

# Analysis of Indistinguishable Trajectories of a Nonholonomic Vehicle Subject to Range Measurements

Francesco Riz, Luigi Palopoli, Daniele Fontanelli

**Abstract**—We propose a *global constructibility* analysis for a vehicle moving on a planar surface. Assuming that the vehicle follows a trajectory that can be uniquely identified by the sequence of control inputs and by some intermittent ranging measurements from known points in the environment, we can model the trajectory as a rigid body subject to rotation and translation in the plane. This way, the localisation problem can be reduced to finding the conditions for the existence of a unique roto-translation of the trajectory from a known reference frame to the world reference frame, given the collected measurements. As discussed in this paper, such conditions can be expressed in terms of the shape of the trajectory, of the layout of the ranging sensors, and of the numbers of measurements collected from each of them. The approach applies to a large class of kinematic models. Focusing on the special case of unicycle kinematics, we provide additional *local constructibility* results.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Mobile robots are increasingly popular in many real-life applications, where they are required to plan and execute complex trajectories (e.g., to avoid humans and complex dynamic obstacles). Inevitably, these operations require an accurate *localisation* of the robot in the environment. The most common strategies to solve this problem are based on a combination of odometry, which provides information on the manoeuvres executed by the robot, and absolute measurements collected through exteroceptive sensors. In the class of exteroceptive sensors used in modern robotics fall those based on radio frequency signals [1], which are attracting interest and consideration due to their robustness, flexibility and the relatively low cost. Such sensing systems rely on some features of the sensed signal such as the sensed power or the time-of-flight, are based on technologies such as Wi-Fi [2], Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) [3] or Ultra Wide Band (UWB) [4] signals, and generate measurements that are functionally related to the distance between a fixed-frame point and the vehicle, exactly as a LiDAR [5] or a radar [6] would do. Other types of sensors, which can be used in an indoor environment, are based mainly on visual information collected by cameras [7], and in most of the cases produce *bearing* measurements.

In this paper, we consider a vehicle moving in an environment, instrumented with ranging sensors. The vehicle is

initially unaware of its position and orientation in the space. In this setting, we analyse the properties of the environment, i.e. number and layout of the sensors, and the “shape” of the trajectory, i.e. the sequence of manoeuvres, that allow the vehicle to localise itself.

**Related work:** The problem considered in this paper is often addressed in the literature from the viewpoint of the *observability analysis*. Very often the most important results rely on the *Observability Rank Condition* (ORC), i.e. a system is observable only if the *Observability Matrix* has full rank. By using ORC, Belo et al. [7] carry out a complete observability analysis of a system composed of moving vehicles (targets) and moving cameras (sensors), collecting planar bearing measurements. Other researchers extend this type of analysis to multiple fixed-frame landmarks in a 3D environment [8], use the same tools to dynamically find the optimal control strategy [9], or implement estimation filters based on a pipeline that starts with visual information collected from cameras, extracts features, and localises the vehicle in the environment [10]. Delaune et al. [11] show that, in some particular cases, bearing measurements are not sufficient to reconstruct the trajectory followed by the vehicle, and they propose to integrate also the information coming from range sensors. Based on the Observability Matrix, Martinelli et al. [12] analyse the observability of a vehicle subject to a single measurement, be it bearing or range. Single landmarks measuring their distance from the target vehicle have been considered in [13] and [14], where the authors build the Observability Matrix and the Observability Gramian, respectively, to quantify the observability of the system. Fernando et al. [15] analyse how the number of ranging sensors affects the observability of a Micro Aerial Vehicle and show that the observability properties of the system heavily depend on the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle. Magnago et al. [16] use RFID tags and show that a suitably designed Unscented Kalman Filter converges only in presence of at least 3 tags. Other researchers use only ranging information to estimate the state of the system [17], [18]. A noteworthy area of research is *active sensing*, i.e., designing control strategies that maximise some observability metrics. This technique may be applied to a moving sensor, finding the trajectory that optimises the observability of a moving target [19], [20], [21], or to the moving vehicle itself which senses some fixed-frame sensors [22], [23], [24].

Restricting to authors who directly addressed global observability properties for vehicles, Bayat et al. [25] analyse the observability properties of an underwater vehicle, mod-

F. Riz and L. Palopoli are with the Department of Information Engineering and Computer Science, University of Trento, Italy, e-mail: {francesco.riz, luigi.palopoli}@unitn.it.

D. Fontanelli is with the Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Trento, Italy, e-mail: danielle.fontanelli@unitn.it

elled as a 2D single integrator with known heading, subject to range measurements. Similar results have been obtained in [13], where the analysed vehicle is represented by a double integrator. The authors define the displacement as the double integration of the control inputs of the vehicle, and analyse the equivalent augmented linear time varying system by means of the observability Gramian. With a similar procedure, Hung et al. [19] analyse an underwater robot modelled as a 3D single integrator vehicle moving through unknown ocean currents. They exploit the displacement of the vehicle, which is known via control, to define an augmented state vector and an output equation with linear form  $\bar{y}(t) = C(t)z(t_0)$ , where  $\bar{y}(t)$  is the augmented output, which is known and based on the collected measurements, while  $z(t_0)$  is the unknown initial augmented state. Observability is tested by checking the singularity of matrix  $C(t)$  over the time interval when measurements are collected. A common requirement of the research papers mentioned above is that the heading of the vehicle is assumed known, and so is the information of the vehicle displacement in the world reference frame. In this paper, we consider a scenario where: 1. measurements are intermittent, 2. vehicles belong to a general class, including the unicycle-like vehicles, for which the displacement in the world reference frame depends on the sequence of control inputs and on the initial (unknown) orientation, 3. the heading is not measurable. As a result, the displacement in the world frame is not known, which makes the results mentioned above inapplicable.

**Paper contributions:** The main part of the technical literature described so far uses the Observability Matrix or the Observability Gramian as tools to quantify the observability of a system. However, since these tools are based on the linearisation of the dynamics of the system or of the output function associated with the measurements collected by the sensors, they produce local results, which are associated with the notion of *weak observability*. By definition, a weakly constructible (or a weakly observable) system can reconstruct its state along its trajectory as long as it is provided with some *a priori* information on its state at a certain time instant, such as a sufficiently narrow set that includes the state itself. In light of this consideration, we analyse the setting where no *a priori* information is given, thus referring to “global observability/constructibility properties”. In our past work [26], we have analysed global observability properties, based on the concept of *indistinguishable* states, in presence of ranging sensors with unbounded sensing range. As a follow-up [27], we have proposed a sufficient condition for attaining global observability in the case of bounded sensing range for a unicycle kinematic model. In this paper we abstract the dynamics of the system by considering a finite number of points that can be regarded as roto-translations of a given sequence of points in a known reference frame. With this consideration, our aim is twofold: first we extend the global constructibility analysis (more formally the *u-constructibility analysis*) with intermittent measurements, and provide both sufficient and necessary conditions to achieve global constructibility. Considering intermittent measurement is key in defining the scope and the contribution of this paper. From the modelling point of view, it allows us to consider real-

life sensors with bounded sensing range. From the analysis point of view, it enables us to carry out the global analysis by simple geometric intuitions. Secondly, we consider a particular nonholonomic vehicle (unicycle kinematic model) and analyse its *local* constructibility properties in the same scenario. We show that, despite the logical intuition, the global property does not always imply local constructibility, and discuss some degenerated cases where this implication does not hold true.

The paper is organised as follows: in Section II we introduce the dynamical and measurement model, and an abstraction of the trajectory allowing us to interpret constructibility properties from a geometrical perspective. With this assumption, Section III and IV analyse the conditions on the shape of the trajectory, on the layout of the sensors, and on the number of measurements and their distribution ensuring constructibility. In Section V, we present a local constructibility analysis based on the Constructibility Gramian and, in Section VI, we draw the conclusions and claim some further research directions.

## II. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

Let us consider a generic continuous-time nonlinear system in its state space representation

$$\dot{q}(t) = f(q(t), u(t)), \quad (1)$$

where  $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state of the system, while  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  denotes its control inputs. We assume that the nonlinear system represents the dynamics of a vehicle, moving on a planar surface, and thus a portion of the state vector  $q(t)$  denotes the Cartesian position  $P(t) = [x(t), y(t)]^\top$  of the vehicle in a reference frame  $\langle W \rangle$  on the plane  $X_w \times Y_w$ . We denote by  $\langle V \rangle$  a reference frame where the initial conditions  $q_V(0)$  of the vehicle are arbitrarily set to 0, i.e. the reference frame is centred on the initial position of the vehicle. In  $\langle V \rangle$ , the position of the vehicle at time  $t$  is represented by  $P_V(t) = [x_V(t), y_V(t)]^\top$  and can be reconstructed by using the control input history  $u(s)$ ,  $s \in [0, t]$ . We will use the following Property 1, which is directly derived from the definition of the rotation matrix  $R_\phi = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\ \sin \phi & \cos \phi \end{bmatrix}$ .

