# **A PVT Estimation for the ERTMS Train Control Systems in presence of Multiple Tracks**

A. Neri<sup>1</sup>, A.M. Vegni<sup>1</sup>, and F. Rispoli<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> RADIOLABS, Rome Italy, {*alessandro.neri*, *annamaria.vegni*}*@radiolabs.it* <sup>2</sup> Ansaldo STS , Genoa Italy, *francesco.rispoli@ansaldo-sts.com*

**BIOGRAPHIES**<br>**Alessandro NERI** is **Alessandro NERI** is Full Professor in Telecommunications at the Engineering Department of the University of ROMA TRE. In 1977 he received the Doctoral Degree in Electronic Engineering from the University of Rome "Sapienza". In 1978 he joined the Research and Development Department of Contraves Italiana S.p.A. where he gained a specific expertise in the field of radar signal processing and in applied detection and estimation theory, becoming the chief of the advanced systems group. In 1987 he joined the INFOCOM Department of the University of Rome "Sapienza" as Associate Professor in Signal and Information Theory. In November 1992 he joined the Electronic Engineering Department of the University of Roma TRE as Associate Professor in Electrical Communications, and became full professor in Telecommunications in September 2001. His research activity has mainly been focused on information theory, signal theory, and signal and image processing and their applications to both telecommunications systems and remote sensing.

Since December 2008, Prof. Neri is the President of the RadioLabs Consortium, a non-profit Consortium created in 2001 to promote tight cooperation on applied research programs between universities and industries.

**Anna Maria VEGNI** is Assistant Professor in Telecommunications at the Department of Engineering of University of Roma Tre, Rome, Italy. She received the Ph.D. degree in Biomedical Engineering, Electromagnetics and Telecommunications from University of Roma TRE in 2010.

From May 2009 to October 2009, she was a visiting scholar in the Multimedia Communication Laboratory, at the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Boston University, Boston, MA. Her research activity is focusing on vehicular networking, indoor and outdoor localization, GNSS and Visible Light Communications. Since 2011, she is in charge of Telecommunications Networks Laboratory course at Roma Tre University.

**Francesco RISPOLI** is responsible for the Satellite and Telecommunication projects in Ansaldo STS since 2011. Previously, he has been with Telespazio (2005-2011) as

chief of the New Initiatives for strategic projectson telemedicine, emergency telecommunications, broadband internet on trains and satellite-based train control systems. By 1983 to 2005 he was with Alenia Spazio (now Thales Alenia Space) where he served various positions as responsible for R&D and institutional programs, vice president of multimedia business unit, general manager of the EuroSkyWay newco for broadband service provisioning. He has been a co-founder of the Telbios company for telemedicine services and member of the its management board. He started his carier in 1980 with Contraves Italiana S.p.A. as technical engineer in the antenna department. In 1978 he received the Doctoral Degree in Electronic Engineering fromt the Polytechnic of Turin. In 1980 he has achieved a Master in Applied Electromagnetism from the University La Sapienza in Roma.

### **ABSTRACT**

GNSS has been recognized a strategic asset for favoring the evolution of the modern railways signaling systems that play a major role to prevent accidents due to human errors. The European ERTMS-ETCS train control system has already envisaged the utilization of GNSS for supporting the odometry function in its evolving path to provide cost-effective solutions for the low traffic lines and, more in general, for those lines which are in semi desert areas where it is imperative to limit the wayside equipment along the line.  $\therefore$ 

The main challenge for the introduction of GNSS-based localization systems on the train signaling systems is to guarantee the same safety levels of the current systems based on wayside equipment (balyse) to estimate the exact train position and the rail where the train is travelling. This latter requirement is at least one order of magnitude more stringent respect to the determination of the train position along the track and, for that reason it requires today the support of the train driver who has to confirm in which rail the train is located. Based on these requirements and since the GNSS constellations are rapidly evolving towards a redundant and resilient global infrastructure, we have developed a novel multi constellation PVT algorithm for train localization

determination, specifically designed to handle the case of multiple track scenarios. This solution is driven by the requirements of the ERTMS-ETCS train control system and compliant with the SIL-4 safety requirements of CENELEC railways norms *i.e.*, Tolerable Hazard Rate  $(THR)$ ,  $10^{-9} \leq THR \leq 10^{-8}$ .

To meet the SIL 4 requirements, we adopted a GNSS architecture comprising of a dedicated integrity monitoring and augmentation network, as well as the use of multi-constellation receivers.

The PVT algorithm estimates the train location by explicitly accounting for the fact that the train is constrained to lie on a railway track. Basically, exploiting this constraint allows to estimate train location even when only two satellites are in view. Effective reduction in the number of required satellites to make a fix, when track constraint is applied, depends on the track-satellite geometry. In essence, satellites aligned along the track give more information than those at the cross-over. By implementing this technique, the satellites in excess are taken into consideration for the elaboration of the PVT only to achieve the desired accuracy, integrity and availability specifically for the rail application.

In this paper, we address the problem of PVT estimation of the train in presence of multiple tracks. This can be formulated as a combination of hypothesis testing (*i.e.*, which is the current track where the train lies on, or, better, which is the probability of a train lying on a given track?) and parameter estimation (i.e. given a track, which is the curvilinear abscissa of the train receiver?).

A detailed description of the overall PVT process is given. The performance of the track detector versus intertrack distance, observation time duration, signal-to-noise ratio and observables (*i.e.*, pseudoranges and carrier phase) are discussed. Then, the impact of satellite failures on the PVT error magnitude and track detection is exploited. Finally, the assessment of the performance is also provided by means of simulation results making use of both synthetic data (Monte Carlo simulations), and measures recorded on a railway test bed environment as a part of the 3InSat project co-funded by the European Space Agency (ESA) in the framework of the ARTES 20 programme.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Modern signaling systems play a major role to provide automatic train protection (ATP) to prevent accidents due to human errors. The deployment of the European radio based signaling train control system, ERTMS-ETCS, mainly for the high speed lines is contributing to a *defacto* global standard in terms of both interoperability among different national systems and for the highest safety level achieved. On the other hands the development of the GALILEO system in Europe has also contributed to the study of safety of life applications for rail [1].

A synergy between GALILEO and ERTMS-ETCS is now becoming a reality since the signature of the new Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for the evolution of the ERTMS-ETCS that has envisaged the adoption of the GNSS to improve its competitiveness in the global market and for the local and regional lines. However, the main challenge in the adoption of GNSS-based Location Determination Systems (LDS) is constituted by the information integrity imposed by the safety requirements of the railways specifications that is generally different and more stringent of the integrity requirement specified by the aeronautical scenario.

In the ERTMS-ETCS system, the Hazardous Failure Rate (HFR) during 1 hour of operation shall be less than  $10^{-9}$ for SIL-4 compliant systems. It implies that the probability that the magnitude of the error of the position provided by the LDS shall not exceed the Alarm Level (*AL*), that is the maximum allowed error, while this event is not detected by the Integrity Monitoring algorithm (e.g. protection Level *PL*<*AL*), has to be in principle less than  $2 \cdot 10^{-13}$ . However the ETCS platform can mitigate some risks relevant to the detection of the virtual balyses that represent the points along the line where the PVT is estimated.

To reach the challenging SIL 4 target, we propose a LDS architecture, which considers (*i*) a multi-constellation capability to manage both accuracy, availability and redundancy, (*ii*) the deployment of a Track Area Augmentation and Integrity Monitoring Network with very high availability, and (*iii*) an independent on-board capability to further mitigate GNSS errors, and autonomously assess the GNSS location integrity, when augmentation data are unavailable.

The Augmentation Network includes a Ranging & Autonomous Integrity Monitoring (RAIM) reference stations, co-located with selected communications base stations for the purpose of integrity monitoring, accuracy improvement of satellite-based position, and for providing correction to mobile receivers. Each reference station has an LDS Safety Server, to elaborate the corrections and to detect systematic satellite faults. Finally, to enhance the systematic satellite fault detection capabilities, the outputs from reference stations are jointly processed by a Track Area LDS Safety (TALS) server.

Railways applications are referred as safety-related systems, a sub case of the well known safety-of-life GNSS application and they requires a higher performance

especially in terms of availability, continuity, integrity and accuracy. Conventional, stand-alone, GPS systems are unable to provide the positioning information with an error bounded by a protection level compliant with the safety requirements of railways applications. On the other hands, recent developments of GNSS prove to be inspiring for safety-of-life applications: for instance, modernized GNSS signals are broadcast with increased power and enhanced characteristics for multipath mitigation, while the presence of multiple constellations may potentially increase the overall availability along a rail line.

To meet the SIL-4 requirements, we believe that a GNSS system characterized by a dedicated integrity monitoring and augmentation network and by the use of multi constellation receivers offers in perspective an higher degree of flexibility. More in detail, in our system, the train is equipped with the GNSS Location Determination System On-Board Unit (LDS OBU), which provides the PVT estimate to the existing train odometry system. Each GNSS LDS OBU is equipped with (*i*) two GNSS receivers, (*ii*) a local processor performing the PVT estimation starting from local measures, (*iii*) a track Data Base and the augmentation data received from a Track Area LDS Safety (TALS) server, and (*iv*) a communication module.

The PVT algorithm estimates the train location by explicitly accounting for the fact that the train is constrained to lie on a railway track. Basically, by exploiting this constraint it is possible to estimate the train location even when only two satellites are in view. Effective reduction in the number of required satellites to make a fix, when track constraint is applied, depends on the track-satellite geometry. In essence, satellites aligned along the track give more information than those at the cross-over. Satellites in excess can then be employed either to increase accuracy or to increase integrity and availability. In [2], we presented a SIL-4 solution for PVT train estimation, for the single-track scenarios. However, in multiple-track scenarios, the ERTMS-ETCS also requires track discrimination. This is far more challenging than PVT estimation alone, due to the fact that inter-track separation is rather smaller compared to the confidence error allowed for localizing the train along the same track. As a matter of fact, the cross-track protection level (*i.e.*, 1.5 m) is one order of magnitude lower than the along track protection level (*i.e.*, 15 m). These aspects concerning the adoption of GNSS for railway signalling and train control for the migration from aviation risk to hazard rate and safety integrity level, and the dependability assessment of Satellite Based Augmentation System for Signalling and Train Control are discussed in detail in [3], [4]. While, respectively, in [6] and [7] the Galileo Integrity Concept and the GBAS Integrity for non-aviation users are provided.

Here we present a novel algorithm that combines single track PVT estimate with track detection. In particular, for each candidate track, we estimate the curvilinear abscissa of the receiver by means of a Weighted Least Square Estimator (WLSE), assuming that the corresponding hypothesis is true. Then, we compute the measurement residuals conditioned to each hypothesis and from them the *a posteriori* probability of each track.

All those a posteriori probabilities can be combined in a generalized log-likelihood ratio tests to detect the current track. In fact, assuming that the hypotheses are uniformly distributed, the Bayesian (optimal) track detection rule selects the hypothesis corresponding to the largest of them. However, to reach track error probabilities compatible with the SIL 4 requirement, multiple observations have to be combined. Since the generalized log-likelihood ratio magnitudes provide information about the reliability of each hypothesis, their values are compared to thresholds to verify that enough information has been acquired before a decision on which track the train is lying on is transmitted to the ATP processor.

For each track, the conditional PVT estimate is computed by solving a set of non-linear equations relating the observables (*e.g.* pseudoranges and carrier phases) to the receiver curvilinear abscissa and clock offset, by means of an iterative Weighted Least Square Error (WLSE) procedure, accounting for the different statistics of the equivalent measurement noise, due to both satellite elevation and signal characteristics specific of each constellation.

This paper is organized as follows. We briefly recall the LDS architecture used in our model, as previously described in [2]. The LDS algorithm for PVT train estimation is then illustrated, first for the case of single track estimation, and then for the multi-track case. Simulation results are then shown in order to assess the effectiveness of the PVT technique. Finally, conclusions are drawn at the end of the paper.

# **II. LDS ARCHITECTURE**

In order to fulfill the basic SIL 4 requirement four basic criteria have been considered in designing the architecture of the GNSS based train LDS system:

- 1) exploitation of multiple constellations, in order to increase both system integrity and availability;
- 2) use of wide area augmentation systems like WAAS and EGNOS, where available, for accuracy and precision increase, as well as integrity monitoring. These networks should be updated in future in order to meet specific railway needs and assure the interoperability with different localization systems;
- 3) deployment of a dedicated Augmentation and Integrity Monitoring Network, co-located with a set of TLC base stations, in regions not served by augmentation networks fulfilling the railway requirements;
- 4) independent on-board capability to mitigate GNSS errors, and autonomously assess the GNSS location integrity.

Considering that satellite ephemerides and clock errors, as well as anomalous propagation conditions in ionosphere and troposphere represent the most relevant sources of hazard for the LDS, adoption of a Ranging and Integrity Monitoring network plays a major role in preventing that any Hazardous Misleading Information may be provided by the On Board LDS unit, without a timely warning.

In fact, processing of satellite signals received at known locations allows to estimating the error sources, which affect train positioning, as well as to detecting eventual GNSS, and more in general Signal In Space (SIS) faults. Compared to actual EGNOS, supporting SIL 4 compliant railway applications may require the deployment of spatially denser RIM stations. On the other hand, to increase SIS availability, the wireless network employed for train signaling is also used for distributing augmentation and integrity information to the LDS OBUs. Thus, since integrity should be assessed for any visible constellation, the RIMs shall adopt multi-constellation receivers. As a matter of fact, the Dilution of Precision (DoP) associated to the estimation the current train location strictly depends on the number of visible satellites, as well as on their line of sight geometry. Use of a multi-constellation receiver reduces the need of higher number of visible satellites that results highly redundant. As a consequence, the DoP decreases.

The on-board LDS comprises a dual-path GPS receiver integrated with a SIL-4 processor board. The LDS on board component is a self-contained unit that connects to the ATP, the antennas, and the locomotive power supply.

Each reference station has an LDS Safety Server based on the same SIL-4 system, as the mobile LDS On Board units, but configured to provide correction services and detect systemic satellite faults.

In order to enhance the systemic satellite fault detection capabilities, as well as to detect eventual faults of the regional LDS Safety Servers, their outputs are jointly processed by a Track Area LDS Safety (TALS) server. Such architecture allows improving the correction function of classical differential GPS systems and mitigating the risk of failure relevant to the GPS reference stations.

As depicted in Figure 1 the LDS system architecture is structured in a modular way. The overall system comprises three sub-systems:

- 1) RIM Reference Stations (RS);
- 2) TALS Server;
- 3) On Board Unit (OBU).

In particular, the set of RSs with RIM functionalities, distributed along the railway, and TALS server constitutes the Augmented and Integrity Monitoring Network (AIMN).

The Augmentation and Integrity Monitoring Network (AIMN) is based on two sub-systems *i.e.*, (*i*) the RIM Stations, and (*ii*) TALS server. It provides the differential corrections to be applied to the GNSS LDS OBU for compensating for the effects produced by satellite ephemerides and clock offset errors, as well as the variation in the propagation delay introduced by

ionosphere and troposphere, and in addition AIMN monitors SIS integrity.



