



**GPS-DENIED LOCALIZATION OF
DAUGHTER-SHIPS IN A
MOTHER-DAUGHTER SHIP
COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT**

THESIS

Ethan W Jacquin, Captain, USAF
AFIT-ENG-MS-21-M-051

**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR UNIVERSITY**

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

The views expressed in this document are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the United States Air Force, the United States Department of Defense or the United States Government. This material is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States.

AFIT-ENG-MS-21-M-051

GPS-DENIED LOCALIZATION OF DAUGHTER-SHIPS IN A
MOTHER-DAUGHTER SHIP COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Graduate School of Engineering and Management
Air Force Institute of Technology
Air University
Air Education and Training Command
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science in Electrical Engineering

Ethan W Jacquin, B.S.E.E.
Captain, USAF

March 2021

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

AFIT-ENG-MS-21-M-051

GPS-DENIED LOCALIZATION OF DAUGHTER-SHIPS IN A
MOTHER-DAUGHTER SHIP COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT

THESIS

Ethan W Jacquin, B.S.E.E.
Captain, USAF

Committee Membership:

Clark N Taylor, Ph.D
Chair

Scott L Nykl, Ph.D
Member

Robert C Leishman, Ph.D
Member

Abstract

The Air Force and other Department of Defense (DoD) branches have expressed interest in small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) that can provide close-in sensing to a target of interest. These small UAVs can be launched from a “mothership” and can act autonomously to collect intelligence, overcome meteorological effects, or provide targeting solutions. However, the closer a UAV is to a target, the easier it will be to jam, spoof, or otherwise degrade Global Positioning System (GPS) signals. These signals are critical to the operation of the UAVs, or “daughter-ships”, as the sensed data collected by the daughter-ships needs to be placed in a geodetic frame so that the mothership can take action on the collected data. Without accurate coordinates for the collected data, a daughter-ship’s utility is dramatically reduced.

This research focuses on investigating the possibility of using the communication link between the mothership and daughter-ship as a replacement of GPS. Specifically, we are assuming a ranging link between the mothership and daughter-ship, and the mothership has not been denied GPS. Both the mothership and daughter ship are station keeping, but on significantly different orbits. A ranging link is used to measure the distance between the two ships at all times. Over the course of recording multiple different range measurements, a location for the daughter-ship can be estimated.

A simulation study was conducted to determine the viability of this approach. The simulation was designed using an Extended Kalman Filter (EKF) to analyze and predict the location of the daughter ship using only the range measurement between the two ships. Factors such as distance, altitude, roll angle, speed, ranging sensor noise, and inertial measurement unit (IMU) uncertainty were considered. The simulation confirmed that the approach was in fact viable and that error between the

truth data and predicted location can be generally kept below 3 meters.

Finally, a maximum error threshold of 3 meters was set in order to obtain the conditions at which this method would be viable. Parameters were set to a baseline value as described in this thesis, and single variables were altered to measure their effect on the ranging solution. From this, the magnitude of the errors were examined and a range of values in which the approach would yield acceptable results was formed.

The research closes by exploring additional options such as improving upon the simulation testing with real world hardware.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	iv
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	x
I. Introduction	1
1.1 Problem Background	1
1.2 Research Objectives	2
1.3 Research Approach	2
1.4 Assumptions/Limitations	2
1.5 Thesis Overview	3
II. Background and Literature Review	4
2.1 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles	4
2.2 UAV Navigation	5
2.2.1 Inertial Navigation Systems	5
2.2.2 The Global Positioning System	7
2.3 The Kalman Filter	10
2.3.1 The Kalman Filter Equations	11
2.3.2 The Extended Kalman Filter	12
2.4 Related Work in GPS Denied Navigation	14
2.4.1 Vision Aided Navigation	15
2.4.2 Navigation Using Bearing Measurements	15
2.4.3 Magnetic Navigation	17
2.4.4 Navigation Using Radio Ranging	18
III. Methodology	24
3.1 Simulation Overview	24
3.2 Assumptions	26
3.3 Measurement Model	27
3.4 Simulation Parameters	27
3.4.1 Simulation Constants	28
3.4.2 Testing Parameters	28
3.5 Error Calculation	29
3.6 Data Generation	29
3.7 Experimental Design	30

	Page
IV. Results and Analysis	32
4.1 Overview	32
4.2 Baseline Simulation Results	32
4.3 Effects of Varied Velocity Values	35
4.4 Effects of Varied Roll Angle Values	39
4.5 Effect of Varied Altitude Values	41
4.6 Effects of Varied Separation Distance Values	45
4.7 Effects of Varied Range Sensor Noise Values	49
4.8 Effects of Varied Ship 2 IMU Uncertainty Values	53
4.9 Acceptable Parameters	57
V. Conclusions	58
5.1 Overview	58
5.2 Research Conclusions	58
5.3 Future Work	59
Appendix A. Full Simulation Results	60
Bibliography	82
Acronyms	85

List of Figures

Figure	Page
1. GPS Control Segment Map	8
2. Radio ranging approach	19
3. UAV Cooperative Navigation Approach.....	21
4. Five bar linkage	21
5. Simulation Overview	25
6. Sim Baseline Output	26
7. Baseline Performance	33
8. Baseline Performance, Zoom	34
9. Error Distribution	35
10. Velocity, X-Error Surface Plot	37
11. Velocity, Y-Error Surface Plot	38
12. Roll Angle, X-Error Surface Plot.....	40
13. Roll Angle, Y-Error Surface Plot.....	41
14. Altitude, X-Error Surface Plot.....	43
15. Altitude, Y-Error Surface Plot.....	44
16. Separation Distance, X-Error Plot	46
17. Separation Distance, Y-Error Plot	47
18. Separation Distance, Average Total Error Plot.....	48
19. Range Sensor Noise, X-Error Plot	50
20. Range Sensor Noise, Y-Error Plot	51
21. Range Sensor Noise, Average Total Error Plot	52
22. Ship 2 IMU Uncertainty, X-Error Plot	54

Figure		Page
23.	Ship 2 IMU Uncertainty, Y-Error Plot	55
24.	Ship 2 IMU Uncertainty, Average Total Error Plot	56

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Grades of INS Systems, Costs, and Errors	7
2.	Simulation Constants	28
3.	Simulation Variable Parameter	29
4.	Simulation Baseline Parameters	31
5.	Simulation Baseline Results	32
6.	Velocity Simulation Results	36
7.	Roll Angle Simulation Results	39
8.	Altitude Simulation Results	42
9.	Separation Distance Simulation Results	45
10.	Range Sensor Noise Simulation Results	49
11.	IMU Uncertainty Simulation Results	53
12.	Test Range and Unacceptable Conditions	57
13	Velocity Tests, Full Results	60
14	Roll Angle Tests, Full Results	65
15	Altitude Tests, Full Results	71
16	Separation Distance Tests, Full Results	77
17	Range Sensor Noise Tests, Full Results	78
18	Daughter-Ship IMU Uncertainty Tests, Full Results	80

GPS-DENIED LOCALIZATION OF DAUGHTER-SHIPS IN A MOTHER-DAUGHTER SHIP COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT

I. Introduction

1.1 Problem Background

The Air Force and other Department of Defense (DoD) branches have expressed an interest in using small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) that can provide close-in sensing of a target of interest. These small, agile UAVs augment the versatile mission set of already existing platforms and can be launched from a “mothership” to be used in various roles including Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR), to overcome weather or other meteorological effects, or even to provide targeting solutions. These platforms would likely be operated in hostile airspace where adversary action can jam, spoof, deny or otherwise degrade Global Positioning System (GPS) signals. These signals are critical to the operation of the UAVs, or “daughter-ships”, as the mothership needs accurate positioning of the daughter-ship in order to take action upon the collected data. Without accurate positioning data, the usefulness of the daughter-ship data is severely reduced. Therefore, a solution is needed to allow the navigation of the daughter-ship in these hostile operational environments that is accurate enough to allow it to continue its mission relatively unimpeded. The solution should allow the daughter-ship to continue to pass useful information to the mothership so that it may act knowledgeably upon the data received. The proposed solution will achieve accurate localization of the daughter-ship by utilizing the ranging link between mothership and daughter-ship as a replacement of GPS.

1.2 Research Objectives

- Using a simulation environment, explore the viability of using the ranging link between the mother and daughter-ship to obtain a position solution of the daughter-ship.
- Determine the accuracy of the GPS-denied localization solution based on range measurements between the mother and daughter-ship.
- Examine the parameters which control the simulation and their effect on the accuracy of the position solution.
- Determine the range of parameters for which the localization solution will be effective.

1.3 Research Approach

Experiments will begin by conducting a simulation study to determine the viability of the proposed approach. The simulation environment will exist within MATLAB and will allow for several different system parameters to be simulated. We demonstrate that in a wide variety of operating conditions, the overall position error of the daughter-ship is under 3 meters. The overall location accuracy for each parameterized scenario is evaluated and a range of values of which the solution is effective will be determined.

1.4 Assumptions/Limitations

The radio that is to be simulated for this research is not yet defined as a real-world radio. It is assumed that there exists a radio which can accurately perform the radio ranging task that is the foundation of this research. This radio is assumed to be

accurate enough to determine the range between the two ships as well as account for any differences in timing between the two systems. It is also assumed that the ships are operating in hostile airspace, with the daughter-ship being GPS-denied whereas the mothership that is GPS-enabled is either resilient enough to resist the GPS denial attempt or is at a distance far enough away to be unaffected.

1.5 Thesis Overview

This thesis document is arranged in five chapters. Chapter II provides some background information about some of the technologies that are dealt with in this research, as well as some previous work from the community that is relevant to the research. Chapter III presents the methodology by which the research was conducted and covers topics such as the creation of the simulation space, error calculation, and data generation. Chapter IV presents and discusses the results of the work, and Chapter V summarizes the research and lays out some potential options for future work.

II. Background and Literature Review

This chapter provides the relevant background subjects and related research that forms the foundation of this thesis work and of which understanding is necessary for later chapters. The chapter begins with a technical summary of some of the technologies used and discussed throughout the work, such as Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, Inertial Navigation Systems, and the Global Positioning System. It also provides a brief overview of the Kalman Filter and Extended Kalman Filter. It follows with a look at related work in the field of GPS denied navigation and some discussion regarding the impact that the works have on this research.

2.1 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles

The United States Air Force (USAF) has increasingly relied on UAVs to accomplish its many and varied mission sets. Dependence on UAVs continues to grow as mission sets expand to include tasks such as ISR and combat support. The motivation and idea of the UAV dates back to 1956, when Air Force Major General David Becker stated “We can readily see that except for certain types of missions, the manned combat aircraft will become technically obsolete in the future.”[1] Early development of UAVs was conducted by the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) for intelligence purposes, to be eventually operated in the combat-support role by the USAF in the 1960s. Throughout the Vietnam War era, USAF developed drones flew more than 3,500 combat sorties in a variety of roles. This prompted the Air Force to commit to invest in UAV development in the early 1970s. By the 1980s, the push to counter the Soviet threat had eclipsed the desire for UAV development, resulting in a “UAV Hiatus.” The 1990s brought the development of the RQ-1 Predator and RQ-4 Global Hawk, operating the former over Bosnia and Kosovo and breaking some of the

secrecy that had formerly surrounded the systems. By 1999, Predators were handing real-time targeting data to operators in support of Operation Allied Force. The terror attacks of September 11, 2001 as well as the resulting wars in Afghanistan and Iraq brought UAVs into full view of the public. Within a decade, USAF acquisition of UAVs had increased by more than 25-fold - with the Air Force operating over 5,000 UAVs [1].

2.2 UAV Navigation

To enable UAV flight, each UAV must be capable of knowing its own state so that it can fly to and observe (or interact with) the correct location and, eventually, land at the correct location. UAVs utilize a suite of sensors, transmitters and receivers to navigate within the world. Typically, UAVs utilize a IMU and GPS receiver to localize themselves. Additional navigation methods can be provided from methods such as visual tracking or computer vision, radio ranging, bearing measurements, or magnetometer readings. The following sections provide a background to commonly used UAV navigation methods.

