

# Improving the Accuracy of Static GPS Positioning with a New Stochastic Modelling Procedure

Chalermchon Satirapod  
*School of Geomatic Engineering  
The University of New South Wales*

## BIOGRAPHY

Chalermchon Satirapod is currently a Ph.D. student at the School of Geomatic Engineering, The University of New South Wales (UNSW), supported by a scholarship from the Chulalongkorn University. He graduated with a Bachelor of Engineering (Surveying) and Master of Engineering (Surveying) from Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, in 1994 and 1997 respectively. He joined the Department of Survey Engineering at Chulalongkorn University as a lecturer in late 1994. In early 1998 he joined UNSW's Satellite Navigation and Positioning (SNAP) group as a Ph.D. student. His research is focussed on automated and quality assured GPS surveying for a range of applications.

## ABSTRACT

For high precision static GPS positioning applications, carrier phase measurements have to be processed. It is well known that there are two important aspects to the optimal processing of GPS measurements: the definition of the functional model, and the associated stochastic model. These two models must be correctly defined in order to achieve high reliability in the positioning results. The functional model is nowadays sufficiently known, however the definition of the stochastic model still remains a challenging research topic. Previous studies have shown that the GPS measurements have a heteroscedastic, space- and time-correlated error structure. Therefore, a realistic stochastic modelling procedure should take all of these error features into account.

In this paper, a new stochastic modelling procedure is introduced. This procedure also takes into account the temporal correlations in the GPS measurements. To demonstrate its performance, both simulated and real data sets for short to medium length baselines have been analysed. The results indicate that the accuracy of GPS results can be improved to the millimetre level.

## INTRODUCTION

GPS carrier phase measurements are extensively used for all high precision static and kinematic positioning applications. The least-squares estimation technique is usually employed in the data processing step, and basically requires the definition of two models: (a) the functional model, and (b) the stochastic model. The functional model describes the mathematical relationship between the GPS observations and the unknown parameters, while the stochastic model describes the statistical characteristics of the GPS observations (see, eg., Leick, 1995; Rizos 1997; and other texts). The stochastic model is therefore dependent on the selection of the functional model. A *double-differencing* technique is commonly used for constructing the functional model as it can eliminate many of the troublesome GPS biases, such as the atmospheric biases, the receiver and satellite clock biases, and so on. However, some unmodelled biases still remain in the GPS observables, even after such data differencing. Many researchers have emphasised the importance of the stochastic model, especially for high accuracy applications, for example, Barnes et al. (1998), Cross et al. (1994), Han (1997), Teunissen (1997), Wang (1998), Wang et. al. (2001) for both the static and kinematic positioning applications. In principle it is possible to further improve the accuracy and reliability of GPS results through an enhancement of the stochastic model. Previous studies have shown that GPS measurements have a heteroscedastic, space- and time-correlated error structure (eg., Wang 1998; Wang et al., 1998a). The challenge is to find a way to realistically incorporate such information into the stochastic model. This paper deals only with the static positioning case.

Several stochastic modelling techniques have recently been proposed to accommodate the heteroscedastic behaviour of GPS observations. Some are based on the signal-to-noise (SNR) ratio model (eg., Barnes et al., 1998; Brunner et al., 1999; Hartinger & Brunner, 1998; Lau & Mok, 1999; Talbot, 1988), others use a satellite elevation dependent approach (eg., Euler & Goad, 1991; Gerdan, 1995; Han, 1997; Jin, 1996; Rizos et al., 1997).


Both of these techniques are equally applicable to static and kinematic GPS positioning. The more rigorous Minimum Norm Quadratic Unbiased Estimation (MINQUE) procedure has been suggested by Wang et al. (1998a), but its applicability is generally restricted to the static positioning case. A comparative study of two GPS quality indicators, namely the SNR and the satellite elevation, has been reported in Satirapod & Wang (2000). This study revealed that in some cases both the use of SNR and satellite elevation information *failed* to reflect the true data quality. In such cases it is necessary to consider a more rigorous statistical method such as the MINQUE technique for estimating the stochastic model of GPS observations. All these methods, however, do not take into account temporal correlations.