**Property 1.** *Given the position of the vehicle  $P_V(t)$ ,  $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ , there exists a unique triplet  $(\Delta x, \Delta y, \phi)$  such that*

$$P(t) = R_\phi P_V(t) + \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix}, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f].$$

From a geometrical point of view, Property 1 states that the path followed by the vehicle in any reference frame is a roto-translation of the path travelled in its local reference frame, i.e. the vehicle can reconstruct the “shape” of its own trajectory by dead reckoning. By Property 1, we may simplify the dynamics (1) of the vehicle and consider the path followed by the vehicle as a rigid body on the  $X_w \times Y_w$  plane.

The environment is instrumented with a set of sparsely deployed ranging sensors, referred to as *anchors*. The  $i$ -th anchor is located at coordinates  $B_i = [X_i, Y_i]^\top$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , and the vehicle collects the ranging measurement  $\|B_i - P(t)\|$ .

**Assumption 1** (Intermittent measurements). *Measurements are collected at known sampling instants  $t_k$ , with  $t_{k+1} > t_k$ .*

In ranging scenarios, the vehicle is usually equipped with *active* devices that sense other devices (active or passive) deployed in the environment, and thus assuming *known* sampling instants is not a demanding condition. For example, this condition holds for radio-frequency ranging measurements (such as Ultra-Wide Band anchors [1] or Radio Frequency IDentification tags [16]) and for camera based solutions [3]. The output  $z_k$  is given by the measurements collected by the anchors, i.e., the output equation is the following:

$$z_k = \|P_k - B_{i_k}\|, \quad (2)$$

where  $P_k = P(t_k)$  is the position of the vehicle at time  $t = t_k$ , while the index  $i_k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  defines the anchor that the vehicle measures its distance from. For the sake of clarity, the collected distance will be denoted by  $\rho_{k,i}$  when the second index  $i$  is not clear from the context. Measurements are intermittent; therefore at time  $t_k$ , only one ranging measurement  $\rho_{k,i}$  is available. The case when multiple measurements can be collected at once has been already solved in [26].

We assume full knowledge of the time instants  $t_k$  when the measurements are taken and of the input sequence  $u(s)$ ,  $s \in [0, t_k]$ , which allows us to reconstruct the sequence of positions  $P_V(t_k)$  of the vehicle in  $\langle V \rangle$ . Therefore, instead of considering the entire paths  $P(t)$  and  $P_V(t)$ , we focus only on the locations where the ranging measurements are collected:

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\Delta x, \Delta y, \phi) = R_\phi P_V(t_k) + \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix},$$

for  $k = 0, \dots, N_m - 1$ , with  $N_m$  being the total number of measurements. Given two points  $\mathcal{P}_l$  and  $\mathcal{P}_m$ , we define by  $\mathcal{S}_{l,m}$  the segment given by their convex combination, with length  $\|\mathcal{S}_{l,m}\|$ . We can restrict our study to an abstract trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ , defined as the union of all the segments connecting two consecutive positions  $\mathcal{P}_k$  of the vehicle, thus

$$\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{N_m-1} \mathcal{S}_{k,k+1}, \quad (3)$$

which can be regarded as a rigid body.

**Remark 1.** *The abstract trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  does not coincide with the actual trajectory  $P(t)$ , but contains all the features that are needed in the following discussion: the sequence of measurements, the distance and the total change in the orientation between any two measurements.*

In light of the definition of  $\mathcal{T}$ , we want to find the conditions on the position of the anchors in  $\langle W \rangle$  and on the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  such that it is possible to find a roto-translation such that the points  $\mathcal{P}_k$  are compliant with the measurements collected from the anchors. To this aim, we need to introduce the concepts of *constructibility* and *backward indistinguishability* of the states of a nonlinear system. For the sake of generality, in the following definitions, adapted from [25], we consider a plant with a continuous-time dynamics (1) and the general version of the discrete-time output equation (2), i.e.

$$\dot{q}(t) = f(q(t), u(t)), \quad z_k = h(q(t_k)). \quad (4)$$

We consider the dynamical system to evolve between an initial time instant  $t_0$  (i.e.  $k = 0$ ) and a final time  $t_f$ , with  $k = k_f$ .

Given the hybrid nature of (4), we will use both  $k$  and  $t$  to denote the time, with the implicit assumption that by the time instant  $k$  we refer to time  $t_k$ .

We deal with the notion of *constructibility*, defined as the ability to reconstruct the state  $q_f$  of the system at the final time instant  $t_f$ . Intuitively, constructibility amounts to reconstructing the current state  $q_k$  given the past history of inputs and outputs. In view of Property 1, the problem of estimating the final state is equivalent to estimating the initial state  $q_0$ , which is the well-known concept of *observability*. However, the performance of an estimation filter, i.e. the uncertainty related to the state estimate based on the previous history of motions and measurements, is not directly associated with the concept of observability, but rather to the notion of *constructibility* (for further details, the reader is referred to [23]). To analyse formally the concept of constructibility, both from a local and from a global perspective, we introduce the definition of *backward indistinguishability*, instead of the notion of *indistinguishability* considered for more common observability analyses [25].

**Definition 1.** *Given the dynamical system (4), a time interval  $T = [t_0, t_f]$ , and an admissible control input function  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , two final states  $q_f$  and  $\bar{q}_f$  are said  **$u^*$ -backward indistinguishable** on  $T$ , if for the input  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , the output sequences  $z_k$  and  $\bar{z}_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_f$  of the trajectories satisfying the final conditions  $q_f, \bar{q}_f$ , are identical. Moreover, we define  $\mathcal{I}_{(b)}^{u^*}(q_f)$  as the set of all the final conditions that are  $u^*$ -backward indistinguishable from  $q_f$  on  $T$ .*

Since we assume full knowledge of the control input, the shape of the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is known in its turn. Hence, we will focus on the concept of *u-backward indistinguishability*. With a slight abuse of definition, we will refer to *indistinguishable* trajectories as trajectories generated by a known control input and by two *u-backward indistinguishable* final conditions.

We now introduce further definitions on *constructibility* that will be useful for the local analysis carried out in Section V.

**Definition 2.** *Given the interval  $T = [t_0, t_f]$ , and the control input  $u^*(t)$ ,  $t \in T$ , the system (4) is said  **$u^*$ -constructible at  $q_f$**  on  $T$ , if  $\mathcal{I}_{(b)}^{u^*}(q_f) = \{q_f\}$ , and is said  **$u^*$ -weakly constructible at  $q_f$**  if  $q_f$  is an isolated point of  $\mathcal{I}_{(b)}^{u^*}(q_f)$ . Moreover, a system is said to be  **$u^*$ -(weakly) constructible** if it is  $u^*$ -(weakly) constructible at any  $q_f$ .*

In the local analysis, associated with the concept of *weak constructibility*, we will refer to a *weakly constructible trajectory* as a trajectory, defined by a control sequence  $u^*$ , such that the system is *u\*-weakly constructible*. By Definition 2, the set of *globally constructible* trajectories is a subset of the *weakly constructible* trajectories, since a unique point in a set is always isolated. Therefore, if a system is *weakly unconstructible*, i.e. the Observability Rank Condition is *not* satisfied, the system is never *constructible*.

**Assumption 2.** *We assume that system (4) with the continuous-time position  $P(t)$  as output is constructible, i.e. we can reconstruct its final state  $q_f$  given the history of inputs and outputs over a given time interval.*

**Remark 2.** *Assumption 2 holds true for nonholonomic systems modelled through kinematic models (e.g. unicycle-like vehicles and car-trailer vehicles). Moreover, vehicles represented by dynamical models meet this assumption as soon as they can rely on additional sensors measuring at least their velocities.*

We can now link the notion of constructibility to the existence of a roto-translation that, when applied to  $\mathcal{T}$ , produces a set of points compliant with the measurements.

**Lemma 1.** *The system is  $u^*$ -constructible if there exists a unique roto-translation  $(\Delta x, \Delta y, \phi)$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  generated by  $u^*$  such that*

$$\|\mathcal{P}_k(\Delta x, \Delta y, \phi) - B_i\| = \rho_{k,i},$$

for each  $i$  such that the measurement is available at time  $k$ , and for  $k = 0, \dots, k_f$ .

*Proof.* The proof directly follows from Property 1 and from Assumption 2.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** *By Assumption 2, as soon as a roto-translation is found, we can reconstruct the entire trajectory followed by the vehicle and thus retrieve both the initial condition  $q(t_0)$  and the final condition  $q(t_f)$ . Therefore, the system is observable if and only if it is constructible. By following the same arguments, a system is weakly observable if and only if it is weakly constructible.*

For the sake of simplicity, we introduce here a new definition to link the number of indistinguishable trajectories to the constructibility properties of the system.