Figure 1. LDS overall architecture. Legend: Signal In Space (*red lines*), RS to TALS application protocol (*blue lines*), and TALS to OBU application protocol (*green line*).

Finally, the GNSS LDS OBU provides PVT estimates, as well as an indication of their accuracy. Each RIM RS is equipped with:

- *i.* independent GNSS receiving chains;
- *ii.* a local processing facility, denoted in the following as LDS Safety Server;
- *iii.* a communication module.

The pseudoranges provided by each RIM station are jointly processed by a central processing facility, named in the following as TALS server, that (*i*) monitors the integrity of the received SISs, then evaluating the health status of each satellite, and providing an estimate of the error sources statistics, and (*ii*) estimate the differential corrections to be applied by each GNSS LDS OBU.

**Table 1. RIM RS, TALS, and OBU Functionalities.**

<b>RIM RS</b>	<b>TALS</b>	OBU
Signal-In-Space	TALS Server	Signal-In-Space
Receive and	RIM RS Data	Receive and
Decode	Exchange	Decode
Pseudorange	<b>GNSS</b>	Pseudorange
Residual	Navigation Data	Residual
Computation	Quality	Computation
	Monitoring	
<b>GNSS</b>	Differential	<b>GNSS</b>
Measurement	Corrections	Measurement
Consistency	Computation	Consistency
Check		Check
Pseudorange	SIS Fault	<b>PVT</b> Estimation
Residual	Detection &	
Combination	Integrity	
	Assessment	
<b>RIM RS TALS</b>	TALS Server	Autonomous
Server Data	GNSS LDS OBU	Integrity
	Data Exchange	Monitoring



Finally, The GNSS LDS OBU will provide the PVT estimate and the confidence interval to the existing localization system.

Each GNSS LDS OBU is equipped with (*i*) independent GNSS receivers, (*ii*) a local processor performing the PVT estimation starting from local measures, the Track DB and augmentation data received from the TALS server, and (*iii*) a track database (Track DB).

#### **III. SINGLE TRACK PVT ESTIMATION**

In this section, we present the weighted least square PVT estimation for train positioning, under the constraint of lying on a single railway track.

From a mathematical point of view, track constraint can be imposed by observing that the train location at a given time *t* is completely determined by the knowledge of its distance from one head end, *i.e.*, by the curvilinear abscissas defined on the geo referenced railway track. Let  $s(t)$  be the curvilinear abscissa of a train reference point, like the center of the antenna of the GNSS receiver, when the GNSS pseudoranges at time are is measured. Without loss of generality, we refer here the train reference point to the ECEF frame. Thus subscripts 1, 2, 3 will identify the corresponding coordinates. Incidentally, we observe, that since we are measuring ranges (or pseudo-ranges) and the Euclidean L2 norm is invariant with respect to changes of orthonormal basis, the measurement equations can be equivalently expressed in any orthonormal basis. single railway track.<br>
(by train positioning, under the constraint of  $\alpha$  citimation algorithm generation of the constraint of  $\alpha$  citimation algorithm generation by observing that the train location at a given<br>
simple s section, we present the weighted least square PVT<br> **Train Access**<br>
an asingle railway track.<br>
an asingle railway track constraint of<br>
an asingle railway track constraint control to estimation algorithm genera<br>
an asingl atical point of view, track constraint can<br>
be the rain location at given be the constraint can<br>
be the text of compactness in the following we drop<br>
celeby determined by the convoltage of its<br>
level end end, i.e., by the or train positioning, under the constraint of<br>
or Early on the stream in oscience the mall noise and eventual radio<br>
by observing that the train location at a given<br>
by observing that the train location at a given<br>
prophe of generality, we refer here the train reference point<br>
of  $\mathbf{F}^{\text{ram}}$  (*K*) =  $\mathbf{F}^{\text{ram}}$  (*K*) = **i** is extended to the interaction of the extraction of the interaction of the state of the prediction of the state o

Then, observing that the Cartesian coordinates) of that point are described by the parametric equations

$$
\mathbf{X}^{Train}(t) = \mathbf{X}^{Train}\left\{s(t)\right\} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{Train}\left[s(t)\right] & \mathbf{x}_2^{Train}\left[s(t)\right] & \mathbf{x}_3^{Train}\left[s(t)\right] \end{bmatrix}^T \quad (1)
$$

the pseudoranges measured by the GNSS receiver can be directly expressed in term of the unknown curvilinear abscissa, also denote in the following as the *train mileage*. In fact, the pseudo-range  $\rho_i(k)$  of the *i*-th satellite measured by the OBU GNSS receiver can be written as follows **Example Solution and Solution and Solution**<br> **Example Solution** and Solution  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{train}}(t) = \mathbf{X}^{\text{train}}[s(t)]$   $\mathbf{x}^{\text{train}}_1[s(t)]$   $\mathbf{x}^{\text{train}}_2[s(t)]$   $\mathbf{x}^{\text{train}}_3[s(t)]$  (1)  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{train}}_1[s(t)]$  (1) differential corrections);<br>  $\epsilon_{\text{A/k}} = \left[ \mathbf{x}^{\text{train}}_1[s(t)] + \mathbf{x}^{\text{train}}_2[s(t)] \right]$  (1) differential correc *I*  $\Lambda E_i^{\text{max}}(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k$ (1) =  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$   $\epsilon$ <sup>1</sup>/<sub>*sat<sub>p</sub>*  $\alpha$ </sup>  $\epsilon$  **L**<sup>*T<sub>i</sub>m*</sub>  $\epsilon$  **L**<sub>*I*</sub><sup>*s*</sup> and estimate the continuous of the </sub></sup>  $\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} x_i^{max}[\mathbf{s}(t)] & x_i^{sum}[\mathbf{s}(t)] & x_i^{sum}[\mathbf{s}(t)] \end{bmatrix}^T & (1) & \text{differential correct} \\ & \text{preudoranges measured by the GNSS receiver can be} & \text{to that such as } \\ & \text{fact, the pseudo-range } \rho(\mathbf{k}) \text{ of the } i\text{-th satellite} \\ & \text{first, the pseudo-range } \rho(\mathbf{k}) \text{ of the } i\text{-th satellite} \\ & \text{source by the OBU GNSS receiver can be written as} \end{aligned} & \begin{aligned} & \text{for } i\text{-th satellite} \\ & \text{first, the$ 

$$
\rho_i(k) = \left\| \mathbf{X}_i^{Sat} \left[ T_i^{Sat}(k) \right] - \mathbf{X}^{Train} \left[ s(T_i^{Train}(k)) \right] \right\| +
$$
  
+  $c \Delta \tau_i^{ion}(k) + c \Delta \tau_i^{top}(k) + c \delta t^{Train}(k) +$   
+  $n_i^{Train}(k) - c \delta t_i^{Sat}(k)$  (2)

where

- $T_i^{Sat}(k)$  is the time instant on which the signal of the *k*-th epoch is transmitted from the *i*-th satellite;
- satellite at time  $T_i^{Sat}(k)$ ;
- $\Delta \tau_i^{ion}(k)$  is the ionospheric incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS

receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral atmosphere;

- receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>atmosphere;<br>
  $\Delta \tau_i^{top}(k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay<br>
along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS<br>
receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>
a  $\Delta \tau_i^{trop}(k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral atmosphere; receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>atmosphere;<br>  $\Delta \tau_i^{top}(k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay<br>
along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS<br>
receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>
atm receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>atmosphere;<br> $\Delta \tau_i^{trap}(k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay<br>along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS<br>receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>atmosph receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>atmosphere;<br>
•  $\Delta \tau_i^{rrop}(k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay<br>
along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS<br>
receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br>
- $\delta t_i^{Sat}(k)$  is the offset of the *i*-th satellite clock for the *k*-th epoch;
- $T_i^{Train}(k)$  is the time instant of reception by the OBU GNSS receiver of the signal of the *k*-th epoch transmitted by the *i*-th satellite;
- 
- **Examplerion**:<br> **Exampleries:**<br> **CA**<sub>*i<sup>rom</sup></sub>(<i>k*) is the tropospheric incremental delay<br> **CA**<sub>*irom*</sub>(*k*) is the tropospheric incremental delay<br> **CA**<sub>*i*</sub><sup>*Cm*</sup>(*k*) is the offset of the *i*-th satellite clock for<br> **CA**</sub> receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br> *i*  $\Delta \tau_i^{prop}(k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay<br> *i*  $\Delta \tau_i^{prop}(k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay<br>
receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral<br> *i n* i estimation algorithm generated by multipath, GNSS receiver thermal noise and eventual radio frequency interference.  $t^{Train}(k)$  is the OBU receiver clock offset;<br> *Satin*  $(t)$  is the error of the time of arrival<br>
timation algorithm generated by multipath,<br>
NSS receiver thermal noise and eventual radio<br>
equency interference.<br>
2 of compactn

For sake of compactness in the following we drop temporal dependence on the epoch index.

A similar equation can be written for carrier phase tracking.

Let:

- $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i^{Sat}$   $\lceil T_i^{Sat} \rceil$  be the coordinate vector of the *i*-th  $\Delta \tau_i^{imp} (k)$  is the tropospheric incremental delay<br>along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS<br>atmosphere;<br> $\delta \tau_i^{imp} (k)$  is the offset of the *i*-th satellite clock for<br>the *k*-th epoch;<br> $\tau_i^{pump} (k)$  is the offs satellite estimated on the basis of the broadcasted navigation data and eventual SBAS data where available;
- mg coordinates. Incidentally, we observe,<br>
any ign to pread to predict and eventual SBAS data who<br>
in an 1.2 norm is invariant with respect to<br>
normal basis, the measurement equations<br>
or  $\Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{\text{Ssc}} \left[T_i^{\text{Ssc}}\right]$  b **EVALUATION (***i* is the transition), we have the transition of the branching coordinates. Incidentially, we observe point and eventual SBAS data when we are measuring roothines. Incidentially, we observe the differentia Continue is invariant with respect to  $\Delta \beta_i^{sw}$   $\left[T_i^{sw} \Delta t\right]$  and the signal basis, the measurement equations<br>  $\{s(t)\}$  =  $x_i^{Tmin}\{s(t)\}$   $x_i^{Tmin}\{s(t)\}$  (1)  $\{s(t)\}$  and  $s(t)$  and  $s(t)$  and  $s(t)$  and  $s(t)$  and  $s(t)$  are cordinates. Inclouding we observe,<br>  $\lim_{\epsilon_1} f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ \pi x^{(n)} + \epsilon_0 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_1 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_2 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_3 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_4 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_5 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_6 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_7 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_8 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_7 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_8 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_9 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_9 x^{(n)} + \epsilon_9 x^{(n)} + \epsilon$  $\Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Sat}$   $T_i^{Sat}$  be the component of the differential  $\delta t_r^{sat}(k)$  is the offset of the *i*-th satellite clock for<br>the *k*-th epoch;<br> $T_r^{Tram}(k)$  is the time instant of reception by the<br>DBU GNSS receiver of the signal of the *k*-th<br>pepoch transmitted by the *i*-th satellite;<br> $\$ correction related to the ephemerides error of the *i*th satellite provided by the TALS server (although TALS server may provide an overall correction, it can always be modeled as the sum of individual corrections);  $n_i^{train}(k)$  is the error of the time of arrival<br>estimation algorithm generated by multipath,<br>GNSS receiver thermal noise and eventual radio<br>frequency interference.<br>ke of compactness in the following we drop<br>idependence on t n the epoch index.<br>
an be written for carrier phase<br>
the coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>
ed on the basis of the broadcasted<br>
and eventual SBAS data where<br>
the component of the differential<br>
d to the ephemerides error of e coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>
on the basis of the broadcasted<br>
and eventual SBAS data where<br>
ne component of the differential<br>
to the ephemerides error of the *i*-<br>
ed by the TALS server (although<br>
provide an overall *Sat*  $\int$  be the component of the differential<br>in related to the ephemerides error of the *i*-<br>te provided by the TALS server (although<br>erver may provide an overall correction, it<br>sys be modeled as the sum of individual<br> <sup>*sat*</sup>  $\int$  be the component of the differential<br>in related to the ephemerides error of the *i*-<br>te provided by the TALS server (although<br>errver may provide an overall correction, it<br>ays be modeled as the sum of individu ince on the epoch index.<br>
ion can be written for carrier phase<br>
be the coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>
timated on the basis of the broadcasted<br>
data and eventual SBAS data where<br>
<br>
] be the component of the differential<br> the coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>ated on the basis of the broadcasted<br>ta and eventual SBAS data where<br>be the component of the differential<br>the to the ephemerides error of the *i*-<br>byided by the TALS server (although<br>ma mpactness in the following we drop<br>nonce on the epoch index.<br>
be the coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>
timated on the basis of the broadcasted<br>
data and eventual SBAS data where<br>
<br>
] be the component of the differential<br>
r endence on the epoch index.<br>
quation can be written for carrier phase<br>  $T_s^{\text{Sur}}$  be the coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>
te estimated on the basis of the broadcasted<br>
ble;<br>  $[T_i^{\text{Sur}}]$  be the component of the differentia endence on the epoch index.<br>
quation can be written for carrier phase<br>  $\int \frac{\sqrt{2}u}{u^2} du$  be the coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>
estimated on the basis of the broadcasted<br>
tion data and eventual SBAS data where<br>  $\int P_t^{\sin$ **113.1** be the coordinate vector of the *i*-th estimated on the basis of the broadcasted<br>  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}$ <br>  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be the component of the differential<br>  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be the component of the differential<br>  $\sum_{n=1}^$ **j** be the coordinate vector of the *i*-th<br>estimated on the basis of the broadcasted<br>on data and eventual SBAS data where<br> $\left[\sum_{s=1}^{S_M} \frac{1}{s} \right]$  be the component of the differential<br>in related to the ephemerides error **Example 1**<br> **EXEMPE 12**<br> **EXEMPE 12**<br>
	- $\varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\rho}_{i}^{Sat}} \left[ T_i^{Sat} \right]$  be the res differential corrections of the ephemerides error of the i-th satellite provided by the TALS server;

so that we can write:

S server may provide an overall correction, it always be modeled as the sum of individual  
sections);  
\n
$$
\[T_i^{Sat}\]
$$
 be the residual estimation error of the  
rential corrections of the ephemerides error of  
th satellite provided by the TALS server;  
\nan write:  
\n
$$
\|\mathbf{X}_i^{Sat}[T_i^{Sat}(k)] - \mathbf{X}^{Train}[s(T_i^{Train}(k))] \| =
$$
\n
$$
= \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i^{Sat}[T_i^{Sat}(k)] - \mathbf{X}^{Train}[s(T_i^{Train}(k))] \| +
$$
\n
$$
+ \Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Sat}[T_i^{Sat}] + \varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Sat}}[T_i^{Sat}]
$$
\n(3)  
\nlet:  
\n
$$
T_i^{M_i}(k)
$$
 be the component of the differential

In addition, let:

