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Abstract—In this paper, we present an efficient and robust GPS-aided visual inertial odometry (GPS-VIO) system that fuses IMU-camera data with intermittent GPS measurements. To perform sensor fusion, spatiotemporal sensor calibration and initialization of the transform between the sensor reference frames are required. We propose an online calibration method for both the GPS-IMU extrinsics and time offset as well as a reference frame initialization procedure that is robust to GPS sensor noise. In addition, we prove the existence of four unobservable directions of the GPS-VIO system when estimating in the VIO reference frame, and advocate a state transformation to the GPS reference frame for full observability. We extensively evaluate the proposed approach in Monte-Carlo simulations where we investigate the system’s robustness to different levels of GPS noise and loss of GPS signal, and additionally study the hyper-parameters used in the initialization procedure. Finally, the proposed system is validated in a large-scale real-world experiment.

I. INTRODUCTION AND RELATED WORK

For any autonomous robotic system, robust and accurate localization is a primary requirement. Localization is typically performed by estimating the robot’s state using measurements from on-board sensors. Of many possible sensor deployments, cameras and inertial measurement units (IMUs) – which measure linear accelerations and angular velocities of the moving robot – are commonly used for 3D navigation [1] in both indoor and outdoor environments, as they are low-cost yet provide high-quality ego-motion estimation [2]–[5]. However, when only using these sensors it is difficult to provide long-term, drift-free estimation due to the accumulation of relative motion errors. A commonly used approach to bound navigation error is a simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) that exploits loop-closure constraints to correct the accumulated error [6], [7]. However, such methods have a major drawback of both increased computational complexity and memory requirements.

As compared to SLAM, global measurement sensors, such as those from Global Positioning System (GPS), directly provide absolute position information to reduce drift. However, the accuracy of GPS measurements is highly dependent on the surrounding environment and the availability of external correction data. Synchronous sensors have been particularly considered in prior works, of which many fused inertial and GPS readings [8]–[11], with others leveraging camera, inertial and GPS sensors fusion [12]–[17] with great success. The asynchronous inclusion of GPS measurements within a sensor fusion framework remains challenging due to their low rate, high noise, and intermittency.

In order to optimally fuse multiple sensor measurements from different sensor frames, the transformation between the sensor frames and the time offset between the sensors must be known. An initial imperfect guess of the calibration between the sensor frames is often known beforehand, but if it is treated as perfect the state estimation can suffer, thus its refinement during online estimation is highly desirable. For a camera and IMU pair, the calibration of spatial and/or temporal parameters is well studied in [18]–[21]. While offline calibration of camera, IMU and GPS is often performed within an optimization framework [22], [23], online estimation of the transformation among the sensors was also investigated within a Kalman filter (KF) framework [13], [24]–[26]. However, to the best of our knowledge, no work to date has considered the estimation of the time offset between the GPS and IMU/camera, and their inherent asynchronous nature can greatly impact the estimation performance if ignored.

GPS provides latitude, longitude, and altitude readings in a geodetic coordinate frame, which is commonly converted to Cartesian coordinate East-North-Up (ENU) \( \{ E \} \), e.g., by setting the first GPS measurement as the datum. Conversely, a visual inertial odometry (VIO) system estimates its state relative to a starting VIO frame \( \{ V \} \), and is known to have four unobservable directions corresponding to the global position and yaw [27], [28]. In order to fuse GPS measurements in the global frame \( \{ E \} \) with VIO state estimates in the \( \{ V \} \) frame, the transformation between them must be computed, which is the “reference frame initialization” problem. Unlike sensor calibration, an initialization procedure is required to find this unknown transformation that varies from run-to-run.

This initialization problem can be formulated as a general 3D position trajectory alignment problem. For example,
Horn [29] used singular value decomposition (SVD) of a covariance matrix to derive a closed-form solution. Shepard et al. [30] leveraged this method to compute a 7 degree-of-freedom (d.o.f) transformation between synchronized GPS and VIO trajectories. Umeyama [31] presented a method in the presence of large trajectory noises, which was used to find the transformation between two gravity aligned trajectories [32], [33]. Other works have employed additional information for initialization, including magnetic sensors [34]–[36], yaw calculation with a straight planar motion assumption [37], or a priori map constructed in the global frame [16].

