Relative global positioning system (GPS) navigation is currently used for autonomous rendezvous and docking of two spacecraft as well as formation flying applications. GPS receivers' measurements are used by the navigation subsystem to determine estimates of the current states of the spacecraft. The success of autonomous proximity operations in the presence of an uncertain environment and noisy measurements is highly dependent on the navigation accuracy. This paper presents the comparison of four Kalman filter architectures to be used for relative GPS navigation. A trade study is performed with the advantages and disadvantages of the four different Kalman architectures used for relative GPS navigation presented and compared.

INTRODUCTION

Relative global positioning system (GPS) navigation is an area of interest currently being studied [1]. The next generation of GPS satellites known as Block IIF GPS will be launched over the next few years, paving the way for GPS navigation to be used for many years to come. Relative navigation for two spacecraft is concerned with determining estimates of both the position and velocity of one spacecraft with respect to the other [2]. Some form of GPS navigation is currently used on multiple orbiting spacecraft [1, 3–6]. With the emergence of formation flying in the past decade, multiple studies have been performed on the use GPS and differential GPS for relative spacecraft navigation for formation flying [7, 8].

The primary focus of this work is the implementation of specific Kalman filter architectures for relative GPS navigation during proximity operations involving a chaser and target vehicle. The four architectures considered for relative GPS navigation are:

1. Position Velocity (PV) Extended Kalman Filter (EKF)
2. Relative Pseudorange (RGPS) EKF
3. Pseudorange (GPS) EKF
4. Reduced GPS EKF

A GPS sensor model is used introducing various errors to the modeled pseudorange measurement [9–12]. Position and velocity estimation algorithms based on pseudorange and range rate
measurements are implemented [13], [14]. The chaser vehicle is also assumed to have a star tracker and inertial measurement unit (IMU) located onboard. The star tracker is used to determine the orientation of the chaser vehicle. The IMU is used to determine changes in the angular velocity and translational acceleration.

With the focus on relative GPS navigation, it is expected that the RGPS and two GPS architectures will perform the best in relative state estimation while the PV architecture will perform the worst in relative state estimation. Although inertial state estimation is not the primary focus, there is a need for some inertial state information when algorithms such as Lambert targeting are used. The PV EKF and two GPS architectures are expected to perform well in inertial state estimation while the RGPS EKF is expected to perform the worst. Each architecture makes use of a dual-inertial filter where relative information is determined as the difference of the two inertial state estimates.

In this paper, models for the mentioned measurements are briefly presented, the four architectures are then introduced. Analysis of each architecture's performance in relative GPS navigation is performed and advantages and disadvantages of each architecture used for relative GPS navigation are drawn through a comparison of sample covariances determined from 100 Monte Carlo runs. A single trajectory is considered for a rendezvous of a chaser vehicle with the International Space Station (ISS).

**MEASUREMENT MODELS**

This section presents the models of the measurements employed in the simulation. The analysis is done on the open loop navigation system. The trajectory is provided externally and consists of two altitude adjusts and four primary burns.

**GPS Sensor**

The GPS sensor provides the user with pseudorange measurements as well as an estimated position and velocity of the current location of the receiver based upon the pseudorange measurements. The pseudorange is defined as the distance between a particular GPS satellite at the time of signal transmission and the GPS receiver at the time of signal reception. There are six primary sources of error that affect the calculation of the pseudorange: ionosphere, troposphere, receiver clock noise, GPS satellite clock bias, multipath and ephemeris. Ionosphere, troposphere and multipath errors are all the result of time delays and therefore are always positive. Receiver clock noise, GPS satellite clock bias and ephemeris errors are due to data and clock drifting resulting in both positive and negative values. In addition to these six error sources, there is also a bias in the onboard clock of the GPS receiver. The measured pseudorange is modeled by the following equation [12]:

\[
\rho_i = \|r_{rec} - (r_{gps_i} + \epsilon_{eph_i})\| + c(\epsilon_{iono_i} + \epsilon_{trop_i} + \epsilon_{mult_i} + \epsilon_{rcb} + \epsilon_{sch_i}) + \epsilon_{\eta} \tag{1}
\]
\( \mathbf{r}_{rec} \): position of receiver at time of signal reception (m)

\( \mathbf{r}_{gps_i} \): position of the \( i^{th} \)GPS satellite at time of signal transmission (m)

\( c \): speed of light = \( 2.99792458 \cdot 10^8 \text{ m/s} \)

\( \epsilon_{iono_i} \): error due to ionosphere time delay of the \( i^{th} \)GPS satellite (s)

\( \epsilon_{trop_i} \): error due to troposphere time delay of the \( i^{th} \)GPS satellite (s)

\( \epsilon_{multi_i} \): error due to multipath time delay of the \( i^{th} \)GPS satellite (s)

\( \epsilon_{rcb} \): error due to receiver clock bias (s)

\( \epsilon_{scb_i} \): error due to GPS satellite clock bias of the \( i^{th} \)GPS satellite (s)

\( \epsilon_{eph_i} \): error due to ephemeris data variations of the \( i^{th} \)GPS satellite (m)

\( \epsilon_{\eta} \): error due to receiver clock noise (m)