- $\cdot$   $\Delta \hat{\tau}^{ion}_{i}(k)$  be the component of the differential correction related to estimated ionospheric incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral atmosphere;
- correction related to the ephemerides error of the *i*-<br>th satellite provided by the TALS server (although<br>TALS server may provide an overall correction, it<br>can always be modeled as the sum of individual<br>corrections);<br> $\epsilon$  $\Delta \hat{\tau}^{trop}_{i}(k)$  be the component of the differential correction related to estimated tropospheric incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral atmosphere;
- $\varepsilon_{\hat{t}_i^{ion}}$  be the estimation error of the ionospheric

incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral atmosphere;

- $\varepsilon_{\hat{t}^{prop}_{i}}$  be the estimation error of the tropospheric incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch w.r.t. the neutral atmosphere;
- 

$$
n_i^{Train}(k) = n_i^{Train,Mp}(k) + n_i^{Train,Rx}(k) + n_i^{Train,RFI}(4)
$$

where

- $\circ$   $n_i^{Train,Mp}(k)$  is the measurement error due to multipaths from the *i*-th satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch;
- $\circ$   $n_i^{Train,Rx}(k)$  is the measurement error due to the thermal plus the internal receiver noise affecting the signal received from the *i*-th satellite for the *k*-th epoch; *n*<sup>Train</sup>(*k*) = *n*<sup>Train,*Mp*</sup>(*k*) + *n*<sup>Train,*Rx*</sup>(*k*) + *n*<sup>Train,*RFI*</sup> (4)<br>
here<br>  $n_i^{Train,Mp}(k)$  is the measurement error due to<br>
multipaths from the *i*-th satellite to the<br>
GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch;<br>  $n$
- radio frequency interference affecting the signal received from the *i*-th satellite for the *k*-th epoch
- $\circ$
- $\delta \hat{t}_i^{Sat}$  be the component of the differential correction related to estimated offset of the *i*-th satellite clock provided by the TALS server;
- $\varepsilon_{\delta \hat{i}^{Sat}_i}$  be estimation error of the offset of the *i*-th satellite clock for the *k*-th epoch, so that we can write Exerce the *i*-th satellite for the<br> **i** and the *i*-th satellite for the<br> **i** component of the differential<br> **ii** Ta<br> **iii** Ta<br> **iii** Ta<br> **iii** Ta<br> **iii** Ta<br> **iii** Ta

$$
\delta t_i^{Sat} = \delta \hat{t}_i^{Sat} + \varepsilon_{\delta \hat{t}_i^{Sat}}.
$$
 (5)

Therefore, for the pseudorange expression, we can write  $||\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}} g_{at}||_{\mathbf{w}}$   $\mathbf{x}_{at}$   $\mathbf{w}$   $\mathbf{y}_{cat}$   $\mathbf{w}$   $\mathbf{y}_{cat}$   $\mathbf{w}$   $\mathbf{y}_{cat}$ 

and in the *i*-th satellite of the *i*-th satellite for the *x*-th epoch  
\n*α<sub>i</sub>*  
\n*δ<sub>i</sub>*<sup>5*i*</sup> to the *i*-th satellite for the *k*-th epoch  
\n*δ<sub>i</sub>*<sup>5*i*</sup> to the *i*-th satellite for the *k*-th population  
\nconvection related to estimated offset of the *i*-th  
\nstatellite clock provided by the TALS server;  
\n*δ<sub>δ<sub>i</sub></sub>*<sup>5*α<sub>i</sub>*</sup> be estimation error of the offset of the *i*-th  
\nsatellite clock for the *k*-th epoch, so that we can write  
\n
$$
\delta t_i^{5*α*} = δ t_i^{5*α*} = δ
$$

Denoting with  $\delta \hat{\rho}^{Diff}_i$  the overall differential correction provided by the Augmentation and Integrity Monitoring

$$
\delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Dijf} = \Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Sat} + c\Delta \hat{\tau}_i^{ion} + c\Delta \hat{\tau}_i^{trop} - c\delta \hat{\tau}_i^{Sat},\tag{7}
$$

we finally obtain

Denoting with 
$$
\delta \hat{\rho}_i^{UU}
$$
 the overall differential correction  
\nprovided by the Augmentation and Integrity Monitoring  
\nNetwork as  
\n
$$
\delta \hat{\rho}_i^{DiU} = \Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Sat} + c\Delta \hat{\tau}_i^{ion} + c\Delta \hat{\tau}_i^{cop} - c\delta \hat{\tau}_i^{Sat},
$$
\n
$$
\rho_i - \delta \hat{\rho}_i^{DiU} = \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_i^{Sat} \left[ T_i^{Sat} \right] - \mathbf{X}^{Train} \left[ s(T_i^{Train}) \right] \right\| + c\delta t^{Train} +
$$
\nthe correct  
\n
$$
n_i = c\varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Sat}} + c\varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\tau}_i^{ion}} + c\varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\tau}_i^{top}} - c\varepsilon_{\delta \hat{\tau}_i^{Sat}} + n_i^{Train}.
$$
\n(9) where **z**

with

$$
n_{i} = c\varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\rho}_{i}^{Sat}} + c\varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\tau}_{i}^{ion}} + c\varepsilon_{\Delta \hat{\tau}_{i}^{prop}} - c\varepsilon_{\delta \hat{\tau}_{i}^{Sat}} + n_{i}^{Train}.\tag{9}
$$

incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch<br>
satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch<br>
expansion around an initial track complemental delay along the pa incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
is atellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch<br>
iterative procedure based on the<br> *i*-th extraination error of the tropospheric<br>
incremental delay along the path fr incremental delay along the path from the *i*-th The pseudo-range equation system can be solved by<br>satellite to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch iterative procedure based on the first order Taylor's see<br>w.r.t the ne mental delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
iie io the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch<br>
ite incertain procedure based on the first of a secure is the neutral atmosphere;<br>
the neutral atmosphere;<br>
the neutral atmospher ntal delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch<br>
iterative procedure based on the fi<br>
encutral atmosphere;<br>
the estimation error of the tropospheric<br>
that delay along the path from the ental delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
in the pseudo-range equation syst<br>
be neutral atmosphere;<br>
in the measurement error of the tropospheric<br>
tend at minital to entral delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
ental de ntal delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch<br>
iterative procedure based on the fi<br>
neutral atmosphere;<br>
the estimation error of the tropospheric<br>
activities 7. Notice that the int<br> ental delay along the path from the *i*-th<br>
the neutral atmosphere;<br>
to the GNSS receiver for the *k*-th epoch<br>
expansion around an initial to<br>
expansion around an initial to<br>
expansion around an initial to<br>
expansion aro The pseudo-range equation system can be solved by an iterative procedure based on the first order Taylor's series expansion around an initial train curvilinear abscissa estimate  $\overline{s}$ . Notice that the initial estimate of the curvilinear abscissa is obtained by first computing the receiver location without track constraint and selecting as initial point for the iteration the position of the virtual reference station that is nearest to the train position estimated at the previous step. mge equation system can be solved by an<br>dure based on the first order Taylor's series<br>und an initial train curvilinear abscissa<br>otice that the initial estimate of the<br>scissa is obtained by first computing the<br>on without t te *s*. Notice that the initial estimate of the<br>near abscissa is obtained by first computing the<br>er location without track constraint and selecting as<br>point for the iteration the position of the virtual<br>nee station that i The pseudo-range equation system can be solved by an<br>therative procedure based on the first order Taylor's series<br>expansion around an initial train curvilinear abscissa<br>estimate  $\overline{s}$ . Notice that the initial estimate o The pseudo-range equation system can be solved by an<br>terative procedure based on the first order Taylor's series<br>expansion around an mital train curvilimear absossa<br>stimate  $\overline{s}$ . Notice that the initial estimate of the equation system can be solved by an<br>based on the first order Taylor's series<br>an initial train curvilinear abscissa<br>that the initial estimate of the<br>ithout track constraint and selecting as<br>itention the position of the vir abscissa is obtained by first computing the<br>ation without track constraint and selecting as<br>to the iteration the position of the virtual<br>tation that is nearest to the train position<br>the previous step.<br>lenote with  $\tilde{P}_i$ 

Let us denote with  $\tilde{\rho}_i$  the *i*-th pseudorange corresponding to the site with mileage equal to  $\bar{s}$ , i.e.,

$$
\tilde{\rho}_i = \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_i^{Sat} \left[ T_i^{Sat} \right] - \mathbf{X}^{Train} \left[ \overline{s} \right] \right\|, \tag{10}
$$

so that

$$
\rho_i - \delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Diff} - \tilde{\rho}_i - c \delta t^{Train} - n_i =
$$
\n
$$
= \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_i^{Sat} \left[ T_i^{Sat} \right] - \mathbf{X}^{Train} \left[ s(T_i^{Train}) \right] \right\| - \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_i^{Sat} \left[ T_i^{Sat} \right] - \mathbf{X}^{Train} \left[ \overline{s} \right] \right\|
$$
\n(11)

Then, denoting with

$$
\Delta s = s \left( T_i^{Train} \right) - \overline{s} \tag{12}
$$

we expand the term

$$
\chi = \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{i}^{Sat} \left[ T_{i}^{Sat} \right] - \mathbf{X}^{Train} \left[ s(T_{i}^{Train}) \right] \right\| \tag{13}
$$

in Taylor's series w.r.t. *s* with initial point  $\bar{s}$ , then obtaining

(11)  
\n**EXECUTE:** 
$$
\sinh \sinh \cos \theta
$$
 **EXECUTE:**  $\sinh \cos \theta$  **EXECUTE:**  $\sinh \cos$ 

where  $n_i^{Taylor}$  accounts for the expansion truncation. Then, we finally obtain:

• 
$$
E_{\delta_i^{x_i}} =
$$
 be estimation error of the offset of the *i*-th  
satellite clock for the *k*-th epoch, so that we can  
write\n
$$
\delta_i^{x_{\text{out}}} = \delta_i^{x_{\text{out}}} + \epsilon_{\delta_i^{x_{\text{out}}}}.
$$
\n(5)  
\nTherefore, for the pseudorange expression, we can write  
\n
$$
\rho_i(k) = \left| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{i}^{x_{\text{out}}}[T_i^{x_{\text{out}}}] - \mathbf{X}^{T \text{right}}[s(T_i^{T \text{right})}\right| + \left| \left| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{i}^{T \text{right}} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{i}^{T \text{right}} + \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_i^{T \text{right}}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}_i^{T \text{right}}}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_i^{T \text{right}}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}_i^{T \text{right}}}{\partial s} \right|_{s = \bar{s}}
$$
\n(14)  
\nTherefore, for the pseudorange expression, we can write  
\n
$$
\rho_i(k) = \left| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{i}^{x_{\text{in}}}[T_i^{x_{\text{out}}}] - \mathbf{X}^{T \text{right}}[s(T_i^{T \text{left}})] + \left| \left| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{i}^{T \text{right}} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{i}^{T \text{right}} \right|
$$
\n
$$
+ \Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{x_{\text{out}}}[T_i^{x_{\text{out}}}] - \Delta \hat{\rho}_i^{x_{\text{out}}}[T_i^{x_{\text{out}}}] + \Delta \hat{\sigma}_i^{T \text{right} + \left| \left| \left| \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_i^{T \text{right}} - \partial \rho_i}{\partial s} \right| \cdot \frac{\partial \rho_i^{T \text{right}}}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_i^{T \text{right}} - \partial s} \cdot \frac{\partial \rho_i^{T \text{right}}}{\partial s} \cdot \frac{\partial \rho_i^{T \text{right}}}{\partial s} \cdot \frac{\partial \rho_i^{T \text{right}}}{\partial s}
$$
\n(15)  
\nDenoting with  $\delta \hat{\rho}_i^{N \text{out}}$  the overall differential correction  
\nprovided by the

satellites.

Now, denoting with  $\Delta \rho_i$  the differential reduced pseudo range

$$
\Delta \rho_i = \rho_i - \delta \hat{\rho}_i^{Diff} - \tilde{\rho}_i , \qquad (16)
$$

the corresponding *NSat* scalar linear equations can be written in compact matrix notation as follows

$$
\Delta \rho = HDz + v , \qquad (17)
$$

where **z** is the array

$$
\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta s \\ c \delta t^{Train} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad (18)
$$

**D** is the matrix with elements given by the directional cosines of the tangent to the railway track at the point with mileage equal to  $\bar{s}$ :

$$
\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}s \\ \mathbf{c}\delta t^{Time} \end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(18) in case of tropospheric incremental delay and multipath  
\nmatrix with elements given by the directional  
\nspace equal to  $\bar{s}$ .  
\n
$$
\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x_1^{Time}}{\partial s} \\ \frac{\partial x_2^{Time}}{\partial s} \end{bmatrix}_{s=s} = 0
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x_1^{Time}}{\partial s} \\ \frac{\partial x_2^{Time}}{\partial s} \end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(19) in the also applied to subset of the visible satellites  
\nclassical *N<sub>SM</sub>* × 4 observation matrix:  
\n
$$
\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x_1^{Time}}{\partial s} \\ \frac{\partial x_2^{Time}}{\partial s} \end{bmatrix}_{s=s} = 0
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x_1^{Time}}{\partial s} \\ \frac{\partial x_2^{Time}}{\partial s} \end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(19) in the case of the two subsets of the visible satellites  
\nobserved Kalman filters to solve the pseudorang-  
\nnonlinear equations. Nevertheless, their computational  
\nclassical *N<sub>SM</sub>* × 4 observation matrix:  
\n
$$
\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{1}_{N_{SM}} \end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(20) in addition, the weighted least square estimate  $\overline{\mathbf{Z}} \text{ is a}$   
\n
$$
\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial s} \\ \frac{\partial x_1^{Time}}{\partial s} \end{bmatrix}_{s=s} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial s} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial s} \end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(21) in addition, the weighted least square estimate  $\overline{\mathbf{Z}} \text{ is a}$   
\n
$$
\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial s} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}}{\partial t} \end{bmatrix}_{s=s} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}}{\partial t} \end{bmatrix}_{s=s} = \begin{bmatrix} \
$$