Note that the closest to this work is VINS-Fusion [12], which is a loosely-coupled estimator that fuses GPS measurements and VIO’s relative poses in a secondary optimization thread. While VINS-Fusion shows impressive performance in terms and VIO’s relative poses in a secondary optimization procedure’s hyper-parameters under different GPS measurement noise levels. We numerically analyze the choice of this procedure [39]. We numerically analyze the choice of this procedure’s hyper-parameters under different GPS measurement noise levels.

• We propose a tightly-coupled multi-state constraint Kalman filter (MSCKF)-based estimator to optimally fuse inertial, camera, and asynchronous GPS measurements. The system can begin with VIO only (e.g., indoors) and convert the frame of reference to the ENU frame at an arbitrarily later timestep when GPS measurements become available for fusion. This ensures that the system provides seamless localization, and once global information is available the system is able to estimate in this frame of reference.

• To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that models GPS-IMU time offset and performs online calibration of both the extrinsics and time offset. We also introduce a reference frame initialization procedure that models GPS-IMU time offset and performs online calibration of both the extrinsics and time offset. We also introduce a reference frame initialization procedure that models GPS-IMU time offset and performs online calibration of both the extrinsics and time offset.

• We perform an observability analysis of the GPS-VIO system to show that there are four unobservable directions if the 4 d.o.f transformation between the ENU to VIO frames is kept in the state vector, while the system is only observable if estimating in the ENU frame.

• We evaluate the proposed GPS-VIO system to show that there are four unobservable directions if the 4 d.o.f transformation between the ENU to VIO frames is kept in the state vector, while the system is only observable if estimating in the ENU frame.

In this paper, we develop a tightly-coupled VIO system aided by intermittent GPS measurements to provide persistent global localization results, while focusing on spatiotemporal sensor calibration and state initialization. In particular, the key contributions of this work are the following:

II. PRELIMINARIES: MSCKF BASED VIO

The standard VIO state $x_i$ at timestep $k$ consists of the current inertial state $x_i$ and $n$ historical IMU measurements $x_{C_i}$ [38]. All states are represented in the arbitrarily chosen gravity aligned frame of reference, $\{V\}$, see Fig. 2:

\[
V x_k = \begin{bmatrix} V x_{I_k} \\ V x_{C_k} \end{bmatrix}
\]

where $l_k^V q$ is the JPL unit quaternion [40] corresponding to the rotation from $\{V\}$ to $\{I\}$, $V p_{I_k}$ and $V v_{I_k}$ are the position and velocity of $\{I\}$ in $\{V\}$, and $b_{ak}$ and $b_{ak}$ are the gyroscopic and accelerometer biases, respectively. We define $x = \bar{x} \oplus x$, where $x$ is the true state, $\bar{x}$ is its estimate, $\bar{x}$ is the error state, and the operation $\oplus$ which maps a manifold element and its correction vector to an updated element on the same manifold [41].

A. State Propagation

The linear acceleration $a_m$ and angular velocity $\omega_m$ measurements of the IMU are used for propagation:

\[
\begin{align*}
V x_{k+1} &= f(V \bar{x}_{k+1}, t_{k}) + g(V \bar{N}_{k}, t_{k}^q, \omega_{m_k}) \\
\bar{x}_{k+1} &= V x_{k+1} + \zeta
\end{align*}
\]

where $\bar{x}_{k+1}$ denotes the estimate at timestep $a$ processing the measurements up to timestep $b$. We linearize (5) at the current estimate and propagate the covariance forward in time:

\[
\bar{P}_{k+1|k} = \Phi(t_{k+1}, t_{k}) \bar{P}_{k|k} \Phi(t_{k+1}, t_{k}) + Q_k
\]

where $\Phi$ and $Q$ are the state transition matrix and discrete noise covariance [38].