The receiver clock bias is modeled using a second order random walk [9]. The ionosphere time delay is modeled using the Klobuchar Ionosphere model [16]. With the current altitude and orientation of the GPS receivers, the troposphere time delay is assumed to be zero for the current application. The ephemeris error is modeled as a second order Gauss-Markov process. The multipath, satellite clock bias, and receiver clock bias are modeled as first order Gauss-Markov processes. Table 1 gives the statistical information used for each Gauss-Markov model pertaining to each error source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Error Sources</th>
<th>Steady State Time Constant (s)</th>
<th>Time Constant (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephemeris</td>
<td>( 1e^{-3} ) [0.3748, 0.5271, 0.1407]</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver Noise</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Clock</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipath</td>
<td>Chaser: 0.5, Target: 2.0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Gauss-Markov Error Statistics

The total pseudorange error is modeled following References [9–12]. The multipath error on the target vehicle is modeled to be slightly higher. Table 2 shows the error values used in the simulation as well as the expected values from the literature. It is assumed that only code pseudorange is used, carrier-phase and integer cycle ambiguity estimation are not used to improve the measurement.
### Active Expected Chaser Sensor Target Sensor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References [9–12]</th>
<th>Chaser Sensor Error (Simulation)</th>
<th>Target Sensor Error (Simulation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ionosphere</td>
<td>2.0-15.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troposphere</td>
<td>0.0-1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephemeris</td>
<td>2.0-2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver Noise</td>
<td>0.0-0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Clock</td>
<td>1.0-2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipath</td>
<td>0.0-1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Error (RMS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0-15.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Pseudorange Errors**

### Star Tracker

The star tracker is assumed to provide the attitude quaternion parametrization of the rotation from the inertial frame $i$ to the star tracker sensor frame $st$. The measurement model is given as follows

\[
\bar{q}_{st}^i = \bar{q}_{st}^b \otimes \bar{q}_{error} \otimes \bar{q}_i^b \otimes \bar{q}_\eta
\]  

(2)

where

- $\bar{q}_{st}^i$: inertial to star tracker quaternion
- $\bar{q}_{st}^b$: body to star tracker quaternion
- $\bar{q}_{error}$: quaternion derived from alignment error
- $\bar{q}_i^b$: inertial to body quaternion
- $\bar{q}_\eta$: quaternion derived from tracker noise and bias, random walk

The matrix that transforms one frame to another frame, derived from Euler parameters (quaternions) relating the two frames, is given by Equation 3 [17].

\[
T(\bar{q}) = I_{3x3} - 2\bar{q}_0[\bar{q}_0 \times] + 2[\bar{q}_0 \times]^2
\]  

(3)

The values for the star tracker errors are given in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Type</th>
<th>$1\sigma$ Values</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{q}_{error}$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{q}_\eta$</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>rad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Star Tracker Errors**

### Gyroscopes

The rate gyroscopes on-board the spacecraft measure the integrated angular velocity of the vehicle. Three-axis gyroscopes are used. The mathematical model used to describe the rate gyroscopes mounted on-board the spacecraft is given by Equation 4 [18].
\[
\Delta \theta^b = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \left\{ \omega^b + \eta_v + w_{m_v} \right\} d\tau 
\] (4)

\[
\omega^b = [T^b_i(q^b_i)] \omega^i
\] (5)

where

- \(\Delta \theta^b\): change in angle vector given in body coordinate system
- \(\omega^b\): angular velocity vector in body coordinate system
- \(T^b_i\): transformation matrix from inertial to body coordinate system
- \(\eta_v\): noise and bias vector associated with angular velocity, random walk
- \(w_{m_v}\): first-order Markov process vector associated with angular velocity

The sample time, \(\Delta t\), is 0.1 seconds. Table 4 gives the error parameters present on the gyroscopes of the IMU [19], [20].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>1σ Values</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_{\text{IMU mis}})</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_{m_v})</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>deg hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\tau_{m_v})</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_{\eta_v})</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>deg/√hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean error, (m_{\eta_v})</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>deg/√hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Gyroscope Model Errors

### Accelerometer

The accelerometer located on-board the spacecraft measures the change in the translational velocity. The mathematical model used to describe the accelerometer mounted on-board the spacecraft is given by Equation 6 [18].

\[
\Delta v_{imu} = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \left\{ a_{imu} + \eta_a + w_{m_a} \right\} d\tau 
\] (6)

where

- \(a_{imu}\): translational acceleration vector in IMU coordinate system
- \(\Delta v_{imu}\): change in the velocity vector in IMU coordinate system
- \(\eta_a\): noise and bias vector associated with acceleration, random walk
- \(w_{m_a}\): first-order Markov process vector associated with acceleration

The sample time, \(\Delta t\), is 0.1 seconds. The error parameters present in the accelerometer of the IMU model are given in Table 5 [21].
Parameters | 1σ Values | Units
--- | --- | ---
$\sigma_{IMU_{mis}}$ | 0.05 | deg
$\sigma_{m_{a}}$ | 7 | $\mu g$
$\tau_{m_{a}}$ | 3600 | sec
$\sigma_{\eta_{a}}$ | 40 | $\mu g\sqrt{s}$
Mean error, $m_{\eta_{a}}$ | 40 | $\mu g$