An exponential function was empirically derived by El-Rabbany (1994) in an attempt to model the temporal correlations in GPS observations. Han & Rizos (1995) and Howind et al. (1999) investigated the effect of temporal correlations on the accuracy, and the repeatability, of static receiver coordinates. These investigations assumed that all one-way GPS measurements have the same variance and same temporal correlations. It has been shown that different satellites have different temporal correlation coefficients (Wang, 1998), hence it is not appropriate to make such assumptions. An iterative stochastic assessment procedure, which takes into account all the error features, has been proposed by Wang et al. (2001).

In the following sections, a brief description of the iterative stochastic modelling procedure is given. A new procedure is then proposed to deal with long observation period data sets, and in order to reduce the computational load. The effectiveness of the new procedure is tested using both real data and simulated data sets for short to medium length baselines.

## ITERATIVE STOCHASTIC MODELLING PROCEDURE

The basic procedure requires the double-differenced (DD) carrier phase measurements to be transformed into a set of new measurements using estimated temporal correlation coefficients. The transformed measurements are free of temporal correlations and thus have a block diagonal variance-covariance matrix (Wang, 1998). Consequently, the immense memory usage and computational load for the inversion of a fully populated variance-covariance matrix can be avoided, and the variance-covariance matrix for the transformed measurements can be estimated using a rigorous statistical method such as the MINQUE method (Rao, 1971). An iterative process is performed until sufficient accuracy is achieved, as illustrated in Figure 1. A detailed description of the iterative stochastic modelling procedure can be found in Wang et al. (2001).




**Figure 1.** Flowchart of the iterative stochastic modelling procedure.

This procedure is suitable for short observation periods as it assumes that the temporal correlation coefficients and the variance of GPS measurements are constant for the whole observation period. Initial experiments based on this procedure have demonstrated encouraging results in the case of short observation periods and for short baselines (Wang et al., 2001). In order to deal with long observation periods, the following issues need to be addressed:

- 1) The assumption that the temporal correlation coefficients and the variance of GPS measurements are constant for the whole observation period is not realistic.
- 2) In practice, an observation period of several hours may be expected for some applications. Thus the memory usage and computational load can be unbearable when the standard MINQUE technique is applied.

## SEGMENTED STOCHASTIC MODELLING PROCEDURE

To process long observation session data sets, a three-step procedure has been proposed to address the shortcomings discussed in the previous section. The first step is to divide the whole session of measurements into short segments. Secondly, the inter-temporal correlation coefficients (for different satellite pairs) should be set to zero. In the third step, the MINQUE procedure for the estimation of variance-covariance components is replaced by an alternative method. The segmented stochastic modelling procedure is illustrated in Figure 2.



**Figure 2.** Flowchart of the segmented stochastic modelling procedure

### Step1: Data segmentation

Given that GPS measurements are contaminated by errors whose characteristics change slowly with time, it is appropriate to divide the whole measurement session into short segments, in which each segment has the same number of satellites and all the measurements for the same satellite pairs have an invariant stochastic model. During a long observation period the satellite geometry changes considerably. Hence, use of fixed 'window' widths in order to segment the measurements is not advisable.

A method to circumvent this problem is proposed, in which a default window width is first selected. Then indices of when the satellite geometry has changed during the entire session are determined, and the number of observations between consecutive indices checked. If the number of observations between any pair of consecutive indices is larger than the default window width, the measurements are divided into short segments until the number of observations in the last segment is smaller than or equal to the default window width. In this case, the observations from the last segment will be combined with the ones from the previous segment. However, if the number of observations between the consecutive indices is not sufficient to form a new segment, the stochastic model estimated from the previous segment is applied to these observations.