**Definition 3.** *Given a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ , if there exist  $n$  roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  that are indistinguishable from  $\mathcal{T}$  itself, we say that  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\text{Ind}(n)$ .*

Definition 3 is associated only with the global constructibility properties, and, since a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is always indistinguishable from itself, it is impossible to have  $\text{Ind}(0)$ . On the other hand, a system is constructible if and only if it is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ . Moreover, in light of Definition 3, a system is unconstructible when  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\text{Ind}(\infty)$ , i.e. when there is an infinite set of roto-translations from  $\langle V \rangle$  to  $\langle W \rangle$  satisfying (2).

#### A. Problem Statement

Given a dynamical system such that Property 1 holds, and the sequence of positions  $P_V(t_k)$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, k_f$ , in the vehicle reference frame, we want to find the conditions on  $\mathcal{T}$ , on the layout of the sensors  $B_i = [X_i, Y_i]^\top$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , in  $\langle W \rangle$ , and on the distribution of the measurements among the sensors, such that the system is  $u$ -constructible (Sections III and IV) and  $u$ -weakly constructible (Section V) at the final condition  $q_f$ . In light of the discussion above, these problems boil down to find whether the equations

$$\|\mathcal{P}_k(\Delta x, \Delta y, \phi) - B_i\| = \rho_{k,i}, \quad \forall k$$

have a unique solution, a finite number of solutions or infinitely many solutions in the unknowns  $\Delta x, \Delta y, \phi$ , where the roto-translation of  $\mathcal{T}$  from  $\langle V \rangle$  to  $\langle W \rangle$  is modelled by the translation vector  $[\Delta x; \Delta y]^\top$  and by the rotation angle  $\phi$ .

### III. GLOBAL CONSTRUCTIBILITY WITH A SINGLE ANCHOR

We consider the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  defined in (3), and discuss how the readings of a single anchor change depending on roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$ . In our past work [26, Thm. 1], we have restricted our analysis to a unicycle-like vehicle, and we have proved that a single anchor collecting range measurements can never ensure observability of the system state. In simple terms, we have proved that  $u$ -constructibility as in Definition 1 can never be achieved with a single anchor. We now want to reformulate this result in terms of the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  and generalise the analysis of the non-constructible subspaces of the system, depending on the number and on the layout of the measurement points sensed by the anchor.

Without loss of generality, we will consider one anchor located at the origin of the reference frame  $\langle W \rangle$ , i.e.  $B = [0, 0]^\top$ , and we will focus on the first three points  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ , where the measurements occur.

**Theorem 1.** *Given a vehicle for which Property 1 holds, its trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  and the set of measurements  $\rho_k$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, N_m - 1$ , collected from an anchor  $B$ , a trajectory  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  is  $u$ -indistinguishable from  $\mathcal{T}$  if: (1) For any  $N_m$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  is a rotation of  $\mathcal{T}$  about the anchor; (2) For  $N_m = 1$  (or  $N_m > 1$  coincident points  $\mathcal{P}_k$ ),  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  is a rotation of  $\mathcal{T}$  about the unique measurement point  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ; (3) For  $N_m = 2$  (or  $N_m > 2$  with collinear points  $\mathcal{P}_k$ ),  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  is symmetric to  $\mathcal{T}$  with respect to an axis passing through the anchor.*

*Proof.* By geometric arguments, any rotation of the trajectory about the anchor does not change the sensor readings, and thus the system sensed with a single anchor is always (at least)  $\text{Ind}(\infty)$ . We now analyse scenarios with increasing number of measurements collected by the anchor.

*One measurement:* With one measurement, we identify a point  $\mathcal{P}_0$  that is sensed by the anchor, thus constraining the possible roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  that satisfy the sensor readings. The measurement point is compliant with the sensor reading only for a position  $\mathcal{P}_0 = [\rho_0 \cos \phi, \rho_0 \sin \phi]^\top$ , for any  $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ . Therefore, the trajectory is compliant with the measurement for any rotation of the trajectory about the anchor plus any rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , i.e. the system is  $\text{Ind}(\infty \times \infty)$ , unless  $\rho_0 = 0$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_0$  coincides with the anchor.

*Two measurements:* By taking the second measurement in position  $\mathcal{P}_1$ , provided that the two measurements are not taken in the same point (otherwise the previous case straightforwardly applies), we are adding a further constraint on the position and orientation of the trajectory. Indeed, with  $\mathcal{P}_0 = R_\phi[\rho_0; 0]^\top$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1 = R_\beta[\rho_1; 0]^\top$ , and  $\|\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_0\| = \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$ , we get an explicit expression of  $\beta$ , which reads as

$$\beta = \phi \pm \arccos\left(\frac{\rho_1^2 - \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|^2 - \rho_0^2}{2\rho_0\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|}\right) \triangleq \phi \pm \delta. \quad (5)$$

This result shows that, for any rotation  $\phi$  about the anchor, there are two different points  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$ , that are compliant with the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle (i.e.  $\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$ ) and the measurements collected by the anchor (i.e.  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$ ), hence this setting leads to a  $\text{Ind}(2 \times \infty)$  system.

The geometric interpretation of (5) is a reflection about an axis passing through the anchor  $B$ . Indeed, any point of a cir-

cle reflected about an axis passing through its centre lies on the circle itself. Moreover, the geometry of the trajectory, which is uniquely identified by the distance  $\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$ , is preserved.

*Three measurements:* Let us consider the setting with two measurements presented previously. For each of the two values of  $\beta$ , we can compute explicitly the position of the third measurement point  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$ , represented in Figure 4.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_2^{(a)} &= \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 + \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \cos(\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \cos(\delta + \mu_{0,1}) \\ \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \sin(\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \sin(\delta + \mu_{0,1}) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{P}_2^{(b)} &= \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 + \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \cos(-\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \cos(-\delta + \mu_{0,1}) \\ \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \sin(-\delta) + \|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \sin(-\delta + \mu_{0,1}) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mu_{0,1}$  is the angle between the segments  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$ . For simplicity, but without loss of generality, we have assumed  $\phi = 0$  in (5). Computing the differences of the distances of  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  from the origin, we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}\|^2 - \|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}\|^2 = 4\rho_0\|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}\| \sin \mu_{0,1} \sin \delta.$$

The two distances are equal when  $\mu_{0,1} = h\pi$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ , i.e. when  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  are collinear, or when  $\delta = h\pi$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ , i.e. the situation described in Remark 4 occurs, hence  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  coincide. Therefore, only trajectories rotated around the anchor are indistinguishable, hence the problem is  $\text{Ind}(\infty)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.** *In the particular case when  $\rho_1 = \rho_0 \pm \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$ , i.e. the vehicle moves on the diameter of the circle centred on the anchor, we get  $\cos \delta = \pm 1$ , i.e. a unique feasible value for  $\beta$  in (5), hence avoiding the ambiguity associated with the rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , i.e.  $\text{Ind}(1 \times \infty) = \text{Ind}(\infty)$ .*

With three non-collinear measurement points, we reach the maximum amount of information that can be collected by a single anchor, and thus we conclude that any further measurement beyond the third is no more informative (unless all the preceding measurement points are collinear). Therefore, with the analysis of 1, 2 and 3 measurements, we have exhaustively addressed the analysis of a single anchor, whose results depend both on the number of collected measurements and on their layout on the plane. In light of the results in Theorem 1, we can define the three equivalence classes **C1**, **C2**, and **C3**, by introducing the following notation.

**Notation.** *By a set **C1** of measurements, we denote any number of measurements collected by the same anchor in the same position  $\mathcal{P}$  on the plane, provided that  $\mathcal{P}$  does not coincide with the anchor;*

*By a set **C2** of measurements, we denote any number of collinear measurements, not lying on the anchor, collected by the same anchor;*

*By a set **C3** of measurements, we denote any number of measurements collected by an anchor, not falling in one of the two cases above, i.e. distinct and non-collinear measurement points or with a point coinciding with the anchor.*

#### IV. GLOBAL CONSTRUCTIBILITY WITH MORE ANCHORS

In this section, we will leverage the results found for a single anchor to extend the analysis of indistinguishable trajectories to the case of multiple anchors. In light of Lemma 1, the localisation problem can be solved, i.e. the state of the system can be determined, if and only if  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ .




Fig. 1. Example 1. The same trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  rotated about the pivot anchor  $B_1$ . When  $\mathcal{P}_3$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_4$  and  $B_1$  are collinear, we always have two roto-translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  that are compliant with the measurements.




Fig. 2. Example 2. The same trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  translated by  $2\Delta$  orthogonally to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ . When  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{2,3}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{4,5}$  are parallel and have the same distance  $\Delta$  from the anchor collecting the measurements, we always have two translations of  $\mathcal{T}$  that are compliant with the measurements.

#### A. Pathological conditions

While our primary interest is to analyse positive and negative results for constructibility in the cases in which the available information is minimal (i.e., small number of anchors), it is useful to discuss some negative constructibility results that apply to an arbitrarily large number of anchors and of measurements. This is done in the following examples.