**H** is the classical  $N_{Sat} \times 4$  observation matrix:

$$
\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{1}_{N_{Sat}} \end{bmatrix},\tag{20}
$$

where **P** is the  $N_{Sat} \times 3$  Jacobian matrix of the pseudoranges,

$$
\mathbf{P} = \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial \mathbf{X}^{Train}}\right]_{\mathbf{X}^{Train} = \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\overline{s}]},
$$
(21)

whose elements are given by the directional cosines of the satellite lines of sight:

$$
\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{1}_{N_{Sat}} \end{bmatrix},
$$
 (20)  
\n**P** is the  $N_{Sat} \times 3$  Jacobian matrix of the pseudo-  
\n**P** $= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial \mathbf{X}^{Train}} \end{bmatrix}_{\mathbf{X}^{Train} = \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]},$  (21)  
\n $\sigma_s^2 =$   
\n $\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial \mathbf{X}^{Train}} \end{bmatrix}_{\mathbf{X}^{Train} = \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]},$  (21)  
\n $\sigma_s^2 =$   
\n $\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial \tilde{X}} \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial \tilde{X}} \end{bmatrix}_{\mathbf{X}^{Train} = \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]} = -\frac{\mathbf{X}_{i,j}^{Sat} - \mathbf{X}_{j}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]}{\mathbf{X}_{i}^{Sat} - \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]}.$  (22)  
\n $\mathbf{P}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{j}^{Train}} \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{j}^{Train}} \end{bmatrix}_{\mathbf{X}^{Train} = \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]} = -\frac{\mathbf{X}_{i,j}^{Sat} - \mathbf{X}_{j}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]}{\mathbf{X}_{i}^{Sat} - \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]}.$  (22)  
\n $\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{j}^{Train} & \mathbf{X}_{j}^{Train} \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{j}^{Train}} \end{bmatrix}_{\mathbf{X}^{Train} = \mathbf{X}_{j}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]} = -\frac{\mathbf{X}_{i,j}^{Sat} - \mathbf{X}_{j}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]}{\mathbf{X}_{i}^{Sat} - \mathbf{X}^{Train}[\mathbf{S}]}.$  (22)  
\n $\mathbf{P} =$ 

with  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $\mathbf{1}_{N_s}$  is the  $N_{Sat} \times 1$  vector:

$CX_j$	$\int_{X^{Train} = X^{Train}[\bar{s}]}$	$IN. MULTI TRACK WEPVT ESTIMATION$
$1_{N_{Sat}}$ is the $N_{Sat} \times 1$ vector:	IV. MULTI TRACK WE PVT ESTIMATION	
$1_{N_{Sat}}$ = $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,	(23)	When the railway consists track PVT estimate is com Let us assume that the train tracks and let denote corresponding to the <i>k</i> -th tr Then, denoting with $\Lambda_k$ ratio given by the condition of the observations <b>p</b> with the conditionality of the observations <b>p</b> with the individuality of the observations <b>p</b> with the equivalent observation noise (with $i = 1, 2$ , et of linear equations can be written when for $\Lambda_k$ (p) = $\frac{1}{2}$ \n

and, finally,

 $V_i = n_i + n_i^{Taylor}$ 

$$
=c\varepsilon_{\Delta\hat{\rho}^{Sat}_{i}}+c\varepsilon_{\Delta\hat{\tau}^{ion}_{i}}+c\varepsilon_{\Delta\hat{\tau}^{prop}_{i}}-c\varepsilon_{\delta\hat{\tau}^{Sat}_{i}}+n_{i}^{Train}+n_{i}^{Taylor}(24)
$$

represents the equivalent observation noise (with  $i = 1, 2$ , …, *NSat*).

A similar set of linear equations can be written when pseudoranges derived from carrier phase tracking are employed.

The set of linear equations (17) may be solved w.r.t. the curvilinear abscissa, and the receiver clock offset by means of a weighted least square, numerical procedure that accounts for the different statistics of the error of the time of arrival estimates related to satellites of different constellations.

We remark that, with respect to ordinary least square solution, it accounts for different characteristics of errors related to satellites of different generations and dependence of receiver noise from satellite elevation, as

in case of tropospheric incremental delay and multipath components.

 $\begin{bmatrix}\n\Delta s \\
c\delta t^{Train}\n\end{bmatrix}$ , (18) in case of tropospheric incremental del<br>
components.<br>
Therefore the described algorithm<br>
employed when a mix of satellites<br>
the railway track at the point<br>  $\begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{1}{T}a^{in} \\
\frac{1}{2S}\n\end$  $\begin{bmatrix} \Delta s \\ c \delta t^{Train} \end{bmatrix}$ , (18) in case of tropospheric incremental delay a<br>components.<br>Therefore the described algorithm can<br>ments given by the directional employed when a mix of satellites from<br>the railway track at the  $=\left[\begin{array}{c} \Delta s \\ c \delta t^{Train} \end{array}\right],$  (18) in case of tropospheric incremental delay a<br>components.<br>
Therefore the described algorithm can<br>
lements given by the directional<br>
to the railway track at the point<br>  $\hat{c} \lambda^{Train}$  $\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta s \\ c\delta t^{Tmin} \end{bmatrix}$ , (18) in case of tropospheric incremental delay and 1<br>
elements given by the directional<br>
to the railway track at the point<br>  $\overline{s}$ :<br>  $\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x^{Tmin}}{\partial s} \end{bmatrix}_{s=\overline{s}}$  0<br>  $\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x^{Tmin$  $\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta s \\ \delta t \end{bmatrix}$ , (18) in case of tropospheric incremental delay and 1<br>
components. Therefore the described algorithm can be<br>
elements given by the directional employed when a mix of satellites from<br>
to the ra Therefore the described algorithm can be directly employed when a mix of satellites from different constellations are used, as far as eventual differences in their timing references are pre-compensated. Nevertheless it can be also applied to subsets of the visible satellites belonging to the same constellation. incremental delay and multipath<br>
ed algorithm can be directly<br>
x of satellites from different<br>
as far as eventual differences in<br>
re pre-compensated. Nevertheless<br>
b subsets of the visible satellites<br>
mstellation.<br>
have b pospheric incremental delay and multipath<br>
e described algorithm can be directly<br>
hen a mix of satellites from different<br>
are used, as far as eventual differences in<br>
eferences are pre-compensated. Nevertheless<br>
he same c escribed algorithm can be directly<br>a mix of satellites from different<br>used, as far as eventual differences in<br>noes are pre-compensated. Nevertheless<br>lied to subsets of the visible satellites<br>filters have been proposed in

0 nonlinear equations. Nevertheless, their computational Recently, particle filters have been proposed in place of extended Kalman filters to solve the pseudorange complexity qualifies them as not mature for high integrity receivers. ed to subsets of the visible satellites<br>
e constellation.<br>
Iters have been proposed in place of<br>
filters to solve the pseudorange<br>
. Nevertheless, their computational<br>
them as not mature for high integrity<br>
: weighted lea constellations are used, as far as eventual differences in<br>their timing references are pre-compensated. Nevertheless<br>it can be also applied to subsets of the visible satellites<br>belonging to the same constellation.<br>Recentl

 $0$  At each iteration, the weighted least square estimate  $\bar{z}$  is computed as

$$
\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{K} \Delta \mathbf{\rho} \tag{25}
$$

where  $\bf{K}$  is the gain matrix

$$
\mathbf{K} = \left(\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}_{\nu}^{-1} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{D}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}_{\nu}^{-1}
$$
 (26)

In addition, the variance of the estimate of the curvilinear abscissa *s* computes as follows

on, the weighted least square estimate 
$$
\overline{z}
$$
 is  
\n $\hat{z} = K\Delta\rho$  (25)  
\ngain matrix  
\n $\overline{z} = (\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}^{-1}_{\nu} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{D})^{-1} \mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}^{-1}_{\nu}$  (26)  
\n $\overline{z}$  variance of the estimate of the curvilinear  
\nputes as follows  
\n $\sigma_s^2 = [\mathbf{R}_{\Delta\hat{z}}]_{1,1} = [(\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}^{-1}_{\nu} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{D})^{-1}]_{1,1}$  (27)  
\n $\overline{s} = \overline{s} + \Delta\hat{z}_{11}$  and the whole procedure is

2)<br>
(19)<br>
complexity qualifies them as not matter or high integrity<br>
complexity qualifies them as not matter for high integrity<br>
receivers.<br>
At each iteration, the weighted least square estimate **7** is<br>
computed as<br>  $\hat$  $\left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \end{array}\right]_{\text{cm}}$ , (19) nonplexity qualities them as not matter equiver<br>  $\left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \end{array}\right]_{\text{cm}}$ , (19) complexity qualities them as not matter for high integrity<br>  $\mathbf{A} \text{ the electric field, } \$  $\frac{X_3}{2s}$ <br>  $\left[\mathbf{P}\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{box}}} \right]_{x=x}$ <br>  $\left[\mathbf{P}\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{box}}}$ Here  $\vec{h}_{\text{new}}$  and the set of ervation matrix:<br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$ ],<br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$ <br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$ <br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$ <br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$ <br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$ <br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{Sav}}}$ <br>  $\mathbf{1}_{N_{\text{$ reiterated until a convergence criterion is met (e.g., magnitude of the incremental mileage correction below a predefined value).

#### **IV. MULTI TRACK WEIGHTED LEAST SQUARE PVT ESTIMATION**

When the railway consists of multiple tracks, the single track PVT estimate is combined with track detection.

Let us assume that the train can be located along one of *M* tracks and let denote with  $H_k$  the hypothesis corresponding to the *k*-th track.

**P** is the  $N_{\text{str}} \times 3$  Jacobian matrix of the pseudo-<br> **i** in addition, the variance of the<br>  $P = \left[\frac{\partial P}{\partial X^{T \text{max}}}\right]_{X^{2 \text{max}} \times N = [r]}$ , (21)  $\sigma_z^2 = [\mathbf{R}_{\text{at}}]_{1,1} = \left[\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial X^{T \text{max}}}\right)_{X^{2 \text{max}} \times N = [r]}$ <br>
elements ar **P** is the  $N_{\text{Sat}}$  **i**  $\mathbf{r} = \left[\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x^{r_{\text{const}}}}\right]_{x^{(m_n x^{(m_n)}|x^2}}$ , (21)  $\sigma_z^2 = [\mathbf{R}_{\Delta}]\mathbf{j} = [(\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}_v^T \mathbf{i} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{D})^{-1}]_{11}$ . (27) elements are given by the directional cosines of the Final In addition, the variance of the estimate of the curvilinear<br>abscissa *s* computes as follows<br> $\sigma_z^2 = [\mathbf{R}_{\Delta z}]_{1,1} = [(\mathbf{D}^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}_v^{-1} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{D})^{-1}]_{1,1}$ . (27)<br>Finally we set  $\overline{s} = \overline{s} + \Delta \hat{E}_{11}$  and the w ratio given by the condition probability density function of the observations **ρ** with respect to the *k*-th hypothesis  $H_k$  divided by any arbitrary function that does not depend on *Hk*:and the whole procedure is<br>
ince criterion is met (e.g.,<br>
il mileage correction below a<br>
GHTED LEAST SQUARE<br>
of multiple tracks, the single<br>
ned with track detection.<br>
can be located along one of *M*<br>
with  $H_k$  the hypoth  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\overline{s} + \Delta_{11}^2$  and the whole procedure is<br>convergence criterion is met (e.g.,<br>cremental mileage correction below a<br><br>CK **WEIGHTED LEAST SQUARE**<br>TION<br>consists of multiple tracks, the single<br>is combined with trac  $\overline{s} = \overline{s} + \Delta \hat{z}_{11}$  and the whole procedure is<br>
a convergence criterion is met (e.g.,<br>
incremental mileage correction below a<br>
<br> **ACK WEIGHTED LEAST SQUARE**<br>
<br> **ACK WEIGHTED LEAST SQUARE**<br>
<br> **ACK WEIGHTED LEAST SQUAR IV. MULTI TRACK WEIGHTED LEAST SQUARE**<br> **PVT ESTIMATION**<br>
When the railway consists of multiple tracks, the single<br>
track PVT estimate is combined with track detection.<br>
Let us assume that the train can be located along

$$
\Lambda_k(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{p_{P/H_k}(\mathbf{p}/H_k)}{w(\mathbf{p})},
$$
\n(28)

and assuming that the hypotheses are uniformly distributed, the Bayesian (optimal) track detection rule

**IV. MULTI TRACK WEIGHTED LEAST SQUARE**<br> **PVT ESTIMATION**<br>
When the railway consists of multiple tracks, the single<br>
track PVT estimate is combined with track detection.<br>
Let us assume that the train can be located along paragraph, **ρ**is a function of the unknown train curvilinear abscissa and receiver clock offset, and of the observation noise  $V$ . Thus for each hypothesis, i.e., for each track, we have **h** let the train can be located along one of *M* let denote with  $H_k$  the hypothesis g to the *k*-th track.<br>
ting with  $\Lambda_k(\rho)$  the generalized likelihood<br>
by the condition probability density function<br>
vations  $\rho$  with

$$
\mathbf{\rho} = \tilde{\mathbf{\rho}}_{H_k} + \delta \hat{\mathbf{\rho}}_{H_k}^{Diff} + \mathbf{H}_{H_k} \mathbf{D}_{H_k} \mathbf{z}_{H_k} + \mathbf{v}.
$$
 (29)

Now, as in [8], we proceed by first estimating  $z_k$  under the hypothesis that  $H_k$  is true, and then we use these estimates in a likelihood ratio test, as if they were correct. Thus for each hypothesis the generalized log-likelihood Now, as in [8], we proceed by first estimating  $\mathbf{z}_k$  under<br>the hypothesis that  $H_k$  is true, and then we use these<br>cstimates in a likelihood ratio Thus for each hypothesis the generalized log-likelihood<br>functional ln functional  $\ln \tilde{\Lambda}_{k}(\rho)$  is computed, where 8], we proceed by first estimating  $z_k$  under<br>
in likelihood ratio test, as if they were correct.<br>
In likelihood ratio test, as if they were correct.<br>
A<sub>k</sub>(**p**) is computed, where<br>  $\overline{\Lambda}_k(\rho) = Max \ln \frac{p_{\nu_i n_k}(\rho/\hat{z}_{n_k})}{w(\$ reed by first estimating  $z_k$  under<br>
s true, and then we use these<br>
ratio test, as if they were correct.<br>
s the generalized log-likelihood<br>
mputed, where<br>  $z_k$  and  $k_k$  **H<sub>k</sub>** =  $C_v$   $\hat{z}_{H_k}$  =  $C_v \hat{v}_{H_k}$ <br>  $\frac{P_{P/H_k}(\$ we proceed by first estimating  $z_k$  under<br>
that  $H_k$  is true, and then we use these<br>
kelihood ratio test, as if they were correct.<br>
hypothesis the generalized log-likelihood<br>  $\tilde{\Lambda}_k(\rho)$  is computed, where<br>  $\tilde{\Lambda}_k(\rho) = M$ ceed by first estimating  $\mathbf{z}_k$  under<br>
is true, and then we use these<br>
ratio test, as if they were correct.<br>
is the generalized log-likelihood<br>
so that  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}_{v} = \mathbf{C}^v_{v} \mathbf{C}_v$ <br>
so that  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}_{v} = \mathbf{C}^v_{v}$ In [8], we proceed by first estimating z<sub>*i*</sub> under<br>
linear thesis that *H<sub>i</sub>* is true, and then we use these<br>
thesis that *H<sub>i</sub>* is true, and then we use these<br>
exercise the generalized log-likelihood<br>
ln λ<sub>*i*</sub>(**ρ**) i in [8], we proceed by first estimating  $\mathbf{z}_k$  under<br>
thesis that  $H_k$  is true, and then we use these<br>
if each hypothesis the generalized log-likelihood<br>
al ln  $\bar{\Lambda}_k(\mathbf{p}) = M_{\text{cav}} \ln \frac{P_{\text{FII}_k}(\mathbf{p}/\sqrt{2\mu_k})}{P_{\text{FII$ *x* and the proceed by first estimating  $z_k$  under<br>
at  $H_k$  is true, and then we use these<br>
probless the generalized log-likelihood<br>
probless incerentized log-likelihood<br>
(p) =  $Max \ln \frac{P_{PUL_k}(p/2_{L_k})}{w(p)}$ .<br>
(30)<br>
(d)<br>
(p) we proceed by first estimating z<sub>a</sub> under<br>
that *H<sub>s</sub>* is true, and then we use these<br>
bethicod ratio test, as if they were correct.<br>
(p) is computed, where<br>  $\hat{\lambda}_k(\mathbf{p}) = M_{\alpha}x \ln \frac{\rho_{P\alpha_{i}}(\mathbf{p})^2}{\omega_{p_i}}$ .<br>
(b) is comp

$$
\ln \tilde{\Lambda}_k(\mathbf{p}) = \underset{\mathbf{z}_{H_k}}{\text{Max}} \ln \frac{p_{\text{P/H}_k}(\mathbf{p}/\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k})}{w(\mathbf{p})} \,. \tag{30}
$$