### Step2: Estimation of temporal correlation coefficients

Assuming that the inter-temporal correlations are zero, the error specification is:

$$\begin{bmatrix} e_1(t) \\ e_2(t) \\ \vdots \\ e_n(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{11} & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{22} & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \rho_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e_1(t-1) \\ e_2(t-1) \\ \cdot \\ e_n(t-1) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \\ \cdot \\ u_n(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho_{ii}$  is the temporal correlation within the  $i^{\text{th}}$  satellite pair;  $n$  is the number of satellite pairs forming the DD measurements; and  $e$  is the vector of original residuals.

According to the Durbin-Watson statistic (Durbin & Watson, 1950), the temporal correlation coefficient can be calculated by:

$$\rho = 1 - d / 2 \quad (2)$$

with

$$d = \frac{\sum_{k=2}^m (e_k - e_{k-1})^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m e_k^2} \quad (3)$$

where  $m$  is the number of observation epochs in a segment.

The estimated temporal correlation coefficient is then used to transform the original measurements. Details of this transformation step can be found in Wang et al. (2001).

### Step3: Estimation of variance-covariance components

In this section, a description of the standard and the simplified MINQUE methods is given first. An alternative method is then proposed and its performance is evaluated through a comparison with the standard and the simplified MINQUE methods.

#### Method 1--The standard MINQUE method

In the following Gauss-Markov model with  $n$  measurements and  $t$  unknowns:

$$l = Ax + v \quad (4)$$

$$C = P^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i T_i \quad (5)$$

$l$  and  $v$  are  $n \times 1$  vectors of the transformed measurements and residuals respectively;  $A$  is the  $n \times t$  design matrix;  $x$  is the  $t \times 1$  vector of the unknown parameters;  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_k$  are the variance-covariance components of the measurements to be estimated;  $k$  is the number of variance-covariance components; and  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k$  are the accompanying matrices (see, e.g., Wang et al., 1998a).  $P$  is the weight matrix of the observations. According to Rao (1970, 1971, 1979), the variance-covariance components can be estimated as:

$$\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2, \dots, \hat{\theta}_k)^T = S^{-1}q \quad (6)$$

where the matrix  $S = \{s_{ij}\}$  with

$$s_{ij} = Tr\{RT_i RT_j\} \quad (7)$$

and the vector  $q = \{q_i\}$  with

$$q_i = v^T RT_i Rv \quad (8)$$

and

$$R = PQ_v P \quad (9)$$

with  $Q_v = [P^{-1} - A(A^T P A)^{-1} A^T]$  being the adjusted residuals cofactor matrix.

Since the estimated variance-covariance components depend on matrix  $C$ , which includes the variance-covariance components themselves, an iterative process must be performed. It should be noted that when the MINQUE method is used in GPS data processing, the storage of the matrix  $R$  may require a huge memory. In addition, the computation relating to this matrix operation is extensive.

#### Method 2--The simplified MINQUE method

A simplification of the MINQUE procedure can be obtained by replacing the matrix  $R$  in Equation (9) by a diagonal matrix  $R^*$ . The matrix  $R^*$  has a block-diagonal structure and can be defined as:

$$R^* = diag(R_{kk}), (k = 1, 2, \dots, m) \quad (10)$$

where  $m$  is the number of the observation epoch in a segment.

Therefore, Equations (7) and (8) can be simplified to:

$$s_{ij} = Tr\{RT_i RT_j\} = \sum_{k=1}^m Tr(R_{kk} T_{ik} R_{kk} T_{jk}) \quad (11)$$

$$q_i = v^T RT_i Rv = \sum_{k=1}^m Tr(v_k^T R_{kk} T_{ik} R_{kk} v_k) \quad (12)$$

In Satirapod et al. (2001) this simplified procedure was shown to produce results that are close in quality to that of the rigorous procedure. In addition, the computational time and the memory requirements of the simplified procedure is much less than in the case of the rigorous procedure.

#### Method 3--The proposed method

The estimation of variance-covariance components can be performed using the classical definition of the variance-covariance matrix:

$$C = E[(v-\mu)(v-\mu)^T] = E[vv^T] - \mu\mu^T \quad (13)$$

where  $\mu$  is the mean value.