B. Visual Measurement Update

We maintain a number of stochastic clones in $V x_{C_i}$, and perform visual feature tracking to obtain series of visual bearing measurements to 3D environmental features. A measurement $z_i$ at timestep $i$ is expressed as a function of a cloned pose and feature position $V p_f$:

\[
\begin{align*}
\z_i &= \Pi(C_i p_f) + n_i \\
C_i p_f &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} R_{V} V p_f - V p_f + C p_f
\end{align*}
\]
where \( \Pi \left( [x \ y \ z]^\top \right) = \left[ \begin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ z \end{array} \right]^\top \) is the perspective projection, and \( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} R \) and \( C_p \) represent the camera to IMU extrinsics. By stacking all measurements for a given feature, the corresponding linearized residuals \( \hat{z}_{ck} \) is given by:

\[
\hat{z}_{ck} = H_{ck}V\hat{x}_{k} + H_{f_{ck}}V\hat{p}_{f} + n_{f_{ck}}
\]

(9)

where \( H_{c} \) and \( H_{f} \) are the measurement Jacobians of the state and the feature. The key idea of the MSCKF is to find the left null space of \( H_{f} \) and left multiply (9) by it to infer a new measurement function that depends only on the state:

\[
\hat{z}'_{ck} = H'_{ck}V\hat{x}_{k} + n'_{f_{ck}}
\]

(10)

which can be directly used in an EKF update without storing features in the state, leading to substantial computational savings as the problem size remains bounded over time.

III. GPS Measurement Update and Calibration

Besides the visual measurement update as in the standard MSCKF, whenever a new GPS measurement in the ENU frame \( \{E\} \) is available, we will update the state with it. This requires knowledge of the transform between the two frames \( \{\hat{V}, \hat{E}_V\} \), which we will explain in the next section. In particular, the GPS measurement \( E_{pG_k} \) at timestep \( k \) is:

\[
z_{G_k} = E_{pG_k} = E_{pV} + \hat{E}_{R}V_{pG_k} + n_{G_k} = h(V_{x_k}) + n_{G_k}
\]

(11)

\[
V_{pG_k} = V_{p_{G_k}} + \hat{V}_{R} \otimes \hat{V}_{G}
\]

(12)

where \( \hat{T}_{G} \) is the GPS to IMU extrinsic calibration and \( n_{G_k} \) is a white Gaussian noise. We note that while here \( \hat{V}_{G} \) is written as a full rotation matrix, we represent it as one that only rotates about the global gravity aligned z-axis. Due to the delayed asynchronous nature of the GPS sensor, the state has likely advanced beyond the collection time and thus we express the measurement as a function of the available stochastic clones. Using linear interpolation [42], the IMU pose in Eq. (12) can be expressed as:

\[
\hat{T}_{G} = \text{Exp} \left( \lambda \log (\hat{T}_{G} \hat{R}_G^{\top}) \right)
\]

(13)

\[
\hat{V}_{p_{G_k}} = (1 - \lambda) \hat{V}_{p_{G_k}} + \lambda \hat{V}_{G}
\]

(14)

\[
\lambda = \frac{(t_k + t_{G} - t_a)/(t_b - t_a)}
\]

(15)

where \( t_{G} \) is the time offset between the GPS and IMU clocks, the bounding poses have timestamps \( t_{a} \leq t_{k} + t_{G} \leq t_{b} \), and \( \text{Exp}() \) and \( \text{Log}() \) are the SO(3) matrix exponential and logarithmic functions [43].

As evident from Eqs. (11)-(15), the GPS measurement model depends on both the IMU states and the GPS-IMU extrinsic and time offset, thus enabling online spatiotemporal GPS-IMU calibration. To update with this measurement in the MSCKF, we linearize it at the current estimate and have the following measurement Jacobians:

\[
\frac{\partial z_{G_k}}{\partial \hat{V} \hat{R}} = -\hat{E}_{R} \hat{V} \hat{R} \otimes \left[ \hat{J}_{1}(\lambda \hat{R} \hat{J}_G) \hat{J}_4(\lambda \hat{R} \hat{J}_G)^{-1} - \hat{J}_4(\lambda \hat{R} \hat{J}_G)^{-1} \right] \]

(16)

\[
\frac{\partial z_{G_k}}{\partial \hat{V} \hat{R}} = -\hat{\lambda} \hat{E}_{R} \hat{V} \hat{R} \otimes \left[ \hat{J}_{1}(\lambda \hat{R} \hat{J}_G) \hat{J}_4(\lambda \hat{R} \hat{J}_G)^{-1} - \hat{J}_4(\lambda \hat{R} \hat{J}_G)^{-1} \right] \]

