

Re: Galileo – what for?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.satellite-nav/2005-12/msg00775.html>

- *From:* "H.W. Stockman" <stockman3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 28 Dec 2005 22:54:23 GMT
-

"Mark McIntyre" <markmcintyre@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:m4p2r1pk8nlbnr3ot6q634llsr37np9bc@xxxxxxxxxxx>

> On Fri, 27 Jan 2006 15:02:44 GMT, in sci.geo.satellite-nav ,

[...]

> Incorrect. GPS accuracy was deliberately bollixed during the conflict,
> to hamper enemy activity. The coalition had kit to descramble the
> signal.

Really? I have used a GPS extensively since early 2003 (every weekend), and tend to get +/- 2-3 meters EPE with WAAS on ridgelines and in the open desert in Nevada. I've used the GPS to revisit rockclimbing routes on south-facing slopes, and the reproducibility is indeed 2-3 m. As always, there are times when visible satellites are nearly colinear, or the GPS must search to reestablish a visible constellation when I change direction and my head blocks signals.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ [*Re: Galileo – what for?*](#)

◇ *From:* Mark McIntyre

• *References:*

- ◆ [*Galileo – what for?*](#)

◇ *From:* Marc Brett

- ◆ [*Re: Galileo – what for?*](#)

◇ *From:* M. Handschuer

- ◆ [*Re: Galileo – what for?*](#)

◇ *From:* Mark McIntyre

- Prev by Date: [*28 December 2005 : New step for the Galileo System*](#)
- Next by Date: [*Re: EU Launches 1st Galileo Program Satellite*](#)
- Previous by thread: [*Re: Galileo – what for?*](#)
- Next by thread: [*Re: Galileo – what for?*](#)
- Index(es):

Re: Galileo – what for?

- ◆ Date
- ◆ Thread