2.2.1 Inertial Navigation Systems

Dr. Charles Stark "Doc" Draper, director of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Instrumentation Laboratory had been thinking about a project for a long time: "the development of a self-contained inertial navigation system that could provide the pilot with an airplane's location in bad visibility without the assistance of external instruments [2]." Doc approached his government partner and friend, Col Lee Davis of the United States Army Air Forces, to attempt to secure funding for the project. The concept, self-contained Inertial Navigation, would overcome the huge navigation problem experienced by the crews of the Air Forces long range bombers during the

war. The forerunner of modern inertial navigation systems, the Space Inertial Reference Equipment (SPIRE) project, first flew on 9 February 1953. SPIRE's accuracy during the 12-hour, 2,600-mile flight was one one-hundredth of a percent (0.00013). The success of SPIRE gave "credibility to the enormous potential of inertial guidance." [2]

The INS at its core is a dead-reckoning system that calculates vehicle position when given a known starting point. The system functions by utilizing two suites of three sensors measuring both linear and angular accelerations. The first set of three sensors consists of accelerometers aligned orthogonally with the purpose of measuring linear accelerations in each of the vehicle's three translational dimensions. The second set of three sensors consists of gyroscopes aligned orthogonally with the purpose of measuring the vehicle's angular accelerations in the three rotational dimensions. The measurements collected by the accelerometers and the gyroscopes are then integrated in the time domain [3].

The primary advantage of an INS is that it requires no external references in order to determine its position, orientation, or velocity once it has been aligned. The largest limitations of an INS is that the system will exhibit drift, as even the best accelerometers and gyroscopes are subject to noise, biases, and misalignment that gradually increase the total error of the INS position solution. Early inertial systems tended to drift by as much as 15° per hour, with modern electrostatically suspended gyroscopes achieving drift rates of the order of 0.0001° per hour [3]. Even small amounts of drift, however, can drastically impact the performance of a system. The large errors present in early INS systems required an additional aiding instrument to be added to the system to help estimate position and constrain the growth of the error in the INS solution. The initial aiding instrument added to early INS was a stellar sensor, used to correct the accumulated error. The combination of both

systems worked well, if not a little “messy and inelegant” as Doc Draper put it [2]. The practice of aiding an INS with an additional sensor input remains heavily in use today. Most modern day systems utilize GPS as the aiding system.

In general, inertial navigation systems are classified by their intended use and amount of drift they experience during a given time period. These parameters stem from the quality of their accelerometer and gyroscope sensors. Table 1 below details a general guideline of the capabilities and costs of some of the typical inertial sensor grades. Note that the values are approximate, as exact drift rates and costs will vary by manufacturer [4].

2.2.2 The Global Positioning System

GPS is a form of a Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) that was developed by the United States to provide precision navigation and timing for military, commercial, and civil uses. Early attempts were explored through the Navy TRANSIT system, the Naval Research Laboratory Timation Satellites, and Air Force Project 621B before the GPS Joint Program Office officially formed in 1973. The first GPS satellites, known as Block I, were launched in 1978. GPS is made up of three separate segments: the space segment, the control segment, and the user segment. The space segment is nominally made up of 24 active satellites, of which 21 are operational and three are spares. Recently, however, there have been more than 30 satellites making

Table 1: Grades of INS Systems, Costs, and Errors [4]

Grade	Price Range	Pos. Error	Gyro Bias Error	Accel. Bias Error
Strategic	> \$ 500K	< 0.030 km/h	0.000 °/h	0.001 mg
Navigation	\$ 90K to > \$ 130K	< 1.700 km/h	0.005 to 0.015 °/h	0.030 to 0.050 mg
Tactical	\$ 6K to > \$ 35K	18 to 40 km/h	0.500 to 10 °/h	0.500 to 1.000 mg
Consumer	> \$ 350	> 40 km/h	1000 °/h	20 mg

up the constellation. The satellites are arranged in six orbital planes with (nominally) four satellites per plane. They orbit at an inclination angle of 55° [5].

The control segment consists of the many ground stations that operate and maintain the GPS constellation. Ground antennas, monitoring stations, and tracking stations are located in strategic locations all over the world. The Master Control Station is located at Schriever Air Force Base in Colorado and is tasked with managing the constellation, monitoring the GPS system performance, and calculating the data sent over the navigation message to keep GPS current [6]. The locations of the components of the control segment are shown in Figure 1. The user segment consists of all users of GPS and the receivers that allow for location. Receivers are found in many devices such as cell phones, automobiles, aircraft, spacecraft, and surface ships. GPS receivers are commercially produced and are used in many applications ranging from obvious such as navigation and precision timing, to more obscure such as power grid management and global banking support [5].




Figure 1: The GPS Control Segment Map [6]

GPS operates through the transmission of Radio Frequency (RF) signals from satellites to receivers within line of sight. Each GPS satellite orbiting in the constellation transmits a unique signal known as a Pseudo-Random Noise (PRN) code and orbital parameters that allow GPS devices to compute the precise location of the satellite. GPS receivers use the satellite location information and trilateration to compute the user's location. Each satellite has its own unique PRN which is transmitted over one of the three carrier frequencies: L1 (1575.42 MHz), L2 (1227.6 MHz) and L5 (1176.45 MHz). PRN codes are transmitted in two classes of code: the coarse-acquisition (C/A) code and the precise (P) code. C/A code and P code differ by the chipping rate, chipping period, and code repeat intervals. C/A code is intended for initial acquisition of the GPS signal, whereas P code provides better performance and more precise positioning. P code is encrypted by an encryption code known as Y code, and is often referred to as P(Y) code. The encryption helps to prevent spoofing of the signal. Also transmitted is the navigation message which contains necessary ephemeris and almanac parameters required to calculate a precise position [5].

Essentially, the GPS receiver measures the distance to each satellite by measuring the amount of time it takes to receive a transmitted signal. The receiver knows the time at which the signal was transmitted, the speed at which the signal travels (the speed of light), and the time at which the signal was received. This method of calculating position is known as code measurement and yields accuracy on the order of 2-4 meters. Typical civilian GPS error averages around 5 meters [7]. The second method of calculating position, known as carrier-phase measurement, generates range by counting the number of wavelengths of the carrier signal from transmission to reception. Signal wavelength is known, but calculation of position is more difficult due to ambiguities in the resolution and where in the phase cycle a measurement occurs. Successfully resolving the ambiguities results in accuracy on the order of 1

cm [5]. Certain applications, such as differential GPS, combine both code and carrier phase measurements. After code or carrier phase measurements are received, solving for position is a matter of having a sufficient amount of measurements to resolve a location. Typically, four satellites and their measurements are needed to calculate position and time. Having four satellites accounts for all variables in the pseudorange equation: x , y , z position and receiver clock error.

GPS is a critical tool for precise navigation and timing and forms the backbone of many modern systems. However, GPS is not infallible and has some key limitations that should be understood. GPS relies on RF signals from space which are susceptible to blocking (GPS jamming) or to being altered to make the receiver tell its user that it is in a different location than it actually is (GPS spoofing). Jamming and spoofing are inherent weaknesses in all GNSS systems and can be achieved through various means depending on the prowess of the adversary [8]. For this reason, studies are being conducted to minimize or mitigate the effect of GPS denial and make systems resilient when used in an operational environment that may be GPS denied.

GPS is just one example of a GNSS. Other systems are owned and operated by various countries around the world, including GLONASS, a Russian built GNSS, Galileo, a GNSS operated by the European Union, and Beidou, a GNSS operated by the Chinese. While each system offers similar objectives of precision navigation and timing, the systems differ in the amount of satellites, orbits, and frequencies used [5].

2.3 The Kalman Filter

The optimal linear estimator, the Kalman filter, is a recursive data processing algorithm that incorporates "all available measurement data, plus prior knowledge about the system and measuring devices, to produce an estimate of the desired variables in such a manner that the error is minimized statistically [9]." The Kalman

filter requires some assumptions to be effective, which are:

- The system model is linear
- Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) is the only noise present
- All system states are Markov Processes
- The system's initial states are Gaussian

The assumption that all system states are Markov processes means that the value assumed by the current state embodies all information needed for propagation to its next step; essentially that the value of the state depends only on its value at the previous time step and at the current input. The states of the system at the current time represent all previous system states and inputs over time [9]. The future states of the system then follow a Bayesian approach [10]:

$$P(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) = \frac{P(\mathbf{z}_k | \mathbf{x}_k) P(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{z}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k)}{P(\mathbf{z}_k | \mathbf{z}_{k-1})} \quad (1)$$

Where $\mathbf{x}_k$ is the state vector of the system, $\mathbf{u}_k$ are the inputs to the system and $\mathbf{z}_k$ are the measurements of the system.

2.3.1 The Kalman Filter Equations

To determine the state distributions, Equation (1) can be solved by applying the Kalman filter equations recursively in two steps: propagate and update. The Kalman filter propagate equations are defined as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- = \Phi \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k-1}^+ + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{u}_k \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_k^- = \Phi \mathbf{P}_{k-1}^+ \Phi^T + \mathbf{Q}_d \quad (3)$$

The state transition matrix, Φ , defines the relationship of the states between the individual time steps whereas $\mathbf{B}$ defines the relationship of the inputs to the system states. The state vector of the system is fully defined by a mean and covariance, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$ and $\mathbf{P}_k$, respectively. $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k-1}^+$ is the mean of the system at time $k-1$ after the measurement update, notated by the $+$ symbol. $\mathbf{P}_k^-$ refers to the system's covariance matrix at the time k , before any measurement updates are applied. $\mathbf{Q}_d$ is the discretized system covariance. After propagating the system forward, the next step is to update. The update step incorporates measurement information about the system from the measurement model. The Kalman filter update equations are defined as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + \mathbf{K}_k \mathbf{Y}_k \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_k^+ = \mathbf{P}_k^- - \mathbf{K}_k \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_k^- \quad (5)$$

Where

$$\mathbf{K}_k = \mathbf{P}_k^- \mathbf{H}^T [\mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_k^- \mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R}]^{-1} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{Y}_k = \mathbf{z}_k - \mathbf{H} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- \quad (7)$$

$\mathbf{K}_k$ is known as the the Kalman gain whereas $\mathbf{Y}_k$ is the residual of the measurements. After applying the update step, the current system mean and covariance are now once again ready to be propagated. This process is continued recursively. More information about the Kalman filter, as well as a full derivation of the propagate and update equations, can be found in [9].

2.3.2 The Extended Kalman Filter

With the Kalman filter, one important assumption was made: the dynamics of the system model are linear. However, this key assumption limits the application of the

Kalman filter in most real world systems as real world systems experience both non-linear process and measurement dynamics. Therefore, a solution is needed to address the linearity assumption to expand the capability of the Kalman filter. One such solution is known as the Extended Kalman Filter (EKF). The EKF is an extension of the Kalman filter estimator for use in a non-linear environment and can handle systems with both linear and non-linear process and measurement models. For the EKF to function, however, the other assumptions must hold true: The states must be Gaussian, Markov processes and noise is still AWGN. If these assumptions remain true, the non-linear functions on the process and measurement models can then be linearized by Taylor Series Expansion about a chosen point. Modified versions of the Kalman filter equations can then be applied. It should be noted that the solution then becomes approximate, meaning that there is no guarantee that the estimates from the filter will be statistically minimized errors. This renders the EKF a sub-optimal filter, mathematically, but has still shown acceptable results in hundreds of applications. The EKF equations are as follows [11] [12]:

Extended Kalman Filter Propagate Equations

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- = f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k-1}^+, \mathbf{u}_k) \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_k^- = \tilde{\Phi}_{k-1} \mathbf{P}_{k-1}^+ \tilde{\Phi}_{k-1}^T + \mathbf{Q}_d \quad (9)$$

Extended Kalman Filter Update Equations

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+ = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^- + \mathbf{K}_k \mathbf{Y}_k \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_k^+ = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_k \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_k) \mathbf{P}_k^- \quad (11)$$

Where

$$\mathbf{K}_k = \mathbf{P}_k^- \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^T [\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \mathbf{P}_k^- \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^T + \mathbf{R}]^{-1} \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{Y}_k = \mathbf{z}_k - h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-) \quad (13)$$

$\mathbf{K}_k$ and $\mathbf{Y}_k$, the Kalman gain and measurement residual, remain the same. The Kalman filter equations use the linear terms Φ and $\mathbf{H}$ described by Equation (14) and Equation (15), whereas the EKF uses the Jacobian of the f and h functions, respectively.

$$\Phi_k = \left. \frac{\delta f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}{\delta x} \right|_{x=\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^+, \mathbf{u}_k} \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{H}_k = \left. \frac{\delta h(\mathbf{x})}{\delta x} \right|_{x=\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k^-} \quad (15)$$

For more information about the EKF, see [9], [11] and [12].