(17)

\[
\frac{\partial z_{G_k}}{\partial \hat{V} \hat{p}_{G_k}} = (1 - \lambda) \hat{E}_{R} \hat{R}, \quad \frac{\partial z_{G_k}}{\partial \hat{V} \hat{p}_{G_k}} = \hat{\lambda} \hat{E}_{R} \hat{R}
\]

(18)

\[
\frac{\partial z_{G_k}}{\partial \hat{T}_{G}} = \hat{E}_{R} \hat{R} \otimes \hat{V}
\]

(19)

As mentioned earlier, when performing an EKF update with GPS measurements Eq. (11), the 4 d.o.f frame transformation \( \{\hat{V}, \hat{E}_V\} \) must be known. To find this, we can collect two sets of position estimates of the GPS receiver in two different frames and formulate a non-linear optimization problem to align them. This process requires us to have estimates of the GPS receiver positions in both \( \{E\} \) and \( \{V\} \) frames. In the case of inaccurate GPS measurements, alignment using a short trajectory length may result in a poor transformation estimate due to the true trajectory being buried in the large measurement noise. As shown in simulations in Section VI, the smart use of longer trajectories allows for accurate alignment even with high noise.

In the standard MSCKF-VIO, the current sliding window typically contains a very short and most recent portion of the trajectory, which does not support reliable GPS-VIO initialization. Therefore, we augment our state by selectively keeping the clone poses (i.e., keyframes) that bound GPS measurements at a fixed temporal frequency. As illustrated in Fig. 3, once we reach the desired trajectory length, we perform interpolation for all GPS measurement times that fall within the keyframe window to find the corresponding position estimates in the VIO frame.

Given a set of GPS position measurements in the ENU frame \( \{E_{pG_1}, \ldots, E_{pG_n}\} \) within the keyframe window and the corresponding interpolated positions in the VIO frame \( \{V_{pG_1}, \ldots, V_{pG_n}\} \), we use the following geometric constraints to derive the frame initialization:

\[
E_{pG_i} = E_{pV} + \hat{E}_{R}V_{pG_i}, \quad \forall i = 1 \ldots n
\]

(21)

\[
E_{pG_j} - E_{pG_i} = \hat{E}_{R}(V_{pG_j} - V_{pG_i}), \quad \forall j = 2 \ldots n
\]

(22)

As mentioned earlier, there is a 4 d.o.f (instead of 6 d.o.f) transformation including 3 d.o.f translation and 1 d.o.f for yaw between the ENU and VIO frames due to the fact that both frames are gravity aligned, which entails that we can simply use the rotation about the global z-axis with yaw
angle $\theta$:

$$
\hat{\mathbf{R}} = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \theta & -\sin \theta & 0 \\
\sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(23)

With (23) we can re-write (22) as the following linear constraint:

$$
\mathbf{A}_j \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{bmatrix} := \mathbf{A}_j \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{b}_j, \forall j = 2 \cdots n
$$

(24)

Stacking all these constraints yields the following linear least-squares with quadratic constraint, which can be solved for $\mathbf{w}$, e.g., by Lagrangian multipliers [39]:

$$
\min \| \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{b} \|^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \| \mathbf{w} \|^2 = 1
$$

(25)

The solution of (25) immediately provides the sought rotation $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$. We substitute it into (21) and solve for $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_V$ as:

$$
\hat{\mathbf{p}}_V = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_{G_i} - \hat{\mathbf{R}}^T \mathbf{p}_{G_i}
$$

(26)

The resulting $\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_V\}$ initial guess of the GPS-VIO frame transformation is further corrected using delayed initialization [42], [45], which appends the transform to the state in a probabilistic fashion. Specifically, by augmenting the state vector with the transformation along with an infinite covariance prior for these new variables, we perform the standard EKF update using all collected GPS measurements. After initialization, we marginalize all the keyframes to reduce the state to the original state size (see Fig. 3).