Then the hypothesis corresponding to the largest generalized log-likelihood functional is selected. Since conditioned to the  $k$ -th hypothesis,  $\rho$  is a Gaussian

random variable with (conditional) expectation

$$
E\left\{\mathbf{p}/\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k}, H_k\right\} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{H_k} + \delta \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{H_k}^{Diff} + \mathbf{H}_{H_k} \mathbf{D}_{H_k} \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k}
$$
 (31)

and covariance matrix

$$
Cov\{\mathbf{p}/\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k}, H_k\} = \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{v}}
$$
 (32)

then, by selecting

$$
w(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{\left[ (2\pi)^{N_{sat}} \det(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{v}}) \right]},
$$
 (33)

we have

estimates in a likelihood ratio test, as if they were correct  
\nThus for each hypothesis the generalized log-likelihood, where  
\n
$$
\ln \tilde{\Lambda}_{\lambda}(\rho) = M_{d\alpha} \ln \left( \frac{P_{\theta_1 \eta_1}(\rho/\hat{z}_{\alpha_2})}{\rho_{\alpha_3}(\rho/\hat{z}_{\alpha_4})} \right).
$$
\n(30)  
\n
$$
\int_{\tilde{\gamma}_{\alpha_4}(\rho)}^{\tilde{\gamma}_{\alpha_5}(\rho)} = M_{d\alpha} \ln \left( \frac{P_{\theta_2 \eta_2}(\rho/\hat{z}_{\alpha_3})}{\rho_{\alpha_5}(\rho/\hat{z}_{\alpha_6})} \right).
$$
\n(31)  
\nand covariance matrix  
\n
$$
\int_{\tilde{\gamma}_{\alpha_6}(\rho)}^{\tilde{\gamma}_{\alpha_7}(\rho/\hat{z}_{\alpha_7})} = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}_{\alpha_6}(\rho/\hat{z}_{\alpha_7})}^{\tilde{\gamma}_{\alpha_7}(\rho/\hat{z}_{\alpha_7})} = \int
$$

Incidentally we observer that the estimate of  $z_k$  employed in track detection is the one for which

$$
\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k} = Arg \left\{ \underset{\mathbf{z}_{H_k}}{Min} \left[ \left( \Delta \mathbf{p}_{H_k} - \mathbf{H}_{H_k} \mathbf{D}_{H_k} \mathbf{z}_{H_k} \right)^T \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{v}}^{-1} \right. \right. \right. \qquad \text{probability} \qquad \text{Denotin} \qquad P_{e_i} \text{ the} \qquad \text{equation} \qquad P_{e_i} \text{ the} \qquad \text{equ
$$

Thus, denoting with

- $\Delta \vec{p}_{H_k}$  the differential reduced pseudo range at the final iteration when the train is assumed to be located along the *k*-th track;
- $\cdot$   $\overline{\mathbf{H}}_{H_k} \overline{\mathbf{D}}_{H_k}$  the observation matrix at the final iteration when the train is assumed to be located along the *k*-th track;
- $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k}$  the estimate of train curvilinear abscissa and receiver clock offset vector at the final iteration when the train is assumed to be located along the *k*-th track;
- $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k}$  the vector of the residuals corresponding to the *k*-th hypothesis,

$$
\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k} = \Delta \breve{\mathbf{p}}_{H_k} - \breve{\mathbf{H}}_{H_k} \breve{\mathbf{D}}_{H_k} \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k}
$$
(36)

• **C**<sub>**v**</sub> the matrix

first estimating 
$$
\mathbf{z}_k
$$
 under  
\nand then we use these  
\nt, as if they were correct.  
\ngeneralized log-likelihood  
\nwhere  
\n $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{p})$  so that  $\mathbf{R}_v^{-1} = \mathbf{C}_v^T \mathbf{C}_v$   
\nwhere  
\n $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{p})$  so that  $\mathbf{R}_v^{-1} = \mathbf{C}_v^T \mathbf{C}_v$   
\nwhere  
\n $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{p})$  so that  $\mathbf{R}_v^{-1} = \mathbf{C}_v^T \mathbf{C}_v$   
\nwhere  
\n $\mathbf{S}_{H_k} = \mathbf{C}_v \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k}$  the normalized vector of the residuals  
\ncorresponding to the *k*-th hypothesis,  
\nand with  $\|\zeta_{H_k}\|^2$  the weighted squared  $L^2$  norm  
\n $\|\zeta_{H_k}\|^2 = \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k}^T \mathbf{R}_v^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k}$ , (38)  
\nobthesis, *p* is a Gaussian  
\nby expectation  
\n $\mathbf{D}_{H_k} = \mathbf{F}_{H_k} \mathbf{D}_{H_k} \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k}$  (31)  
\n $\mathbf{D}_{H_k} = \mathbf{F}_{H_k} \mathbf{D}_{H_k} \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{H_k}$  (31)  
\nTherefore the Bayesian detector will select the track with  
\nthe smallest weighted squared  $L^2$  norm  $\|\zeta_{H_k}\|^2$ .  
\nIn addition the posterior probability of each hypothesis is  
\napproximated as follows:

corresponding to the *k*-th hypothesis,

*w*(**p**) corresponding to the largest and with  $\left\| \zeta_{H_k} \right\|^2$  the weighted squared L<sup>2</sup> norm

$$
\left\| \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{H_k} \right\|^2 = \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k}^T \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{v}}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k},
$$
 (38)

we have

$$
\ln \tilde{\Lambda}_k(\mathbf{p}) = -\frac{1}{2} \left\| \zeta_{H_k} \right\|^2 \tag{39}
$$

Therefore the Bayesian detector will select the track with the smallest weighted squared  $L^2$  norm  $\|\zeta_{H_n}\|^2$ .

In addition the posterior probability of each hypothesis is approximated as follows:

 2 <sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> exp <sup>2</sup> Prob . 1 exp 2 *H<sup>k</sup> k Hm <sup>m</sup> <sup>H</sup>* **ζ ζ**(40)

#### **V. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

*Diff* provides the controllar controllar the existence of the conditional spectral in section<br> *Diff*  $z_{n_k}$ ,  $H_s$  =  $\phi_{n_k}^T$ ,  $H_s$ ,  $\left\{\frac{Min}{z_{n_k}}\right\}$  ( $\Delta \mathbf{p}_{H_k} - \mathbf{H}_{H_k} \mathbf{p}_{H_k} \mathbf{z}_{H_k}$ )  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{v}}^{-1}$  probability of declaring that a train is on a wrong track. *k*  $\hat{h}$ ,  $H_k$  =  $\tilde{p}_{n_k}$  +  $\delta \tilde{p}_{n_k}^{n_k}$  +  $\tilde{H}_{n_k}$  **D**,  $\tilde{h}_{n_k}^{n_k}$  +  $\tilde{H}_{n_k}$  **D**,  $\tilde{h}_{n_k}^{n_k}$  **Exi**  $Cov\{\rho/\hat{p}/\hat{z}_{n_k}, H_k\}$  = **R**, (32) Therefore the Hayesian detector will select the emailles **<sup>z</sup> <sup>z</sup> ρ H D z R** *H<sub>H,</sub> H<sub>k</sub>*</sub>  $|\mathbf{R}_v|$  **H**  $\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)$  **EXECUTE 10 H EXECUTE AND H EXECUTE AND H EXECUTE AND H EXECUTE AND EXECUTE AND H EXECUTE AND EXECUTE AND EXECUTE AND EXECUTE AND EXECUTE AND EXEC Properties Are the system of the system of**  $\theta_{\mu_i} = \mathbf{H}_{\mu_i} \mathbf{D}_{\mu_i} \mathbf{z}_{\mu_i}$ **) and**  $\left[ \mathbf{H}_{\mu_i} \right]$  **and**  $\left[ \mathbf{H}_{\mu_i} \right]$  **and**  $\left[ \mathbf{H}_{\mu_i} \right]$  **and \left[ \math** In presence of multiple tracks, in addition to the probability that the mileage error will exceed the Alert Limit and no timely warning is provided, the relevant figure of merit for the computation of the probability of providing an hazardous misleading information is constituted by the track error probability, i.e. the probability of declaring that a train is on a wrong track.  $P_{e_i}$  the conditional error probability conditioned to the leage error will exceed the Alert<br>varning is provided, the relevant<br>computation of the probability of<br>ous misleading information is<br>rack error probability, i.e. the<br>g that a train is on a wrong track.<br>track error probabil  $\begin{aligned}\n&= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathbf{g}_{H_k}\right\|^2\right)}{\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathbf{g}_{H_m}\right\|^2\right)}. \qquad (40) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\mathbf{g}_{H_m}\right\|^2\right)}. \n\end{aligned}$  **E ASSESSMENT**<br>
tiple tracks, in addition to the nileage error will exceed the Alert

vent that the *i*-th hypothesis is true, and assuming the a priori the *M* hypotheses are uniformly distributed we have

$$
P_e = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{1}{M} P_{e_i}
$$
 (41)

is the one for which<br>
is the one for which<br>
is the one for which<br>  $Arg\left\{\frac{M_{Hn}}{k_{\alpha_{s}}}\left[\left(\Delta\varphi_{n_{t}} - H_{n_{t}}D_{n_{t}}\mathbf{z}_{n_{t}}\right)^{T}R_{v}^{+}\right.\right.$ The conditional error probability<br>  $P_{s_{t}}$  the conditional error probability Here, for sake of compactness of the mathematical model, let us examine the case of parallel tracks without split and merge. The more general case is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, the general results can be obtained by extending the results reported here, with the aid of a Markovian model.

For the computation of  $P_{e_i}$  we observer that two different

situations have to be considered: either all the remaining tracks fall on the same side of the "true" track (corresponding to  $i=1$  and  $i=M$ ) or the remaining tracks fall on both sides of the "true" track corresponding to 1<*i*<*M*). merge. The more general case is beyond the scope of this<br>paper. Nevertheless, the general results can be obtained<br>by extending the results reported here, with the aid of a<br>Markovian model.<br>For the computation of  $P_{e_i}$  w

Based on the results of the previous paragraph, and residuals corresponding to the *k*-th hypothesis when the *i*th hypothesis is the true one, we will have a track error as

soon as there exists at least one hypothesis, let say the *h*th one for which the normalized squared  $L^2$  norm satisfies soon as there exists at least one hypothesis, let say the *h*-<br>th one for which the normalized squared L<sup>2</sup> norm satisfies<br>the condition<br> $\|\zeta_{H_k/H_i}\|^2 < \|\zeta_{H_i/H_i}\|^2$ ,  $h \neq i$  (42) experiment<br>Since the PVT estimation proced

$$
\left\| \zeta_{H_h/H_i} \right\|^2 < \left\| \zeta_{H_i/H_i} \right\|^2, \quad h \neq i
$$
 (42)

Since the PVT estimation procedure operates on a linearized system, in order to compute the statistics of  $\zeta_{H}$  conditioned to the Hypothesis  $\tilde{H}_i$ , let us denote with

 $\hat{s}^{nf}_{i}$  the estimate of the train mileage for the *i*-th track in absence of receiver noise and multipath (noise-free case), under the condition that the *i*-th hypothesis is true. In addition

Let us denote with  $\mathbf{b}_{i,k}$  the offset of the *k*-th track with respect the *i*-th one. Then as demonstrated in Appendix A, the conditional probability of selecting one of the other tracks when the i-th track is the true one, can be written as follows:

2,1 i 1,i i 1,i 1, 1 <sup>2</sup> 2 2 1 1 <sup>1</sup> 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 <sup>2</sup> 2 2 *i i i i <sup>e</sup> i M M P erfc erfc i M* (43)

where

$$
\Gamma_i = \mathbf{C}_\mathbf{v} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK}) \mathbf{P}_i. \tag{44}
$$

Let us now specify the above results for the case of *M* equispaced coplanar parallel tracks. Let  $e_i$  the unit vector orthogonal to the track tangent and lying on the tracks' plane, al let  $\Delta b$  be the offset between to adjacent tracks, so that

$$
\mathbf{b}_{k,i} = (k-i)\mathbf{b}_0 = (k-i)\Delta b \mathbf{e}_{\perp} \,. \tag{45}
$$

Considering that in this case we have *M*-2 tracks (to  $1 \le i \le M$ ) for which the remaining tracks fall on both sides of the "true" track while we have two tracks (corresponding to *i*=1 and *i*=*M*) for which the remaining tracks fall on the same side of the "true" track, for the track error probability we have:

$$
P_e = \left(1 - \frac{1}{M}\right) \text{erfc}\left\{\frac{\left\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{e}_\perp\right\|}{2\sqrt{2}} \Delta b\right\}.
$$
 (46)

As expected, the track error probability decreases with the track separation.

This expression applies to both code pseudorange based and carrier phase tracking track discrimination. In fact, for each satellite the projection of inter track distance on its line of sight is normalized with respect to the pseudorange equivalent noise standard deviation (see Eqs. (37) and (44)). Thus the difference in achievable performance with stand alone and differential receivers making use of C/A code pseudoranges and/or carrier phase tracking based pesudoranges, strictly depends on the different error budgets associated to the related receivers.

*M* is at least one hypothesis, let say the *h* the different error budgets associated to the r<br>the normalized squared L<sup>2</sup> norm satisfies receivers.<br>As illustrated in the next section devoted to<br> $\zeta_{H_i/H_i} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}^$ As illustrated in the next section devoted to the experimental results, for the Olbia-Cagliari railway values in the range [0.75, 2.1] can be expected for the the different error budgets associated to the related<br>receivers.<br>As illustrated in the next section devoted to the<br>experimental results, for the Olbia-Cagliari railway<br>values in the range [0.75, 2.1] can be expected for t quantity  $\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i} \mathbf{e}_{i}\|$  in presence of 2 parallel tracks with an offset of 1.5 m and a pseudo range receiver equivalent noise variance of  $1 \text{ m}^2$ , that can be considered typical for differential GPS receivers making use of the A/C code.

This in turn implies that the corresponding worst case track error probability will be about 0.29.

On the other, the achievable equivalent pseudorange noise standard deviation when real time tracking of the carrier phase is employed (i.e. when the receiver operates in RTK mode) can be at least one orders of magnitude smaller than the one associated to the A/C code.