2.4 Related Work in GPS Denied Navigation

Work has been accomplished on other, alternative methods of navigation that do not require GPS. Methods such as visual tracking or computer vision, radio ranging, bearing measurements, or magnetic navigation provide alternative methods of localizing the aircraft in the absence of GPS. These methods will be described in the subsections below. While these methods do have the benefit of adding navigation resiliency to the aircraft, they have their own set of challenges and disadvantages to contend with. Note that the methods mentioned are not all-inclusive or necessarily standalone, meaning research on other methods or combination of methods may exist to help localize aircraft in the absence of GPS.

2.4.1 Vision Aided Navigation

Vision aided navigation is an alternative navigation method that utilizes one or more cameras on the UAV to obtain vehicle pose information during a GPS outage. Navigation using a camera is appealing because the typical UAV already carries a camera, either for remote piloting or surveillance. Typical vision aided navigation approaches can be broadly categorized into two methods: 1) methods that rely on identifying features in the scene, and 2) methods that use only registered models of the environment [13]. Images from the camera can be processed to create lines of sight to landmarks or features that can then be identified. The lines of sight can be used to triangulate the pose of the camera, and thus the vehicle [14]. The first approach uses feature tracking that can only provide partial navigation aiding. The second approach can achieve full localization, but requires a registered model of the environment. The models can be derived from man-made structures or natural features. The main disadvantage for vision aided navigation is the differences that may occur between reference imagery and operational conditions that can effect system performance. For example, weather (cloud cover, snow, rain) could cause the environment to be suitably altered to the point at which the features or landmarks no longer properly register as such and therefore do not allow for localization. Vision methods have the potential to augment the ranging work described in this thesis research, but are not included in the scope of this work.

2.4.2 Navigation Using Bearing Measurements

Another type of alternative navigation is the use of bearing measurements to localize a GPS-denied aircraft. This approach is similar to navigation using radio ranging, the key difference being the measured quantity is bearing instead of range. Prior works have explored the use of bearing measurements as a replacement or aide

for GPS. Research performed by Zhang, Ye, Anderson, Sarunic, and Hmam, attempts to cooperatively use bearing measurements to navigate in a GPS-denied environment. The work assumes that multiple UAVs exist in a two-dimensional space: at least one with GPS, and others that are GPS-denied but are INS-enabled. The GPS-equipped vehicle broadcasts its global coordinates to the GPS-denied vehicles and the GPS-denied vehicles also obtain a bearing measurement to the GPS-equipped vehicle. By obtaining four or more measurements between at least two UAVs, localization of a GPS-denied vehicle in the global coordinate frame is possible. Additional special cases are examined like the performance when noise is added to the measurements as well as some bearing ambiguities such as a stationary ship or bearings of equal value [15]. This approach has a few key assumptions, namely that the ships are operating in a two-dimensional space and that the bearing measurements are free of noise. Additional related work involves cooperative navigation of Miniature Air Vehicles (MAVs) using bearing measurements. In the work performed by Sharma and Taylor, each MAV in a swarm estimates position, attitude, and velocity of all MAVs in sensor range including itself. These measurements are then fused with relative range and bearing measurements, and that data is used in an EKF to estimate the navigation states [16]. This prior research differs from this thesis in a few key ways:

- The prior work involves multiple UAVs, where this thesis considers just two
- Prior work was restricted to two-dimensions while the simulations in this thesis utilize a three-dimensional world
- This thesis considers range-only measurements, without bearing

2.4.3 Magnetic Navigation

Magnetic anomaly navigation is a method of analyzing the magnetic field in the local area and cross-referencing it with known magnetic field strength data to localize oneself. The technique is not GPS dependent and has been shown to have been accurate to tens of meters over both land and water [17]. In order to obtain the maps needed for this method, an aircraft must fly in a close set of parallel flight lines over an area of interest. The aircraft collects intensity data using high resolution magnetic sensors, of which the data is analyzed and magnetic fluctuations due to the collection platform are compensated for. Another type of mapping of magnetic anomaly data is the collection of magnetic vector data, which is substantially more difficult than collecting intensity data. This data must be collected using high quality, extremely sensitive sensors and must be collected using very precise attitude accuracy [17]. In Hardy et al's research into UAV navigation in GPS denied environments, magnetometer readings are one source of data discussed to obtain localization of the UAV. The research assumes an identical magnetic field vector acting on both aircraft as they are in close proximity. Using this assumption, the relative attitude between the two platforms is used to rotate the body axis magnetometer data from one platform to the other. Then, the magnetometer sensor data is used to make a comparison between the two platforms which helps to minimize the drift in the INS [18]. These methods do have a few drawbacks, however. First and foremost, the area in which the aircraft are operating must have been mapped. As Canciani and Brennan mention, the collection of high quality magnetic field vector data on airborne platforms is substantially more difficult than collecting intensity data as well as more expensive [17]. Additionally, research has focused on using this type of sensing as an aide to other GPS-denied navigation methods rather than a single solution. While this solution is extremely resilient, the accuracy of the position solution is currently

on the order of tens of meters which is unacceptable for precision navigation uses.

2.4.4 Navigation Using Radio Ranging

Navigation through the usage of radio ranging is the primary method of GPS-denied navigation that was explored for this thesis work. There is some previous work on the topic with various assumptions that set conditions on the real-world application of such methods. Navigation using radio ranging is a method which uses the on board navigation system and ranging radio to estimate the relative pose of an aircraft in flight. Most applications require two or more moving aircraft and multiple measurements to resolve ambiguities when calculating position using the ranging measurements. Additionally, much of the available research incorporates navigation methods other than the radio ranging to provide a more precise position solution.

In their approach, Strader, Gu, Gross, De Petrillo, and Hardy use a pair of UAVs with on board INS and a ranging radio to estimate the relative pose of each UAV using a single range measurement. This is conducted in a two-dimensional environment, or co-altitude, using motion to augment the limited amount of information available. A graph is formed from the range measurements and displacement in position over time, and the analytical solution is derived from the constructed graph. The approach is also assumed to be noise free. Figure 2 shows the approach graphically. A and B are the two systems, where the position of each system is denoted by $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$ for platform A and $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n$ for platform B where n is the total number of locations. The displacement in distance is between locations is $d_{A1}, d_{A2}, \dots, d_{A_{n-1}}$ for platform A and $d_{B1}, d_{B2}, \dots, d_{B_{n-1}}$ for platform B [19].

The relative pose between the platforms can be obtained by modeling the system as a series of mechanical linkages with rigid links and joints. More information about




Figure 2: Graphical representation of radio ranging approach [19]

solving this system of equations can be found in [19]. As mentioned in the paper, with sufficient information four possible solutions are obtained for the relative position of platform B , two solutions for relative bearing and two solutions for relative position. Weights are assigned to each solution, and this information is stored in memory. Platform A then turns to a different heading and the residual distances are calculated. The system weights are determined and in a noise free system, one solution's weight will approach infinity. Also examined are four special cases which emerge depending on the geometry and path of the platforms.

1. There is one unique solution for the position if the platforms are traveling along the same line in opposing directions.
2. There are two solutions for the position if the platforms are traveling parallel to each other with different velocities.
3. There are four possible solutions for the position if the platforms travel along

intersecting lines.

4. There are an infinite number of solutions for the position if the platforms are travelling parallel to each other with equal velocities.

Conclusions include that the frequency of the measurement impacts the error more than the flight geometry. The approach taken in the aforementioned research differs from this thesis research in a couple of ways. First, the research conducted by Strader et al. assumes two UAVs performing cooperative navigation with no prior or outside navigation information, whereas the thesis research is a mother-daughter ship configuration with the mothership being GPS enabled. Additionally, the thesis research is conducted in three dimensions instead of two.

Ranging radio estimates are also mentioned in the research performed by Hardy et al. on UAV navigation in GPS denied environments. This research takes a similar approach to the research performed by Strader et al., in which a peer-to-peer ranging radio solution is utilized to form the "mechanical linkage" model. The model is then used to estimate position using an EKF. This research primarily focuses on fusing multiple solutions into one resilient approach. The ranging measurements are used, along with IMU measurements, magnetometer readings, and computer vision. This approach assumes cooperative navigation between two UAVs and that both are GPS-denied. A graphical representation of this approach is seen in Figure 3 [18].

In Figure 3, platform A is assumed to be the UAV which is tracking a target whereas platform B is having the target handed off to it. In this example, both systems are assumed to be equipped with a downward facing camera, a peer-to-peer radio ranging system, a tri-axial IMU system, and magnetometer sensors. No prior information about the relative pose of each platform is needed. The mechanical linkage model seen in the work performed by Strader et al. is used to construct a graph with the range measurements between platforms and distance travelled over




Figure 3: UAV Cooperative Navigation Approach [18]

time [19]. An example can be seen in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Trajectories of platforms A and B over time [19]

The four "special cases" from the research are examined, particularly the case in which the platforms are travelling along intersecting lines and the case in which the platforms are travelling along parallel lines but have different velocities. The possible solutions are obtained from solving the loop closure equations of the linkage.

$$\alpha \cos \theta_3 = \beta \quad (16)$$

$$\alpha \tan^2(\theta_2/2) + b \tan(\theta_2/2) + c = 0 \quad (17)$$

In Equation (16), α and β are constant and are a function of the link lengths. In Equation (17), a , b , and c are constant and are a function of the link lengths and θ_3 from Equation (16). By substituting in values from the ranging radio measurements and distances, Equation (16) and Equation (17) can be solved. This is assumed to be noise-free. When noisy measurements are used, the equations are solved using the linear least squares method and are then smoothed. An EKF is used to predict the relative pose and angular coordinates for updating the measurements. When the filter converges, then one of the two platforms turns to a different heading and travels at a constant speed. Using the estimate, the position is propagated using the INS and the difference between the radio ranging measurement and the predicted distance can be calculated. The likelihood of the solution is weighted and the solution with the highest likelihood is selected [19].

The radio ranging approach is then combined with measurements and calculations from computer vision and magnetometers. More information about the calculation and usage of that data can be found in [18]. The results of this study show that in GPS-denied cases, position accuracy is on the order of 10-meter-level and degree accuracy is on the order of 0.5 degree-level. It was also shown that the magnetometer measurements had little impact on the overall performance of the algorithm. The work done by Hardy et al. provides a foundation that ranging measurements combined with a Kalman Filter can provide useful and accurate positioning. Their work incorporates additional sensors such as the computer vision sensors and magnetometer to achieve better accuracy. The thesis research described in this document takes

this foundational work and narrows the scope, focusing only on providing accurate measurements using the ranging sensor alone but in the case when one of the two platforms has GPS.

III. Methodology

This research seeks to utilize the ranging radios of the mothership and daughter-ship to provide a position solution when the daughter-ship is operating in a GPS-denied environment. In order to evaluate the viability of this potential solution, a simulation environment was created and utilized within MATLAB that tests the principles of the approach. This research focuses on using the platform's onboard inertial sensors, with just the ranging radio information passed between platforms and the movement of the platforms as the information to allow the algorithm to work.