Table 5. Accelerometer Model Error Parameters

**PROPAGATION MODEL**

The state model for estimated state propagation of both the chaser and target vehicles is given by

\[
\dot{\hat{r}} = \hat{v} \\
\ddot{\hat{r}} = g(\hat{r}) + \hat{a}
\] (7)

The gravitational acceleration is given by $g(\hat{r})$ and includes effects due to the oblateness of the Earth. The gravitational acceleration is defined as [22]:

\begin{align*}
g1(\hat{r}) &= u_r + k_1 \left(1 - 5U^2\right) u_r + 2k_1U u_p \\
g2(\hat{r}) &= g1(\hat{r}) + 5k_2U \left(3 - 7U^2\right) u_r - 3k_2 \left(1 - 5U^2\right) u_p \\
g3(\hat{r}) &= g2(\hat{r}) + 3k_3 \left(1 - 14U^2 + 21U^4\right) u_r + 4k_3U \left(3 - 7U^2\right) u_p \\
g(\hat{r}) &= -\frac{\mu}{\hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}} g3
\end{align*}

where

\begin{align*}
k_1 &= \frac{3}{2} J_2 \left(\frac{R_e}{\hat{r} \cdot u_r}\right)^2 \\
k_2 &= \frac{1}{2} J_3 \left(\frac{R_e}{\hat{r} \cdot u_r}\right)^3 \\
k_3 &= -\frac{5}{8} J_4 \left(\frac{R_e}{\hat{r} \cdot u_r}\right)^4 \\
U &= (u_r \cdot u_p) \\
u_r &= \frac{\hat{r}}{\|\hat{r}\|} \\
u_p &= [0 \ 0 \ 1]^T
\end{align*}

and perturbation coefficients $J_\#$ and parameters are defined as follows.
\( J_2 \) : \( J_2 \) perturbation coefficient, \( 1.08263 \times 10^{-3} \)
\( J_3 \) : \( J_3 \) perturbation coefficient, \( -2.56 \times 10^{-6} \)
\( J_4 \) : \( J_4 \) perturbation coefficient, \( -1.58 \times 10^{-6} \)
\( R_e \) : radius of the Earth, \( 6378.1363 \ km \)
\( \mu \) : gravitation constant

The estimated acceleration of the chaser vehicle during thruster firings is given by Equation 9. Equation 10 gives the acceleration each vehicle experiences due to atmospheric drag. Equation 10 is used during instances of free drift.

\[
\dot{a}_c = \dot{a}_{imu} \quad (9)
\]

\[
\dot{a}_{c,t} = -D_{c,t} \frac{\dot{v}_{c,t}}{\|\dot{v}_{c,t}\|} \quad (10)
\]

where

\( D_c \) : chaser atmospheric drag, \( 6.2 \times 10^{-6} \ \frac{m}{s^2} \)
\( D_t \) : target atmospheric drag, \( 12.4 \times 10^{-6} \ \frac{m}{s^2} \)

The state dynamics matrix for the chaser vehicle is given by Equation 11.

\[
F_c = \begin{bmatrix}
0_{3\times3} & I_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times3} \\
J_2 & 0_{3\times3} & [\dot{a} \times] & T_{imu}^i \\
0_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times3} & -[\tilde{\omega} \times] & 0_{3\times3} \\
0_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times3}
\end{bmatrix} \quad (11)
\]

The matrices \([\dot{a} \times]\) and \([\tilde{\omega} \times]\) are the skew symmetric matrices of the estimated acceleration and measured angular velocity vectors respectively. The transformation matrix \( T_{imu}^i \) is derived from \( \bar{q}_{imu}^i \). The matrix \( J_2 \) is given as

\[
J_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{-m}{r^5} + \frac{3r^2_x}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p - 1) \right) & \frac{3r_x r_z}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p - 1) \right) & \frac{3r_x r_y}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p + 4) \right) \\
\frac{3r_x r_y}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p - 1) \right) & \frac{m}{r^5} + \frac{3r^2_y}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p - 1) \right) & \frac{3r_y r_z}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p + 4) \right) \\
\frac{3r_x r_z}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p + 4) \right) & \frac{3r_y r_z}{r^5} \left( \frac{m}{r^3} + \Lambda(p + 4) \right) & -(J_2(1,1) + J_2(2,2))
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where

\[
\Lambda = \frac{\mu J_2 R_e^2}{r^5}
\]
\[
m = \mu \left( 1 + \frac{3J_2 R_e^2 p}{4r^2} \right)
\]
\[
p = 2 \left( 1 - \frac{5r_e^2}{r^2} \right)
\]
with the perturbation coefficient $J_2$ and parameters definitions defined the same as above. Equation 12 gives the state matrix of the target vehicle.

$$
F_t = \begin{bmatrix}
0_{3 \times 3} & I_{3 \times 3} \\
J_2 & 0_{3 \times 3}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(12)

The covariance matrix $Q_{x_k}$ is

$$
Q_{x_k} = \begin{bmatrix}
Q_{p_{vk}} & Q_{pv_{vk}} & 0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{p_{vk}} & Q_{pv_{vk}} \\
Q_{pv_{vk}} & Q_{vv_{vk}} & 0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{pv_{vk}} & Q_{vv_{vk}} \\
0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{q_k} & 0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} \\
Q_{p_{vk}} & Q_{pv_{vk}} & 0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{p_{vk}} & Q_{pv_{vk}} \\
Q_{pv_{vk}} & Q_{vv_{vk}} & 0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{pv_{vk}} & Q_{vv_{vk}}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

