure, also not all satellites might be in view for all receivers
- get the normal vector between all receivers and each sat.
- Calculate the average normal vector.
- get the difference in pseudorange between all receivers along each normal vector
- create a plane with the normal vector with that distance
- solve via optimization (least squares)
- use clock adjustment from abs gps? or have as another optimisation variable
- antenna problems? misalignment?
- share clock bias's between solving for different reference sets? - do it one by one or all together?
- need to align the time of signal sent to the receivers before calculating average normal vector

- have weighted planes based on ? have weighted area on the planes?
- if one plane intercepts far away from the others then ignore it (multipath). hyper-dimensional surface to minimise

how to send data between receivers? do it offline on a different platform?

<https://www.e-education.psu.edu/geog862/node/1759> - errors in psedorange

<http://www.insidegnss.com/node/2898> - how to get pseudorange from raw data

3.1.1 Assumptions

Static Receivers

All receivers are static for the time in between all receivers get a GPS lock. This makes for an easier transform to align the satellite positions to a common time. It also ignores the problem of how the pseudorange from each receiver would be sent to either all of the receivers or to a central device for computation and the time delay associated with that. The incorporation of moving receivers is an area to explore for future work on the algorithm.

Transform asynchronous time

any two receivers will not be synchronized. The earliest time between all the receivers will be used as the time reference point. The satellite position in the future time steps were backcalculated to find the difference in the pseudorange. As the time between receivers will be ≈ 1 second, this extra distance is only in the vacuum of space and is not affected by potential nonlinear affects such as ionosphere and troposphere errors that affect the speed of light.

The error in the normal vector due to the time difference is

There have been many advances in the field, therefore to test the planar algorithm itself it is assumed that the asynchronous time is transformed to a common epoch time.

Parallel plane assumption

It is assumed for the plane equations that all receivers point to a satellite along the same vector. This is valid for a dispersion of receivers for 10km for an error of XX. This is synonymous to if the satellites were at infinity and all the receiver vectors are parallel to a satellite

$$\delta = \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{d}{a} \right) \quad (3.1)$$

$$e = 2d \tan \delta \quad (3.2)$$

$$(3.1) \& (3.2) \Rightarrow e = \frac{2d^2}{a} \quad (3.3)$$

Where a is the altitude, d is the distance between two receivers and e is the error in the plane created. The worst configuration for error in the vector normal to the plane is if the satellite is directly above the receivers at the smallest distance from the Earth in orbit, $a > 20000 \text{ km}$. For $d=5 \text{ km}$ the perpendicular error is 2.5 m

3.1.2 Algorithm

Pre-Processing

Select reference receiver α The receiver α is used as the reference location and common time in the NED frame.

Collect data of one timestep from all receivers The raw data as well as the estimated absolute location and clock bias (what frame of reference is this?) from non-linear least squares optimisation is collected from all GNSS receivers.

Align to reference Epoch time

Distance Optimisation

By optimising the distance between each pair of receivers, the error in the whole system is minimised. This means that the position receivers are not only relative to the reference receiver α but between all receivers just with the reference frame origin located at α . It is because of this step a receiver does not need to have all the same satellites in view as all other receivers, including the designated α .


Average normal Vector Find the average normal vector pointing to each satellite $\hat{\eta}_s$ from the receivers. The normal vector is calculated by using the position all of the satellites in view at the common time t_α as previously transformed in 3.1.2 and the estimated absolute position of all receivers. The average for each satellite is calculated by taking the mean across all receivers.

Difference in Pseudorange The differences in pseudorange are calculated $\Delta\rho_{\omega_i\omega_j}^s$ where s is the satellite, ω_i and ω_j are receivers (*for* $i < j, i \neq j$).

Optimise Pseudorange The pseudorange between each pair of receivers along each normal vector $\hat{\eta}_s$ creates an overdetermined linear system that is solved via least squares.

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & \dots \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & \dots \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.4)$$

Figure 3.1 – text



$$\Omega_s = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_s \\ \gamma_s \\ \delta_s \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.5)$$

$$\rho_s = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{\alpha\omega_1} \\ \rho_{\alpha\omega_2} \\ \dots\dots\dots \\ \rho_{\omega_1\omega_2} \\ \rho_{\omega_1\omega_3} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.6)$$

$$\Phi \times \Omega_s = \rho_s \quad (3.7)$$

Solve by linear least squares for an overdetermined system by the pseudo inverse matrix

$$\Omega_s = (\Phi^T \Phi)^{-1} \Phi^T \rho_s \quad (3.8)$$

Point Optimisation

Create Planes Create sets of planes for each receiver ω from the normal vectors $\hat{\eta}_s$ and the set of distances from the reference point α to receiver ω along each of the normal vectors denoted Ω_ω .