This chapter will cover the methodology used in testing the radio ranging approach. The simulation parameters, platform data generation, and governing models of motion will be discussed. This chapter also provides mathematical and graphical verification for the described methodology. The results of the experiments are presented in Chapter IV.

3.1 Simulation Overview

The simulation is built in MATLAB and contains two ships, the mothership and daughter-ship which will be referred to as Ship 1 and Ship 2 respectively. Each ship completes orbits with Ship 1 orbiting around the origin and Ship 2 orbiting around a point specified by setting a desired separation distance variable. The two ships behave according to their measurement models and editable parameters, which are described in more detail in the sections that follow. The general idea behind the ships in the simulation space is seen in Figure 5.

The parameters for each ship are set individually at the beginning of the simulation run and remain constant throughout the run. As the two ships move through the




Figure 5: Overview of the simulation, showing the principle behind recovering the geodetic location of Ship 2 when it is GPS-denied.

simulation space, the distance between them changes and this data is then fed into an EKF to estimate the position of Ship 2 based on the input data of the range between the two platforms. A typical simulation run produces a graphical output of the run post-calculation and is not drawn in real-time. The data in the output image includes the path of both ships as well as the EKF's prediction of the position of Ship 2 based on the input data of the range between the two platforms. Data output from the simulation is in the form of the amount of error between the predicted solution and known truth data. A typical output plot is shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Output figure (bird’s eye view) from the simulation. The blue spiral is the path taken by Ship 1, whereas the red spiral is the path taken by Ship 2 during the simulation. The yellow spiral is the EKF’s estimation of the position of Ship 2. For this example, the estimation of the filter completely covers the path of Ship 2 which lies underneath the yellow spiral.

3.2 Assumptions

The following assumptions are made when designing and executing the experiments within the simulation space:

- Ship 1 is GPS-enabled and is geographically separated from the GPS-denied Ship 2.
- Both ships have a functioning INS.
- The parameters of each ship’s flight such as altitude, airspeed, and roll angle

remain constant throughout the simulation.

- The ranging link is available to both ships and is not jammed or denied.
- The ranging sensor is able to achieve expected accuracy, as well as operates independently of GNSS functions and does not rely on those systems for precision timing.

3.3 Measurement Model

Both ships have identical equations of motion that govern their movement in the simulation space. As previously mentioned, parameters such as altitude and airspeed are assumed to be held constant. Velocity (V) and the roll angle of the aircraft (ϕ) are the control inputs that define the movement of the ships in the simulation environment. The state vector of the aircraft is x , y , and heading (ψ). The dynamic equations of motion below are adapted from work by Nelson, Barber, McLain, and Beard and are used for the simulation of both ships [20]. It should be noted that the measurement models are subjected to random noise in order to better simulate a real-world environment.

$$\dot{x} = V \cos \psi \quad (18)$$

$$\dot{y} = V \sin \psi \quad (19)$$

$$\dot{\psi} = \frac{g}{V} \tan \phi \quad (20)$$

3.4 Simulation Parameters

The simulation environment allows for multiple variables to influence the motion of the ships as well as the performance of the filter. The subsections that follow

describe the parameters that can be set and how they affect the performance of the simulation.

3.4.1 Simulation Constants

Certain parameters affect the behavior of the simulation but are not changed during testing. The parameters are able to be changed to fit the desired performance of the simulation but are kept constant for the purposes of this research. These constants include the force of gravity, length of the simulation, and sampling rate of the simulation. The values used in the simulation are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Simulation Constants

Parameter	Value
Gravity	9.81 m/s ²
Length (seconds)	5,000
Sampling Rate (samples/second)	100

3.4.2 Testing Parameters

The following parameters are changed during testing to observe the effect that the parameter has on filter performance and accuracy. Values were selected with the intention of being reasonable and realistic for the proposed operational aircraft. Ship 1 was modeled to be similar to an AC-130U gunship [21] and Ship 2 was modeled to be similar to the ALTIUS-600 UAV [22]. The parameters tested in the simulation and the range over which they were tested is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Simulation Variable Parameters

Parameter	Test Range
Velocity, Ship 1	75 m/s - 150 m/s
Velocity, Ship 2	5 m/s - 30 m/s
Roll Angle, Both Ships	-50° - 50°
Altitude, Ship 1	100 m - 10,000 m
Altitude, Ship 2	50 m - 3,000 m
Separation Distance	500 m - 100,000 m
Range Sensor Noise	$0.001^2 - 2^2$
IMU Uncertainty, Ship 2	$0.00001^2 - 0.02^2$

3.5 Error Calculation

Error is the main metric that is measured in this work. The error is defined as the difference between the known truth data of Ship 2 and the predicted values that are calculated by the filter in both the x and y directions. Experiments performed in this work use root-mean-square error (RMS error) to appropriately display the accuracy of the position solution. RMS error is computed for both x and y sources of error. RMS error is calculated according to Equation (21), where n is the number of measurements, $\hat{p}_{x,y}$, $p_{x,y}$ are the estimated and truth values of Ship 2 in the x and y directions at position p , respectively [23].

$$RMS\ Error = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{n=1}^p (\hat{p}_{x,y} - p_{x,y})^2}{n}} \quad (21)$$

3.6 Data Generation

The simulation is run using pre-generated data based on the measurement model and parameters. Data must be generated before being used by the EKF. The data generation process follows the following steps:

1. Desired simulation parameters are defined by the user and saved as a .mat file to be loaded as a model.

2. Model parameters are loaded and truth trajectories are generated for both Ship 1 and Ship 2.
3. Trajectories are corrupted with noise to better simulate real-world environment.
4. Range is calculated and saved as a variable in the workspace. Range takes into account distance and altitude differences.
5. Range measurement is corrupted with noise to better simulate real-world environment.

After the data is generated and stored in the workspace, then the EKF can access it and the simulation may run.

3.7 Experimental Design

Following data generation, the filter is run and results are recorded. The experiments are conducted with two primary goals in mind. The first goal is to determine the viability of using ranging measurements to correctly determine the location of Ship 2 when operating in a GPS-denied environment. Once this capability is shown to be viable the next goal is to determine the effect of the simulation parameters on the accuracy of the position solution. To accurately determine the effect that the individual parameters have on the overall performance of the filter and accuracy of the position solution, a baseline simulation is created and the results are recorded. The values of the baseline simulation are described in Table 4.

The experimental procedure then follows by selecting one parameter and making changes to the value while the remainder of the parameters remain set to the baseline values. This allows for an accurate determination of the effect that the individual parameter has on the performance of the entire system. The tested values are evenly distributed across the testing range mentioned in Table 3. For the parameters of

Table 4: Simulation Baseline Parameters

Parameter	Baseline Value
Velocity, Ship 1	125 m/s
Velocity, Ship 2	15 m/s
Roll Angle, Ship 1	25°
Roll Angle, Ship 2	5°
Altitude, Ship 1	3000 m
Altitude, Ship 2	500 m
Separation Distance	10,000 m
Range Sensor Noise	0.1 ²
IMU Uncertainty, Ship 2	0.01 ²

velocity, roll angle, and altitude, 100 combinations of tests were performed to get an accurate representation of the test space. This corresponds to 10 evenly spaced test parameters across Ships 1 and 2 and all permutations of those values. For the parameters of separation distance, range sensor noise, and IMU uncertainty, the testing space was evenly distributed into 20 values to be tested. This allowed for a more thorough examination of the testing space with acceptable resolution between test values.

Each test is run 50 times in order to capture enough data to be representative of the performance of the simulation. The RMS error from each run is collected and stored and the average of the 50 tests is then taken. The results are recorded and stored in a .mat file for analysis and plotting, which is discussed in the corresponding results section. This process is repeated for all parameters to be tested.

IV. Results and Analysis

4.1 Overview

This chapter describes the results obtained from testing the parameters described in Chapter III within the simulation. The baseline results are discussed first and subsequent parameters are discussed as they relate to the change from the baseline performance. Results are displayed in multiple formats. First, results are shown in numerical form in a table. Error values are displayed for both x and y as well as the root-sum-square error. For parameters where a range of values are tested, a maximum and minimum error value are shown. Results of all tests are shown in full in Appendix A. Results are also shown graphically, either as a depiction of the path taken by the two ships for the baseline model or as surface plots for individual parameters that are tested.

4.2 Baseline Simulation Results

This section analyzes the feasibility and accuracy of the approach by comparing the baseline model results to the known truth data. The simulation is configured with the parameters set according to Table 4 in Chapter III. Note that the simulation was run for 50 iterations and the associated error values were averaged across the runs. Table 5 provides the results from the baseline experiment tests.

Table 5: Simulation Baseline Results, 50-Run Average

Description	Value
Average X Error	0.936 m
Average Y Error	1.193 m
Average Total Error	1.516 m

The baseline simulation averages out at 1.516 meters of error across the 5,000

second long testing range. Figure 7 and Figure 8 show the performance of the filter, with Figure 7 showing the overview from a distance whereas Figure 8 shows a close-up of the behavior of Ship 2.




Figure 7: Performance of the baseline model. Ship 1 is in blue, the truth data for Ship 2 is in red and the filter estimation of Ship 2 is in yellow.

Figure 9 shows the distribution of the error values of the baseline simulation. Error values range from 1.0 to 2.0 meters of error, with the majority of the runs providing results within the range of 1.4 to 1.5 meters of error. The differing results are due to the addition of random noise to the parameters. These results indicate that the simulation is functioning properly and does not have large outliers in the data.

Note that these results fulfill our first objective of ensuring that the ranging measurements can be used to replace GPS in the mothership/daughter-ship scenario




Figure 8: Performance of the baseline model, zoomed on Ship 2. The truth data is in red and the filter estimation of position is in yellow. The estimation is very close to the truth data indicating a well operating filter.

described in Chapter I. Notice that the results described in Table 5 are less than 2 meters of error. Furthermore, Figure 7 and Figure 8 show graphically that the filter estimation is very close to the truth data of Ship 2. This indicates a well operating filter and serves as the reference performance for the rest of the tests performed. The path of the ships does not follow perfect orbits due to random noise present in the parameters in order to provide a better approximation of operation in a real-world environment.




Figure 9: Histogram showing the distribution of the error values of the baseline simulation. Error values fall in the range of 1 meter to 2 meters, with the majority of the runs falling between 1.4 and 1.5 meters of error.

4.3 Effects of Varied Velocity Values

The velocity of the two ships has a moderate impact on the error between the truth and predicted values. The tested values of Ship 1 velocities ranged from 75 meters per second to 150 meters per second and Ship 2 values ranged from 5 meters per second to 30 meters per second. Table 6 provides the numerical results from the velocity experiment tests. Note that the error values are the maximum, minimum, and average error results obtained from a 50-run average. Figure 10 and Figure 11 show surface plots of the velocity experiment tests, plotting Ship 1, Ship 2, and X and Y error, respectively.

Table 6: Velocity Simulation Results, 50-Run Average

Description	Value
Minimum X Error	0.393 m
Maximum X Error	3.345 m
Average X Error	1.371 m
Minimum Y Error	0.587 m
Maximum Y Error	3.559 m
Average Y Error	1.573 m
Minimum Total Error	0.706 m
Maximum Total Error	4.954 m
Average Total Error	2.088 m

It is seen that the X-error and Y-error plots are nearly identical, and the values seen in Table 6 reflect this fact. Values range from sub 1 meter error on the lower end to over 5 meters of error on the upper end. The performance is tied more to Ship 2's velocity, trending upward as the velocity of the ship increases. Ship 1's velocity has little impact on the performance of the filter. This is likely due to the orbiting behavior of the ships in the simulation. As the velocity of Ship 2 increases, the orbits become larger and farther apart. This results in more erroneous position estimations as the distance measurements are spread out more and therefore do not change as rapidly.