The definition of each individual covariance matrix in $Q_{x_k}$ remains the same for all four Kalman filters studied. The individual covariance matrices are given as follows where $s$ denotes the spacecraft [22].

$$
\begin{align*}
Q_{p_{vk}} &= \frac{1}{3} Q_{vv_{vk}} \Delta t^2 \\
Q_{pv_{vk}} &= \frac{1}{2} Q_{vv_{vk}} \Delta t \\
Q_{vv_{vk}} &= T_{vlvh}^i Q_{vv} (t) T_{vlvh}^i \Delta t \\
Q_{q_k} &= Q_{q}(t) \\
Q_{p_{vk}} &= \frac{19}{20} Q_{p_{vk}} \\
Q_{pv_{vk}} &= \frac{19}{20} Q_{pv_{vk}} \\
Q_{vv_{vk}} &= \frac{19}{20} Q_{vv_{vk}}
\end{align*}
$$

Table 6 gives the spectral densities corresponding to each individual covariance matrix for each Kalman filter studied where $s$ denotes chaser or target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spectral Density</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{vv}(t)$</td>
<td>$9 \times 10^{-6}$ $I_3$</td>
<td>$\left( \frac{m^2}{s^2} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{q}(t)$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-11}$ $I_3$</td>
<td>$\left( \frac{rad}{\sqrt{s}} \right)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Spectral Density Values for all Kalman Filters

**KALMAN FILTER DEVELOPMENT**

Four Kalman filter architectures are studied to determine the advantages and disadvantages of each architecture for relative GPS navigation. The four architectures employ dual inertial states
that represent position and velocity of both chaser and target vehicles. Other states include the
orientation of the chaser vehicle and the accelerometer bias. The architecture is an extended Kalman
filter (EKF) which is a sequential state estimator that utilizes a continuous propagation of the system
dynamics and a discrete update logic. The model for the states and measurements is given by
Equations 13-14.

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), t) + w(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

$$\tilde{y}_k = h(x_k) + \nu_k$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

where the vector \(w(t)\) is a zero mean white process. The measurement model is corrupted by a zero
mean white sequence \(\nu_k\) [23]. The process noise \(w(t)\) and the measurement noise \(\nu_k\) are assumed
to be uncorrelated to each other. The spectral density of the process noise is given by \(Q(t)\) while
the covariance matrix corresponding to the measurement noise is given by \(R_k\).

$$E \{ w(t)w^T(\tau) \} = Q(t)\delta(t - \tau)$$

$$E \{ \nu_k\nu_j^T \} = \begin{cases} 0 & k \neq j \\ R_k & k = j \end{cases}$$

where \(\delta(t - \tau)\) is the Dirac delta function.

Given an initial state vector and error covariance matrix

$$\hat{x}(t_0) = \bar{x}_0$$

$$e = x - \hat{x}$$

$$P_0 = E \{ e_0e_0^T \}$$

the Kalman gain at a given time step, \(K_k\), can be computed as

$$K_k = P_k^{-}H_k^T(\hat{x}_k^-)[H_k(\hat{x}_k^-)P_k^{-}H_k^T(\hat{x}_k^-) + R_k]^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where

$$H_k(\hat{x}_k^-) \equiv \frac{dh}{dx} |_{\hat{x}_k^-}$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

The state and error covariance update is

$$\hat{x}_k^+ = \hat{x}_k^- + K_k[\tilde{y}_k - h(\hat{x}_k^-)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

$$P_k^+ = (I_{n\times n} - K_kH_k(\hat{x}_k^-))P_k^- (I_{n\times n} - K_kH_k(\hat{x}_k^-))^T + K_kR_kK_k^T$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

The states are propagated as
\[
\dot{x}(t) = f(\dot{x}(t), u(t), t) \quad (19)
\]
\[
P_{k+1}^{-} = \Phi_k P_k^+ \Phi_k^T + Q_k \quad (20)
\]

The discrete form of error covariance propagation is used where \(P_{k+1}^{-}\) refers to the preupdate value of the error covariance matrix and \(P_k^+\) is the postupdate covariance matrix at the previous time step. The state transition matrix is determined solving the following differential equation

\[
\dot{\Phi}(t, t_k) = F(t) \Phi(t, t_k) \quad \Phi(t_k, t_k) = I \quad (21)
\]

\[
F(\dot{x}(t), t) \equiv \frac{df}{dx} \dot{x}(t) \quad (22)
\]

The covariance matrix \(Q_k\) is determined from the spectral density \(Q(t)\).