**Example 1 (Rotation).** Consider the scenario shown in Figure 1. An anchor  $B_1$  is used to collect a set  $\{\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$  of **C3** measurements. Consider an additional set  $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\}$  of **C2** measurements from a second anchor  $B_2$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_3$  and  $\mathcal{P}_4$  are aligned with  $B_1$ ; let  $\eta$  be the angle between  $\mathcal{S}_{3,4}$  and the line  $B_{1,2}$  joining the two anchors. If we rotate the whole set  $\mathcal{T}$  by  $2\eta$  about  $B_1$  neither the new readings for  $\{\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$  will be affected (Theorem 1), nor the new readings for  $\{\mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4\}$  because of the axial symmetry around  $B_{1,2}$ . Hence, the blue and red trajectories in Figure 1 are indistinguishable.  $\star$

**Example 2 (Translation).** Consider the scenario in Figure 2. We collect a set  $\{\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1\}$  of **C2** measurements from anchor  $B_1$ . Let  $\Delta$  be the distance between  $B_1$  and segment  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ . By translating the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  by  $2\Delta$  in the direction orthogonal to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ , we achieve an axial symmetry, which by Theorem 1 makes the translated measurements for  $\{\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1\}$  indistinguishable from the previous ones. Consider an additional set  $\{\mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3\}$  of **C2** measurements from an anchor  $B_2$  such that  $\mathcal{S}_{2,3}$  is parallel to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ , and its distance from  $B_2$  is  $\Delta$ . By construction, the translation of the trajectory by  $2\Delta$  generates an axial symmetry on both the anchors. Therefore, the blue and red trajectories in Figure 2 are indistinguishable.  $\star$

**Remark 5.** *Notice that we have presented two examples where each anchor collects a set of at least **C2** of measurements. If*

one or more anchors collect a set  $\mathbf{C1}$  of measurements, the condition for indistinguishability simplifies:  $\mathcal{S}_{3,4}$  should not be necessarily aligned with  $B_1$  for Example 1; likewise  $\mathcal{S}_{2,3}$  should not be necessarily parallel to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  for Example 2.

The construction in the previous examples extends to any number of anchors, leading to this statement.

**Fact 1.** *Given  $p$  anchors  $B_i = [X_i, Y_i]^\top$ ,  $1, \dots, p$ , deployed on a plane, there always exists at least one abstract trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  for which it is possible to find indistinguishable trajectories.*

This fact is the first main result of this paper: given any configuration of anchors, there is not a sufficiently high number of measurements and/or anchors such that the system is always constructible. Luckily, this negative result is limited to specific pathological trajectories. As discussed next, in the general case it is possible to overcome this problem.

### B. Conditions for unconstructibility

After discussion some pathological abstract trajectories, which remain indistinguishable no matter the number of anchors and measurements taken, we can now shift our focus to the analysis of *generic trajectories collecting a small number of measurements* from the anchors to determine the conditions for unconstructibility. We will henceforth adopt a special notation to list the number of measurements collected by each anchor: we will use numbers separated by a “+” sign, e.g.  $3 + 1$  denotes a  $\mathbf{C3}$  set of measurements collected from the first anchor and a set of  $\mathbf{C1}$  measurements from the second. Our main results on necessary and sufficient conditions for indistinguishability will be constructed analysing this property for an increasing number of measurements.

a)  $1 + 1$ : When two anchors are used to collect one measurement each, a single roto-translation from  $\langle V \rangle$  to the world frame  $\langle W \rangle$  is impossible to construct, which clearly leads to unconstructibility. More precisely, given the two measured points  $\mathcal{P}_0^{(0)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(0)}$ , we can always construct an indistinguishable trajectory as follows. First, we rotate  $\mathcal{T}$  about  $B_1$  of any angle  $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$  (as in the analysis of the single anchor). Assuming that  $\mathcal{P}_0^{(0)}$  has coordinates  $[\rho_0, 0]$ , its rotated version  $\mathcal{P}_0$  will have coordinates  $\mathcal{P}_0 = [\rho_0 \cos \phi; \rho_0 \sin \phi]^\top$ , and be indistinguishable from  $\mathcal{P}_0^{(0)}$ . In order for the rotated point  $\mathcal{P}_1$  to be indistinguishable from  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(0)}$  it is sufficient that it lies the intersection between the circle centred on  $\mathcal{P}_0$  of radius  $\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|$  and the circle centred on  $B_2$  of radius  $\rho_1$ . Therefore, by assuming that  $B_1 = [0; 0]^\top$ , we can find two possible indistinguishable points

$$\mathcal{P}_1^{(a),(b)} = R_\psi \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + R_\phi \begin{bmatrix} \rho_0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the angle  $\psi$  can take one of the following *two* values (one for each intersection between the two aforementioned circles):

$$\psi = \phi + \arctan2(D \sin \phi, \rho_0 - D \cos \phi) \pm \arccos\left(\frac{\rho_1^2 - \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|^2 - d^2}{2\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\|d}\right), \quad (7)$$




Fig. 3. Locus where the third measurement point  $\mathcal{P}_2$  can lie after the first two measurements  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  (dashed lines) are collected from the first two anchors. The blue and red colours are associated with the two intersections between the aforementioned circles. The solid green circle represents the third measurement  $\rho_2$  collected by  $B_3$  in a  $1 + 1 + 1$  setting. After  $\rho_2$ , the blue and the red trajectories are no more indistinguishable ( $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  does not lie on the green circle), but there are still 6 intersections of the locus with the green circle, and thus  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\text{Ind}(6)$ .

where  $d^2 = D^2 + \rho_0^2 - 2D\rho_0 \cos \phi$  is the (unknown) distance between  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $B_2$ , while  $D = \|\mathcal{B}_{1,2}\|$  is the distance between the two anchors.  $\beta$  in (5) is a particular case of  $\psi$ , when the two anchors coincide, i.e. when  $D = 0$ . To summarise, *this setting generally leads to  $\text{Ind}(2 \times \infty)$  trajectories*. For some particular values of  $\phi$ , the two circles become tangent and the two points  $\mathcal{P}_1$  coincide. Moreover, since two pairs of points are involved in this analysis (two anchors and two measurement points), the trajectories symmetric with respect to  $\mathcal{B}_{1,2}$  are indistinguishable. As a summary we can state the following:

**Case 1.** *In the  $1 + 1$  case, generic trajectories are  $\text{Ind}(2 \times \infty)$  (hence, indistinguishable). In the degenerate case when  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1} \subset \mathcal{B}_{1,2}$ , the trajectory is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ .*

b)  $1 + 1 + 1$ : We search for indistinguishable trajectories following the same line as in the paragraphs above. We start from a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  characterised by three points  $\mathcal{P}_0^{(0)}, \mathcal{P}_1^{(0)}, \mathcal{P}_2^{(0)}$ , associated with the measurements  $\rho_0, \rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ . As for the  $1 + 1$  case, we rotate the whole trajectory about  $B_1$  of an angle  $\phi$  and come up with two potential points  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$ , which lie on the intersection between a circle centred on  $B_2$  of radius  $\rho_1$  and a circle centred onto  $\mathcal{P}_0$  of radius  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$  (see (7)). The two points  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$  uniquely determine the third potential measurements  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$ . By changing  $\phi$ , the points  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  generate the locus shown in Figure 3. The locus is parametrised by the angle  $\phi$  (and thus its dimension is 1), it is defined only when  $|\|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| - d| < \rho_1 < \|\mathcal{S}_{0,1}\| + d$ , and it is continuous and differentiable on its domain. Indistinguishability arises when the locus intersects the circle centred on  $B_3$  of radius  $\rho_2$  in more than one point, i.e. when  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  have the same sensor readings.

As a consequence, the indistinguishable third point  $\mathcal{P}_2$  has at most 8 different locations. Indeed, by defining  $C = \cos \phi$  and  $S = \sin \phi$ , we take the differences  $\rho_2^2 - \rho_0^2$  and  $\rho_1^2 - \rho_0^2$  and obtain linear equations in the unknowns  $C$  and  $S$ , thus yielding a unique solution  $(\bar{C}, \bar{S})$ . Then we impose the constraints  $\bar{C}^2 + \bar{S}^2 = 1$  and  $x_0^2 + y_0^2 = \rho_0^2$ , being polynomials with degree 4 and 2 in the unknowns  $x_0$  and  $y_0$ , respectively.

By Bezout's theorem, the maximum number of real solutions  $(x_0, y_0)$  to this set of equations is the product between the degrees of the two polynomials, i.e. 8.

Finally, also for the 1+1+1 case, we can have a degenerate case, as detailed next.

**Case 2.** In the 1 + 1 + 1 case, generic trajectories are  $\text{Ind}(\bar{n})$ ,  $\bar{n} \leq 8$ , and thus indistinguishable. In the degenerate case when the locus is tangent to the circle centred on  $B_3$  of radius  $\rho_2$  in one point, the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ .

c) 2 + 1: We address the case 2 + 1 following the same procedure as in the previous case. From (6) we can compute the distances  $d_2^{(a)}$  and  $d_2^{(b)}$  of the points  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$  from  $B_1$ , and the locus in Figure 3 degenerates to two circles centred on  $B_1$ . Each of the two circles has two intersections as long as  $\underline{d} < \|\mathcal{P}_2^* - B_1\| < \bar{d}$  holds true, where  $\underline{d} = |D - \rho_2|$  and  $\bar{d} = D + \rho_2$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_2^*$  denotes any of the two points  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$ . Hence, there are *at most* four indistinguishable trajectories. This particular condition allows us to compute the number of indistinguishable trajectories. Moreover, we can introduce a degenerate case for this setting.