Figure 10: Surface plot comparing ship velocities to X-error. The circles, in purple, show the individual data points which make up the surface mesh.




Figure 11: Surface plot comparing ship velocities to Y-error. Nearly identical to the X-error plot, the Y-error is slightly higher overall.

4.4 Effects of Varied Roll Angle Values

The roll angle of the two ships has little impact on the error. The tested values of both ships roll angles were from -50° to 50° . Table 7 displays the numerical results from the roll angle experiment tests. Note that the error values are the maximum, minimum, and average error results obtained from a 50-run average. Figure 12 and Figure 13 show surface plots of the roll angle experiment tests, plotting Ship 1, Ship 2, and X and Y error, respectively.

Table 7: Roll Angle Simulation Results, 50-Run Average

Description	Value
Minimum X Error	0.639 m
Maximum X Error	1.817 m
Average X Error	1.119 m
Minimum Y Error	0.826 m
Maximum Y Error	1.746 m
Average Y Error	1.058 m
Minimum Total Error	1.221 m
Maximum Total Error	2.239 m
Average Total Error	1.558 m

The values shown in Table 7 illustrate that the roll angle of the two platforms does not have much of an effect on the error between the truth and predicted values of Ship 2. All error values fall below 3 meters, with minimums below 1 meter. It should be noted that this analysis purposefully avoids the roll angle of zero degrees for both platforms. The algorithm depends on the range measurements changing over time, therefore having the ships at zero degrees of roll angle breaks the method. This is especially important for Ship 2, which is making smaller orbits than Ship 1. Although zero degrees is avoided, the behavior still begins to exhibit itself when approaching zero degrees. This can be seen in Figure 12.

As previously mentioned, error begins to increase around the zero degree line and




Figure 12: Surface plot comparing ship velocities to X-error. The magnitudes of the error remain low, but clearly rise as Ship 2 approaches zero degrees of roll angle.

is especially prominent in the X-error plot. Similar spikes, yet not as apparent, show themselves in the Y-error plot.




Figure 13: Surface plot comparing ship velocities to X-error. The magnitudes of the error are low, but less cohesive than the X-error plot. Slightly higher error values can be observed closer to the zero degree line.

4.5 Effect of Varied Altitude Values

Altitude has little impact on the error between the truth and predicted values of Ship 2. The tested values of Ship 1 altitudes ranged from 100 meters to 10,000 meters and the values of Ship 2 ranged from 50 meters to 3,000 meters. The numerical results of the altitude experiments are shown in Table 8. The error values are tightly distributed within a range between 1 and 2 meters. Note that the error values are the maximum, minimum, and average error results obtained from a 50-run average. Figure 14 and Figure 15 show surface plots of the altitude experiment tests, plotting Ship 1, Ship 2, and X and Y error, respectively.

Table 8: Altitude Simulation Results, 50-Run Average

Description	Value
Minimum X Error	0.983 m
Maximum X Error	1.278 m
Average X Error	1.114 m
Minimum Y Error	1.192 m
Maximum Y Error	1.461 m
Average Y Error	1.313 m
Minimum Total Error	1.516 m
Maximum Total Error	1.941 m
Average Total Error	1.722 m

It can be observed that the error is generally lower as the two ships become closer in altitude. The error is lowest as the ships are co-altitude. The altitude of Ship 2 seems to have a larger effect on the total error, however the magnitude of the error is small.




Figure 14: Surface plot comparing ship altitudes to X-error. The magnitude of the error is low across the range of tested values.




Figure 15: Surface plot comparing ship altitudes to Y-error. The magnitude of the error is low across the range of tested values.

4.6 Effects of Varied Separation Distance Values

Separation distance has little to no impact on the error between the truth and predicted values of Ship 2. The tested values of the separation distance ranged from 500 meters to 100,000 meters. The numerical values of the separation distance experiments are shown in Table 9. Note that the error values are the maximum, minimum, and average error results obtained from a 50-run average. Figure 16 and Figure 17 show separation distance plotted against X and Y error, respectively. Figure 18 shows the separation distance plotted against the average total error.

Table 9: Separation Distance Simulation Results, 50-Run Average

Description	Value
Minimum X Error	0.876 m
Maximum X Error	0.949 m
Average X Error	0.919 m
Minimum Y Error	1.104 m
Maximum Y Error	1.213 m
Average Y Error	1.176 m
Minimum Total Error	1.409 m
Maximum Total Error	1.532 m
Average Total Error	1.492 m

Error generally remains below 1 meter in the X direction and between 1.15 and 1.30 meters in the Y direction. The small magnitude of the error could simply be noise in the data. It should be noted that one of the primary assumptions of the experiment is that the ranging link between the two ships remains intact. This assumption negates some of the reasoning behind testing separation distance. Factors such as atmospheric interference can effect the behavior of the ranging link in the real world. These factors are not accounted for in the separation distance testing. Noise in the ranging sensor is examined later in this chapter.




Figure 16: Plot comparing separation distance to X-error. Separation distance has little to no impact on the error. The magnitude of the error is very small and could be accounted for by noise.




Figure 17: Plot comparing separation distance to Y-error. Separation distance has little to no impact on the error. The magnitude of the error is very small and could be accounted for by noise.




Figure 18: Plot comparing separation distance to the average total error. Separation distance has little to no impact on the error. The magnitude of the error is very small and could be accounted for by noise.

4.7 Effects of Varied Range Sensor Noise Values

Range sensor noise has a noticeable impact on the error between the truth and predicted values of Ship 2. The tested values of the range sensor noise were from 0.001^2 to 2^2 . Table 10 shows the numerical results of the range sensor noise experiments. Note that the error values are the maximum, minimum, and average error results obtained from a 50-run average. Figure 19 and Figure 20 show range sensor noise plotted against X and Y error, respectively. Figure 21 shows the range sensor noise plotted against the average total error. It should be noted that this is a squared value in the simulation, therefore all numbers shown have had the square root of the raw data taken in order to make the data more presentable.

Table 10: Range Sensor Noise Simulation Results, 50-Run Average

Description	Value
Minimum X Error	0.370 m
Maximum X Error	2.057 m
Average X Error	1.718 m
Minimum Y Error	0.419 m
Maximum Y Error	2.336 m
Average Y Error	1.962 m
Minimum Total Error	0.559 m
Maximum Total Error	3.113 m
Average Total Error	2.608 m

As the sensor noise value increases, the error present between the predicted and actual values of Ship 2 increases. The error increases linearly until about 0.45 on the range sensor noise scale and then begins to climb more slowly. This behavior is exhibited in both X and Y. The error continues to rise as the range sensor noise value increases. The testing range stops at 2 but the same behavior continues outside of the tested range. Note that most current manufacturers of ranging devices claim centimeter or better accuracy levels, making even large range errors pessimistic.




Figure 19: Plot comparing range sensor noise to X-error. The noise has a noticeable impact on error and should be kept as low as possible for best performance.




Figure 20: Plot comparing range sensor noise to Y-error. The noise has a noticeable impact on error and should be kept as low as possible for best performance.




Figure 21: Plot comparing range sensor noise to average total error. The noise has a noticeable impact on error and should be kept as low as possible for best performance.

4.8 Effects of Varied Ship 2 IMU Uncertainty Values

The uncertainty of the IMU has a noticeable impact on the error between the truth and predicted values of Ship 2. The tested values of the IMU uncertainty were from 0.00001^2 to 0.02^2 . Table 11 shows the numerical results of the IMU uncertainty experiments. Note that the error values are the maximum, minimum, and average error results obtained from a 50-run average. Figure 22 and Figure 23 show IMU uncertainty plotted against X and Y error, respectively. Figure 24 shows the IMU uncertainty plotted against the average total error. It should be noted that this is a squared value in the simulation, therefore all numbers shown have had the square root of the raw data taken in order to make the data more presentable.

Table 11: IMU Uncertainty Simulation Results, 50-Run Average

Description	Value
Minimum X Error	0.167 m
Maximum X Error	1.312 m
Average X Error	1.067 m
Minimum Y Error	0.182 m
Maximum Y Error	1.479 m
Average Y Error	1.213 m
Minimum Total Error	0.247 m
Maximum Total Error	1.977 m
Average Total Error	1.615 m

Very small changes to the IMU uncertainty of Ship 2 result in large increases in error. Similar to the behavior exhibited by the range sensor noise, the IMU uncertainty increases linearly until about 0.006 at which time it begins a slower increase. Of note however, is the range of values of which the tests are run. As seen in Table 3, the IMU uncertainty of Ship 2 is tested over a range from 0.00001^2 to 0.02^2 . The uncertainty of the IMU of Ship 2 cannot be much larger than the maximum tested value, as doing so makes the error rise sharply. This is expected behavior, as increasing the uncertainty

of the IMU of Ship 2 decreases the confidence of the filter which allows it to diverge. For best performance, it is recommended to keep IMU uncertainty low by utilizing a good quality IMU.




Figure 22: Plot comparing the Ship 2 IMU uncertainty to X-error. The uncertainty has a noticeable impact on error. The error rises sharply outside of the tested range rendering the filter unstable.




Figure 23: Plot comparing the Ship 2 IMU uncertainty to Y-error. The uncertainty has a noticeable impact on error. The error rises sharply outside of the tested range rendering the filter unstable.




Figure 24: Plot comparing the Ship 2 IMU uncertainty to the average total error. The uncertainty has a noticeable impact on error. The error rises sharply outside of the tested range rendering the filter unstable.

4.9 Acceptable Parameters

In order to draw useful conclusions about the range of parameters in which this approach is viable, a benchmark value of 3 meters of error was set. The value of 3 meters of error was chosen to allow for use in operational environments to be accurate under GPS-denied conditions and falls below the civilian GPS average error of 5 meters. Table 12 gives the test range and unacceptable conditions for the tested parameters.

Table 12: Test Range and Unacceptable Conditions

Parameter	Test Range	Unacceptable Conditions
Velocity, Ship 1	75 m/s - 150 m/s	None
Velocity, Ship 2	5 m/s - 30 m/s	Above 25 m/s
Roll Angle, Ship 1	-50° - 50°	0°
Roll Angle, Ship 2	-50° - 50°	0°
Altitude, Ship 1	100 m - 10,000 m	None
Altitude, Ship 2	50 m - 3,000 m	None
Separation Distance	500 m - 100,000 m	None
Range Sensor Noise	0.001^2 - 2^2	Above 0.1^2
IMU Uncertainty, Ship 2	0.00001^2 - 0.02^2	Above 0.01^2

V. Conclusions

5.1 Overview

This section summarizes the research and results of the work performed during the experimental tests. Section 5.2 reiterates the notable conclusions found by the testing and analysis of the simulation. Section 5.3 provides possibilities for future work in line with the planned execution of this research.

5.2 Research Conclusions

This research was successful in meeting the objectives it set out to accomplish: first, to establish that the approach of using only the ranging link between the mother-ship and daughter-ship to achieve a position solution is viable; second, to examine the impact that various parameters have on the performance of the position solution; and third, to establish the range of parameters at which the daughter-ship can operate in successfully.

As hypothesized, the GPS-denied daughter-ship is able to be located by using just measurements from the ranging link between the mother and daughter-ship. The amount of total error between the measured location of the daughter-ship and the predicted location from utilizing the ranging link is about 2 meters. The approach, therefore, is deemed viable by the results of the simulation.

Additional conclusions can be drawn from the work when analyzing the effect that flight parameters have on the accuracy of the position solution. The velocity of the two ships moderately impacts the accuracy of the position solution and the daughter-ship should remain under 25 meters per second to minimize error. Roll angle has little impact on the accuracy of the position solution, however both ships should avoid a roll angle of zero degrees as this does not allow the filter to operate

properly. Altitude also has little impact on the accuracy of the position solution with the accuracy tending to increase as the ships become closer in altitude, the greatest accuracy being when the ships are co-altitude. Separation distance has little to no impact on the accuracy of the position solution and is tested with the assumption that the ranging link remains intact for the duration of the flight. Therefore, impacts on error are minimized. Range sensor noise has a large impact on the position solution with the position solution rapidly failing outside of the tested range. As expected, adding noise to the range sensor quickly degrades the usefulness of the solution. Daughter-ship IMU uncertainty also has a noticeable impact on the position solution. Again, the solution rapidly degrades outside of the tested range and quickly makes the filter fail. Accordingly, the IMU used in this solution should be of high quality in order to keep the error at a minimum.