The equation of a plane is $Ax + By + Cz + D = 0$ where the coefficients $[A,B,C]$ describe the normal vector of the plane and the coefficient D sets the plane in 3D space along the vector. As the normal vector is already calculated for each satellite, only the D coefficient must be solved for each receiver and satellite pair.

$$P_\omega^s = (i \cdot \hat{\eta}_s)x + (j \cdot \hat{\eta}_s)y + (k \cdot \hat{\eta}_s)z + D_\omega^s \quad (3.9)$$

$$P_{\omega}^s = I \cdot H + D_{\omega} \quad (3.10)$$

$$(3.11)$$

Where $I = x\hat{\mathbf{i}} + y\hat{\mathbf{j}} + z\hat{\mathbf{k}}$ is the *identity* vector and H is a matrix of normal vectors to each satellite:

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\eta}_1 \\ \hat{\eta}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\eta}_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.12)$$

The coefficient D can be calculated by finding a point on the plane f_{ω}^s , then substituting it into (3.9) for x,y,z. The point of the plane is calculated by moving along the normal vector by the optimised pseudo distance from the reference point (3.13).

$$f_{\omega}^s = \Delta_{\omega}^s \hat{\eta}_s \quad (3.13)$$

$$P_{\omega}^s = \hat{\eta}_s \cdot f_{\omega}^s + D_{\omega}^s = 0 \quad (3.14)$$

$$D_{\omega}^s = -\hat{\eta}_s \cdot f_{\omega}^s \quad (3.15)$$

$$D_{\omega}^s = -\Delta_{\omega}^s ||\hat{\eta}_s|| \quad (3.16)$$


$$||\hat{\eta}_s|| = 1 \quad (3.17)$$

$$D_{\omega}^s = -\Delta_{\omega}^s \quad (3.18)$$

$$\Rightarrow P_{\omega}^s = I \cdot H - \Omega_{\omega} \quad (3.19)$$

Ω_{ω} is a vector of optimised pseudo-distances from reference α to receiver ω for all satellites $s \in 1, 2, \dots, n$

$$\Omega_{\omega} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{\omega}^1 \\ \Delta_{\omega}^2 \\ \vdots \\ \Delta_{\omega}^n \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.20)$$

Figure 3.2 – Find position f_ω^s on the plane

Where Ω_s is the vector of optimised pseudo-distances from α to each receiver $\omega \in 1, 2 \dots m$ for a single satellite s :

$$\Omega_s = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{\omega_1}^s \\ \Delta_{\omega_2}^s \\ \vdots \\ \Delta_{\omega_m}^s \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.21)$$

Solve for Intersection As the system of homogeneous linear equations is overdetermined, it can be solved using singular value decomposition to find a point that has the minimum residuals from all of the planes in its set P_ω . Each set of planes for a particular receiver is independent to all other receivers. The vector X_ω describes the position of receiver ω in NED coordinates and τ_ω describes a final receiver clock bias

that alters the displacement of all the planes in the set P_ω by the same parameter.

$$X_\omega = \begin{bmatrix} x_\omega \\ y_\omega \\ z_\omega \\ \tau_\omega \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.22)$$

$$P_\omega X_\omega = D_\omega \quad (3.23)$$

$$(3.24)$$

In order to solve all of the receivers with the least amount of error in the whole system, all of the position vectors X_ω are solved at the same time. The reference planes of α must be included as a constraint on the system. All of the clock biases are also constrained with the clock bias from τ_α , see (3.25). The receiver clock bias only affects the equation of the planes by altering the constant as a change in the pseudorange has no affect over the angle of the plane. Each receiver clock bias alters all the planes associated with that receiver proportionally.

$$P_\omega^s = (i \cdot \hat{\eta}_s)x + (j \cdot \hat{\eta}_s)y + (k \cdot \hat{\eta}_s)z + D_\omega^s + (\tau_\omega - \tau_\alpha) \quad (3.25)$$

$$(3.26)$$

3.2 Summary

?? and [Chapter 4](#) take things to a more advanced level.

Chapter 4

Experiments That Prove Things

4.1 Method

4.1.1 Creating a Simulation

Matlab was chosen as the platform to simulate and evaluate the program due to the ease of matrix manipulation and graphical interaction.

