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GLONASS ambiguity resolution is difficult!

- Diverse frequencies across GLONASS L1/L2 bands
  - Inter-frequency phase biases (i.e. IFPB) at receivers
  - IFPBs don’t cancel after differencing between satellites

Takac et al. Inside GNSS 2009
Aha, inter-frequency biases can be corrected

- IFPBs are linear function of frequency channel numbers
  - IFPBs appear to depend on receiver types/families
  - L1 and L2 signals seem to share identical IFPBs

Sleewaegen et al. Inside GNSS 2012
In fact, it’s differential code-phase bias that matters

- Sleewaegen (2012) found that
  - Differential code-phase biases (DCPBs) are the physical origin of IFPBs
  - DCPBs consist of DSP and hardware induced parts
    - DSP induced DCPBs are fixed values for a specific receiver type
    - Hardware induced DCPBs are negligible for all phase observables

Sleewaegen et al. Inside GNSS 2012
Mysteries of IFPBs/DCPBs

- **Question 1**: Uncertainty of IFPB/DCPB estimates?
- **Question 2**: Receiver type specific IFPBs/DCPBs suffice or not?
- **Question 3**: One IFPB/DCPB for a receiver type suffice or not?

Wanninger Journal of Geodesy 2012
First, a little bit of math for DCPBs

- Pseudorange and carrier-phase have different clocks and hardware biases.
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \Delta P^i_g &= \Delta \rho^i + c \Delta t_P + c \Delta b^i_{P,g} \\
  \Delta L^i_g &= \Delta \rho^i + c \Delta t_L + c \Delta b^i_{L,g} + \lambda_q^i \Delta N^i_q
  \end{align*}
  \]

- Therefore, a common clock assumption results in DCPBs,
  \[
  \Delta L^i_g = \Delta \rho^i + c \Delta t_g + c \Delta B^i_g + \lambda_q^i \Delta N^i_q
  \]

- which consist of DSP and hardware induced parts.
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \Delta B_g &= \Delta B_{DSP} + \Delta B_{HW,g} \\
  \Delta B_{DSP} &= \Delta t_L - \Delta t_P \\
  \Delta B_{HW,g} &= \Delta b_{L,g} - \Delta b_{P,g}
  \end{align*}
  \]

Hardware and observable dependent
In theory, how do DCPBs relate to different observables?

- DSP induced DCPBs $B_{DSP}$
  - is constant for all observables (wide-lane, narrow-lane, etc.)
- Hardware induced DCPBs $B_{HW,g}$
  - is however observable dependent
- In fact, we have for ionosphere-free and wide-lane DCBPs that
  \[ \Delta B_{IF} = 2.53125 \Delta B_1 - 1.53125 \Delta B_2 \]
  \[ \Delta B_w = 4.5 \Delta B_1 - 3.5 \Delta B_2 \]

- Clearly, if $\Delta B_1 = \Delta B_2$
  \[ \Delta B_1 = \Delta B_2 = \Delta B_{IF} = \Delta B_w \]

Is this true?
$\Delta B_{HW,g}$ matters or not, subject to uncertainties of DCPBs

- **How to estimate DCPBs**
  - use wide-lane and narrow-lane ambiguity fixing,
  - but wide-lane fixing can be difficult over baselines of 1000+ km because
    - Melbourne-Wübbena combination doesn’t work and
    - no precise ionosphere data for wide areas can be used

- **Repeatabilities of DCPBs over a long period**
  - The risk is whether DCPBs should be physically stable or not

---

Wanninger Journal of Geodesy 2012
How to estimate DCPBs for a huge network

- An efficient method for huge networks (Banville 2016; Liu et al. 2016)
  - can be applied to a broad/global network of stations
  - use only ionosphere-free ambiguity fixing,
  - though its wavelength is only ~5.3 cm which
    - isn’t a big problem on account of the quality of IGS final orbit products
  - Note that only ionosphere-free DCPBs can be estimated

- We compare these DCPB estimates with those from ultra-short baseline solutions
  - DCPBs from ultra-short baseline solutions are easily achievable and presumed as benchmarks
  - We can take this to assess the accuracy of DCPBs
Data and processing

- 212 days of data in 2015
- 200 stations involved
  - DCPBs for ionosphere-free observables are estimated in a network solution
- 10 ultra-short baselines (<210m) across Europe
  - DCPBs on L1 and L2 are directly estimated
Uncertainties of DCPBs

- 0.7 ns (RMS) for ionosphere-free DCPBs against L1/L2 DCPBs
- L1/L2 DCPBs can be quite different
  - DCPBs are actually observable dependent
- DCPBs vary with time which can be significant
  - Repeatabilities will then be problematic to quantify DCPB precisions
DCPBs specific to receiver types or stations?

- DCPBs can be quite different among the same types of receivers by up to 30 ns
  
  - These differences are statistically significant
  - The differences are subject to not only receiver types, but also antennas, domes, firmware, etc.
How will the “30 ns” affect ambiguity resolution?

- Biases on ambiguities in cycles due to DCPB:

\[ \xi_g = \Delta B_g (h^i - h^j) \Delta f_q \]

Channel number difference (at most 13)

\[
\begin{align*}
\xi_1 & \rightarrow 0.22 \text{ cycle} \\
\xi_2 & \rightarrow 0.17 \text{ cycle} \\
\xi_w & \rightarrow 0.05 \text{ cycle} \\
\xi_n & \rightarrow 0.39 \text{ cycle} \\
\xi_{en} & \rightarrow 0.78 \text{ cycle}
\end{align*}
\]

Wide-lane is little affected while ionosphere-free is most.
Which observable specific DCPBs to provide for users?

- DCPBs on L1 and L2 signals can differ by up to 10 ns
  - What if we use L1 DCPBs for ionosphere-free ambiguity resolution?
- Ionosphere-free DCPBs are preferred
  - High efficiency to compute
  - L1, L2 and wide-lane are more resistant to DCPB errors
Implications to IGS Bias-SINEX products

- DCPBs of sub-ns accuracy can be achieved over a large network by efficiently resolving ionosphere-free ambiguities;
- DCPBs should be estimated and applied on account of their station and observable specific properties, especially for ambiguities of short wavelengths.
  - DCPBs can differ significantly by up to 30 ns for the same types of receivers
  - Provide both L1 and L2 DCPBs if possible, otherwise ionosphere-free DCPBs are preferred. Their difference can be up to 10 ns
- More details and interesting aspects refer to
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