5.3 Future Work

Future work should focus on a few key areas. First, this research assumed a ranging radio exists that can achieve the desired performance specifications. Work should be accomplished to locate or design such a radio that is capable of performing the experiments laid out in this research. Additionally, a look can be taken at some of the other assumptions such as timing synchronicity and atmospheric impacts. The simulation could also be expanded to handle additional parameters or ships operating cooperatively as well as making the operation more user friendly and able to plot the ships trajectory real-time. Finally, the approach should be tested in the real world on hardware in a low-cost, original system before being flight tested on the desired hardware.

Appendix A. Full Simulation Results

Table 13: Velocity Tests, Full Results

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Baseline	V1=125, V2=15		0.936	1.193	1.516359
V_1_1	75	5	0.771181	0.868191	1.161239
V_1_2	75	7.777778	0.935092	1.042325	1.400299
V_1_3	75	10.55556	1.103391	1.229607	1.652091
V_1_4	75	13.33333	1.347196	1.478373	2.000131
V_1_5	75	16.11111	1.477591	1.597713	2.176226
V_1_6	75	18.88889	1.54198	1.670803	2.273607
V_1_7	75	21.66667	1.914747	2.007275	2.77406
V_1_8	75	24.44444	2.364593	2.471868	3.420735
V_1_9	75	27.22222	3.825553	3.97118	5.514084
V_1_10	75	30	3.209552	3.251453	4.568716
V_2_1	83.33333	5	0.699807	0.807453	1.068508
V_2_2	83.33333	7.777778	0.890878	1.028235	1.360489
V_2_3	83.33333	10.55556	1.019634	1.163427	1.547002
V_2_4	83.33333	13.33333	1.186078	1.332302	1.783763
V_2_5	83.33333	16.11111	1.464462	1.616376	2.181128
V_2_6	83.33333	18.88889	1.501876	1.627426	2.214531
Continued on next page					

Table 13 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
V_2_7	83.33333	21.66667	1.706091	1.840369	2.509523
V_2_8	83.33333	24.44444	2.068871	2.198267	3.018709
V_2_9	83.33333	27.22222	2.522446	2.639283	3.650828
V_2_10	83.33333	30	4.229751	4.418677	6.116821
V_3_1	91.66667	5	0.666879	0.783991	1.029257
V_3_2	91.66667	7.777778	0.817181	0.987831	1.282028
V_3_3	91.66667	10.55556	0.960342	1.101509	1.461362
V_3_4	91.66667	13.33333	1.061135	1.255018	1.643496
V_3_5	91.66667	16.11111	1.271317	1.473612	1.946222
V_3_6	91.66667	18.88889	1.518411	1.715036	2.290616
V_3_7	91.66667	21.66667	1.621891	1.781791	2.409421
V_3_8	91.66667	24.44444	1.963423	2.102898	2.877014
V_3_9	91.66667	27.22222	2.35192	2.522894	3.449134
V_3_10	91.66667	30	3.572615	3.686165	5.133361
V_4_1	100	5	0.597302	0.753579	0.961588
V_4_2	100	7.777778	0.748649	0.918849	1.185225
V_4_3	100	10.55556	0.908114	1.122867	1.444127
V_4_4	100	13.33333	1.009486	1.208098	1.574345
Continued on next page					

Table 13 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
V_4_5	100	16.11111	1.209775	1.410386	1.858156
V_4_6	100	18.88889	1.738402	2.074979	2.706951
V_4_7	100	21.66667	1.588192	1.766964	2.375819
V_4_8	100	24.44444	1.875887	2.055558	2.782853
V_4_9	100	27.22222	2.372979	2.538003	3.474548
V_4_10	100	30	3.138722	3.234435	4.507011
V_5_1	108.3333	5	0.557213	0.721819	0.911871
V_5_2	108.3333	7.777778	0.697003	0.881953	1.124124
V_5_3	108.3333	10.55556	0.832743	1.03949	1.331916
V_5_4	108.3333	13.33333	1.003111	1.186049	1.553365
V_5_5	108.3333	16.11111	1.126741	1.371893	1.775285
V_5_6	108.3333	18.88889	1.347279	1.608586	2.098264
V_5_7	108.3333	21.66667	1.573709	1.843741	2.424034
V_5_8	108.3333	24.44444	1.725187	1.979989	2.626143
V_5_9	108.3333	27.22222	2.253161	2.486609	3.355587
V_5_10	108.3333	30	3.081274	3.291837	4.508929
V_6_1	116.6667	5	0.524134	0.678942	0.857717
V_6_2	116.6667	7.777778	0.654183	0.85481	1.076408
Continued on next page					

Table 13 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
V_6_3	116.6667	10.55556	0.796567	1.042828	1.312253
V_6_4	116.6667	13.33333	0.903318	1.139399	1.454034
V_6_5	116.6667	16.11111	1.086866	1.341899	1.726838
V_6_6	116.6667	18.88889	1.320303	1.578478	2.057861
V_6_7	116.6667	21.66667	1.77805	2.165219	2.80172
V_6_8	116.6667	24.44444	1.909691	2.114377	2.849124
V_6_9	116.6667	27.22222	2.251648	2.420525	3.305882
V_6_10	116.6667	30	2.646517	2.837651	3.880247
V_7_1	125	5	0.511669	0.669076	0.8423
V_7_2	125	7.777778	0.61241	0.81976	1.023256
V_7_3	125	10.55556	0.725835	0.947319	1.19342
V_7_4	125	13.33333	0.856291	1.124992	1.413804
V_7_5	125	16.11111	1.042415	1.31227	1.675912
V_7_6	125	18.88889	1.200706	1.512123	1.930857
V_7_7	125	21.66667	1.48988	1.83131	2.360813
V_7_8	125	24.44444	1.819555	2.001132	2.704683
V_7_9	125	27.22222	2.143794	2.362493	3.190177
V_7_10	125	30	2.63749	2.823937	3.864062
Continued on next page					

Table 13 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
V_8_1	133.3333	5	0.476359	0.654427	0.809439
V_8_2	133.3333	7.777778	0.59378	0.809573	1.003984
V_8_3	133.3333	10.55556	0.730158	0.939865	1.190158
V_8_4	133.3333	13.33333	0.848186	1.088397	1.379865
V_8_5	133.3333	16.11111	1.005222	1.278765	1.626565
V_8_6	133.3333	18.88889	1.193945	1.552703	1.958671
V_8_7	133.3333	21.66667	1.495877	1.810883	2.348818
V_8_8	133.3333	24.44444	1.945907	2.253071	2.97706
V_8_9	133.3333	27.22222	2.361192	2.558409	3.481478
V_8_10	133.3333	30	2.894131	3.089239	4.23313
V_9_1	141.6667	5	0.446976	0.626999	0.77001
V_9_2	141.6667	7.777778	0.563615	0.778171	0.960839
V_9_3	141.6667	10.55556	0.680064	0.967066	1.182245
V_9_4	141.6667	13.33333	0.829823	1.100146	1.378016
V_9_5	141.6667	16.11111	0.968074	1.25136	1.582109
V_9_6	141.6667	18.88889	1.217321	1.497084	1.929542
V_9_7	141.6667	21.66667	1.506443	1.769145	2.323628
V_9_8	141.6667	24.44444	1.851141	2.119076	2.813753
Continued on next page					

Table 13 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
V_9_9	141.6667	27.22222	2.417736	2.643364	3.582293
V_9_10	141.6667	30	2.896336	3.110373	4.25008
V_10_1	150	5	0.435662	0.603868	0.744619
V_10_2	150	7.777778	0.538383	0.773902	0.942751
V_10_3	150	10.55556	0.643494	0.903275	1.10905
V_10_4	150	13.33333	0.796746	1.047922	1.316413
V_10_5	150	16.11111	0.935285	1.23017	1.54534
V_10_6	150	18.88889	1.212555	1.502069	1.930415
V_10_7	150	21.66667	1.589588	1.802178	2.403048
V_10_8	150	24.44444	2.030492	2.239674	3.023084
V_10_9	150	27.22222	2.545509	2.773897	3.764854
V_10_10	150	30	3.257892	3.300411	4.637518

Table 14: Roll Angle Tests, Full Results

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Baseline	RA1=0.4363, RA2=0.0873		0.936	1.193	1.516359
RA_1_1	-0.8727	-0.8727	1.089224	0.964884	1.455132
Continued on next page					

Table 14 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
RA_1_2	-0.8727	-0.6788	1.254147	1.116561	1.679164
RA_1_3	-0.8727	-0.4848	1.206916	1.064268	1.609135
RA_1_4	-0.8727	-0.2909	1.203112	1.068407	1.609028
RA_1_5	-0.8727	-0.0970	1.248746	1.13963	1.690599
RA_1_6	-0.8727	0.0970	1.32861	1.132895	1.74604
RA_1_7	-0.8727	0.2909	1.255481	1.098238	1.668041
RA_1_8	-0.8727	0.4848	1.218963	1.073086	1.624002
RA_1_9	-0.8727	0.6788	1.251582	1.097994	1.664947
RA_1_10	-0.8727	0.8727	1.149005	1.004698	1.526313
RA_2_1	-0.6788	-0.8727	1.178126	0.996956	1.543341
RA_2_2	-0.6788	-0.6788	1.224043	1.061451	1.620173
RA_2_3	-0.6788	-0.4848	1.226843	1.03126	1.602698
RA_2_4	-0.6788	-0.2909	1.27834	1.078873	1.672758
RA_2_5	-0.6788	-0.0970	1.594503	1.373095	2.104241
RA_2_6	-0.6788	0.0970	1.497656	1.17563	1.903964
RA_2_7	-0.6788	0.2909	1.282302	1.082477	1.67811
RA_2_8	-0.6788	0.4848	1.289306	1.049976	1.662756
RA_2_9	-0.6788	0.6788	1.270062	1.079144	1.666616
Continued on next page					

Table 14 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
RA_2_10	-0.6788	0.8727	1.183809	1.000419	1.549916
RA_3_1	-0.4848	-0.8727	1.20931	0.966119	1.547842
RA_3_2	-0.4848	-0.6788	1.319085	1.057277	1.690509
RA_3_3	-0.4848	-0.4848	1.33413	1.05958	1.703705
RA_3_4	-0.4848	-0.2909	1.300199	1.034633	1.661621
RA_3_5	-0.4848	-0.0970	1.3139	1.072667	1.696157
RA_3_6	-0.4848	0.0970	1.485463	1.090231	1.842608
RA_3_7	-0.4848	0.2909	1.360126	1.047028	1.716453
RA_3_8	-0.4848	0.4848	1.279424	1.000372	1.62409
RA_3_9	-0.4848	0.6788	1.342337	1.06368	1.712683
RA_3_10	-0.4848	0.8727	1.209707	0.966626	1.548469
RA_4_1	-0.2909	-0.8727	1.356277	0.981062	1.673908
RA_4_2	-0.2909	-0.6788	1.463013	1.038819	1.794311
RA_4_3	-0.2909	-0.4848	1.376534	1.035043	1.722255
RA_4_4	-0.2909	-0.2909	1.423225	0.994297	1.736144
RA_4_5	-0.2909	-0.0970	1.378511	1.06495	1.741956
RA_4_6	-0.2909	0.0970	1.575282	1.057957	1.897574
RA_4_7	-0.2909	0.2909	1.450006	0.989338	1.755365
Continued on next page					