Simulate Satellite Locations

Using real ephemeris data for the GPS constellation, the location of all of the satellites were calculated, see Table [4.1](#). The approximate reference location of the network of receivers was inputted into the program as longitude, latitude, height geocentric coordinate system. The satellite positions were transformed to the local tangent plane of the reference location in polar coordinates. The satellites that had an elevation of above 12deg were selected as potential visible satellites. This lower elevation limit was selected to minimised multipath effects that would likely occur at ground level [REF](#).

Table 4.1 – Ephemeris data for GPS constellation

| Orbital parameters | Value |
|--------------------|-------|
|--------------------|-------|

Table 4.2 – Magnitude of simulated errors

| Error Source | meters |
|--------------|--------|
|--------------|--------|

True Location of Receivers

The dispersion of receivers from α is a variable to the program. The actual displacement is calculated by multiplying the dispersion magnitude by a uniformly distributed random vector ranging from $[0,1]$ in three dimensions for all remaining receivers in ECEF frame localised at α . The positions were then transformed to the global ECEF frame.

Calculation of Pseudorange

In ECEF frame, the instantaneous distance between each visible satellite and each receiver was calculated. The errors were simulated by adding random distance proportional to error models in the literature to each individual satellite, see Table 4.2. The errors followed the structure in Eq In the literature, the errors were expressed in meters which were converted to seconds.

$$Error(seconds) = (Error) \quad (4.1)$$

Planar Algorithm

The normal vector was

- what data is it using from receiver? pseudorange, time

- what errors to include and how to incorporate into the simulation.
- how to include the different(asynchronous) time received for all receivers-> is for the one receiver
- how extra receivers affects computational time/ accuracy
- how number of sats affect comp time/accuracy
- configuration of sats
- large multipath affects
- no receiver sees the same sat? - does it just output the relative difference between abs values? -> incorrect? just have it fail? not actually implementing, can control the environment
- distance of receivers apart
- configuration of receivers
- what data received and how to simulate misaligned timing between receivers
- what magnitude are the errors and how to simulate them
- simulate the errors individually (to see how each type affects the sim - convergence time and accuracy) and/or all errors at once


4.1.2 Evaluation

The expected error due to the assumptions were outlined in Section XX. To evaluate the parallel plane assumption, two receivers were a set distance apart.

Dilution of Precision The dilution of precision (DOP) is a measure of how the geometry of the satellites affect the position measurement precision. It is used in GNSS to evaluate how much error there may be in a measurement. Figure 4.1 shows two different configurations of satellites in the 2D circular solution case. With some error bounds as shown in B and C, the solution can lie anywhere in the green area. Due to the geometry configuration of the satellites in C, the area is considerably larger even though the error bounds on the signals are the same.

- fake gps data

Figure 4.1 – Geometric Dilution of Precision



- how to simulate noise - what level SNR
- to calculate your own GPS location using the normal algorithm? - space 3
- use real GPS locations? (and through time) -space 3


How to evaluate?: - accuracy in relative space

- compare to just taking differences in absolute position
- between individual receivers and the total error in the whole system
- markov? error analysis -> cannot do precision without statistical analysis but isolate errors in x,y,z. how much worse is z than horizontal?
- computational time-> how does more receivers/satellites affect the comp time -> what time and space complexity?

4.2 Evaluation

Base Evaluation In NED frame, have two receivers - vary the distance by 0.1m, 1m, 10m ... 100km - set it as x, y, z for each distance and satellite configuration - Use 'fake' satellite positions? Sat configs: - only sats in one orbit - 1D - cluster directly above - cluster at the edges - sats in the same plane as the difference in receivers -

- how close the 'approximate location' setting is to the alpha receiver
- what affect random errors have on the accuracy - use a time scale
- vary number of satellites in view
- vary GDOP (good GDOP and bad)
- when receivers don't see the exact same satellites
- vary number of receivers
- simulate a multipath error and how does it account for it or how much error does it introduce

Figure 4.2 – text

Fake Satellite Positions

It is assumed that the orbits are circular, this is valid as the eccentricity (e) of the GPS satellites are all $e < 10^{-3}$. The eccentricity is a measure of how elliptical an orbit is; where $e = 0$ is a perfect circle and $e = 1$ is a parabola. It is also assumed that the Earth is circular and has a radius of $r_e = 6.378137 \times 10^6 m$.