**Case 3.** The 2 + 1 setting is a particular case of the 1 + 1 + 1 setting, since the locus in Figure 3 is a pair of circles centred on the first anchor. Generic trajectories are  $\text{Ind}(4)$ , while in the degenerate cases when  $\min\{d_2^{(a)}, d_2^{(b)}\} = \|B_2 - B_1\| - \rho_2$  or  $\max\{d_2^{(a)}, d_2^{(b)}\} = \|B_2 - B_1\| + \rho_2$ , the circles are tangent in a point lying on  $B_{1,2}$ , and the trajectory is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ .

d) 3 + 1: With the same *rationale*, we reconstruct the distance  $d_3$  between  $\mathcal{P}_3$  and  $B_1$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{P}_3$  lies on the intersection between the circle centred on  $B_1$  of radius  $d_3$  and the circle centred on  $B_2$  of radius  $\rho_3$ , thus yielding two intersections with the following degenerate case.

**Case 4.** In the 3 + 1 case, generic trajectories are  $\text{Ind}(2)$ . When  $d_3 = D \pm \rho_3$ , the two circles are tangent in a point lying on the line connecting  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ . In this degenerate case, the two intersections, i.e. the two indistinguishable trajectories, collapse on each other, thus achieving  $\text{Ind}(1)$ .

With the definition of these four degenerate cases, keeping in mind that the role of the two anchors can be switched (i.e., 3 + 1 is equivalent to 1 + 3), and considering that any number  $N_m$  of measurements can be at most a **C3** set of measurements, we can now state the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** Given a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $N_m$  measurement points, the system is unconstructible when two anchors collecting  $N_m - 1$  and 1 measurement, respectively, are involved, or when  $N_m \leq 3$ , unless at least one among the degenerate cases in Case 1, 2, 3 and 4 occurs.

We have shown a set of settings where constructibility is never achieved, or it is achieved only for some particular shapes of  $\mathcal{T}$  and layouts of the anchors. These setting are summarised in red in Figure 5.

### C. Conditions for constructibility

We now consider all the other cases and search for constructibility conditions, keeping in mind that trajectory indis-




Fig. 4. New reference frame showing the setting 2 + 1. The blue and red lines represent the two trajectories  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ . Each of them has a circle centred on their last point  $\mathcal{P}_2$ , hence yielding an overall number of 4 intersections (i.e. possible positions of  $B_2$ ) with the circle centred on  $B_1$  of radius  $D$ .

tinguishability may arise when pathological trajectories are selected, as stated in Section IV-A.

a) 2+2: For this analysis, we will define a new reference frame, which will simplify the forthcoming discussion. To this aim, we consider Equation (6), with  $\phi = 0$ . This way, we know the position of the first anchor  $B_1$ , lying on the origin, and of the two trajectories  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ , as shown in Figure 4. In this particular reference frame, the 4 indistinguishable trajectories arising in the setting 2 + 1 correspond to 4 positions of the second anchor  $B_2$ . For each pair of indistinguishable trajectories, we want to analyse how a further measurement collected by the second anchor preserves or solves the ambiguity. At first, we notice that ambiguities may arise between two trajectories rotated both about  $B_1$  and about  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ , or between two trajectories only rotated about the anchor  $B_1$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$ , and thus the analysis will be divided into two parts, one for each pair of trajectories.

**Rotation about anchor:** Given the two measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_2 = [x_2, y_2]^T$  and  $\mathcal{P}_3 = [x_3, y_3]^T$ , we want to find the position of the anchor  $B_2$  satisfying the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} X_2^2 + Y_2^2 = D^2, \\ (X_2 - x_2)^2 + (Y_2 - y_2)^2 = \rho_2^2, \\ (X_2 - x_3)^2 + (Y_2 - y_3)^2 = \rho_3^2. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

To this end, we take the difference of the last two equations with respect to the first and get to these linear equations in the unknowns  $X_2, Y_2$

$$MB_2 = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 & y_2 \\ x_3 & y_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_2 \\ Y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} D^2 - \rho_2^2 + x_2^2 + y_2^2 \\ D^2 - \rho_3^2 + x_3^2 + y_3^2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

To find a unique solution for  $B_2$ , we need a nonsingular matrix  $M$ , whose determinant is

$$\det M = x_3 y_2 - x_2 y_3. \quad (10)$$

Therefore,  $B_2$  has a unique solution, i.e. *there exists no pair of indistinguishable trajectories rotated about the first anchor, if  $B_1, \mathcal{P}_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_3$  are not aligned*. Hence, to guarantee  $\text{Ind}(1)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_3$  cannot lie on the two lines joining  $B_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$ , and joining  $B_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}$ , which are available in the reference frame  $\langle V \rangle$ . From a geometric point of view, we may reformulate the problem as finding the position of  $B_2$  by using three ranging measurements. Indeed, by using trilateration this problem has

a unique solution if the three ranging measurement points are non-collinear. This result is perfectly in line with the scenario proposed in Example 1.

**Rotation about anchor and initial point:** Given two points  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$ , we can derive  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(b)}$  as  $\mathcal{P}_\star^{(b)} = R_\zeta(\mathcal{P}_\star^{(a)} - \mathcal{P}_0) + \mathcal{P}_0$ , where  $\zeta = -2\delta$  and  $\delta$  defined in (5), and the subscript  $\star$  is either 2 or 3. With these two pairs, we want to find the positions of two anchors  $B_2^{(a)}, B_2^{(b)}$  satisfying the set of equations (9), for both  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ . With the same rationale followed previously, we take the differences

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)} - B_2^{(a)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(a)}\|^2 &= \|\mathcal{P}_2^{(b)} - B_2^{(b)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(b)}\|^2 \\ \|\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)} - B_2^{(a)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(a)}\|^2 &= \|\mathcal{P}_3^{(b)} - B_2^{(b)}\|^2 - \|B_2^{(b)}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

As in the previous case, we get to two linear equations as  $M[X_2^{(a)}, Y_2^{(a)}]^\top = h$ , with the same  $M$  as in (10). With this result, given one of the two feasible  $B_2^{(b)}$  obtained in the case  $2+1$ , we find a unique anchor  $B_2^{(a)}$  satisfying the differences of the distances, provided that  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  and  $B_1$  are not aligned, as before. Since  $D$  is the distance from  $B_1$  to  $B_2$  and  $B_1$  is in the origin of the reference frame, we now add the constraint  $\|B_2\| = D$ , i.e.  $\|B_2^{(a)}\| - \|B_2^{(b)}\| = 0$ , with  $B_2^{(a)}$  obtained as the unique solution of (11). Therefore, we have a quadratic equation in the coordinates of  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  in the form  $[x_3; y_3; 1]^\top Q [x_3; y_3; 1] = 0$ , where the matrix of the quadratic equation  $Q$ , representing a conic section, is

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} S & b \\ b^\top & c \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , and where its invariants characterise the conic. In particular, the centre of the conic is  $O = -S^{-1}b = \mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$ , while  $\det Q = 0$ , and thus this is a degenerate conic with centre  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$ . To identify its shape, we analyse the determinant of the submatrix  $S$ , that yields

$$\det S = -\rho_0^2 (X_2^{(b)} - \mathcal{X}_2^{(b)})^2 (\|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}\|^2 - \underline{d}^2) (\bar{d}^2 - \|\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}\|^2),$$

where  $\mathcal{X}_2^{(b)} = X_2^{(b)} \cos \zeta - \rho_0 (\cos \zeta - 1) + Y_2^{(b)} \sin \zeta$  is the  $x$  coordinate of the point obtained by rotating  $B_2^{(b)}$  about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  by  $-\zeta$ . The condition  $\underline{d} < \|\mathcal{P}_2\| < \bar{d}$  guarantees that the product of the last two terms is always positive, while the intermediate term is always nonpositive, and it is 0 when the points  $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$  and  $B_2^{(b)}$  are collinear. This situation is the mirrored version of the situation analysed above, where the two measurement points collected from  $B_2$  and  $B_1$  were aligned, and thus there exists no points  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  that can recover  $\text{Ind}(1)$ , as in Example 1. In fact, matrix  $Q$  is in this case the 0 matrix, i.e. a conic describing the whole  $X_w \times Y_w$  motion plane. When this unfortunate situation does not occur, the determinant is negative, hence the conic described by  $Q$  is a degenerate hyperbole, i.e. two lines intersecting in  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$  and thus, for each of the two positions  $B_2^{(b)}$  arising from the setting  $2+1$ , we find two critical lines.