V. OBSERVABILITY ANALYSIS OF GPS-VIO

As system observability plays an important role state estimation [27], [46], in this section we perform an observability analysis for the proposed GPS-aided VIO system to gain insights about state/parameter identifiability. For concise presentation, we consider a simplified case where the state does not contain biases or stochastic clumps and assumes a single feature with perfectly synchronized and calibrated sensors, while the results can be extended to general cases:

$$
\mathbf{x}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{t}_k^T \mathbf{v}_k^T \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{v}_k^T \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{p}_V^T \mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{p}_V^T \end{bmatrix}^T
$$

(27)

The linearized error state evolution and residuals of both the GPS and visual measurement are generically given by (see (5), (7) and (11)):

$$
\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k = \Phi(t_k, t_0)\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 + \mathbf{w}_k
$$

(28)

$$
\hat{\mathbf{z}}_k = \mathbf{H}_k\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k + \mathbf{n}_k
$$

(29)

Given this linearized system, we have the following result:

**Lemma 5.1:** If estimating states in the ENU frame, even with global GPS measurements, the GPS-VIO system remains unobservable and has four unobservable directions.

**Proof:** We first compute the state transition matrix (6):

$$
\Phi(t_k, t_0) = \begin{bmatrix}
\Phi_1 & \mathbf{0}_3 & \mathbf{0}_3 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 7} \\
\Phi_2 & \mathbf{I}_3 & \Delta \mathbf{I}_3 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 7} \\
\Phi_3 & \mathbf{0}_3 & \mathbf{I}_3 & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 7} \\
\mathbf{0}_{7 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{7 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{7 \times 3} & \mathbf{I}_7
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(30)

where $\Phi_1 = \frac{t_k}{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{R}_{k_0} \mathbf{R}_{k}^T$

(31)

$$
\Phi_2 = -\mathbf{V} \mathbf{p}_{k_0} - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{p}_k + \frac{1}{2} \Delta t^2 \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}_{k_0} \mathbf{R}_{k}^T
$$

(32)

$$
\Phi_3 = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{p}_k - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{p}_k + g \Delta t \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}_{k_0} \mathbf{R}_{k}^T
$$

(33)

Linearization of (7) and (11) yields the following measurement Jacobians:

$$
\mathbf{H}_k = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_3, \mathbf{H}_4, \mathbf{I}_8, \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \mathbf{H}_4 \mathbf{R}_{k_0} \mathbf{R}_{k} \mathbf{I}_8, \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \mathbf{I}_8, \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(34)

where $\mathbf{H}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{p}_k \mathbf{v}_k \times \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_k \times \mathbf{g} \end{bmatrix}$, and $(\cdot)_3$ is the third column of the matrix. Note that the fifth column is 5 by 1, because we have 1 d.o.f for the $\{ E \}$ to $\{ V \}$ rotation. Now we can construct the observability matrix $\mathbf{M}$ (see [47]) and compute its null space as:

$$
\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{H}_k \hat{\mathbf{E}}(t_k, t_0), \text{null}(\mathbf{M}) = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{0}_3 \\
\mathbf{0}_3 \\
\mathbf{0}_3 \\
\mathbf{0}_{1 \times 3} (\hat{\mathbf{R}} \mathbf{g})_3 \\
\hat{\mathbf{R}} \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 1}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(35)

where $(\cdot)_3$ is the third element of the vector. The span of the columns of this matrix encodes the unobservable subspace. By inspection, the first block column corresponds to the translation of $\{ V \}$ relative to $\{ E \}$ and the second block column to the rotation of $\{ V \}$ with respect to $\{ E \}$ along the axis of gravity. It thus becomes clear that the GPS-VIO system in the VIO frame has these four unobservable directions which are essentially inherited from the standard VIO [27], [28].

While the above results seem to be counter-intuitive given the availability of global GPS measurements, the root cause of this unobservability is the gauge freedom of the 4 d.o.f GPS-VIO frame transformation. Thus even though we utilize global measurements, the system maintains a non-trivial null space. Unobservable directions are known to cause inconsistencies for linearized estimators as these null spaces falsely disappear due to numerical errors. Therefore the estimator gains information in spurious directions, hurting overall consistency and accuracy, unless special techniques are utilized [27], [48]. To address this issue, we perform state estimation directly in the ENU global frame of reference once initialized, which can be shown to make the system fully observable.