**Position Velocity Kalman Filter**

The position velocity (PV) EKF processes estimated positions and velocities of each receiver’s current location provided by the GPS sensor which are corrupted by colored noise. Since the EKF development assumes zero mean white process and measurement noise, additional states are augmented to the state vector to compensate for colored measurement noise. The state and measurement vectors are given as follows.

\[
x = \begin{bmatrix} r_c^T & v_c^T & \theta^T & r_t^T & v_t^T & \xi_{rc}^T & \xi_{vc}^T & \xi_{rt}^T & \xi_{vt}^T & a_b^T \end{bmatrix}^T
\]

\[
\tilde{y} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{r}_c^T & \tilde{v}_c^T & \tilde{r}_t^T & \tilde{v}_t^T \end{bmatrix}^T
\]

The chaser’s accelerometer bias is modeled as first order Gauss-Markov processes with a steady state standard deviation of 40 \(\mu g\) and time constant \(\tau_a\) of 1 hour for each axis [21]. The accelerometer bias vector is given by:

\[
a_b = [a_{bx} \ a_{by} \ a_{bz}]^T
\]

The PV filter uses a linear measurement equation.

\[
\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), t) + w(t) \quad (23)
\]
\[
\tilde{y}_k = H_k \tilde{x}_k \quad (24)
\]

where \(w(t)\) is the white process noise and \(H_k\) is the measurement sensitivity matrix. There is no white measurement noise since all the measurement error is modeled as a first order Gauss-Markov process. The measurement sensitivity matrix is:
\[
\begin{align*}
H_k' &= \begin{bmatrix}
I_{6 \times 6} & \frac{dx_c}{d\theta} & 0_{6 \times 6} \\
0_{6 \times 6} & I_{6 \times 6} \\
\end{bmatrix} \\
H_k &= \begin{bmatrix}
H_k' & I_{12 \times 12} & 0_{12 \times 3}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

(25)

(26)

where

\[
\frac{d\mathbf{x}_a}{d\theta} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{dx_c}{d\theta} \\
\frac{dx_v}{d\theta} \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\left[ (T^T(q_b) r_o) \times \right] \\
\left[ (T^T(q_b) v_o) \times \right]
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and \( r_o, v_o \) are the position vectors corresponding to the offset of the GPS sensor from the center of gravity of the vehicle and \([u \times]\) denotes the skew symmetric matrix corresponding to the vector \( u \).

\[
\mathbf{w}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{w}_x(t) \\
\mathbf{\nu}(t) \\
\mathbf{w}_a(t)
\end{bmatrix}^T
\]

(27)

\[
\xi_k = 0_{12 \times 1}
\]

(28)

The vector \( \mathbf{\nu}(t) \) is a zero mean white process corresponding to the colored measurement noise states. The colored noise is modeled as a first order Gauss-Markov process for all 12 states. Table 7 gives the statistics of the Markov process corresponding to colored noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>( \sigma_{ss}, 1\sigma ) Values</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position (m)</td>
<td>Velocity (m/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaser</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Statistics for Position and Velocity Errors

The process noise spectral density is given by

\[
Q'(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
Q_x(t) & 0_{15 \times 12} & 0_{15 \times 3} \\
0_{12 \times 15} & Q_\xi(t) & 0_{12 \times 3} \\
0_{3 \times 15} & 0_{3 \times 12} & Q_\alpha(t)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( Q_x(t) \) is the spectral density corresponding to the white process noise present on the position, velocity and attitude states, \( Q_\xi(t) \) is the spectral density of the colored noise, and \( Q_\alpha(t) \) is the spectral density corresponding to the accelerometer bias states. The spectral density corresponding to the colored noise states is

\[
Q_\xi(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
Q_{r_e}(t) & 0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} \\
0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{v_e}(t) & 0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} \\
0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{p}(t) & 0_{3 \times 3} \\
0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 3} & Q_{v}(t)
\end{bmatrix}
\]
The first subscript defines the measurement, either position or velocity, and the second subscript defines the vehicle, either chaser or target. The spectral density corresponding to a first-order Gauss-Markov process is given by

\[ Q_{\text{state}}(t) = \frac{2}{\tau} \sigma_{ss}^2 I_{3 \times 3} \]  

(29)

The discrete form of Equation 29 is given by

\[ Q_k = \sigma_{ss}^2 \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{2 \Delta t}{\tau}} \right) I_{3 \times 3} \]  

(30)

The covariance of each position and velocity error as well as the accelerometer bias is found using Equation 30.

The position and velocity estimation algorithms of the GPS sensor require at least four GPS satellites visible in order to provide an estimate. If less than four are visible, no estimates are provided and the PV EKF propagates the current states only.

Relative Pseudorange Kalman Filter

The relative pseudorange (RGPS) EKF processes relative pseudorange measurements. Two additional states are modeled, the relative clock bias and clock drift \((\Delta b, \Delta f)\). As many as six relative pseudorange measurements are processed during each update. The measurement vector is populated by relative pseudoranges, \(\delta \rho\), found by differencing the chaser and target pseudoranges corresponding to the same GPS satellite with each pseudorange assumed acquired at exactly the same time.