In conclusion, we have two critical directions for  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  arising from the first situation and four from the second, and thus there exists 6 lines in  $\langle V \rangle$ , intersecting in  $\mathcal{P}_2^{(a)}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_3^{(a)}$  should not lie onto to ensure that the trajectory is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ .

b)  $2+1+1$ : With respect to the previous case, we here collect the same number of measurements, but we distribute them among 3 anchors. One can follow the same procedure as before, obtaining more convoluted expressions leading to the same result with a more complex geometrical interpretation. However, as in the previous case, we can conclude that, in the reference frame  $\langle V \rangle$  there are at most 6 lines where  $\mathcal{P}_3$  should not lie onto to achieve a  $\text{Ind}(1)$  problem. Indeed, given the (at most) four indistinguishable trajectories arising in the setting  $2+1$ , we can find the four possible positions of the third anchor in  $\langle V \rangle$ . We can compute the distances between a given fourth position  $\mathcal{P}_{V,3}$  and each of the four ‘‘virtual’’ anchors  $B_{V,3}^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ . Two among these distances coincide, i.e.  $\|B_{V,3}^{(i)} - \mathcal{P}_{V,3}\| = \|B_{V,3}^{(j)} - \mathcal{P}_{V,3}\|$ ,  $i \neq j$ , if and only if  $\mathcal{P}_{V,3}$  lies on the axis of the segment having as vertexes a pair of the ‘‘virtual’’ anchors themselves. If  $\mathcal{P}_{V,3}$  lies on one of these 6 critical lines, then the system is  $\text{Ind}(2)$ , while when  $\mathcal{P}_{V,3}$  does not lie on any of these lines,  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ .

c)  $3+2$ : The analysis carried out in this section is a particular case of the setting  $2+2$ . Indeed, by collecting **C3** measurements from the first anchor, we can discard one of the two indistinguishable trajectories  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$ . Therefore, indistinguishability can be obtained only by rotation about the first anchor, coming up with a set of equations as in (8), with the proper modifications on the subscript to account for the additional point sensed by the first anchor. We get to the same conclusion as in (10), i.e. that the trajectories are indistinguishable only if  $B_1, \mathcal{P}_3$  and  $\mathcal{P}_4$  are aligned.

d)  $3+1+1$ : With the same *rationale* as in the analysis of the  $3+2$  setting based on the  $2+2$  scenario, we can adapt here the analysis of the setting  $2+1+1$ . After the first 4 measurements ( $3+1$ ), there exist two indistinguishable trajectories and thus, in the reference frame  $\langle V \rangle$ , there is a line (obtained with the same procedure presented in the setting  $2+1+1$ ) where  $\mathcal{P}_4$  should not lie to solve this ambiguity.

e)  $1+1+1+1$ : As discussed in the analysis of the setting  $1+1+1$ , after three measurements, there is a finite number  $\bar{n} < 8$  of indistinguishable trajectories. As in the previous cases, for each of the (at most) 28 pairs there is a line where  $\mathcal{P}_3$  should not lie to achieve a  $\text{Ind}(1)$  trajectory.

With these findings, we can state the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *Given a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $N_m$  measurement points, the system is constructible when  $N_m \geq 4$  and each anchor collects at most  $N_m - 2$  measurements, unless the last point of  $\mathcal{T}$  lies on one of the indistinguishability line identified in the analysis.*

Using the necessary and sufficient conditions to attain constructibility identified previously, the final taxonomy of Figure 5 can be derived, where the area highlighted in red subsumes the results of Theorem 2, while the part highlighted in green is referred to Theorem 3.

**Remark 6.** *Apparently, there is a duality between the conditions for constructibility in Theorem 2 and 3. However, from a practical view point, in the latter case, the vehicle can compute numerically in  $\langle V \rangle$  the ‘‘critical’’ lines before collecting the last measurement, plan its last manoeuvre to avoid such lines*




Fig. 5. Summarising picture subsuming the taxonomy derived in this paper as a function of the overall number of measurements and of their distribution among the different anchors. The number in brackets denotes the number of indistinguishable trajectories. The red part is referred to Theorem 2, while the green part is associated with the results obtained in Theorem 3.

and achieve  $\text{Ind}(1)$ . On the other hand, in the former scenario, the vehicle is not able to plan its trajectory to fall into the degenerate cases 1, 2, 3, 4, since they are detected once all the measurements are collected.

**Remark 7.** We now reverse the perspective, by considering the problem of mapping, the dual problem with respect to localisation. In this case, we want to find the position of the anchors  $B_i = [X_i; Y_i]^T$  in the reference frame  $\langle V \rangle$ , where the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  of the vehicle is known. Although the two problems are dual, there are remarkable differences in the analysis. Indeed, in the localisation problem, we have used both the shape of the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  and the layout of the anchors  $B_i$ , while here we have no information on the layout of the anchors on the plane. Thus, the overall mapping problem boils down to an independent mapping problem for each anchor, which leads to the classic trilateration problem [26].

## V. LOCAL CONSTRUCTIBILITY

In the previous sections, we have focused our analysis on the concept of *indistinguishability* of trajectories. In this section we shift our focus on *local* (weak) constructibility properties of the system, and we show that when some *a priori* information is known, e.g. an estimate of the initial state of the system, a lower number of measurements is needed to reconstruct the state of the vehicle. As expected, some results devised in the previous sections are inherited for this analysis, i.e. weak constructibility is *usually* ensured when the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\text{Ind}(1)$ , while other settings (e.g. the degenerated cases 1, 2, 3, and 4) yield pathological conditions from a local perspective. To analyse *weak* constructibility, we build the *Constructibility Gramian* of the system, which depends explicitly on the system dynamics. Therefore, we consider a unicycle-like vehicle collecting ranging measurements. The state  $q$  of the system includes its Cartesian coordinates  $x, y$  and its heading  $\theta$  with respect to a reference axis, and has the following dynamics:

$$\dot{x} = v \cos \theta, \quad \dot{y} = v \sin \theta, \quad \dot{\theta} = \omega, \quad (12)$$

where the forward velocity  $v$  and the angular velocity  $\omega$  of the vehicle are the control inputs  $u$ . Being the unicycle kinematic

model a differentially flat system with its position as flat output [28], it satisfies Property 1 and Assumption 2.

### A. Constructibility Gramian

We build the Constructibility Gramian (CG) for the unicycle kinematic model (12) subject to intermittent ranging measurements (2). The CG is an  $n \times n$  matrix, where  $n$  is the size of the state of the system, that may be used as a tool to check for nonlinear constructibility, i.e. it describes how difficult it is to reconstruct the final state of the system given the controls and the measurements over a time window  $[t_0, t_f]$ . In particular, the reciprocal of its smallest singular value (or equivalently of its smallest eigenvalue, since the CG is symmetric and positive semidefinite), quantifies how measurement noise affects the estimate of the final state, and if it is equal to 0, i.e. if the CG is singular, then the system is *weakly unconstructible* (see [29]). The CG is defined either for continuous- or discrete-time systems, and thus we have to extend its definition to a generic system with continuous-time dynamics and intermittent (discrete-time) measurement output (4). For a continuous-time system

$$\dot{q}(t) = f(q(t), u(t)), \quad z(t) = h(q(t)),$$

the Constructibility Gramian  $G_C(t_0, t_f)$  is defined as

$$G_C(t_0, t_f) = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \Phi^T(\tau, t_f) H^T(\tau) W_C(\tau) H(\tau) \Phi(\tau, t_f) d\tau, \quad (13)$$

where  $H(t) = \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial q} \right) \Big|_{q=q(t)}$  is the Jacobian of the measurement evaluated at the current time  $t$ , and  $W_C(t)$  is a weighing matrix, which accounts for heterogeneous measurement units, different uncertainties among sensors, or for nonlinear effects, such as bounded sensing range. The *sensitivity matrix*  $\Phi(t, t_f) = \frac{\partial q(t)}{\partial q_f}$  represents how small perturbations in the final condition of the system affect the state at the current time  $t$ , and is the unique solution to the final value problem:

$$\dot{\Phi}(t, t_f) = F(t) \Phi(t, t_f), \quad \Phi(t_f, t_f) = \mathbf{I}_n,$$

where  $F(t) = \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \right) \Big|_{q=q(t)}$  is the linearised dynamics of the system and  $\mathbf{I}_n$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. To model intermittent measurements, we design  $W_C$  such that

$$W_C(t_k) = \begin{cases} \delta_D \text{diag}(e_i) & \text{if } B_i \text{ is measured at } t_k, \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbf{0}$  denotes the null matrix, the  $\text{diag}(w)$  operator indicates a diagonal matrix having the entries of the vector  $w$  as diagonal entries,  $e_i$  is the unitary vector aligned with the  $i$ -th axis, thus assuming that the sensors have homogeneous uncertainty, and  $\delta_D$  is the Dirac delta. This way, with the same idea as in the previous section, we can disregard the dynamics of the system and the trajectory followed by the vehicle and focus on a finite number of points  $\mathcal{P}_k$  where the measurements are collected. However, the definition of the CG explicitly contains the final state  $q_f$  and, by computations carried out hereafter, it depends on the final position  $\mathcal{P}_f = [x_f, y_f]^T$ ,