Table 14 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
RA_4.8	-0.2909	0.4848	1.432396	1.03068	1.76467
RA_4.9	-0.2909	0.6788	1.430809	1.006312	1.749251
RA_4.10	-0.2909	0.8727	1.346344	0.925849	1.633965
RA_5.1	-0.0970	-0.8727	1.675698	1.098948	2.003908
RA_5.2	-0.0970	-0.6788	1.759741	1.269535	2.169887
RA_5.3	-0.0970	-0.4848	1.746825	1.082941	2.055276
RA_5.4	-0.0970	-0.2909	1.740847	1.181663	2.104014
RA_5.5	-0.0970	-0.0970	1.819456	1.238954	2.201233
RA_5.6	-0.0970	0.0970	1.895844	1.233318	2.261703
RA_5.7	-0.0970	0.2909	1.769311	1.150609	2.110536
RA_5.8	-0.0970	0.4848	1.753172	1.220099	2.135943
RA_5.9	-0.0970	0.6788	1.7522	1.121419	2.080333
RA_5.10	-0.0970	0.8727	1.604513	1.125343	1.959811
RA_6.1	0.0970	-0.8727	1.017038	1.065974	1.473318
RA_6.2	0.0970	-0.6788	1.137519	1.289714	1.719684
RA_6.3	0.0970	-0.4848	1.048448	1.172796	1.573116
RA_6.4	0.0970	-0.2909	1.030942	1.264324	1.631366
RA_6.5	0.0970	-0.0970	1.124131	1.170167	1.622641
Continued on next page					

Table 14 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
RA_6.6	0.0970	0.0970	1.472142	1.615431	2.185594
RA_6.7	0.0970	0.2909	1.1234	1.285113	1.70691
RA_6.8	0.0970	0.4848	1.108053	1.210595	1.641134
RA_6.9	0.0970	0.6788	1.100782	1.248883	1.664761
RA_6.10	0.0970	0.8727	0.970976	1.137779	1.495773
RA_7.1	0.2909	-0.8727	0.726071	1.058925	1.28394
RA_7.2	0.2909	-0.6788	0.748709	1.121757	1.348667
RA_7.3	0.2909	-0.4848	0.739884	1.18308	1.395387
RA_7.4	0.2909	-0.2909	0.746662	1.131368	1.355543
RA_7.5	0.2909	-0.0970	0.824578	1.700247	1.889648
RA_7.6	0.2909	0.0970	0.909535	1.212543	1.515755
RA_7.7	0.2909	0.2909	0.775432	1.11772	1.360365
RA_7.8	0.2909	0.4848	0.777013	1.098114	1.345215
RA_7.9	0.2909	0.6788	0.755645	1.144768	1.371675
RA_7.10	0.2909	0.8727	0.723613	1.054346	1.278774
RA_8.1	0.4848	-0.8727	0.770737	1.099183	1.342474
RA_8.2	0.4848	-0.6788	0.89041	1.222947	1.512755
RA_8.3	0.4848	-0.4848	0.865512	1.203668	1.482541
Continued on next page					

Table 14 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
RA_8.4	0.4848	-0.2909	0.835812	1.156374	1.426809
RA_8.5	0.4848	-0.0970	0.949901	1.392902	1.685968
RA_8.6	0.4848	0.0970	0.942929	1.185471	1.514746
RA_8.7	0.4848	0.2909	0.842919	1.156246	1.43088
RA_8.8	0.4848	0.4848	0.883446	1.146293	1.447226
RA_8.9	0.4848	0.6788	0.879595	1.185402	1.476098
RA_8.10	0.4848	0.8727	0.804812	1.113545	1.373937
RA_9.1	0.6788	-0.8727	0.880253	1.065738	1.38226
RA_9.2	0.6788	-0.6788	0.925849	1.140848	1.469261
RA_9.3	0.6788	-0.4848	0.945219	1.165892	1.500914
RA_9.4	0.6788	-0.2909	0.940107	1.150492	1.485743
RA_9.5	0.6788	-0.0970	1.114677	1.475691	1.84937
RA_9.6	0.6788	0.0970	1.323962	1.579921	2.061317
RA_9.7	0.6788	0.2909	0.964876	1.152004	1.502697
RA_9.8	0.6788	0.4848	0.981249	1.171839	1.528416
RA_9.9	0.6788	0.6788	0.969685	1.178737	1.526338
RA_9.10	0.6788	0.8727	0.895281	1.086336	1.407712
RA_10.1	0.8727	-0.8727	0.949568	1.062797	1.425208
Continued on next page					

Table 14 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
RA_10_2	0.8727	-0.6788	0.997527	1.140849	1.515453
RA_10_3	0.8727	-0.4848	0.978403	1.109295	1.479124
RA_10_4	0.8727	-0.2909	0.988242	1.137478	1.506811
RA_10_5	0.8727	-0.0970	1.064174	1.261094	1.650099
RA_10_6	0.8727	0.0970	1.111913	1.204931	1.639576
RA_10_7	0.8727	0.2909	0.999269	1.130357	1.508724
RA_10_8	0.8727	0.4848	1.004764	1.138158	1.518207
RA_10_9	0.8727	0.6788	1.024725	1.167323	1.553288
RA_10_10	0.8727	0.8727	0.942148	1.06772	1.423963

Table 15: Altitude Tests, Full Results

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Baseline	Alt1=3000, Alt2=500		0.936	1.193	1.516359
Alt_1_1	100	50	1.109583	1.364651	1.75882
Alt_1_2	100	377.7778	1.110187	1.325499	1.729006
Alt_1_3	100	705.5556	1.11891	1.310728	1.723359
Alt_1_4	100	1033.333	1.069261	1.273438	1.662817
Continued on next page					

Table 15 – continued from previous page

Sim Name		Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Alt_1_5	100	1361.111	1.11317	1.3539	1.752767
Alt_1_6	100	1688.889	1.14289	1.361465	1.777578
Alt_1_7	100	2016.667	1.145673	1.350372	1.770896
Alt_1_8	100	2344.444	1.098898	1.311365	1.710922
Alt_1_9	100	2672.222	1.114867	1.305272	1.716585
Alt_1_10	100	3000	1.096438	1.327171	1.7215
Alt_2_1	1200	50	1.139507	1.350764	1.767212
Alt_2_2	1200	377.7778	1.134436	1.34842	1.762152
Alt_2_3	1200	705.5556	1.157104	1.389556	1.808246
Alt_2_4	1200	1033.333	1.059709	1.274906	1.65782
Alt_2_5	1200	1361.111	1.12037	1.344916	1.750436
Alt_2_6	1200	1688.889	1.080631	1.31315	1.700626
Alt_2_7	1200	2016.667	1.111744	1.316411	1.723053
Alt_2_8	1200	2344.444	1.191835	1.382195	1.825084
Alt_2_9	1200	2672.222	1.116799	1.336343	1.741566
Alt_2_10	1200	3000	1.111601	1.351795	1.750145
Alt_3_1	2300	50	1.132585	1.347435	1.760207
Alt_3_2	2300	377.7778	1.14772	1.338064	1.76286
Continued on next page					

Table 15 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Alt_3_3	2300	705.5556	1.103434	1.318213	1.719085
Alt_3_4	2300	1033.333	1.101894	1.308431	1.710603
Alt_3_5	2300	1361.111	1.08722	1.300802	1.695327
Alt_3_6	2300	1688.889	1.116673	1.343642	1.747093
Alt_3_7	2300	2016.667	1.068207	1.303376	1.685187
Alt_3_8	2300	2344.444	1.128212	1.342128	1.753331
Alt_3_9	2300	2672.222	1.129495	1.351761	1.761538
Alt_3_10	2300	3000	1.12642	1.353739	1.761088
Alt_4_1	3400	50	1.135966	1.352575	1.766318
Alt_4_2	3400	377.7778	1.135382	1.33464	1.752243
Alt_4_3	3400	705.5556	1.150352	1.358889	1.780419
Alt_4_4	3400	1033.333	1.135391	1.373326	1.781891
Alt_4_5	3400	1361.111	1.134508	1.349644	1.763136
Alt_4_6	3400	1688.889	1.082446	1.273507	1.671379
Alt_4_7	3400	2016.667	1.104717	1.33171	1.730275
Alt_4_8	3400	2344.444	1.139442	1.373037	1.784253
Alt_4_9	3400	2672.222	1.147308	1.346129	1.768722
Alt_4_10	3400	3000	1.098282	1.288133	1.692781
Continued on next page					

Table 15 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Alt_5_1	4500	50	1.154532	1.384129	1.802431
Alt_5_2	4500	377.7778	1.192517	1.39553	1.835647
Alt_5_3	4500	705.5556	1.14656	1.341779	1.764928
Alt_5_4	4500	1033.333	1.137146	1.341512	1.758623
Alt_5_5	4500	1361.111	1.186305	1.398047	1.833536
Alt_5_6	4500	1688.889	1.158048	1.392381	1.811022
Alt_5_7	4500	2016.667	1.170804	1.375286	1.806154
Alt_5_8	4500	2344.444	1.120314	1.329549	1.738621
Alt_5_9	4500	2672.222	1.152052	1.3713	1.791002
Alt_5_10	4500	3000	1.137771	1.344011	1.760934
Alt_6_1	5600	50	1.182617	1.372618	1.811812
Alt_6_2	5600	377.7778	1.189953	1.384418	1.825541
Alt_6_3	5600	705.5556	1.160408	1.355091	1.784045
Alt_6_4	5600	1033.333	1.196105	1.406556	1.846366
Alt_6_5	5600	1361.111	1.15415	1.350313	1.776346
Alt_6_6	5600	1688.889	1.18218	1.372549	1.811475
Alt_6_7	5600	2016.667	1.165635	1.355061	1.787427
Alt_6_8	5600	2344.444	1.129711	1.356089	1.764999
Continued on next page					

Table 15 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Alt_6_9	5600	2672.222	1.156659	1.361137	1.786212
Alt_6_10	5600	3000	1.13703	1.33903	1.756655
Alt_7_1	6700	50	1.190047	1.368494	1.813556
Alt_7_2	6700	377.7778	1.205536	1.426755	1.867872
Alt_7_3	6700	705.5556	1.188258	1.417801	1.849897
Alt_7_4	6700	1033.333	1.172022	1.389674	1.817919
Alt_7_5	6700	1361.111	1.179956	1.362237	1.802217
Alt_7_6	6700	1688.889	1.182466	1.387766	1.823217
Alt_7_7	6700	2016.667	1.1736	1.370973	1.80469
Alt_7_8	6700	2344.444	1.154448	1.377884	1.797586
Alt_7_9	6700	2672.222	1.164425	1.376251	1.802763
Alt_7_10	6700	3000	1.134433	1.316459	1.737815
Alt_8_1	7800	50	1.226228	1.420823	1.876799
Alt_8_2	7800	377.7778	1.275706	1.47576	1.950716
Alt_8_3	7800	705.5556	1.234521	1.422036	1.883143
Alt_8_4	7800	1033.333	1.19011	1.381435	1.823383
Alt_8_5	7800	1361.111	1.219531	1.430131	1.879503
Alt_8_6	7800	1688.889	1.176894	1.401351	1.82999
Continued on next page					

Table 15 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Alt_8_7	7800	2016.667	1.225417	1.436894	1.888468
Alt_8_8	7800	2344.444	1.222505	1.443211	1.891396
Alt_8_9	7800	2672.222	1.181915	1.376322	1.814163
Alt_8_10	7800	3000	1.172717	1.382035	1.812536
Alt_9_1	8900	50	1.342625	1.54456	2.046535
Alt_9_2	7800	377.7778	1.271102	1.463837	1.93869
Alt_9_3	7800	705.5556	1.261296	1.46143	1.930452
Alt_9_4	7800	1033.333	1.276652	1.492805	1.964258
Alt_9_5	7800	1361.111	1.206788	1.411403	1.856986
Alt_9_6	7800	1688.889	1.233397	1.427886	1.88683
Alt_9_7	7800	2016.667	1.232969	1.439231	1.895152
Alt_9_8	7800	2344.444	1.20748	1.375171	1.830055
Alt_9_9	7800	2672.222	1.202118	1.402643	1.847294
Alt_9_10	7800	3000	1.175048	1.377338	1.810469
Alt_10_1	10000	50	1.374715	1.569243	2.086233
Alt_10_2	10000	377.7778	1.288248	1.469931	1.954554
Alt_10_3	10000	705.5556	1.276719	1.458635	1.93846
Alt_10_4	10000	1033.333	1.30683	1.477073	1.972194
Continued on next page					