The residuals obtained from the transformed measurements are random and have zero mean ( $\mu=0$ ). Hence, the variance-covariance matrix can be obtained by averaging the residuals within the same segment:

$$C = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m v_k v_k^T \quad (14)$$

Similar to the above procedure, an iterative estimation procedure is required as the estimation of the residuals is dependent on the variance-covariance matrix. Based on Equation (14) the implementation of the proposed method is relatively simple and straightforward. Its performance has been evaluated using three data sets. For ambiguity discrimination, the difference between the best and second best ambiguity combination is crucial. The statistics, F-ratio (e.g., Euler & Landau, 1992) and the W-ratio (Wang et al., 1998b), are chosen for comparison (see Table 1).

**Table 1.** Comparison of F-ratio and W-ratio statistics.

Baseline	Method	F-ratio	W-ratio
14m	1	12.76	26.65
	2	12.77	26.67
	3	12.80	26.72
1km	1	9.20	29.92
	2	9.16	29.87
	3	9.17	29.86
2km	1	4.54	16.12
	2	4.59	16.25
	3	4.57	16.19

Remark: The observation period used here is 15 minutes and the sampling rate is 15 seconds.

From Table 1, there is no significant difference in the F-ratio and W-ratio statistics obtained from the three methods. In terms of the estimated baseline components, the results obtained from the three methods are also essentially identical. A comparison of the computational time and memory usage is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Comparison of computational time and memory usage.

Baseline	Method	Computational time (seconds)	Memory usage (Kbytes)
14m (5 sats)	1	263.4	450.0
	2	7.6	7.5
	3	1.2	None
1km (7 sats)	1	1519.0	1012.5
	2	33.2	16.9
	3	1.9	None
2km (6 sats)	1	700.6	703.1
	2	18.6	11.7
	3	1.5	None

Remark: All solutions computed using Matlab GPS baseline software developed at UNSW on a PentiumII-366MHz processor.

Interestingly, if the matrix  $R^*$  in the simplified MINQUE method is assumed to be constant, the variance-covariance components obtained from the proposed method are quite similar to those obtained from the simplified method. The assumption that the matrix  $R^*$  is constant is reasonable for short observation periods. This is supported by the study described in Han & Rizos (1995), which established that the maximum difference in the matrix  $A$  is about 8% for a 15 minute observation span.

In summary, the proposed method can not only substantially reduce the computational load but also ease the memory usage. The proposed method is therefore appropriate for estimating variance-covariance components in the segmented stochastic modelling procedure.

## TEST DATA

Both simulated and real data have been used in this study.

## Simulations

There are two main advantages to using simulated data: (a) to evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm (since it is very difficult to derive highly accurate GPS station coordinates in practice), and (b) to study the impact of incorporating different systematic errors. The data simulation involves two parts.

### Simulating the raw GPS observations


A simulation of the raw GPS observations was performed using the Bernese software version 4.0. Different observation noises were assigned to different satellites varying from 1mm to 3mm. Two data sets, for a 9km and a 79km baseline, were simulated. Details of these data sets are shown in Table 3.


**Table 3.** Details of the simulated data sets.

Baseline length (km)	9	79
Survey date	March 1, 2000	March 1, 2000
Satellites	15,21,17,3,31, 23,9,29	1,5,9,11,14,15, 16,18,21,22,23, 25,29,30
Data interval (sec)	15	15
Data span (hr)	0.5	5

### The systematic error components

A wavelet-based technique (see, e.g., Collin & Warnant, 1995; Fu & Rizos, 1997; Ogaja et al., 2001; for GPS applications) was applied to the GPS DD residuals in order to extract the systematic error component. The GPS DD ambiguity-fixed residuals obtained from other real data sets were decomposed into the low-frequency bias and the high-frequency noise term. The extracted systematic error component was then added to the simulated GPS observations. Two different systematic error patterns, denoted E1 and E2, were extracted and are plotted in Figures 3 and 4. These systematic error patterns have been used in later sections.