Fig. 6. The vehicle is located in the point  $\mathcal{P}_k$ , and it is sensed by the anchor  $B_i$ . The quantities affecting the term  $g_k$  of the CG only depend on the angle  $\alpha_k$  of the measurement and not on the collected distance  $\rho_k$ .

reached by the vehicle at time  $t = t_f$ . Therefore, the CG in (13) may be rewritten in the following simplified expression

$$G_C(t_0, t_f) = \sum_{k=0}^{N_m-1} g(t_k, t_f),$$

where  $N_m$  is the overall number of measurements, and the contribution  $g(t_k, t_f)$  of the  $k$ -th measurement, denoted as  $g_k$  in the following, is computed with its definition in (13)

$$g_k = \gamma_k \gamma_k^\top, \quad \gamma_k = [\cos \alpha_k, \sin \alpha_k, p_k]^\top, \quad (14)$$

with  $\alpha_k = \arctan2(y_k - Y_i, x_k - X_i)$ , while  $p_k$  is the distance of the final point from the line passing through the measured anchor  $B_i$  and having slope  $\alpha_k$ , i.e.

$$p_k = \frac{(x_f - x_k)(Y_i - y_k) - (y_f - y_k)(X_i - x_k)}{\sqrt{(x_k - X_i)^2 + (y_k - Y_i)^2}}.$$

Notice that  $p_k$  is not dependent on the collected measurement, i.e. the distance  $\rho_k$ . Figure 6 shows the relevant parameters defining  $g_k$ . By construction,  $g_k$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix with rank 1, whose column space is  $\gamma_k$ . We will leverage considerations on the rank of sum of matrices, relying on alignment among null and column spaces of the contributions  $g_k$ . To formally define the relationship between *weak constructibility* properties and rank of the CG, we report here the following theorem, adapted from [30], whose proof is skipped for brevity.

**Theorem 4** ([30]). *Given system (4), if there exists a sequence of control inputs  $u(t)$ ,  $t \in [t_0, t_f]$ , i.e. a shape of  $\mathcal{T}$ , such that  $CG(t_0, t_f)$  is full rank, then system (4) is weakly constructible.*

As in the previous sections, we analyse the settings with increasing number of measurement and anchors.

### B. Single anchor

With a single anchor collecting measurements, the analysis of the CG trivially leads to the same conclusions drawn in Theorem 1, i.e. the trajectory can rotate about the anchor without modifying the sensor readings.

*a) One measurement:* When a single measurement is collected, in  $\mathcal{P}_0 = [x_0, y_0]^\top$ , the Constructibility Gramian is simply computed as  $G = \gamma_0 \gamma_0^\top$ , where  $\gamma_0$  is defined in (14) and thus, by construction, the CG has rank 1. Its null space, i.e. the unconstructible subspace, is a two-dimensional vector subspace with the vectors  $[-(y_f - Y_1); x_f - X_1; 1]$  and  $[-(y_f - y_0); x_f - x_0; 1]$  as basis. The two vectors defining the unconstructible subspace are tangent to the circles passing through  $\mathcal{P}_f$  and centred on  $B_1$  and on  $\mathcal{P}_0$ , respectively. This




Fig. 7. A pair of measurements collected by anchor  $B_1$ . (a) The three points are not aligned, the rank of the CG is 2 and the two tangents of the circles passing through  $\mathcal{P}_1$  are not aligned. (b) The particular situation where  $B_1$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  are aligned occurs, the two circles passing through  $\mathcal{P}_1$  share the same tangent, hence making the CG rank deficient.

result is compliant with Theorem 1, hence highlighting the same constructibility properties.

*b) Two measurements:* The second measurement collected by the anchor generates an overall Constructibility Gramian  $G = \gamma_0 \gamma_0^\top + \gamma_1 \gamma_1^\top$ , having at most rank 2, since it is the sum of two rank 1 matrices. Since the column space of  $g_0$  is  $\gamma_0$  by construction, we can analytically derive the conditions on  $\mathcal{P}_1$  such that the Gramian has still rank 1, by solving  $\gamma_1 = \ell \gamma_0$ , with  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ , yielding  $\mathcal{P}_1 = \ell \mathcal{P}_0 + (1 - \ell) B_1$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $B_1$  are collinear, occurring whenever the vehicle is moving on the diameter of the circle centred on the anchor. From an analytical viewpoint, this result is not surprising, since  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  share the same angle  $\alpha$ , and thus  $\gamma_0 = \gamma_1$ . This result may be interpreted by keeping in mind that we are dealing with local properties, i.e. we are regarding rotations as (small) translations along the tangent of the circle centred on the rotation pole. In this particular scenario, the rotation about  $B_1$  and about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  share the same tangent, orthogonal to  $\mathcal{S}_{0,1}$ , and thus, only in this setting, also a rotation about  $\mathcal{P}_0$  is allowed. The two situations with rank 2 and rank 1 are represented in Figure 7.

**Remark 8.** *This result has a strong connection with the scenario described in Remark 4, where indistinguishability was avoided, while preventing weak constructibility. In this situation, the angle  $\delta$  defined in (5) is equal to 0 and the two points  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(a)}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1^{(b)}$  collapse on each other.*

Any further measurement collected by the first anchor, beyond the second, is not informative from a local point of view (provided that the two measurement points are not collinear with the anchor itself). Indeed, the vector  $[-(y_f - Y_1); x_f - X_1; 1]^\top$ , associated with the rotation of the trajectory about the anchor, does not depend on the sensed measurement point. Hence, a single anchor always generates a singular Gramian, independently on the number of measurements collected.

### C. Two anchors

As in Section IV, we now consider a higher number of anchors and an increasing number of measurements distributed among them. Since the maximum number of informative measurements collected by an anchor is 2, we will analyse the settings 1 + 1, 2 + 1 and 2 + 2 hereafter.

*a) 1 + 1:* Since we are summing two rank-1 matrices, we can already state upfront that the CG will be singular.

However, with the same rationale of the previous case, we look for the condition on  $\mathcal{P}_1$  such that the Gramian has rank 1, i.e. when  $\gamma_1 = \ell\gamma_0$ , thus getting from the first two equations

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \ell(\mathcal{P}_0 - B_1) + B_2. \quad (15)$$

By plugging this definition of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  into the third equation, which reads as  $p_1 = \ell p_0$ , we get a linear equation in  $y_0$ , yielding

$$y_0 = \frac{Y_1 - Y_2}{X_1 - X_2}x_0 + \frac{X_1Y_2 - X_2Y_1}{X_1 - X_2},$$

i.e.  $\mathcal{P}_0$ ,  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  collinear. By plugging this result in (15), we get that also  $\mathcal{P}_1$  lies on the same line. Thus, as soon as the four points are not collinear, the rank of the Gramian is 2.

**Remark 9.** *This condition has already been discussed in the degenerate Case 1, where the circles passing through  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and centred on  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, share the same tangent. In this situation, two indistinguishable trajectories coincide, thus achieving Ind(1) and preventing weak constructibility.*

b) 2 + 1: Without loss of generality, let us consider two measurements in  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  from  $B_1$ , and one in  $\mathcal{P}_2$  from  $B_2$

$$\ker(\gamma_0\gamma_0^\top + \gamma_1\gamma_1^\top) = [-(y_f - Y_1), \quad x_f - X_1, \quad 1]^\top,$$

while the column space of  $\gamma_2^\top\gamma_2$  is  $\gamma_2$  itself. The CG has rank 2 when these two vectors are orthogonal, i.e. their inner product  $\langle \ker(\gamma_0\gamma_0^\top + \gamma_1\gamma_1^\top), \gamma_2 \rangle$  is 0, hence when

$$X_1Y_2 - X_2Y_1 - X_1y_2 + Y_1x_2 + X_2y_2 - Y_2x_2 = 0,$$

i.e. when  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  are aligned. To give a geometrical interpretation, we need to refer to the results obtained in the case 2 + 1 in Section IV (see Figure 4). From a local perspective we have some knowledge on the initial state of the system, i.e. we can a priori distinguish whether the vehicle is travelling along the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}^{(a)}$  or  $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}$  in Figure 4, and thus we can compute the distance of  $\mathcal{P}_2$  from the anchor  $B_1$ . Therefore, we know that  $\mathcal{P}_2$  lies on the intersection between two circles centred in  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  respectively. Whenever  $\mathcal{P}_2$  lies on the line connecting the two anchors, these two circles intersect in a single point, and therefore they share the same tangent direction, with the same conclusions as in the 1 + 1 setting, described in Figure 7. Notice that, in this case, we do not have a perfect duality with the degenerated case 3, since we can discard a priori one of the two circles in Figure 4.

c) 2 + 2: We consider two pairs of measurement points being not collinear with the anchor collecting their distance. In this scenario, the CG is singular as long as the 1-dimensional null spaces of the Gramians  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$ , associated with each anchor, are aligned. The condition  $\ker(G_2) = \ell \ker(G_1)$  reads

$$-y_f + Y_2 = -\ell y_f + \ell Y_1, \quad x_f - X_2 = \ell x_f - \ell X_1, \quad 1 = \ell,$$

hence yielding  $B_1 = B_2$ , which is impossible by assumption of distinct anchors. Therefore, when two anchors collect a pair of measurements each, the system is weakly constructible as far as the pair of measurement points and the anchor collecting their distances are not collinear.

