

PHOTOGRAMMETRY AND LIDAR: COMPARISON OF TWO METHODS FOR VESSEL COORDINATE SURVEY (VCS)

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this work was to test two methods for vessel coordinate survey (VCS).

Two vessels were surveyed, and results compared with each other and previous offsets.

 Conclusions were made about which method to prefer considering possible limitations

TOPICS

- Hydrographic survey error budget
- How to reduce errors
- Methods for VCS
- Performed tasks
 - 1. preparations
 - 2. survey
 - 3. data processing
- Results and conclusions

MULTIBEAM SURVEY ERROR BUDGET

Horizontal uncertainty

- GNSS horizontal accuracy
- Antenna lever arm
- Raytracing error
- HRP error
- VCS error

Vertical uncertainty

- GNSS vertical accuracy
- Depth error
- Raytracing error
- HRP error
- VCS error
- Sound velocity error
- Tide error
- Vessel draft error



Modern methods for vessel coordinate survey

- Total station
- 3D LIDAR scanning
- Photogrammetry



PERFORMED TASKS

- 1. Preparations
- 2.3D scanning
- 3. Drone photogrammetry
- 4. Data processing





• EVA-320

• EVA-301

PREPARATIONS



Photogrammetry DJI Phantom 4 RTK DJI Mini SE







Stationary 3D LIDAR scanner – Trimble X7



Data processing







RESULTS

- 3D scanning
- 1. EVA-320 X offset – 3,795 m Y offset – 0,903 m Z offset – 9,395 m HRP offset - 0° 45' 6"

- Photogrammetry
- 1. EVA-320 X offset – 3,83 m
- Y offset 0,898 m
- Z offset 9,397 m

2. EVA-301 X offset – 0,817 m Y offset – 1,047 m Z offset – 6,180 m HRP offset – 0° 1' 24"

2. EVA-301
X offset – ...
Y offset – ...
Z offset – ...

RESULTS

	3D scanning	Photogrammetry
Relative precision	\checkmark	\checkmark
Relative simplicity	\checkmark	×
Practical usability	\checkmark	×
Instruments cost	×	\checkmark
Survey time	×	\checkmark
Data processing time	\checkmark	×
Min required personnel	\checkmark	\checkmark
Dependence on the weather	\checkmark	×
Unexpected restrictions	\checkmark	×



THANK YOU FOR ATTENTION!