**Lemma 5.2:** If estimating states in the ENU frame, the GPS-VIO system is fully observable.

**Proof:** The simplified state in the ENU frame is:

$$
\mathbf{x}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{t}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \mathbf{E} \mathbf{p}_k^T \end{bmatrix}^T
$$

(36)

Then the state transition matrix of the new state $\Phi'(t_k, t_0)$ is equivalent to Eq. (30) with all parameters that are in $\{ E \}$ are now in $\{ E \}$. Also, the corresponding GPS measurement Jacobian is $\mathbf{H}_g = \mathbf{0}_3 \mathbf{I}_3 \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 10}$ (see Eq. (11)). Clearly, the multiplication of $\mathbf{H}_g \Phi'(t_k, t_0)$ with null$(\mathbf{M})$ does not yield a zero matrix which means the four unobservable directions of Eq. (27) are now observable given GPS measurements. Since VIO is known to have four unobservable directions [27], [28], we can conclude that the state in the ENU, see Eq. (37), is fully observable.
As a final remark about the proposed GPS-VIO estimator, based on the above lemma, after GPS-VIO initialization, we therefore transform the state from $\{V\}$ to the $\{E\}$ and propagate the error state and covariance based on the linearization of this transform function $g(\cdot)$ as follows:

$$
E\mathbf{x}_k = g(V\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{R}, E\mathbf{p}_V)
$$

$$
\Rightarrow E\mathbf{\dot{x}}_k = \Psi V\mathbf{x}_k, \quad \mathbf{P}\dot{\mathbf{}} = \Psi \mathbf{P} \odot \Psi^\top
$$

where $\Psi$ is the Jacobian matrix [44]. We note that the $\{E\}$ to $\{V\}$ transformation inserted into the state during initialization, see Section IV, has been marginalized since all measurements can now be written directly in terms of the remaining state variables.

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

The proposed GPS-VIO was implemented within OpenVINS [49] which provides both simulation and evaluation utilities. The key simulation parameters are: maximum of 15 clones, maximum of 100 actively tracked features with 1 pixel Gaussian noise, while the IMU was simulated using realistic noise from a real sensor. The camera was simulated at 5Hz, while the GPS sensor was simulated with a lower frequency of 2Hz with varying measurement noises ranging from 0.1m to 5m. As shown in Fig. 1, the trajectory of the dataset is 9.1km in length, following that of a planar vehicle motion with an average velocity of 9m/s. Except for the results in Section VI-C, Monte-Carlo simulation results are reported over 10 runs.

A. Initialization with Different Hyper-parameters

To gain insight into how the initialization procedure is affected by GPS measurement noise and trajectory length, we simulated 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2 and 5m GPS measurement noise and 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100m initialization distance thresholds. To prevent biasing these results to the initial section of this particular trajectory, it is split into non-overlapping segments for each distance threshold. The initialization procedure was independently performed on each segment and the resulting statistics on the accuracy of the initialized VIO to ENU transform are shown in Table I.

In general, the initialization errors are smaller with a larger distance threshold and with smaller GPS noise. The results indicate that reasonable accuracy for this transformation can be achieved after 50m for most realistic levels of GPS measurement noise. In practice, these results can be used to determine the needed distance threshold for different sensor uncertainties.

B. Calibration with Different GPS Noise Levels

In order to study the calibration convergence of the proposed system, we performed extrinsic calibration and time offset between the GPS and IMU with poor initial guesses. The groundtruth and initial guess for the extrinsic were offset between the GPS and IMU with poor initial guesses.

The dataset is 9.1km in length, following that of a planar trajectory, it is split into non-overlapping segments for each distance threshold. The initialization procedure was independently performed on each segment and the resulting statistics on the accuracy of the initialized VIO to ENU transform are shown in Table I.

In general, the initialization errors are smaller with a larger distance threshold and with smaller GPS noise. The results indicate that reasonable accuracy for this transformation can be achieved after 50m for most realistic levels of GPS measurement noise. In practice, these results can be used to determine the needed distance threshold for different sensor uncertainties.

The groundtruth and initial guess for the extrinsic were offset between the GPS and IMU with poor initial guesses. The groundtruth and initial guess for the extrinsic were $[2.00, 3.00, 1.00]^\top$ and $[5.40, 1.65, 6.62]^\top$ meters, while for the time offset they were 0 and -1.3 seconds. The calibration results for the first 400 seconds are shown in Fig. 4, which clearly demonstrates that the time offset calibration converges to near zero. The final converged extrinsic calibration error follows that of the GPS measurement noise except in the 5m $\sigma$ case. This shows that the convergence of the extrinsic is highly dependent on the measurement noise and whose final error is on the order of the GPS measurements.