#### D. Three anchors

With three anchors, we only consider the scenario 1 + 1 + 1, which is expected to yield results similar to the case 2 + 1. We build the column spaces  $\gamma_k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2$ , of the three contributions to the CG. The overall Gramian is full rank as soon as the three column spaces are linearly independent, and this conditions may be checked by computing the determinant of  $W = [\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2]$ , yielding  $\det W = ax_2 + by_2 + c$ , where  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$  are three parameters depending on the coordinates of the three anchors  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B_3$ , and of the two measurement points  $\mathcal{P}_0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . Hence,  $\det W = 0$  describes a line on the  $X_w \times Y_w$  plane, passing through the anchor  $B_3$ . Therefore, the Gramian is singular as soon as  $\mathcal{P}_2$  lies on this line, with known analytical form. From a geometric point of view, this line has a similar interpretation to the one obtained in the scenario 2 + 1. Indeed, by combining the rotation of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  about  $B_1$  and of  $\mathcal{P}_2$  about  $B_2$  such that  $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$  maintains the same length, the (tangent to the) resulting motion of the third point  $\mathcal{P}_3$  is tangent to the circle centred on  $B_3$  and passing through  $\mathcal{P}_3$  itself. From a global perspective, in this situation two intersections between two 1D geometrical varieties coincide (see Remarks 4 and 8), but there are guarantees on its uniqueness.

By the conclusions drawn so far, the main result on *weak constructibility* is stated in the following Theorem.

**Theorem 5.** *Given at least three measurements, distributed among at least 2 anchors, the trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is weakly constructible, unless the last point of  $\mathcal{T}$  lies on one of the critical lines identified in the analysis.*

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have proposed an analysis of indistinguishability by abstracting the manoeuvres executed by the vehicle and the measurements collected by the ranging sensors, in order to have an easy geometric interpretation of the results obtained in this analysis for the localisation problem. Then, we have proposed a local constructibility analysis based on the Constructibility Gramian, showing analysis and differences between the local and global analysis. In the near future, we plan to develop control strategies considering the anchors as moving agents of a multiagent system, ensuring both global constructibility and desired levels of local constructibility that can be quantified through some norm of the CG, in the spirit of the active sensing. Before using the obtained results in single- or multi-agent trajectory planning, a deeper analysis on the effect of actuation uncertainties and measurement noises would be beneficial to the synthesis of planning algorithms.

## REFERENCES

- [1] V. Magnago, P. Corbalán, G. Picco, L. Palopoli, and D. Fontanelli, "Robot Localization via Odometry-assisted Ultra-wideband Ranging with Stochastic Guarantees," in *Proc. IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and System (IROS)*. Macao, China: IEEE, Nov. 2019, pp. 1607–1613.
- [2] P. Chen, Y. B. Xu, L. Chen, and Z. A. Deng, "Survey of WLAN Fingerprinting Positioning System," *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, vol. 380, pp. 2499–2505, Aug. 2013.
- [3] P. Nazemzadeh, F. Moro, D. Fontanelli, D. Macii, and L. Palopoli, "Indoor Positioning of a Robotic Walking Assistant for Large Public Environments," *IEEE Trans. on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 2965–2976, Nov 2015.

- [4] N. Cheok, M. Radovnikovich, P. Vempaty, G. Hudás, J. Overholt, and P. Fleck, "UWB tracking of mobile robots," in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*, Istanbul, Turkey, Sep. 2010, pp. 2615–2620.
- [5] M. J. Gallant and J. A. Marshall, "Two-Dimensional Axis Mapping Using LiDAR," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 150–160, Feb. 2016.
- [6] D. Barnes and I. Posner, "Under the Radar: Learning to Predict Robust Keypoints for Odometry Estimation and Metric Localisation in Radar," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2020, pp. 9484–9490.
- [7] F. A. Belo, P. Salaris, D. Fontanelli, and A. Bicchi, "A complete observability analysis of the planar bearing localization and mapping for visual servoing with known camera velocities," *International Journal of Advanced Robotic Systems*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 197, 2013.
- [8] H. Sert, W. Perruquetti, A. Kokosy, X. Jin, and J. Palos, "Localizability of unicycle mobiles robots: An algebraic point of view," in *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 223–228.
- [9] G. L. Mariottini, G. Pappas, D. Prattichizzo, and K. Daniilidis, "Vision-based localization of leader-follower formations," in *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 635–640.
- [10] Y. Wu, Y. Li, W. Li, H. Li, and R. Lu, "Robust LiDAR-based localization scheme for unmanned ground vehicle via multisensor fusion," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 32, no. 12, pp. 5633–5643, 2020.
- [11] J. Delaune, D. S. Bayard, and R. Brockers, "Range-visual-inertial odometry: Scale observability without excitation," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 2421–2428, 2021.
- [12] A. Martinelli, "The unicycle in presence of a single disturbance: Observability properties," in *2017 Proceedings of the Conference on Control and its Applications*. SIAM, 2017, pp. 62–69.
- [13] D. De Palma, F. Arrichiello, G. Parlangei, and G. Indiveri, "Underwater localization using single beacon measurements: Observability analysis for a double integrator system," *Ocean Engineering*, vol. 142, pp. 650–665, 2017.
- [14] J. D. Quenzer and K. A. Morgansen, "Observability based control in range-only underwater vehicle localization," in *2014 American control conference*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 4702–4707.
- [15] E. Fernando, O. De Silva, G. K. Mann, and R. Gosine, "Toward Developing an Indoor Localization System for MAVs Using Two or Three RF Range Anchors: An Observability Based Approach," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 5173–5187, 2021.
- [16] V. Magnago, L. Palopoli, A. Buffi, B. Tellini, A. Motroni, P. Nepa, D. Macii, and D. Fontanelli, "Ranging-free UHF-RFID Robot Positioning through Phase Measurements of Passive Tags," *IEEE Trans. on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 2408–2418, May 2020.
- [17] D. Fontanelli, F. Shamsfakhr, D. Macii, and L. Palopoli, "An uncertainty-driven and observability-based state estimator for nonholonomic robots," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 70, pp. 1–12, 2021.
- [18] B. Araki, I. Gilitschenski, T. Ogata, A. Wallar, W. Schwarting, Z. Choudhury, S. Karaman, and D. Rus, "Range-based cooperative localization with nonlinear observability analysis," in *2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1864–1870.
- [19] N. T. Hung and A. M. Pascoal, "Range-based navigation and target localization: Observability analysis and guidelines for motion planning," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 14620–14627, 2020.
- [20] D. Coleman, S. D. Bopardikar, and X. Tan, "Observability-aware target tracking with range only measurement," in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 4217–4224.
- [21] F. Mandić, N. Mišković, N. Palomeras, M. Carreras, and G. Vallicrosa, "Mobile beacon control algorithm that ensures observability in single range navigation," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 49, no. 23, pp. 48–53, 2016.
- [22] S. Cedervall and X. Hu, "Nonlinear observers for unicycle robots with range sensors," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 1325–1329, 2007.
- [23] P. Salaris, M. Cognetti, R. Spica, and P. R. Giordano, "Online Optimal Perception-Aware Trajectory Generation," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1307–1322, 2019.
- [24] O. Napolitano, D. Fontanelli, L. Pallottino, and P. Salaris, "Information-aware Lyapunov-based MPC in a feedback-feedforward control strategy for autonomous robots," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 4765–4772, April 2022.
- [25] M. Bayat, N. Crasta, A. P. Aguiar, and A. M. Pascoal, "Range-based underwater vehicle localization in the presence of unknown ocean currents: Theory and experiments," *IEEE Transactions on control systems technology*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 122–139, 2015.
- [26] L. Palopoli and D. Fontanelli, "Global observability analysis of a nonholonomic robot using range sensors," in *2020 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1300–1305.
- [27] F. Riz, L. Palopoli, and D. Fontanelli, "On Local/Global Constructibility for Mobile Robots using Bounded Range Measurements," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 3038–3043, 2022.
- [28] M. Fliess, J. Lévine, P. Martin, and P. Rouchon, "Flatness and defect of non-linear systems: introductory theory and examples," *International journal of control*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 1327–1361, 1995.
- [29] A. J. Krener and K. Ide, "Measures of unobservability," in *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) held jointly with 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 6401–6406.
- [30] N. D. Powell and K. A. Morgansen, "Empirical observability gramian rank condition for weak observability of nonlinear systems with control," in *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 6342–6348.