The communication time delay between the two vehicles is neglected from this analysis. The state and measurement vectors for the RGPS EKF are defined as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{x} &= [r^T_c \ v^T_c \ \theta^T \ r^T_t \ v^T_t \ \Delta b \ \Delta f \ a^T_b]^T \\
\tilde{\mathbf{y}} &= [\delta \rho_1 \cdots \delta \rho_n]^T
\end{align*}
\]

The scalar \(n\) is the total number of processed pseudorange measurements. The accelerometer bias is modeled as previously described. The relative clock bias and drift are modeled by a second order random walk [12] and the covariance matrix \(Q_{bf_k}\) is

\[
Q_{bf_k} = \begin{bmatrix}
4 \times 10^{-19} \Delta t + 16 \pi^2 \times 10^{-20} \Delta t^3 & 16 \pi^2 \times 10^{-20} \Delta t^2 \\
16 \pi^2 \times 10^{-20} \Delta t^2 & 16 \pi^2 \times 10^{-20} \frac{\Delta t^3}{3}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Under the assumption that the bias and drift of the two receivers are uncorrelated to each other, Equation 31 gives the covariance matrix \(Q_{\Delta bf_k}\).

\[ Q_{\Delta bf_k} = Q_{bf_1} + Q_{bf_2} \]  

(31)

The covariance matrix \(Q_k\) is
The covariance matrix $Q_{xk}$ corresponds to the position and velocity states of both vehicles and orientation of the chaser vehicle. The covariance matrix, $Q_{\Delta bfk}$, is defined in Equation 31 and the covariance matrix, $Q_{ak}$, corresponds to the noise on the accelerometer bias. The measurement noise covariance matrix is given as:

$$R_k = 2\sigma_{\delta\rho}^2 I_{n \times n}$$

where $\sigma_{\delta\rho}$ is 7 meters. The steady state standard deviation is high due to the remaining measurement noise being colored instead of white. Since the measurements are relative pseudoranges, the measurement noise covariance matrix corresponding to each pseudorange is added together hence the factor of two.

The components of the measurement sensitivity matrix, $H_k$ are

$$\frac{d\delta\rho_i}{d\mathbf{r}_c} = \left(\frac{(\mathbf{r}_{gps_i} - \mathbf{r}_c)^T}{\rho_c}\right)$$

$$\frac{d\delta\rho_i}{d\mathbf{r}_t} = -\left(\frac{(\mathbf{r}_{gps_i} - \mathbf{r}_t)^T}{\rho_t}\right)$$

$$\frac{d\delta\rho_i}{d\mathbf{v}_c} = [0 \ 0 \ 0] = \frac{d\delta\rho_i}{d\mathbf{v}_t}$$

Line of sight vectors are defined as

$$l_c = \frac{(\mathbf{r}_{gps_i} - \mathbf{r}_c)}{\rho_c}$$

$$l_t = \frac{(\mathbf{r}_{gps_i} - \mathbf{r}_t)}{\rho_t}$$

The derivatives of the relative pseudorange measurements with respect to the attitude angles of the chaser vehicle involves a knowledge of the location of the GPS receiver antenna. Given the location of the GPS receiver antennas as $\mathbf{r}_{oc}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{ot}$, the velocities are given by:

$$\mathbf{v}_{oc} = \mathbf{\omega}_c \times \mathbf{r}_{oc}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{ot} = \mathbf{\omega}_t \times \mathbf{r}_{ot}$$

The partial derivatives of the position and velocity of the chaser and target vehicles with respect
to the chaser attitude parameters are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dr_c}{d\theta} &= [(T^T(q_c)r_{oc}) \times] \\
\frac{dv_c}{d\theta} &= [(T^T(q_c)v_{oc}) \times] \\
\frac{dr_t}{d\theta} &= [(T^T(q_t)r_{ot}) \times] \\
\frac{dv_t}{d\theta} &= [(T^T(q_t)v_{ot}) \times]
\end{align*}
\]

(37) (38) (39) (40)

The partial derivatives of the relative pseudorange with respect to the chaser attitude is given by

\[
\frac{d\delta\rho_k}{d\theta} = l_c \frac{dr_c}{d\theta} - l_t \frac{dr_t}{d\theta}
\]

(41)

The measurement sensitivity matrix is constructed as

\[
H_{k_i} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{d\delta\rho_c}{dr_c} & \frac{d\delta\rho_c}{dv_c} & \frac{d\delta\rho_c}{d\theta} & \frac{d\delta\rho_t}{dr_t} & \frac{d\delta\rho_t}{dv_t} & 1 & 0_{1\times4}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(42)

**Pseudorange Kalman Filter**

The pseudorange (GPS) EKF processes up to twelve pseudorange measurements, six from the chaser and six from the target. Measured pseudoranges from common GPS satellites are processed first. If there are less than six common satellites, pseudorange measurements from non-common satellites are then processed. In cases when one or both vehicles see four or less satellites, less than twelve pseudorange measurements are processed. Ten additional states are added to the existing state vector to estimate the common pseudorange errors unique to each GPS satellite and the clock bias and drift of each vehicle. The state and measurement vectors used for the GPS EKF are given as follows.

\[
x = \begin{bmatrix} r_c^T & v_c^T & \theta^T & b_c & f_c & r_t^T & v_t^T & b_t & f_t & a_i^T & \xi_{\rho}^T \end{bmatrix}^T
\]

\[
\tilde{y} = [\rho_{e1} \rho_{e2} \cdots \rho_{en} \rho_{t1} \rho_{t2} \cdots \rho_{tn}]^T
\]

The common pseudorange errors are modeled using a first order Gauss-Markov process with a steady state standard deviation, $\sigma_{\xi_{\rho}}$, of 6 meters and a time constant, $\tau_{\xi_{\rho}}$, of 100 seconds.