A representative run is shown in Fig. 5, all calibration was able to converge within the first 100 seconds of the dataset while remaining consistent. The static lines at the beginning of the each are from before initialization in the ENU and thus no GPS measurements that are required to update these parameters have been used. As expected, the y-error, which is mostly aligned with gravity in this scenario, shows little decrease in state uncertainty due to this axis corresponding to the normal of the plane of motion [21].
C. Robustness to Intermittent GPS Signals

To validate the robustness to intermittent GPS measurements, we simulated a series of GPS dropouts during which the GPS-VIO purely relied on visual and inertial information. The GPS dropouts lasted 120 seconds in length, the ENU to VIO transformation was set to identity to allow for comparison to pure VIO, and the calibration was perturbed as in the last simulation.

Fig. 6 shows the errors of GPS-VIO with online calibration, GPS-VIO without online calibration, and pure VIO. Before initialization in ENU all systems are purely VIO. After the initialization in the ENU at around 150 seconds, the proposed method begins fusing GPS data and thus quickly bounds its errors. It is clear that poor calibration can hurt the system’s estimation even in the presence of global measurements. Finally, the relatively good accuracy of the VIO is able to “bridge the gap” between the GPS-available regions, providing high-quality navigation estimates over the entire trajectory. Note that reducing error of the pure VIO at time around 800 seconds is because the trajectory has loops, which brings the estimation and groundtruth close by chance.

VII. Experimental Results

We further evaluate the proposed GPS-VIO in a real-world scenario. The trajectory begins in an indoor parking garage during which the system does not have access to GPS measurements until a minute in when it exits the structure. During the outdoor segment the vehicle travels several kilometers before returning to the same GPS-denied structure. The total length of the data is about 4.9km, and we used a monocular camera-imu pair, alongside two GPS receivers all of which were mounted rearward on the trunk of the collection vehicle. One low-cost GPS sensor was used for GPS measurements while the second provided RTK data for groundtruth. The covariance of each GPS measurement was computed by RTKLIB library [50]. We compared our system against the open sourced VINS-Fusion [12] system. We used 30 clones and a max of 150 features for the proposed GPS-VIO while for VINS-Fusion a max of 200 features and a max solver time 0.04 were used. We note that VINS-Fusion does not take into account the GPS-IMU calibration.

Fig. 7 shows the result of the experiment. The RMSE of each trajectory compared with RTK groundtruth whenever it is available are: 3.57m (GPS-VIO w. calib), 7.03m (GPS-VIO wo. calib), 6.66m (VINS-Fusion) and 15.95m (VIO). We gave the initial hand measured extrinsic value $[0.06 \ 0.11 \ -0.03]^	op$ meters and time offset of zero for both GPS-VIO w. calib and GPS-VIO wo. calib. The extrinsic calibration converged to a value of $[-0.49 \ 0.70 \ -0.07]^	op$ at the end of the dataset which is within the expected convergence bounds associated with the 1-10 meters observed GPS noise. We found time offset calibration quickly converged to a nontrivial value of -0.85 seconds which given the 7.4m/s average vehicle velocity equates to 6.3m position error if not properly calibrated, and thus validates the need for online estimation of this parameter. As compared to VINS-Fusion our method can achieve higher accuracy while also being a lightweight single threaded estimator which runs in real time. We also note that since VINS-Fusion does not estimate VIO to ENU transform explicitly, its pose output may not suitable for real time applications, and Fig. 7 shows the final optimized trajectory after completion of the dataset.

VIII. Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we have developed an efficient and robust GPS-VIO system that fuses GPS, IMU, and camera measurements in a tightly-coupled estimator. In particular, to robustify the system, we have focused on the online GPS-VIO spatiotemporal sensor calibration and frame initialization. The observability analysis shows that if estimating states naively in the VIO frame, the system remains unobservable as the standard VIO; however, this can be mitigated by transforming the system to the global ENU frame after GPS-VIO frame initialization, which is exploited in the proposed GPS-VIO estimator. This system has been validated in both Monte-Carlo simulations and real-world experiments. In the future, we will integrate mapping capability into this GPS-VIO system.