$$\sin \alpha = \frac{r_e \sin(\pi/2 + \theta)}{a} \quad (4.2)$$

$$R = \frac{a \sin(\pi - (\pi/2 + \theta) - \alpha)}{\sin \theta} \quad (4.3)$$

$$R = \frac{a \cos\left(\theta + \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{r_e \cos(\theta)}{a}\right)\right)}{\sin(\theta)} \quad (4.4)$$

Some configurations will not reflect what can be achieved in our current reality but may be able to in the future. The European GNSS constellation *Galileo* will have 30 satellites operating in tandem with GPS. There are also the constellations GLONASS and BeiBo the Russian and Chinese constellations that there may be international cooperation in the future to have all the GNSS constellations operating together in a high density system.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Future work: using what satellites are in view to identify what the approximate location is? -> just use NLLS

List of References

- AS 4024.3301-2009: Safety of machinery - robots for industrial environments - safety requirements. May 2009. ISBN 0-7337-9152-2.
- Tom Allen, Andrew Hill, James Underwood, and Steven Scheduling. Dynamic path planning with multi-agent data fusion: the parallel hierarchical replanner. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 2009 International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 4445–4450. IEEE Press, May 2009. ISBN 978-1-4244-2788-8.
- Australian Academy of Science. The science of climate change: Questions and answers., August 2010.
- Nelson H. F. Beebe. A bibliography of literate programming.
<http://www.literateprogramming.com/litprog-bib.pdf>. March 2002. Version 2.49, accessed 17 July 2001.
- M. Bennewitz, W. Burgard, and S. Thrun. Learning motion patterns of persons for mobile service robots. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 2002 International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, volume 4, pages 3601–3606, 2002.
- Laura A. Connolly and Steven Scheduling. Comparative analysis of sensors, algorithms, and models within a navigation system. *Proceedings of the 2008 IEEE International Conference on Multisensor Fusion and Integration for Intelligent Systems*, pages 26–32, August 2008.
- R. S. Dahiya, G. Metta, M. Valle, and G. Sandini. Tactile sensing—from humans to humanoids. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 26(1):1–20, 2010.
- Bertrand Douillard. *Laser and vision based classification in urban environments*. PhD thesis, The University of Sydney, January 2009.
- Andrew Hill. Personal communication, June 2011.
- Matthew Johnson-Roberson, Oscar Pizarro, Stefan B. Williams, and Ian Mahon. Generation and visualization of large-scale three-dimensional reconstructions from underwater robotic surveys. *Journal of Field Robotics*, 27(1):21–51, 2010.

- Maxim Likhachev, David Ferguson, Geoffrey Gordon, Anthony (Tony) Stentz, and Sebastian Thrun. Anytime dynamic A*: the proofs. Technical Report CMU-RI-TR-05-12, Robotics Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, May 2005. URL http://www.ri.cmu.edu/pub_files/pub4/likhachev_maxim_2005_2/likhachev_maxim_2005_2.pdf. Accessed 17 July 2011.
- Nancy A. Lynch. *Distributed Algorithms*, chapter 13: Atomic objects, pages 397–454. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 1996.
- Ian Mahon and Stefan Williams. Three-dimensional robotic mapping. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Australasian Conference on Robotics and Automation*. Australian Robotics and Automation Association, Sydney, Australia, 2003.
- Laura Merry. Generic architecture design for navigation filtering. MPhil thesis, The University of Sydney, August 2009.
- E. Nettleton, S. Thrun, H. Durrant-Whyte, and S. Sukkarieh. Decentralised SLAM with low-bandwidth communication for teams of vehicles. In Shinichi Yuta, Hajima Asama, Erwin Prassler, Takashi Tsubouchi, and Sebastian Thrun, editors, *Field and Service Robotics*, volume 24, pages 179–188, 2006.
- D.C Rye and T. Furukawa, editors. *Proceedings of the 2001 Australian Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2001. Australian Robotics and Automation Association, Sydney, Australia.
- Bjarne Stroustrup. *The C++ Programming Language*, volume 1 of *The Series*. Addison Wesley, The address., 2nd edition, Jan. 2000. This is a note.
- J.P. Underwood, Andrew Hill, Thierry Peynot, and S.J. Scheduling. Error modeling and calibration of exteroceptive sensors for accurate mapping applications. *Journal of Field Robotics*, 27(1):2–20, 2010.
- S.B. Williams, G. Dissanayake, and H. Durrant-Whyte. An efficient approach to the simultaneous localisation and mapping problem. *Proceedings of the IEEE 2006 International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 406–411, 2006.

Appendix A

An Example Appendix

As an appendix, this should contain some content that's not really required for the argument in the main body of the thesis, but is clearly relevant and supports the work.