The covariance matrix, $Q_k$, is given as follows:

\[
Q_k = \begin{bmatrix}
Q_{\rho_{e1}^{pre}} & 0_{6\times3} & 0_{6\times2} & Q_{\rho_{e1}/f_c} & 0_{6\times2} & 0_{6\times3} & 0_{6\times6} \\
0_{3\times6} & Q_{\rho_{e2}^{pre}} & 0_{3\times2} & 0_{3\times2} & 0_{3\times3} & 0_{3\times6} & 0_{3\times6} \\
0_{2\times6} & 0_{2\times3} & Q_{\rho_{e3}^{pre}} & 0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times3} & 0_{2\times6} \\
0_{1\times6} & 0_{1\times3} & 0_{1\times2} & Q_{\rho_{e4}^{pre}} & 0_{1\times2} & 0_{1\times3} & 0_{1\times6} \\
0_{2\times6} & 0_{2\times3} & 0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times3} & 0_{2\times3} & 0_{2\times6} \\
0_{1\times6} & 0_{1\times3} & 0_{1\times2} & 0_{1\times6} & 0_{1\times3} & 0_{1\times6} & 0_{1\times6} \\
0_{6\times6} & 0_{6\times3} & 0_{6\times2} & 0_{6\times6} & 0_{6\times2} & 0_{6\times3} & Q_{\xi_{\rho}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
The covariance matrix corresponding to the pseudorange error states $Q_{\xi \rho_k}$ is given by Equation 29. The process noise covariance matrices $Q_{c_{pvk}}, Q_{c_{\theta k}}, Q_{t_{pvk}}, Q_{t/c_k}$, and $Q_{c/t_k}$ are known. The covariance matrix corresponding to the clock bias and drift of each GPS receiver is defined as follows where $s$ denotes the vehicle, chaser or target.

$$Q_{sbf_k} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{h_0}{2} \Delta t + 2h_{-1} \Delta t^2 + \frac{2}{3} \pi^2 h_{-2} \Delta t^3 & h_{-1} \Delta t + \pi^2 h_{-2} \Delta t^2 \\ h_{-1} \Delta t + \pi^2 h_{-2} \Delta t^2 & \frac{h_0}{2\pi} + 4h_{-1} + \frac{8}{3} \pi^2 h_{-2} \Delta t \end{bmatrix}$$

where the coefficients $h_{\#}$ are defined as

$$h_0 : 2 \times 10^{-19} \ (s^2)$$
$$h_{-1} : 7 \times 10^{-21} \ (s)$$
$$h_{-2} : 2 \times 10^{-20}$$

For instances when less than six satellites are visible, the correlations between the common pseudorange errors of the missing satellites and the remaining states are removed and the steady state variance of the common pseudorange error is placed in the diagonal. The estimation error covariance matrix and estimated pseudorange error state are also restructured every time new satellites are acquired, lost or both at which point correlations are removed and the covariance of the new state is set to the steady state covariance. The pseudorange error not accounted for by the common pseudorange error is modeled as a white sequence with covariance matrix, $R_k$, given as follows.

$$R_{ke} = 15 \cdot I_{n \times n} \ m^2$$
$$R_{kt} = 30 \cdot I_{n \times n} \ m^2$$

Sequential processing of the pseudorange measurements is used. The measurement sensitivity matrices are given by

$$H_{ke} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_c \\ \rho_c(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_c) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times 6} & 1 & 0_{1 \times 18} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$H_{ke}(i + 22) = 1 \quad (43)$$

$$H_{kt} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times 11} & \hat{\mathbf{r}}_t \\ \rho_c(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times 3} & 1 & 0_{1 \times 10} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$H_{kt}(i + 22) = 1 \quad (45)$$

where $i$ is the current pseudorange measurement being processed.
Reduced Pseudorange Kalman Filter

The reduced pseudorange (GPS) EKF is similar to the GPS EKF in the measurements processed and the total number of states. However, the common pseudorange error states are considered and not estimated. The effects of the common pseudorange error states on the other states are considered but not compensated for. As a result, the reduced GPS EKF is more conservative in state estimation compared to the GPS EKF. In addition, each of the six states devoted to the common pseudorange errors are not constantly associated to the same satellite. This process reduces the complexity of the filter since avoids the bookkeeping associated with which satellites correspond to which states. The bookkeeping can be omitted since the common pseudorange error states are no longer being estimated. If the states were still being estimated, bookkeeping would be performed otherwise the filter would fail. By removing the bookkeeping from the reduced GPS filter, more conservatism is also added to the state estimation errors. The reason is that when a new satellite comes replace a previous satellite in view, the correlations are not reset, hence the error are not assumed uncorrelated, which is more conservative when those states are considered only. By considering and not estimating as well as removing the bookkeeping of the common pseudorange error states, the complexity of the Kalman filter is reduced at little cost in the means of filter performance.