**Figure 3.** Signal extraction using wavelets. Top: Original DD residuals. Bottom: E1 error pattern.



**Figure 4.** Signal extraction using wavelets. Top: Original DD residuals. Bottom: E2 error pattern.

### Real data sets

Two data sets were downloaded from <http://sopac.ucsd.edu/>, collected by receivers of the Southern California Integrated GPS Network (SCIGN). For demonstration purposes, 3-hr and 5-hr observation periods were considered for the 23km and 75km baseline data sets respectively (Table 4).

**Table 4.** Details of the real data sets.

Baseline length (km)	23	75
Survey date	Nov 23, 2000	Nov 23, 2000
Satellites	4,5,7,8,9,24,26	2,4,5,6,7,9,10,17,30
Data interval (sec)	30	30
Data span (hr)	3	5

### RESULTS FROM SIMULATED DATA TESTS

In this section, the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm is demonstrated using both the short and medium length baseline data sets. For both data sets, the impact of systematic errors on the GPS positioning results was analysed for two different cases. The first case involved varying the number of satellites but adding the same error pattern to the same satellite pair. In the second case, the two error patterns were added to the satellite pairs alternately (see Tables 6 and 8). In this case, the approach consisted of the following steps: i) adding the error pattern E1 to different satellite pairs and obtaining a solution, ii) adding the error pattern E2 to different satellite pairs and obtaining a solution.

#### The short length baseline


Matlab-coded GPS baseline processing software developed at The University of New South Wales was

used to process the data sets. Only single-frequency data was used. To obtain more reliable baseline results for comparison purposes, the data set with observation noise was first processed using the MINQUE procedure and the results were used as reference values. Then, in both cases, the data set with intentionally added systematic errors was processed using the following two procedures:

- The standard procedure with the simplified stochastic model (which includes only mathematical correlation), and assuming that temporal correlations are absent.
- The segmented stochastic modelling procedure with a 20-epoch window width.

#### Case I – Varying the number of satellites

The number of satellites varied from 8 to 5 satellites, and the E1 error pattern was added to satellite pair PRN23-15 for every satellite geometry. The DD residuals for satellite pair PRN 23-15 are shown in Figure 5. The red line denotes the post-fit residuals obtained using method A, while the black line shows the residuals obtained from method B. It can be clearly seen that the systematic errors of the transformed measurements are much smaller than those of the original measurements. Similar results from real data sets, for the short baseline case, were reported in Wang et al. (2001).



**Figure 5.** DD residuals obtained from the 9km baseline for satellite pair PRN 23-15.

The estimated baseline components obtained from both methods were compared with the reference values. The differences for each coordinate component are shown in Table 5. It can be seen that in all cases the proposed algorithm always produced more reliable results than the standard procedure.

**Table 5.** The differences between estimated baseline components and the reference values (Case I).

Sat used	Method	Difference in each component		
		dN (mm)	dE(mm)	dH(mm)
8 sats	A	0.4	0.2	2.1
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
7 sats	A	0.0	0.1	1.7
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
6 sats	A	1.2	0.8	3.4
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 sats	A	3.2	4.0	10.7
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0

*Remark: E1 error pattern added to PRN23-15.*

In addition, the impact of systematic errors on the positioning results tends to increase with a decrease in the number of satellites used in method A. In the case of 5 satellites, the difference in the height component is as large as 10.7mm.

*Case II – Varying the error patterns and satellite pairs*

The E1 and E2 error patterns were added to different satellite pairs for the geometry consisting of 5 satellites only. The DD residuals showed similar trends to those obtained from Case I. The differences in each coordinate component are shown in Table 6. It is evident that different error patterns and different satellites have a different influence on the positioning results for method A, but not method B.