Table 15 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description		X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Alt_10_5	10000	1361.111	1.276039	1.456364	1.936304
Alt_10_6	10000	1688.889	1.237957	1.396908	1.866518
Alt_10_7	10000	2016.667	1.218708	1.420567	1.8717
Alt_10_8	10000	2344.444	1.25564	1.434935	1.906743
Alt_10_9	10000	2672.222	1.235964	1.414512	1.878417
Alt_10_10	10000	3000	1.233478	1.441371	1.897108

Table 16: Separation Distance Tests, Full Results

Sim Name	Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Baseline	D=10,000	0.936	1.193	1.516359
Dist_1	500	0.972052	1.242916	1.577886
Dist_2	5736.842	0.962577	1.221914	1.555515
Dist_3	10973.68	0.979452	1.244575	1.58376
Dist_4	16210.53	0.964501	1.221851	1.556658
Dist_5	21447.37	0.972691	1.257889	1.590098
Dist_6	26684.21	0.985487	1.271303	1.608538
Dist_7	31921.05	0.974231	1.259472	1.592293
Continued on next page				

Table 16 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Dist_8	37157.89	0.965385	1.196369	1.537292
Dist_9	42394.74	0.920412	1.171081	1.489493
Dist_10	47631.58	1.001211	1.204616	1.566372
Dist_11	52868.42	0.936262	1.168227	1.497111
Dist_12	58105.26	0.991917	1.251233	1.596711
Dist_13	63342.11	0.992052	1.232606	1.582241
Dist_14	68578.95	0.983957	1.262575	1.600709
Dist_15	73815.79	0.974755	1.25192	1.586648
Dist_16	79052.63	0.996322	1.218286	1.57381
Dist_17	84289.47	0.942571	1.219915	1.541634
Dist_18	89526.32	0.947248	1.253686	1.571308
Dist_19	94763.16	0.993933	1.240476	1.589555
Dist_20	100000	0.951802	1.195667	1.528249

Table 17: Range Sensor Noise Tests, Full Results

Sim Name	Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Baseline	R=0.1	0.936	1.193	1.516359
Continued on next page				

Table 17 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Rval_1	1.00E-03	0.371148	0.410636	0.55351
Rval_2	0.4588325	1.45857	1.63741	2.192838
Rval_3	0.648886374	1.550201	1.750322	2.338108
Rval_4	0.794719944	1.669034	1.851475	2.492716
Rval_5	0.917663366	1.723605	1.916918	2.577865
Rval_6	1.025978711	1.760053	2.039337	2.693823
Rval_7	1.123903278	1.797572	2.036852	2.716622
Rval_8	1.213954217	1.822074	2.056832	2.747819
Rval_9	1.297771592	1.888238	2.110371	2.831803
Rval_10	1.376494594	1.890867	2.139127	2.855038
Rval_11	1.450952663	1.917537	2.197462	2.916468
Rval_12	1.521771959	1.923888	2.176171	2.904663
Rval_13	1.589438944	1.943988	2.21318	2.945718
Rval_14	1.654340479	1.972673	2.2301	2.977379
Rval_15	1.716790227	2.007757	2.247941	3.014021
Rval_16	1.777046693	1.992074	2.288872	3.034352
Rval_17	1.835325914	2.021212	2.297025	3.059677
Rval_18	1.891810634	2.032827	2.303035	3.071866
Continued on next page				

Table 17 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Rval_19	1.946657067	2.087049	2.36814	3.156558
Rval_20	2	2.08639	2.339812	3.134923

Table 18: Daughter-Ship IMU Uncertainty Tests, Full Results

Sim Name	Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Baseline	$Q=0.01^2$	0.936	1.193	1.516359
Qval_1	1.00E-05	0.169246	0.181702	0.248314
Qval_2	5.74E-03	0.834511	0.930255	1.249714
Qval_3	0.008111077	0.923565	1.037458	1.388989
Qval_4	0.009933997	0.97189	1.108861	1.474497
Qval_5	0.01147079	1.01951	1.159786	1.544184
Qval_6	0.012824732	1.043392	1.172271	1.569359
Qval_7	0.01404879	1.067231	1.219672	1.620674
Qval_8	0.015174427	1.105635	1.233031	1.656139
Qval_9	0.016222144	1.136525	1.252068	1.690966
Qval_10	0.017206182	1.155599	1.300628	1.73984
Qval_11	0.018136908	1.177497	1.311137	1.762265
Continued on next page				

Table 18 – continued from previous page

Sim Name	Description	X-Error	Y-Error	Total Error
Qval_12	0.019022149	1.202118	1.338987	1.799437
Qval_13	0.019867986	1.211898	1.350845	1.814794
Qval_14	0.020679256	1.231218	1.39376	1.859694
Qval_15	0.021459877	1.224467	1.39452	1.855804
Qval_16	0.022213083	1.260763	1.405996	1.888478
Qval_17	0.022941574	1.296518	1.447713	1.943407
Qval_18	0.023647633	1.286772	1.440437	1.931487
Qval_19	0.024333213	1.298724	1.488027	1.975072
Qval_20	0.025	1.337063	1.509094	2.016209

Bibliography

1. Thomas P Ehrhard. Air Force UAVs: The Secret History. *The Mitchell Institute for Airpower Studies*, (July):89, 2010.
2. Thomas Wildenberg. Origins of Inertial Navigation. 63(4):17–24, 2016.
3. David Titterton, John L Weston, and John Weston. *Strapdown inertial navigation technology*, volume 17. IET, 2004.
4. Zupt’s inertial technology systems information. <https://www.zupt.com/inertial-technology/>, Sep 2015. Accessed: 2020-12-07.
5. John Raquet. EENG 533 Navigation Using the GPS Course Slides, 2020.
6. Gps.gov: Control segment. <https://www.gps.gov/systems/gps/control/>. Accessed: 2020-12-08.
7. Error analysis for the global positioning system. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Error_analysis_for_the_Global_Positioning_System. Accessed: 2021-01-12.
8. R. T. Ioannides, T. Pany, and G. Gibbons. Known vulnerabilities of global navigation satellite systems, status, and potential mitigation techniques. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(6):1174–1194, 2016.
9. Peter S Maybeck. *Stochastic models, estimation, and control*. Academic press, 1982.
10. Aaron Canciani. EENG 765 Stochastic Estimation and Control I Course Slides, 2019.

11. Aaron Canciani. EENG 766 Stochastic Estimation and Control II Course Slides, 2020.
12. Robert Grover Brown and Patrick YC Hwang. Introduction to random signals and applied kalman filtering: with matlab exercises and solutions. *itrs*, 1997.
13. Liang Boon Wee, Wei Sheng, Eugene Lee, and Haoyong Yu. A Unified Method for Vision Aided Navigation of Autonomous Systems. *2020 IEEE/ION Position, Location and Navigation Symposium, PLANS 2020*, pages 1635–1641, 2020.
14. R. Madison, G. Andrews, P. Debitetto, S. Rasmussen, and M. Bottkol. Vision-aided navigation for small UAVs in GPS-challenged environments. *Collection of Technical Papers - 2007 AIAA InfoTech at Aerospace Conference*, 3(September 2015):2733–2745, 2007.
15. Lvtianyang Zhang, Mengbin Ye, Brian D.O. Anderson, Peter Sarunic, and Hatem Hmam. Cooperative localisation of UAVs in a GPS-denied environment using bearing measurements. In *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control, CDC 2016*, pages 4320–4326, 2016.
16. Rajnikant Sharma and Clark Taylor. Cooperative navigation of MAVs in GPS denied areas. *IEEE International Conference on Multisensor Fusion and Integration for Intelligent Systems*, (4):481–486, 2008.
17. Aaron J. Canciani and Christopher J. Brennan. An Analysis of the Benefits and Difficulties of Aerial Magnetic Vector Navigation. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 56(6):1–1, 2020.
18. Jeremy Hardy, Jared Strader, Jason N. Gross, Yu Gu, Mark Keck, Joel Douglas, and Clark N. Taylor. Unmanned aerial vehicle relative navigation in GPS denied

- environments. *Proceedings of the IEEE/ION Position, Location and Navigation Symposium, PLANS 2016*, pages 344–352, 2016.
19. Jared Strader, Yu Gu, Jason N. Gross, Matteo De Petrillo, and Jeremy Hardy. Cooperative relative localization for moving UAVs with single link range measurements. *Proceedings of the IEEE/ION Position, Location and Navigation Symposium, PLANS 2016*, pages 336–343, 2016.
 20. Derek R. Nelson, D. Blake Barber, Timothy W. McLain, and Randal W. Beard. Vector field path following for miniature air vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 23(3):519–529, 2007.
 21. Ac-130u, u.s. air force, fact sheet display. <https://www.af.mil/About-Us/Fact-Sheets/Display/Article/104486/ac-130u/>, Jan 2016. Accessed: 2021-01-05.
 22. Area-I. ALTIUS-600 Fact Sheet. <https://areai.com/altius-600-2/>. Accessed: 2021-01-05.
 23. Root-mean-square deviation. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Root-mean-square_deviation. Accessed: 2021-01-08.

Acronyms

AWGN Additive White Gaussian Noise. 11

C/A coarse-acquisition. 9

DoD Department of Defense. iv, 1

EKF Extended Kalman Filter. iv, 13

GNSS Global Navigation Satellite System. 7

GPS Global Positioning System. iv, 1

IMU inertial measurement unit. iv

ISR Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance. 1

MAVs Miniature Air Vehicles. 16

NRO National Reconnaissance Office. 4

P precise. 9

PRN Pseudo-Random Noise. 9

RF Radio Frequency. 9

RMS error root-mean-square error. 29

SPIRE Space Inertial Reference Equipment. 6

UAVs Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. iv, 1

USAF United States Air Force. 4

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					<i>Form Approved</i> OMB No. 0704-0188	
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.						
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 25-03-2021		2. REPORT TYPE Master's Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (From — To) Sept 2019 — Mar 2021		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE GPS-Denied Localization of Daughter-Ships in a Mother-Daughter Ship Collaborative Environment				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
				5b. GRANT NUMBER		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Jacquin, Ethan W, Capt				5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
				5e. TASK NUMBER		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Institute of Technology Graduate School of Engineering and Management (AFIT/EN) 2950 Hobson Way WPAFB OH 45433-7765				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AFIT-ENG-MS-21-M-051		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) AFRL/RQQC Building 146 WPAFB OH 45433-7765 DSN 798-4628, COMM 937-938-4628 Email: paul.fleitz@us.af.mil				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) AFRL/RQQC		
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES						
14. ABSTRACT This research investigates the possibility of using the communication link between a mothership and daughter-ship UAV and an Extended Kalman Filter algorithm as a replacement of GPS, assuming a ranging link exists between the mothership and daughter-ship and that the mothership is GPS-enabled. A simulation study examines the viability of the approach and the effect of parameters such as distance, altitude, roll angle, speed, ranging sensor noise, and inertial measurement unit uncertainty were considered. The magnitude of the errors between predicted and measured position were examined and a range of acceptable flight parameters was formed.						
15. SUBJECT TERMS GPS-Denied Navigation, Inertial Navigation System, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, Extended Kalman Filter						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Captain Ethan W. Jacquin, AFIT/ENG	
U	U	U	UU	97	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) (937) 255-3636; ethan.jacquin@afit.edu	