

Report on GNSS Training

Course ID: T151-40

Team No: 01

Team Members:

Ali Cherif Abdel Karim (Algeria)

Md. Rownak Islam (Bangladesh)

Ping Jack Soh (Malaysia)

Kritchayan Intarat (Thailand)

Aman Arora (India)

Training held at GIC/AIT, Thailand

6 – 10 JAN 2020

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Team 1	3
1.1. Team Members	3
2.1. Introduction	4
2.2. Methodology of Collection Data	4
2.3. Results	4
2.4. Comparison and Accuracy.....	5
2.5. Conclusion.....	6

1. TEAM 1

1.1. TEAM MEMBERS

Write name, affiliation and e-mail ID of all team members here

1. Ali cherif Abdel Karim, Engineer, Department of Survey, Algeria,

Email: krimotopo@live.fr,

2. Md. Rownak Islam, Center for Resource Development Studies, Dhaka, Bangladesh,

Email: rownakbrac@gmail.com

2. Ping Jack Soh, Associate Professor, UniMAP, Malaysia

Email: sohpingjack@gmail.com

4. kritchana Intarat, Lecturer, Thammasat University, Thailand

Email: intaratt@gmail.com

5. Aman Arora, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India,

Email: aman158911@st.jmi.ac.in

2 REPORT

2.1. INTRODUCTION

- In this GNSS training program, the introduction and scope about GNSS is given to the participants and afterwards the esteemed experts have taught us about the collection and processing of the data.
- Then, the practical work was assigned to the participants for collecting data from various kind of receivers and post processing of the same to make it more precise and accurate.
- Our team has collected Single Point Positioning (SPP) and Real-Time Kinematic (RTK) data from M8T receiver.

2.2. METHODOLOGY OF COLLECTION DATA

Antenna Type: Fixed (Tallysman)

Receiver Type: M8T

Data type: Static

Data processing type: SPP and RTK


Parameters:

Elevation Mask: 10 & 15 degrees

Integer Ambiguity Res: Instantaneous and Continuous


2.3. RESULTS

Results- Comparison of collected data (for M8T @10 Deg. Elev. Mask)




Results- Comparison of collected data (for M8T)

Elv. Mask 10



Elv. Mask 15



2.4. COMPARISON AND ACCURACY

Data	Setting 1				Setting 2	Error (m)		
	Positioning mode	Frequencies	Elevation mask (degree)	Excluded satellites	Integer Ambiguity Res	STD E	STD N	STD U
Team1static2	SPP		10	N/A	N/A	0.864	1.046	4.204
	SPP		15	N/A	N/A	0.922	1.051	4.858

Base and Rover	Setting 1				Setting 2	Position	Error (m)		
	Positioning mode	Frequencies	Elevation mask (degree)	Excluded satellites	Integer Ambiguity Res		STD E	STD N	STD U
UT_NetR9_M8T	Kinematic	L1	10	C	Continuous	Header	0.012	0.027	0.030
		L1	15	C	Continuous	Header	0.015	0.029	0.043
		L1	10	C	Continuous	ECEF	0.011	0.027	0.030
		L1	15	C	Continuous	ECEF	0.014	0.029	0.042
		L1	10	C	Instantaneous	Header	0.581	0.671	1.514
		L1	15	C	Instantaneous	Header	0.624	0.734	1.744

2.5. CONCLUSION

- It has been observed from the results that the best setting for Day 3's measurement is performed using RTK with:
 - 10 degrees elevation mask
 - Continuous integer ambiguity resolution
 - The known position of base station in ECEF format
 - From the results it can be said that the use of SPP and RTK data can be utilized on the basis of the user requirement and application.
- For instance, the SPP data might be useful for Regional to Small Level Land Use Land Cover Mapping while the RTK can be utilized in Mining and Military services, where accuracy and precision are the only requirement.