**Table 6.** The differences between estimated baseline components and the reference values (Case II).

Error pattern /sat pair	Method	Difference in each component		
		dN (mm)	dE(mm)	dH(mm)
E1/23-15	A	3.2	4.7	10.7
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
E1/23-03	A	3.4	4.0	10.9
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
E1/23-31	A	0.3	0.1	0.3
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
E2/23-15	A	0.4	2.0	5.4
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
E2/23-03	A	1.7	2.2	5.7
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
E2/23-31	A	0.2	0.0	0.2
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0


**The medium length baseline**

It is a common practice to process dual-frequency data in cases of medium length baselines. The data processing consisted of three steps. The first and second steps were carried out in the Bernese software. The DD ambiguities were solved in the first program run. These ambiguities were then introduced as fixed values in the next program run. In this step, some information were output for further use with the Matlab-coded GPS processing software. In the first and second program runs standard parameters such as the Saastamoinen troposphere model and the IGS precise orbit were used. In the third program run, the output information was processed using the proposed procedure. Since the dual-frequency data was used, the initial coordinates applied to simulate the GPS observations were used as true values for comparison purposes. Similar to the short baseline case, in both cases the data set which contains systematic errors was processed using methods A and B.

*Case I – Varying the number of satellites*

The number of satellites varied from 14 to 11 satellites and the E1 error pattern was added to the satellite pair PRN25-1 for every satellite geometry. The DD residuals for the satellite pair PRN25-1 are plotted in Figure 6. The

red line denotes the post-fit residuals obtained from method A, while the black line shows the residuals obtained from method B. It is clear that the post-fit residuals obtained from method B are more random than those obtained from method A.



**Figure 6.** DD residuals obtained from the 79km baseline for satellite pair PRN25-1.

The estimated baseline components obtained from both methods were subsequently compared with the true values, and the differences in each coordinate component are shown in Table 7. The results are similar to the short baseline case. Therefore, it can be concluded that method B is a significant improvement over method A.

**Table 7.** The differences between estimated baseline components and the true values (Case I).

Sat used	Method	Difference in each component		
		dN (mm)	dE(mm)	dH(mm)
14 sats	A	0.1	0.2	1.9
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
13 sats	A	0.1	0.3	2.4
	B	0.1	0.0	0.1
12 sats	A	0.2	0.2	2.5
	B	0.1	0.0	0.1
11 sats	A	0.1	0.1	2.6
	B	0.1	0.0	0.2

Remark: E1 error pattern added to PRN25-1.

*Case II – Varying the error patterns and satellite pairs*


Once again the E1 and E2 error patterns were added to different satellite pairs for the geometry consisting of 11 satellites only. The DD residuals showed similar trends (for the sake of brevity, the residuals are not shown here). Table 8 shows the differences between the estimated baseline components and the true values. The results confirm that different error patterns and different satellites have a different influence on the positioning results for method A, but not method B.

**Table 8.** The differences between estimated baseline components and the true values (Case II).


Error pattern /sat pair	Method	Difference in each component		
		dN (mm)	dE(mm)	dH(mm)
E1/25-01	A	0.1	0.1	2.6
	B	0.1	0.0	0.2
E1/25-14	A	2.9	0.1	0.7
	B	0.0	0.0	0.0
E1/25-21	A	0.7	0.1	2.7
	B	0.1	0.0	0.3
E2/25-01	A	0.1	0.0	1.1
	B	0.1	0.1	0.2
E2/25-14	A	1.3	0.1	1.2
	B	0.1	0.0	0.1
E2/25-21	A	0.5	0.0	1.5
	B	0.1	0.0	0.2

## RESULTS FROM REAL DATA SETS

The data processing strategies used here are the same as in the medium length baseline case, except that systematic errors have not been added to the observations. The DD residuals obtained from all satellite pairs show similar trends. Selected residuals obtained from the 23km and 75km baselines are plotted in Figures 7 and 8 respectively. Again, the red line denotes the post-fit residuals obtained from method A, while the black line shows the residuals obtained from method B. Clearly method B generates random residuals for both data sets.



**Figure 7.** Selected DD residuals obtained from the 23km baseline for several satellite pairs.



**Figure 8.** Selected DD residuals obtained from the 75km baseline for several satellite pairs.

The differences in estimated baseline components between methods A and B are presented in Table 9. It can be seen that the differences are 1.2 mm and 1.9 mm for the 23-km and 75-km baselines consecutively. These discrepancies are certainly significant for high-accuracy applications.