The measurement vector consists of pseudoranges from as many as six satellites per receiver. The number of pseudorange measurements available during every update process will vary depending upon the number of GPS satellites in view of the receiver. Again measurements from common satellites are processed first followed by measurements unique to each receiver if needed. The state and measurement vectors are as follows.

\[ \mathbf{x} = \left[ \mathbf{r}_c^T \mathbf{v}_c^T \mathbf{\theta}^T \mathbf{b}_c \mathbf{f}_c \mathbf{r}_t^T \mathbf{v}_t^T \mathbf{b}_t \mathbf{f}_t \mathbf{a}_b^T \mathbf{\xi}_{gps}^T \right]^T \]

\[ \mathbf{\tilde{y}} = \left[ \rho_{c1} \rho_{c2} \cdots \rho_{cn} \rho_{t1} \rho_{t2} \cdots \rho_{tn} \right]^T \]

The subscript \( n \) denotes the \( n^{th} \) and final visible satellite. The covariance matrix \( \mathbf{Q}_k \), corresponding to the zero mean white process noise, is the same as given for the full state GPS EKF. The measurement covariance matrix, \( \mathbf{R}_k \), is given by the following equation.

\[ \mathbf{R}_k = \sigma_{\rho_{ss}}^2 \mathbf{I}_{n \times n} \]  \( (47) \)

Sequential measurement processing is used. The steady state standard deviation, \( \sigma_{\rho_{ss}} \), is 5 meters. The sensitivity matrix corresponding to measured pseudoranges from the chaser vehicle is given by Equations 43-44 while Equations 45-46 give the sensitivity matrix for pseudorange measurements from the target.

RESULTS

For each Kalman architecture studied, 100 Monte Carlo runs are performed. The sample covariance from the 100 estimation errors is calculated and compared to determine the advantages and disadvantages of using each architecture for relative GPS navigation. The sample covariances shown are the root sum square (RSS) of the three directions (\( x, y, z \)) and are 1\( \sigma \) values. A 75° field of view is assumed for the GPS antennas located on both the chaser and target vehicles. GPS navigation is implemented from when the chaser vehicle is approximately 25 kilometers to approximately 0.5 kilometers from the target vehicle.
Figure 1 provides a comparison of the total sample standard deviation of all four Kalman architectures for the relative position between the two vehicles. The relative position estimate provided by the PV EKF is approximately twice as large as compared to the three pseudorange architectures. The large relative position error is due to the inability of the PV EKF to determine error directionality. Since the PV architecture takes advantage of calculations performed inside the GPS sensors and processes the estimated position and velocity from the GPS sensors, it cannot determine the magnitude of error in each axis. The estimated position and velocity do not provide direct information about which satellites are used to compute the estimates, therefore leading to the inability to assign directionality to the error. Therefore, the specification of position error given for the GPS sensor is assigned to each axis resulting in conservative predicted estimation errors by the estimation error covariance. Calculations similar to those performed inside the GPS sensor can be performed inside the PV architecture to determine error directionality but doing so would nullify one main advantage of the PV EKF which is its simplicity. The relative position estimation error is also higher due to the incapability to remove common pseudorange errors.

![Figure 1. Relative Position RSS Sample Standard Deviation Comparison](image)

The conservatism of the reduced GPS architecture compared to the GPS EKF is visible in Figure 1. The estimation error corresponding to the reduced GPS EKF is always slightly above the GPS EKF estimation error.

Figure 2 gives the RSS of the sample standard deviations for the four architectures corresponding to the relative velocity between the chaser and target vehicles. As is the case with the relative position error, the PV architecture again performs the worst for relative velocity estimation. Error directionality and inability to remove common pseudorange errors again result in the elevated estimation errors. In addition, the conservative nature of the reduced GPS EKF is again apparent when compared to the estimation errors for the GPS architecture. The RGPS architecture performs worse in velocity estimation compared to the two GPS architectures. The worse performance in velocity estimation is attributed to the multipath rich environment modeled. When pseudoranges from common satellites are differenced, common state errors cancel but errors due to multipath and receiver noise do not cancel. Since the multipath is relatively high on the target vehicle due to its assumed complex geometry, the remaining errors on the relative pseudoranges are higher than expected. Currently the uncommon pseudorange errors are modeled as white noise. With the re-
remaining errors being colored, the filter encounters difficulty modeling the elevated colored errors as white errors. As a result, higher values are needed for the measurement covariance matrix contributing to the elevated estimation error in relative velocity. In order to achieve results comparable to the other two pseudorange architectures, additional states are required to estimate the remaining colored noise on the common pseudorange errors. However, by estimating additional states, the computational cost associated with the RGPS EKF increases therefore removing an advantage of the RGPS architecture.
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Figure 2. Relative Velocity RSS Sample Standard Deviation Comparison

CONCLUSIONS

A comparison of four different Kalman filters architectures is provided to further understand the advantages and disadvantages of using each architecture for relative GPS navigation. While the PV filter performs well in absolute state estimation, it lacks in the ability to perform as well as the pseudorange architectures in relative position and velocity estimation. The RGPS EKF is capable of providing small errors in the relative position and velocity between the two vehicle but cannot provide the user with any usable inertial state information. In addition, complications arise in the presence of multipath rich environments. The GPS EKF provides the best overall performance in both inertial and relative state estimation. However, the high complexity of the filter results in the highest computational cost of the four Kalman filters studied. The complexity and computational cost of the reduced GPS EKF are less than the GPS EKF since satellite bookkeeping is avoided and common pseudorange error states are considered instead of estimated. As a result of both the removal of the bookkeeping and common pseudorange error state consideration instead of estimation, the estimation errors are more conservative compared to those of the GPS EKF.
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