This in turn implies that for the case at hand the worst case track error probability drops to 10-8 .

1 pseudorange noises affecting code and carrier phase based s at least one hypothesis, let say the *h*-<br>
the different error budgets associated to the related<br>
enormalized squared L<sup>2</sup> norm satisfies<br>
As illustrated in the mext section devoted to the<br>
experimental results, for the estimation procedure operates on a<br>
usuanity  $\|\Gamma_{,\epsilon}\|$  in presence of 2 parallel tacks with an<br>
in order to compute the statistics of<br>
order the Hypothesis *H<sub>n</sub>*, let us denote with<br>
noise variance of 1 m<sup>2</sup>, that can b least one hypothesis, let say the *h* the different error budgets associated<br>
ranalized squared L<sup>2</sup> norm satisfies<br>  $\left|\frac{1}{2}F_{M_1,H_1}\right|$ ,  $h \neq i$  (42) experimental results, for the Olbia-C:<br>
alation procedure operates n as there exists at least one hypothesis, let say the *h*<br>
ne different error budgets associated to the related<br>
condition<br>
condition<br>  $\left\|\frac{x_0}{x_1}y\right\|^2 \le \left\|\frac{x_1}{x_2}y\right\|^2$ ,  $\hbar \neq i$ <br>
ce the PVT estimation procedur  $\left\| \frac{d}{dx} \right\|_{\left\{x, \mu, \mu\right\}}^{2}$ ,  $\left\| \frac{d}{dx} \right\|_{\left\{x, \mu, \mu\right\}}^{2}$ ,  $\left\| \frac{d}{dx} \right\|_{\left\{x, \mu, \mu\right\}}^{2}$ ,  $\left\| \frac{d}{dx} \right\|_{\left\{x, \mu\right\}}^{2}$ , where incerease to the magne (0.75, 2.1] can be experimental results). f **Example 1** and multipal ( $\left\| \mathbf{F}_{n} \right\|$ )  $\left\| \mathbf{F}_{n} \right\|$   $\left\| \mathbf{F}_{n} \right\|$  and **h** the normalized squared 1.<sup>2</sup> norm satisfies<br>  $\|\xi_{B_i/B_i}\|^2 < \|\xi_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$ ,  $h \neq i$ <br>  $\mathbf{F}_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{B_i/B_i}\|^2$  and be expecting t **Figure 11** (17) and the range [0.75, 2.1] can adding properties or a quantity  $\left\| \Gamma_{\cdot} \mathbf{b}_{\cdot} \right\|$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  cross or  $\mathbf{b}$  from the range of 2 properties or a quantity  $\Gamma_{\cdot} \mathbf{b}_{\cdot}$  must be train mileage the Hypothesis *H<sub>i</sub>*, let us denote with<br>
the explore the train mileage for the *i*-th track in<br>
the considered<br>
the train mileage for the *i*-th track in<br>
the differential GPS receivers making use of fits<br>
n turn implie To further illustrate the difference among the equivalent pseudoranges, in Figure 2 a detail of the train receiver locations estimated without imposing the track constraint for both, code tracking Differential GNSS, and RTK mode, using GPS and GLONASS satellites, recorded during the measurement campaign along the Roma- Salerno railway (see next section for further details) are shown.

Difference in magnitude of the cross-track error component between code and carrier phase estimates is rather evident. We further observe that selecting the track nearest to the unconstrained estimate represents just a suboptimal solution.



Figure 2. Detail of the Roma-Salerno measurement campaign: RTK unconstrained estimate (green-line) and code based Differential GNSS (blue line) versus ground truth (red line).

In both cases, to improve the performance multiple independent measures at different epochs can be used. In this case, two approaches can be applied.

In the first case the overall generalized likelihood ratio is computed. Thus for *N<sup>O</sup>* independent observations we have

\n $\text{Prob}\{H_k\} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_O} \ \zeta_{H_k}(t_h)\ ^2\right)}{\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_O} \ \zeta_{H_m}(t_h)\ ^2\right)}$ \n	\n        (47)\n	\n        1.13\n
\n $\text{Prob}\{H_k\} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_O} \ \zeta_{H_m}(t_h)\ ^2\right)}{\sum_{h=1}^{N_O} \ \zeta_{H_m}(t_h)\ ^2}$ \n	\n        (47)\n	\n        2.14\n
\n $\text{Prob}\{H_k\} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_O} \ \zeta_{H_m}(t_h)\ ^2\right)}{\sum_{h=1}^{N_O} \ \zeta_{H_m}(t_h)\ ^2}$ \n	\n        (48)\n	\n        3.14\n
\n $\text{D verify the impact of the satellite geometry on the track discrimination capabilities of the proposed algorithm, the track distribution capabilities have been computed for a reference case of a set of 24 trains travelling along a 350 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari every our. The first term is the total increase of 30 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari every our. The second term is the total increase of 30 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari every our. The second term is the total increase of 30 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari every our. The second term is the total increase of 30 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari every our. The second term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The second term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The second term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The second term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the total increase of 30 km/hour. The third term is the$		

Performance can then be evaluated as straightforward extension of the single epoch track detection. Thus by introducing the partitioned vector

$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_o} \left\|\mathbf{S}_{H_k}(t_h)\right\|^2\right)}{\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_o} \left\|\mathbf{S}_{H_m}(t_h)\right\|^2\right)}
$$
\nthen be evaluated as straightforward  
\nsingle epoch track detection. Thus by  
\nrtitioned vector\n
$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\Gamma_i(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_1) \\
\Gamma_i(t_2)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_2) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma_i(t_{N_o})\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{N_o})\n\end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(48)\n
$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\Gamma_i(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_1) \\
\Gamma_i(t_2)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_2) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma_i(t_{N_o})\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{N_o})\n\end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(49)\n
$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\Gamma_i(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma_i(t_2)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{N_o})\n\end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(41)\n
$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\Gamma_i(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma_i(t_{N_o})\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{N_o})\n\end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(42)\n
$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\Gamma_i(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma_i(t_2)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{N_o})\n\end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(43)\n
$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\Gamma_i(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma_i(t_2)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{N_o})\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n(47)\n
$$
\mathbf{g}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\Gamma_i(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma_i(t_2)\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{N_o})\n\end{bmatrix},
$$
\n(47)\n $$ 

we can write

$$
\mathbf{P}_{\epsilon}^{(N_{\epsilon})} = \begin{cases}\n\frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\epsilon}} \|\mathbf{S}_{H_{\epsilon}}(t_{\delta})\|^2\right) & \text{gain and the same observation matrix for}\\
\text{Performance can then be evaluated as straightforward:} \mathbf{S}_{\epsilon} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\epsilon}} \|\mathbf{S}_{H_{\epsilon}}(t_{\delta})\|^2\right) & \text{discretization of the single epoch track detection. Thus by introducing the partitioned vector \\
\mathbf{S}_{\epsilon} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_{\delta})\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{\delta}) \\
\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_{\delta})\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{\delta})\n\end{bmatrix}\n\end{cases}
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{B}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix}\n\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_{\delta})\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{\delta}) \\
\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_{\delta})\mathbf{b}_{k,i}(t_{\delta})\n\end{bmatrix}, \text{ this, the initial state of the state of the state. The process of the state of the state of the state. The process of the state of the state of the state. The process of the state of the state of the state. The process of the state of the state of the state. The process of the state of the state. The process of the state of the state. The process of the state. The data of the state
$$

As particular case, we observe that for equispaced coplanar tracks, and a slowly moving train (ideally a still train) the track error probability, when  $N<sub>O</sub>$  epochs are employed, is

$$
P_e^{(N_O,I)} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{M}\right) \text{erfc}\left\{\frac{\left\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{e}_\perp\right\|}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{N_O} \Delta b\right\} (50)
$$

In the second case, a rank order statistics test can be employed. For instance, we decide that the train is lying on the *i*-th track if at least for  $k<sub>O</sub>$  out of  $N<sub>O</sub>$  epochs the  $P_{\gamma_{\alpha}}^{(N_{\alpha})} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} erfc \left\{ \frac{\left\| \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{1\alpha} \right\|}{2\sqrt{2}} \right\} & i=1 \end{cases}$  The map of the selected<br>  $P_{\gamma_{\alpha}}^{(N_{\alpha})} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} erfc \left\{ \frac{\left\| \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{1\alpha} \right\|}{2\sqrt{2}} \right\} + \frac{1}{2} erfc \left\{ \frac{\left\| \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{1\alpha} \right\|}{2\sqrt{2}} \$ devised in the first case is the optimal one in presence of Gaussian observation noise, use of rank order statistics provides a more robust outlier resilience and, therefore, it appears as a better candidate when strong multipath has to be faced.

Concerning performance, for equispaced coplanar tracks, and a slowly moving train, the single epoch track error probability can be considered constant during the observation interval, and for the evaluation of the overall track error probability the Bernoulli distribution applies. Thus we can write

$$
P_e^{(N_o,II)} = 1 - \sum_{h=k_0}^{N_0} \binom{N_o}{h} \left(1 - P_e\right)^h P_e^{N_o - h} \,. \tag{51}
$$

Considering track discrimination integrity, we observer that undetected satellite faults and/or incremental ionospheric and tropospheric delays not fully compensated by the augmentation system, may potentially affect the track error probability.

The loss in track error probability can be assessed using Eq. (69) of Appendix A.

However, to reduce the impact on integrity we force in the track discrimination algorithm the use of the same

 $\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left\|\zeta_{H_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)$  so that due the isotropic behavior of the pdf of  $\zeta_{H_i}$ gain and the same observation matrix for each hypothesis, Eq.(46) and Eq. (50) are still valid.

#### **VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

 $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \left\| \zeta_{H_k}(t_h) \right\|^2 \right)$ <br>  $\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \left\| \zeta_{H_k}(t_h) \right\|^2 \right)$ <br>  $\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \left\| \zeta_{H_k}(t_h) \right\|^2 \right)$ <br>
(47) Eq.(46) and Eq. (50) are still valid.<br>
Thus by **Eq.(**  $\left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\| \left\langle f_h(t_h) \right\|^2 \right\rangle \right]$  (47) and the same observation matrix for each hy<br>  $\left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\| \left\langle f_{H_n}(t_h) \right\|^2 \right\rangle \right]$ .<br>
(47) and the same observation matrix for each hy<br>  $\left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0$  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \left\| \left\| g_{H_k}(t_h) \right\|^2 \right\}$ (47) so that due the isotropic behavior of the pdf<br>  $\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\| g_{H_k}(t_h) \right\|^2 \right\}$ .<br>
(47) so that due the isotropic behavior of the pdf<br>  $\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{h=1}$  $\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\| \left| \left[ \kappa_{H_0}(t_k) \right] \right| \right\|^2 \right)$  gain and the same observation matrix for each hypotropic behavior of the pdf<br>  $\left( \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\| \left[ \kappa_{H_0}(t_k) \right] \right|^2 \right)$ . (47) <br>
(47) <br>  $\left[ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{$  $\left[\frac{\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} ||\mathbf{s}_{H_k}(t_h)||^2}{2 \sum_{h=1}^{N_0} ||\mathbf{s}_{H_k}(t_h)||^2}\right]$  (47) again and the same observation matrix for each h<br>so that due the isotropic behavior of the perpendicular<br>of the perpendicular of the perpendicular of th  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} ||\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)||^2$  (47) and the same observation matrix for each h<br>
so that due the isotropic behavior of the p<br>  $-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} ||\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)||^2$  (47) <br>  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} ||\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)||^2$  (47) <br>
altanted  $\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\|\left[\mathbf{r}_{n_k}(t_k)\right]\right\|^2\right)$  (47) as that due the isotropic behavior of the position of the Eq. (46) and  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0}\|\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)\|^2\right)$  (47)<br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0}\|\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)\|^2\right)$  (47)<br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0}\|\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)\|^2\right)$  (47)<br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0}\|\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)\|^2\right)$ <br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0}\|\zeta_{H_k}(t_h)\|^2\right$  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\|\xi_{H_k}(t_h)\right\|^2\right)$ <br>  $\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\|\xi_{H_k}(t_h)\right\|^2\right)$ <br>  $\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\|\xi_{H_k}(t_h)\right\|^2\right)$ <br>  $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{1, } (49) \text{ and } (40) \text{ are still valid.}\end$  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\| \xi_{H_i}(t_k) \right\|^2 \right)$  gain and the same observation matrix for each hyposphere  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\| \xi_{H_i}(t_k) \right\|^2 \right)$ .<br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\| \xi_{H_i}(t_k) \right\|^2 \right)$ . (47) Eq.(46) and Eq. **Γ b**  $\mathbf{F}_{\text{eff}}(t_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{h=1}^{N_0} ||\mathbf{S}_{H_h}(t_h)||^2$  (47)<br> **Follow (47)**<br> **Follow (46)** and Eq. (50) are still valid.<br> **Follow (48)**  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\| \xi_{H_1}(t_h) \right\|^2\right)$ <br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\| \xi_{H_2}(t_h) \right\|^2\right)$ <br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_0} \left\| \xi_{H_2}(t_h) \right\|^2\right)$ <br>
(47) Eq.(46) and Eq. (50) are still valid.<br>
Eq.(46) and Eq. (50) are still  $B_{k,j} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_2} \left\|\left\|g_{H_k}(t_h)\right\|^2\right)}{\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{h=1}^{N_2} \left\|\left\|g_{H_k}(t_h)\right\|^2\right)}\right)}$ (47) Eq.(46) and Eq.(50) are still valid<br>
the valuated as straightforward<br>
in the evaluated as straightforward<br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0}\left\|\xi_{n_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)$   $\sum_{m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0}\left\|\xi_{n_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)$ (47) Eq.(46) and Eq.(50) are still valid.<br>
Eq.(46) and Eq.(50) are still valid.<br>
Eq.(46) and Eq.(50) are still valid.<br>
The valua  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} ||\mathbf{\hat{g}}_{N_k}(t_k)||^2\right)$ <br>  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} ||\mathbf{\hat{g}}_{N_k}(t_k)||^2\right)$ <br>
be evaluated as straightforward<br>
evaluated as straightforward<br>
evaluated as straightforward<br>
evaluated as straightforward<br>
ev Prob  $\{H_k\} = \begin{bmatrix} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left\|g_{x_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right) & (47) \\ \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left\|g_{x_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right) & (47) \\ \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \left\|g_{x_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right) & (48) \\ \text{time one then be evaluated as straightforward} \\ \text{using the partitioned vector} \\ \text{using the partitioned vector} \\ \text$  $\text{Prob}\{H_k\} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_E} \left\|\zeta_{n_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)}{\sum_{n} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_E} \left\|\zeta_{n_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)}$ (47) So that due the isotropic behavior of the pdf<br>
iso that due the isotropic behavior of the pdf<br>
Eq.(46) and Eq.  $\mathbf{B}_{k,i} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_{k,i} \\ \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\|\mathbf{g}_{n_i}(t_i)\right\|^2\right) & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\|\mathbf{g}_{n_i}(t_i)\right\|^2\right) & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\|\mathbf{g}_{n_i}(t_i)\right\|^2\right) & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N}$ To verify the impact of the satellite geometry on the track discrimination capabilities of the proposed algorithm, the track error probabilities have been computed for a reference case of a set of 24 trains travelling along a 350 km route, from Cagliari to Olbia (Italy), at a nominal speed of 80 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari every our, with the aid of the 3InSat GNSS simulator [5]. In the performed evaluation the masked areas as tunnel and bridges have been neglected. gain and the same observation matrix for each hypothesis,<br>so that due the isotropic behavior of the pdf of  $\zeta_{n_i}$ <br>Eq.(46) and Eq. (50) are still valid.<br><br><br> **VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**<br>
To verify the impact of the satelli