**Table 9.** The differences in estimated baseline components between methods A and B.

Baseline	Difference in each component		
	dN (mm)	dE(mm)	dH(mm)
23-km	0.8	0.2	1.2
75-km	1.9	1.9	0.1

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Based on a new framework of error analysis of GPS measurements, a new stochastic modelling procedure, which takes into account the temporal correlations in the GPS measurements, has been introduced to effectively deal with long observation periods for high precision static positioning applications. It has been shown that the GPS measurements have a heteroscedastic, space- and time-correlated error structure, and that any misspecification in the stochastic model may have a significant influence on the positioning results. The impact of temporal correlations was analysed using simulated and real data sets. The results indicate that there are significant effects on the positioning results when the temporal correlations are taken into account in the stochastic model. By applying the proposed segmented

stochastic modelling procedure, the residuals are more random and the accuracy of the estimated baseline components is improved.

As demonstrated in this paper, initial experiments have shown promising results. However, there are some challenges in implementing this new stochastic modelling procedure for precise positioning as carried out to address geodetic applications. For example, the optimal length of the segments to be used in the stochastic modelling needs to be investigated, and the significance of the inter-temporal correlations should be statistically tested.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is sponsored in his Ph.D. studies by a scholarship from the Chulalongkorn University, Thailand. Many thanks to Professor Chris Rizos and Dr. Jinling Wang for their invaluable support. Much gratitude to Clement Ogaja for the fruitful discussions he had with the author. The author's warmest thanks to Pierre Fridez from the Astronomical Institute of the University of Berne who assisted with understanding the source code of the Bernese software. The Southern California Integrated GPS Network is also acknowledged for providing some of the data used in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Barnes B.J., Ackroyd N. & Cross P.A. (1998) Stochastic modelling for very high precision real-time kinematic GPS in an engineering environment, *Proceedings of FIG XXI International Conference*, 21-25 July, Brighton, U.K., Commission 6, 61-76.
- Brunner F.K., Hartinger H. & Troyer L. (1999) GPS signal diffraction modelling: The stochastic SIGMA- $\Delta$  model, *Journal of Geodesy*, 73, 259-267.
- Collin F. & Warnant R. (1995) Applications of the wavelet transform for GPS cycle slip correction and comparison with Kalman filter, *Menuscripta Geodaetica*, 20, 161-172.
- Cross P.A., Hawksbee D.J. & Nicolai R. (1994) Quality measures for differential GPS positioning, *Hydrographic Journal*, 72, 17-22.
- Durbin J. & Watson G.S. (1950) Testing for serial correlation in least squares regression I, *Biometrika*, 37, 409-428.
- El-Rabbany, A.E-S. (1994) *The effect of Physical Correlations on the Ambiguity Resolution and Accuracy Estimation in GPS Differential Positioning*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Geodesy and Geomatics Engineering, University of New Brunswick, Canada, 161pp.
- Euler H.J. & Goad C.C. (1991) On optimal filtering of GPS dual-frequency observations without using orbit information, *Bull Geod*, 65, 130-143.
- Euler H.J. & Landau H. (1992) Fast GPS ambiguity resolution on-the-fly for real-time applications, *6<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Satellite Positioning*, Columbus, Ohio, 17-20 March, 650-659.
- Fu W.X. & Rizos C. (1997). The applications of wavelets to GPS signal processing, *10th Int. Tech. Meeting of the Satellite Division of the U.S. Inst. of Navigation GPS ION'97*, Kansas City, Missouri, 16-19 September, 697-703.
- Gerdan G.P. (1995) A comparison of four methods of weighting double-difference pseudorange measurements, *Trans Tasman Surveyor*, Canberra, Australia, 1(1), 60-66.
- Han S. (1997) Quality control issues relating to instantaneous ambiguity resolution for real-time GPS kinematic positioning, *Journal of Geodesy*, 71(7), 351-361.
- Han S. & Rizos C. (1995) Standardization of the variance-covariance matrix for GPS rapid static positioning, *Geomatics Research Australasia*, 62, 37-54.
- Hartinger H. & Brunner F.K. (1998) Attainable accuracy of GPS measurements in engineering surveying, *Proceedings of FIG XXI International Conference*, 21-25 July, Brighton, U.K., Commission 6, 18-31.
- Howind J., Kutterer H. & Heck B. (1999) Impact of temporal correlations on GPS-derived relative point positions, *Journal of Geodesy*, 73, 246-258.
- Jin X. (1996) *Theory of Carrier Adjusted DGPS Positioning Approach and Some Experimental Results*, Ph.D. thesis, Delft University Press, The Netherlands.
- Lau L. & Mok E. (1999) Improvement of GPS relative positioning accuracy by using SNR, *Journal of Surveying Engineering*, 125(4), 185-202.
- Leick A. (1995) *GPS Satellite Surveying*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, N.Y., 560pp.
- Ogaja C., Rizos C., Wang J. & Brownjohn J. (2001) Towards the implementation of on-line structural monitoring using RTK-GPS and analysis of results using the wavelet transform, *10th FIG Int. Symp. on Deformation Measurements*, Orange, California, 19-22 March.
- Rao C.R. (1970) Estimation of heterogeneous variances in linear models, *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 65, 161-172.