1 The map of the selected railway is reported in Figure 3.

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{Prob}\{H_k\}=\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_m} \left\|g_{k,k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{N_m} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_m} \left\|g_{k,k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)} \mbox{ (47)} & \mbox{for the single epoch track detection. Thus by}\\ \mbox{no: $E$ is the same, the total number of the single epoch track detection. Thus, by the first term is the maximum of the single one of the single one.\\ \mbox{no: $E$ is the same, the second term is the maximum of the single one of the single one.\\ \mbox{no: $E$ is the second term$  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbf{r}_{1}(l_{1})\mathbf{b}_{k,l}(l_{k})] = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left|\mathbf{g}_{k,l}(l_{k})\right|^{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left|\mathbf{g}_{k,l}(l_{k})\right|^{2} \end{bmatrix}$  For verify the impact of the satellite geoperation of excludied as straightforward<br>
Fig **Prob** $\{H_k\}$   $= \begin{bmatrix} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n_i} \left\|g_{i,j}\right\|_{\mathcal{M}_k}(\zeta_i)\right\|^2 \\ \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n_i} \left\|g_{i,j}\right\|_{\mathcal{M}_k}(\zeta_i)\right\|^2 \end{bmatrix}$ <br>
Performance can then be evaluated as straightforward<br> *P* erformance can then  $\mathbf{B}_{k,j} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{|\mathbf{B}_{k,j}|}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{|\mathbf{B}_{k,j}|}{2\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix}$  (47) Eq.(46) and Eq.(50) are still valid.<br>
then be evaluated as straightforward VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS<br>
then be evaluated as straightforward VI. EXPERIMENT  $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\|\mathbf{g}_{n_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)$ <br>  $\mathbf{F}_k = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \left\|\mathbf{g}_{n_k}(t_k)\right\|^2\right)$  (47) Eq.(46) and Eq. (50) are still valid.<br>
be evaluated as straightforward<br>
be evaluated as straightforward<br>  $\mathbf{F$ Prob $\{H_k\}$ <br>  $\sum_{k=1}^{n} exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|g_{k,i_k}(s_k)\right|\right\}$ <br>
ance can then be evaluated as straightforward<br>
ance can then be evaluated as straightforward<br>
on of the single epond track  $\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|g_{k,i_k}(s_k)\right|$ <br>  $\beta_{k$ 2.1. The most final of the same of a set of 24 trains travelling along<br>
signed of 80 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari ever<br>
with the aid of the 31nSat GNSS simulator [5].<br>
perced of 80 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliar  $\beta_{i,j} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{i}(t_1)\mathbf{b}_{i,j}(t_1) & \mathbf{F}_{i}(t_2)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_2) & \mathbf{F}_{i}(t_3)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_3) & \mathbf{F}_{i}(t_4)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_4)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_5)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_6)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_7)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_7)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_8)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_9)\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_{10})\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_{11})\mathbf{F}_{i}(t_{12})\mathbf{F}_{i$ Some  $f(c)$ <br>  $\mathbb{E}_z[\mathbf{B}_{k+1,d}]$ <br>  $\mathbb{E}_z[\mathbf$ **Figure 1.1** (48) **Figure 1.1** (48) **Figure 1.1** (48) **Figure 1.1** (48) **Figure 1.1 Figure 1.1 Fig**  $\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{b}_0\|/\|\mathbf{b}_0\| = \|\mathbf{C}_v (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK}) \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{e}_\perp\|$  versus the train mileage, when code tracking is used and the GPS-EGNOS receiver equivalent noise variance is  $1 \text{ m}^2$ , is is reported for GPS constellation based PVT and joint GPS-GLONASS- EGNOS PVT estimates. GLONASS receiver equivalent noise is scaled w.r.t. to the GPS one based on the characteristics of waveforms and modulations of the two constellations. GLONASS augmentation data availability for EGNOS services has been assumed. track error probabilities have been computed for a<br>reference case of a set of 24 trains travelling along a 350<br>km route, from Cagliari to Olbia (Italy), at a nominal<br>speed of 80 km/hour, and leaving from Cagliari every ou

Based on the reported results it appears that when the GPS alone is employed, for that particular railway, the key performance indicator  $\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i}\mathbf{b}_{0}\|/\|\mathbf{b}_{0}\|$  presents a lower bound of about 0.75, while when both GPS and GLONASS satellites are employed the over bound is about 1.45.



Figure 3. The Olbia-Cagliari railway



 $\|\Gamma_i \overline{\mathbf{b}_0}\|/\|\mathbf{b}_0\| = \|\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{K})\mathbf{P}_i\mathbf{e}_\perp\|$  versus train mileage – GPS only.

By means of Eq. $(46)$  and Eq.  $(50)$ , it can be easily verified that in presence of 2 parallel tracks with an offset of 1.5 m, to achieve a track error probability of  $10^{-11}$ (two orders of magnitude lower than the HMI probability of  $10^{-9}$  in 1 hour) we need about 130 epochs when the GPS alone is employed, and about 40 epochs when both constellations GPS and GLONASS are used.

To further verify the effectiveness of the GNSS based train LDS, a measurement campaign has been performed, in the framework of the 3InSat research project, by means of a diagnostic train CARONTE (CAR ON TEchnology) provided by the Italian Railway Operator RFI (Rete Ferroviaria Italiana). The train was moving along the Rome-Salerno route (around 300 km), in a sunny day, with minimal impact of local atmospheric disturbances (see Figure 6).



 $\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{b}_0\|/\|\mathbf{b}_0\| = \|\mathbf{C}_v (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK}) \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{e}_\perp\|$  versus train mileage – GPS – GLONASS code tracking.

The train was equipped with a 3G Internet connection based on multi mobile carriers on the Italian territory (*i.e.*, Democrito system). For the test, an antenna with magnetic mount (Tallysmann TW2410), of diameter less than 10 cm, able to receive GPS, GLONASS and SBAS (EGNOS) signals of single frequency L1 and having an LNA gain equal to 25 dB min. on the band from 1575.42-1606 MHz has been installed on the roof of the train.



Figure 6.. Rome-Cassino railway (part of Rome-Salerno railway).

The antenna was positioned above the cab 1 of the train, with an offset of about 40 centimeters on the carriage's left side with respect to the central axis of the train; the TW2410 was connected via an RF cable of 5 m length to an evaluation-kit with on-board low-cost, single frequency, code and carrier phase, multi-constellation GNSS receiver (*i.e.*, GPS, GLONASS, GALILEO, COMPASS, SBAS).

As reference, collected data were also processed with RTKLIB software supporting both absolute positioning algorithms (*i.e.*, stand-alone) and precise positioning algorithms (*i.e.*, Differential GNSS Real Time Kinematic, and Precise Point Positioning), with corrections received from the ItalPos network in RTK Nearest mode (1 sec correction-rate).

.



Figure 7. RFI CARONTE diagnostics train.

The recorded data set has been post processed, to evaluate the performance of the multiple track detector, in case of two parallel tracks with an inter-track offset of 2 m. Since the measurement campaign has been made at an early stage of the 3InSat project, the psudoranges provided by the ItalPos network have been employed as input to the augmentation and integrity monitoring network, in place of those provided by RIMs' receivers.

Moreover, for similar reason the track data base has been built on the basis of the train location estimated by post processing the carrier phase with a Differential GNSS Real Time Kinematic algorithm. This in turn implies that the reported evaluation is also affected by track data base inaccuracies, mostly due to multipath.



Figure 8. Posterior probability of the hypothesis corresponding to the true track based on single epoch observations.

In Figure 8 an excerpt of 1000 epochs (sampling interval of 1 sec.), corresponding to about the first 25 km of travelled distance, the posterior hypothesis corresponding to the true track (actually track #1), based on single epoch residuals, given by Eq. (40) is reported, together with the flag indicating the validity of the computed data.



Figure 9. Correct detection of the hypothesis corresponding to the true track.

In Figure 9 the event corresponding to the correct track detection is also reported.

The experimental track error probability for the intertrack offset of 2 m. is about 0.15. This result is in good accordance with the value obtained from Eq. (46). In fact, The experimental track error probability for the inter-<br>track offset of 2 m. is about 0.15. This result is in good<br>accordance with the value obtained from Eq. (46). In fact,<br>for  $M=2$ ,  $\Delta b=2$  m,  $\|\Gamma_b b_0\|/||\mathbf{b}_0|| = 0.7$ 



Figure 10. Posterior probability of the hypothesis corresponding to the true track based on 10 epochs observations.

In Figure 10 the posterior track probability based on 10 observations is also reported. Although at least 10 times more epochs should be employed to meet the required track error probability, statistical relevance of the reported results motivated the selection of a smaller number of epochs to verify the applicability of Eq. (50). The reported results evidenced that, in presence of signal degradations like those due to multipath, the errors are not statistically independent. Instead some form of clustering is present. The temporal correlation of the decisions (and consequently of the errors) may reduce the gain obtained by temporal integration, especially when a small number of epochs is employed.

#### **VII. CONCLUSIONS**

This paper has presented a novel solution to allow the discrimination of the track where the train is located, as a contribution for the adoption of GNSS on the ERTMS- ETCS train control system. As confirmed by the experimental activity, the joint use of a track database and GNSS measurements allow to discriminate the current train track.

To achieve track error probabilities compatible with SIL 4 operational requirements, temporal integration has to be performed when pseudoranges extracted from code tracking measurements are employed. Moreover, considering that track detector performance is driven by the ratio between the track offset and the receiver equivalent noise, some kind of augmentation (e.g. WAAS, EGNOS) has to be adopted to reduce the impact of ephemerides errors, and ionospheric and tropospheric incremental delays.

Since, based on Eq. (50),  $\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{b}_0\| / \|\mathbf{b}_0\|$  increases with the<br>square root of the number of epochs employed in the<br>decision, achievement of fast track discrimination<br>requires a consistent reduction of the rec Since, based on Eq. (50),  $\|\mathbf{\Gamma}_i \mathbf{b}_0\| / \|\mathbf{b}_0\|$  increases with the square root of the number of epochs employed in the decision, achievement of fast track discrimination requires a consistent reduction of the receiver equivalent noise, as the one achievable, for instance, by resorting to carrier phase tracking. On the other hand, the alternative solution based on the adoption of RTK mode requires a larger telecommunications bandwidth and a denser augmentation network, compared to the one actually deployed by the EGNOS system

#### **APPENDIX A. TRACK ERROR PROBABILITY**

Since the PVT estimation procedure operates on a linearized system, in order to compute the statistics of  $\zeta_{H_k}$  conditioned to the Hypothesis  $H_i$ , let us denote with  $\hat{s}^{nf}_{i}$  the estimate of the train mileage for the *i*-th track in absence of receiver noise and multipath (noise-free case), under the condition that the *i*-th hypothesis is true. In addition let us denote with  $\mathbf{b}_{i,k}$  the offset of the *k*-th track with respect the *i*-th one. **EXERCISE APPENDIX A. TRACK ERROR PROBABILITY** can be applied, so that for the single difference of the principal state of the *i*-th single difference of the principal state of the *i*-th single difference of the princip **Examplementation activenty, compared to the one actually<br>
<b>Explored by the EGNOS system**<br> **APPENDIX A. TRACK ERROR PROBABILITY**<br> **CONVERTIFY** can be applied, so that for the single difference of the<br>
linear the PVT estim **PENDIX A. TRACK ERROR PROBABILITY** can be applied, so that for the PVT estimation procedure operates on a<br>
ized system, in order to compute the statistics of the *p*-th<br>
anditioned to the Hypothesis *H<sub>n</sub>*, let us denote stem, in order to compute the statistics of<br>
each othe Hypothesis  $H_0$ , the us denote with<br>
ate of the train mileage for the *i*-th track in<br>
ceciver noise and multipalt (noise-free case),<br>
Observing that<br>
sceiver noise **PVT** estimation procedure operates on a<br>
syncotonages of the *p*-th satellite th<br>
system, in order to compute the statistics of<br>
tioned to the Hypothesis *H<sub>i</sub>*, let us denote with<br>
timate of the train mileage for the *i* 

Using  $\hat{s}^{nf}_i$  as initial point for the mileage estimation for the k-th hypothesis, with reference to Fig.2, the difference between the geometrical distance  $r_k^p$  between the *p*-th satellite and the point lying on the *k*-th track with mileage  $\hat{s}_i^{nf}$ , can be written in terms of the analogous quantity  $r_i^p$  have pect the *i*-th one.<br>  $\int_{t_i}^{nf}$  as initial point for the mileage estimation for<br>
hypothesis, with reference to Fig.2, the difference<br>
the geometrical distance  $r_k^p$  between the *p*-th<br>
and the point lying on the *k*-th

$$
r_k^p \mathbf{e}_k^p = \left\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,i} + r_i^p \mathbf{e}_i^p, \mathbf{e}_k^p \right\rangle \mathbf{e}_k^p = \left\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,i}, \mathbf{e}_k^p \right\rangle \mathbf{e}_k^p + r_i^p \left\langle \mathbf{e}_i^p, \mathbf{e}_k^p \right\rangle \mathbf{e}_k^p \ (52)
$$

so that for their difference we have

$$
\Delta r_{k,i}^p = r_k^p - r_i^p =
$$
  
=  $r_i^p \left[ \left\langle \mathbf{e}_i^p, \mathbf{e}_k^p \right\rangle - 1 \right] + \left\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,i}, \mathbf{e}_k^p \right\rangle,$  (53)

where  $\mathbf{e}_k^p$  and  $\mathbf{e}_i^p$  are the unit vectors corresponding to the lines-of-sights from the *p*-th satellite and the receiver lying on the i-th track and on the k-th track respectively.



Figure 11. Receivers geometry

On the other hand, with reference to Figure 11, considering that:

$$
r_k^p = r_i^p \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{b_{k,i}}{r_i^p}\right)^2 - 2\frac{b_{k,i}}{r_i^p} \cos(\varphi_{k,i}^p)},
$$
 (54)  
or  $|b_{k,i}| < 20$  m, for the GPS constellation we have  

$$
\left|\frac{b_{k,i}}{r_i^p}\right| < 10^{-6},
$$
 (55)  
r's expansion  

$$
\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} \equiv 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}
$$
 (56)  
applied, so that for the single difference of the  
ages of the *p*-th satellite the following  
ation holds  

$$
b_{l,i} \cos(\varphi_{k,i}^p) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{k,i}^2}{r_i^p} \approx -b_{l,i} \cos(\varphi_{k,i}^p).
$$
 (57)  
g that  

$$
\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,i}, \mathbf{e}_i^p \rangle = -b_{k,i} \cos(\varphi_{k,i}^p)
$$
 (58)  
namally write  

$$
\Delta \mathbf{r}_{k,i} = \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i}.
$$
 (59)  
the output of the k-th  
when the true hypothesis is the i-th one, we

and that for  $|b_{k,i}|$ < 20 m, for the GPS constellation we have

$$
\left|\frac{b_{k,i}}{r_i^p}\right| < 10^{-6},\tag{55}
$$

the Taylor's expansion

$$
\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} \approx 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \tag{56}
$$

can be applied, so that for the single difference of the pseudoranges of the *p*-th satellite the following approximation holds Taylor's expansion<br>  $\left| \frac{b_{k,i}}{r_i^p} \right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br>
Taylor's expansion<br>  $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} \equiv 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  (56)<br>
be applied, so that for the single difference of the<br>
udoranges of the *p*-th satellite the following<br>
roximati *p*  $\left| \frac{b_{k,i}}{r_i^p} \right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br>
Taylor's expansion<br>  $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} \equiv 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  (56)<br>
1 be applied, so that for the single difference of the<br>
udoranges of the *p*-th satellite the following<br>
proximation holds<br>  $r_{$  $r_k^p = r_i^p \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p}\right)^2 - 2\frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p} \cos(\varphi_{k,l}^p)}$ , (54)<br>
d that for  $|b_{k,l}| < 20$  m, for the GPS constellation we have<br>  $\left|\frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p}\right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br>
e Taylor's expansion<br>  $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} \equiv 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  (56  $r_k^p = r_i^p \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{b_{k,j}}{r_i^p}\right)^2 - 2\frac{b_{k,j}}{r_i^p} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p)}$ , (54)<br>
and that for  $|b_{k,j}| < 20$  m, for the GPS constellation we have<br>  $\left|\frac{b_{k,j}}{r_i^p}\right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br>
he Taylor's expansion<br>  $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} \equiv 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$   $r_k^p = r_i^p \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p}\right)^2 - 2\frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p} \cos(\varphi_{k,l}^p)}$ , (54)<br>
and that for  $|b_{k,l}| < 20$  m, for the GPS constellation we have<br>  $\left|\frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p}\right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br>
the Taylor's expansion<br>  $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon} \equiv 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  $\equiv 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  (56)<br>
for the single difference of the<br> *p*-th satellite the following<br>  $b_{k,i}^2 \equiv -b_{l,i} \cos(\varphi_{k,i}^p)$ . (57)<br>  $r_i^p$ <br>  $\left(\frac{p_i}{p_i}\right) = -b_{k,i} \cos(\varphi_{k,i}^p)$  (58)<br>  $\Delta$ **r** – **Ph** (59)

$$
\Delta r_{k,i}^p \cong -b_{l,i} \cos\left(\varphi_{k,i}^p\right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{k,i}^2}{r_i^p} \cong -b_{l,i} \cos\left(\varphi_{k,i}^p\right). \tag{57}
$$

$$
\left\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,i}, \mathbf{e}_i^p \right\rangle = -b_{k,i} \cos \left( \varphi_{k,i}^p \right) \tag{58}
$$

we can finally write

$$
\Delta \mathbf{r}_{k,i} = \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i} \,. \tag{59}
$$

 $r_i^p$  have *k*<sub>*ki*</sub>  $\left| \frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p} \right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br> *k* if  $\left| \frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p} \right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br> *k*  $\left| \frac{b_{k,l}}{r_i^p} \right| < 10^{-6}$ , (55)<br> *k* the single difference of the the single difference of the the following<br>  $\frac{a}{b} =$ pseudoranges of the *p*-th satellite the following<br>approximation holds<br> $\Delta r_{k,j}^p \approx -b_{l,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{k,j}^2}{r_l^p} \approx -b_{l,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p)$ . (57)<br>Observing that<br> $\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,j}, \mathbf{e}_i^p \rangle = -b_{k,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p)$  (58)<br>we c estimator when the true hypothesis is the i-th one, we have  $|\overline{r_i}^p|$   $\rightarrow$  10  $\rightarrow$  (33)<br>
sion<br>  $\sqrt{1-\varepsilon} \equiv 1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  (56)<br>
that for the single difference of the<br>
the *p*-th satellite the following<br>
ds<br>  $\mu$ ) +  $\frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{k,l}^2}{r_i^p} \approx -b_{l,i} \cos(\varphi_{k,l}^p)$ . (57)<br>  $\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,i},$ 1  $\epsilon = 1$  2 (30)<br>
1, so that for the single difference of the<br>
of the p-th satellite the following<br>
holds<br>  $s(\varphi_{k,j}^p) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{k,j}^2}{r_i^p} \approx -b_{l,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p)$ . (57)<br>  $\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,j}, \mathbf{e}_l^p \rangle = -b_{k,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p)$  (58)<br> **approximation holds**<br>  $\Delta r_{k,j}^p \equiv -b_{l,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{k,j}^2}{r_i^p} \equiv -b_{l,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p)$ . (57)<br>
Observing that<br>  $\langle \mathbf{b}_{k,j}, \mathbf{e}_i^p \rangle = -b_{k,j} \cos(\varphi_{k,j}^p)$  (58)<br>
we can finally write<br>
Therefore denoting with  $\hat$ 

$$
\hat{z}_{H_k/H_i} = \hat{z}_{H_i} + \mathbf{KP}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i} \,. \tag{60}
$$

Therefore it follows that

$$
E\{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k} / H_i\} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK})\mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i}.
$$
 (61)

Similarly, we have

$$
\zeta_{H_k/H_i} = \zeta_{H_i} + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{v}} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK}) \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i} . \tag{62}
$$

For sake of compactness of notation let us pose

$$
\Gamma_i = \mathbf{C}_\mathbf{v} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK}) \mathbf{P}_i. \tag{63}
$$

(57)<br>  $\left(\mathbf{b}_{k,i}, \mathbf{e}_i^p\right) = -b_{k,i} \cos\left(\varphi_{k,i}^p\right).$  (57)<br>  $\left(\mathbf{b}_{k,i}, \mathbf{e}_i^p\right) = -b_{k,i} \cos\left(\varphi_{k,i}^p\right)$  (58)<br>  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{b}_{k,i}.$  (59)<br>  $\frac{1}{2} \sin\left(\frac{2}{\pi} \mathbf{b}_{k,i}\right).$  (59)<br>  $\frac{1}{2} \sin\left(\frac{2}{\pi} \mathbf{b}_{k,i}\right).$ Then, we observe that the magnitude of  $\zeta_{H_k}$  will exceed Therefore it follows that<br>  $E\{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_k}/H_i\} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK})\mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i}$ . (61)<br>
Similarly, we have<br>  $\zeta_{H_k/H_i} = \zeta_{H_i} + \mathbf{C}_v (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK})\mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i}$ . (62)<br>
For sake of compactness of notation let us pose<br>  $\Gamma$ Solution of *K*<sub>*K<sub>i</sub>*</sub> **c** is the interpolation of *H*<sub>*P<sub>I</sub>*, *M<sub>i</sub>*, will be output of the k-th estimator when the true hypothesis is the i-th one, we have  $\hat{z}_{H_k/H_l} = \hat{z}_{H_l} + \mathbf{KP}_l \mathbf{b}_{k,l}$ . (60)<br>
Therefore it f</sub> Therefore denoting with  $\hat{z}_{n_k/n_k}$  the output of the k-th<br>estimator when the true hypothesis is the i-th one, we<br>have<br> $\hat{z}_{n_k/n_k} = \hat{z}_{n_k} + KP_i \mathbf{b}_{k_k}$ . (60)<br>Therefore it follows that<br> $E{\hat{v}_{n_k}/H_i} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK})\mathbf{P}_i \$ greater than the half of the magnitude of  $\Gamma_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i}$  and its sign will be such that it will point in the opposite direction aave<br>  $\hat{z}_{H_k/H_i} = \hat{z}_{H_i} + \mathbf{K}P_i\mathbf{b}_{k,i}$ . (60)<br>
Therefore it follows that<br>  $E{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_i}/H_i} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{K})P_i\mathbf{b}_{k,i}$ . (61)<br>
Similarly, we have<br>  $\zeta_{H_k/H_i} = \zeta_{H_i} + \mathbf{C}_v(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{K})P_i\mathbf{b}_{k,i}$ . (62)<br> of  $\Gamma_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i}$ . Considering that  $\zeta_{H_k}$  is a zero mean Gaussian variable with independent components with unitary variance, i.e., at<br>  $H_i$ } = (**I** – **HK**)**P**<sub>*i*</sub> *b*<sub>*ki*</sub>. (61)<br>
(**K**)**P**<sub>*i*</sub>*h***<sub>***ki***</sub>. (62)<br>
ess of notation let us pose<br>
= <b>C**<sub>v</sub>(**I** – **HK**)**P**<sub>*i*</sub>. (63)<br>
t the magnitude of  $\zeta_{H_k}$  will exceed<br>
the direction of **Γ**<sub>*i*</sub>**b**<sub></sub> Similarly, we have<br>  $\zeta_{H_i/H_i} = \zeta_{H_i} + C_v(I - HK)P_i b_{k,i}$ . (62)<br>
For sake of compactness of notation let us pose<br>  $\Gamma_i = C_v(I - HK)P_i$ . (63)<br>
Then, we observe that the magnitude of  $\zeta_{H_k}$  will exceed<br>
the magnitude of  $\zeta_{H_k}$ 

$$
\zeta_{H_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}) \tag{64}
$$

a zero mean Gaussian random variable with unitary variance too.

In presence of multiple hypotheses, an error event is generated each time the lower threshold (i.e., the one associated to the adjacent track) is exceeded. Therefore the conditional probability of selecting one of the other tracks when the i-th track is the true one, given by Eq. (43) immediately follows.

To evaluate the track error probability increase due to undetected satellite faults and/or incremental ionospheric and tropospheric delays not fully compensated by the augmentation system, let us denote with  $\Delta \xi_p$  the error affecting the *p*-th pseudorange due to the cited error sources. In this case the estimate  $\hat{z}_{H_i}$  will be affected by

the additional error **Kξ** so that:

$$
E\left\{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{H_i} / H_i\right\} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK})\Delta\xi\,,\tag{65}
$$

and

$$
\zeta_{H} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{K})\Delta \xi, \mathbf{I})
$$
 (66)

On the other hand, we have

$$
\zeta_{H_k/H_i} = \zeta_{H_i} + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{v}} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{HK}) \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i} + \n+ \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{v}} (\mathbf{H}^{(i)} \mathbf{K}^{(i)} - \mathbf{H}^{(k)} \mathbf{K}^{(k)}) \Delta \xi .
$$
\n(67)

where the *i* and *k* superscripts have been introduced to remark that their values may be potentially different, being referred to different initial point for Taylor's expansion.<br>Thus denoting with  $\Psi^{(i,k)}$  the quantity and<br>  $\zeta_{H_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{C}_v (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H} \mathbf{K}) \Delta \xi, \mathbf{I})$  (66) [6] Galileo<br>
On the other hand, we have<br>  $\zeta_{H_k/H_i} = \zeta_{H_i} + \mathbf{C}_v (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H} \mathbf{K}) \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{b}_{k,i} + \mathbf{C}_v (\mathbf{H}^{(i)} \mathbf{K}^{(i)} - \mathbf{H}^{(k)} \mathbf{K}^{(k)}) \Delta \xi$ 

$$
\Psi^{(i,k)} = C_v (H^{(i)} K^{(i)} - H^{(k)} K^{(k)}), \qquad (68)
$$

the conditional probability of selecting one of the other tracks when the i-th track is the true one, is

(1,2) 2,1 ( ,k) <sup>1</sup> k,i 1 (M,M 1) 1, 1 1 <sup>2</sup> 2 2 1 1 <sup>2</sup> 2 2 1 <sup>2</sup> 2 2 *i i i i i e k i k i i M M erfc i P erfc i M erfc i M* **Γ b Ψ ξ Γ b Ψ ξ Γ b Ψ ξ** . (69)

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Filip, A., Beugin, J., Marais, J. "Safety Concept of Railway Signalling Based on Galileo Safety-of-Life Service," COMPRAIL, Toledo, Spain, Sept 15-17, 2008, pp. 103-112.
- [2] A. Neri, A. Filip, F. Rispoli, and A.M. Vegni, "An Analytical Evaluation for Hazardous Failure Rate in a Satellite-based Train Positioning System with reference to the ERTMS Train Control Systems," in Proc. of ION GNSS 2012, September 17-21, 2012, Nashville, TN, USA.
- [3] Filip, A., Neri, A. Rispoli, F. "GNSS for railway signalling and train control: migration from aviation risk to hazard rate and safety integrity level," EUROPEAN Transport Research Review (manuscript submitted on June 10th, 2012).
- [4] Filip, A. "Dependability Assessment of Satellite Based Augmentation System for Signalling and Train Control," International Heavy Haul Association Conference (IHHA 2011), Calgary, Canada, 19-22 June 2011.
- multiple hypotheses, an error event is<br>
time the lower threshold (i.e., the one<br>
identication from a calgaent track) is exceeded. Therefore<br>
in the columnical of the signalling and train control: migration from a<br>
e adj **f** multiple hypotheses, an error event is<br>
time the lower threshold (i.e., the one<br>
is gradling and train control: migration from av<br>
be probability of selecting one of the other<br>
probability of selecting one of the othe (ac of multiple hypotheses, an error event is<br>
acach time the lower threshold (i.e., the one<br>
ignalling and train control: migration from it<br>
at to the adjacent track) is exceeded. Therefore<br>
in the interact is exceeded multiple hypotheses, an error event is [3] Filip, A., Neri, A. Rispoli, F. "GNSS for<br>
time the lower threshold (i.e., the one signaling and train control: ingration from<br>
rediction of the control interaction from the lowe (ellite faults and/or incremental ionospheric<br>
ecrite days ont fully compensated by the<br>
system, let us denote with  $\Delta \xi_p$  the error<br>  $J_p$ -th pseudorange due to the cited error<br>  $J_p$ -th pseudorange due to the cited error [5] Rispoli F., Filip, A. ; Castorina, M. ; Di Mambro, G. ; Neri, A. ; Senesi, F., "Recent progress in application of GNSS and advanced communications for railway signaling", RADIOELEKTRONIKA, 2013 23rd International Conference, Pardubice, 16-17 April 201, Page(s):13 – 22, ISBN: 978-1-4673-5516-2, D.O.I. 10.1109/RadioElek.2013.6530882.
	- [6] Galileo Integrity Concept, ESA document ESA- DEUI-NG-TN/01331, 2005.
	- [7] S. Pullen, T., Walter, and P. Enge, "SBAS and GBAS Integrity for Non-Aviation Users: Moving Away from Specific Risk," Intl. Tech. Meeting of the Institute of Navigation, San Diego, CA, USA, pp.533-543, 2011.
	- [8] Van Trees, *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory*, Part III, John Wiley & Sons, 2001.