Rao C.R. (1971) Estimation of variance and covariance components - MINQUE, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 1, 257-275.

Rao C.R. (1979) MINQUE theory and its relation to ML and MML estimation of variance components, *Sankhya*, 41, Series B, 138-153.

Rizos C. (1997) *Principles and Practice of GPS Surveying*, Monograph 17, School of Geomatic Engineering, The University of New South Wales, 555pp.

Rizos C., Han S. & Hirsch B. (1997) A high precision real-time GPS surveying system based on the implementation of a single-epoch ambiguity resolution algorithm, *Proceedings of the 38<sup>th</sup> Australian Surveyors Congress*, 12-18 April, Newcastle, Australia, 20.1-20.10.

Satirapod C. & Wang J. (2000) Comparing the quality indicators of GPS carrier phase observations, *Geomatics Research Australasia*, 73, 75-92.

Satirapod C., Wang J. & Rizos C. (2001) A simplified MINQUE procedure for the estimation of variance-covariance components of GPS observables, *Submitted to GPS Solutions* ([http://www.gmat.unsw.edu.au/snap/publications/satirapod\\_etal2001a.pdf](http://www.gmat.unsw.edu.au/snap/publications/satirapod_etal2001a.pdf)).

Talbot N. (1988) Optimal weighting of GPS carrier phase observations based on the signal-to-noise ratio, *Int. Symp. on Global Positioning Systems*, Brisbane, Australia, October, 4.1-4.17.

Teunissen P.J.G. (1997) On the sensitivity of the location, size and shape of the GPS ambiguity search space to certain changes in the stochastic model, *Journal of Geodesy*, 71, 541-551.

Wang J. (1998) Stochastic assessment of the GPS measurements for precise positioning, *11th Int. Tech. Meeting of the Satellite Division of the U.S. Inst. of Navigation GPS ION'98*, Nashville, Tennessee, 15-18 September, 81-89.

Wang J., Stewart M.P. & Tsakiri M. (1998a) Stochastic modelling for static GPS baseline data processing, *Journal of Surveying Engineering*, 124(4), 171-181.

Wang J., Stewart M.P. & Tsakiri M. (1998b) A discrimination test procedure for ambiguity resolution on-the-fly, *Journal of Geodesy*, 72, 644-653.

Wang J., Satirapod C. & Rizos C. (2001) Stochastic assessment of GPS carrier phase measurements for precise static relative positioning, *Submitted to Journal of Geodesy* ([http://www.gmat.unsw.edu.au/snap/publications/wang\\_etal2001a.pdf](http://www.gmat.unsw.edu.au/snap/publications/wang_etal2001a.pdf)).