

**COMPARISON OF THREE MULTIBEAM ACOUSTIC WAVE PATH
REFRACTION COMPENSATION TECHNIQUES**

LOH KHAI XIAN

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

COMPARISON OF THREE MULTIBEAM ACOUSTIC WAVE PATH
REFRACTION COMPENSATION TECHNIQUES

LOH KHAI XIAN


A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirement for the award of the degree of
Master of Science (Hydrography)

Faculty of Geoinformation and Real Estate
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JULY 2014

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled “Comparison of Three Multibeam Acoustic Wave Path Refraction Compensation Techniques” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accept for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature :  _____
Name : Loh Khai Xian _____
Date : 17th July 2014 _____

DEDICATION

To my beloved family and friends.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mohd Razali Mahmud for supervising me from the start to the end of the study. It is advice, guidance, and encouragements, has helped me to complete this thesis successfully.

Besides, I am feeling grateful to Mr. Eranda Gunathilaka, Mr. Hilmi Abdullah and fellow staffs from Hydrographic Research and Training Office (HRTTO), UTM, for the advices and assistances in data collecting and program development. Also, many thanks to Ms. Kong Chin Yee from Faculty of Science, UTM, and Mr. Goh Jing Qiang from University of Tampere, for the advices and technical support in developing the program. All the effort is much appreciated.

Special thanks to Mr. Kumaraguru Ramayah for taking me in as teaching and research assistance to aid my financial difficulties along the study. Without the financial aiding provided, it will be impossible for me to finish my master course. Last but not least, I am indebted to my family who gave me supports and encouragements for this entire time. Words are not enough to express my appreciation to them.

ABSTRACT

The main mechanism of bathymetry survey is relied on the measurement of the travel time of the two ways sound wave. Speed of sound wave is dependent on the water density. Density of every water layer is affected by temperature, salinity and pressure. According to Snell's Law, when sound wave travel through water layers with different densities, the travel speed will change and leads to refraction. Thus, the variation of sound speed will significantly affect the accuracy of the bathymetry result, as the refraction will cause the sound wave to be refracted from their ideal propagation path, and, resulting false depth and position. Compensation of the refraction can be completed by Trigonometry Method, Curvature Method and the Combined Method. The Trigonometry Method is implementing the averaging of the sound speed for a determined layer of depth. Conversely, the Curvature Method assumes the sound wave to travel in an arc of circle of different radius in every different depth layer. Meanwhile, the Combined Method is the combination of the Trigonometry Method and Curvature Method. This study aims to identify which approach provides the better positional result and depth. The sound speed data of the water column is recorded using the sound velocity probe at four different study areas. The outer beam of the particular ping is selected for comparison and analysis. As a result, the average of overall difference in horizontal distance between Trigonometry Method and Combined Method obtained from 30° beam and 60° beam is 0.038m and 0.122m, respectively. From the simulation, as the sound speed increases or decreases continuously, the horizontal difference among Trigonometry Method and Combined Method exceeds the special order of International Hydrographic Organisation Standard (IHO) at the depth level where the sound speed exceed the difference of 10m/s from the transducer.

ABSTRAK

Mekanisma utama ukur batimetri adalah bergantung kepada cerapan masa perambatan dua hala gelombang bunyi. Halaju gelombang bunyi adalah bergantung kepada ketumpatan air. Ketumpatan air setiap lapisan dipengaruhi oleh suhu, kemasinan dan tekanan. Menurut Hukum Snell, apabila gelombang merambat melalui lapisan air yang berbeza ketumpatan, halaju gelombang akan berubah dan menghasilkan pembiasan. Justeru, perubahan halaju gelombang bunyi akan memberi kesan terhadap hasil kejituan batimetri, kerana pembiasan akan menyebabkan gelombang bunyi terbias dari laluan perambatan yang sepatutnya, dan menghasilkan selisih dalam penentuan kedalaman dan kedudukan. Pembetulan untuk pembiasan boleh dijalankan dengan Kaedah Trigonometri, Kaedah Kelengkungan dan Kaedah Gabungan. Kaedah Trigonometri menggunakan purata halaju untuk lapisan kedalaman yang ditentukan; Kaedah Kelengkungan menganggap gelombang bunyi merambat dalam bentuk arka bulatan di setiap lapisan kedalaman dengan jejari yang berbeza; Kaedah Gabungan merupakan gabungan Kaedah Trigonometri dan Kaedah Kelengkungan. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengenalpasti kaedah yang lebih baik dalam memberi keputusan kedudukan dan kedalaman. Data halaju gelombang bunyi direkod dengan pengesan halaju bunyi di empat kawasan kajian yang berlainan. Ping daripada alur luar dipilih untuk perbandingan dan analisis. Menurut keputusan yang diperolehi, purata keseluruhan untuk perbezaan jarak mendatar antara Kaedah Trigonometri dan Kaedah Gabungan yang diperolehi dari alur 30° dan alur 60° adalah masing-masing 0.038m dan 0.122m. Berdasarkan kepada simulasi, apabila halaju gelombang bunyi meningkat atau menurun secara berterusan, perbezaan jarak mendatar antara Kaedah Trigonometri and Kaedah Gabungan mencecah standard minima Piawaian Organisasi Hidrografi Antarabangsa (IHO) pada paras kedalaman dari tranduser yang mencapai perbezaan halaju gelombang bunyi sebanyak 10m/s.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	TITLE PAGE	i
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ASBTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENT	vii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xii
	LIST OF TABLES	xvii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xviii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background	1
	1.2 Problem statements	2
	1.3 Research objectives	5
	1.4 Scope of study	5
	1.5 Significant of research	6
2	LITERATURE REVIEWS	8
	2.1 Multibeam Echo Sounder Systems	8
	2.1.1 Principle of MBES Operation	9
	2.1.2 Transducer	10

2.1.3	Transducer Array	11
2.1.3.1	Curved Array Transducers	12
2.1.3.2	Flat Array Transducers	13
2.2	Beam Steering	14
2.2.1	Beam Steering in Curved Array MBES	15
2.2.2	Beam Steering in Flat Array MBES	18
2.2.3	Mechanical Beam Steering	18
2.2.4	Electronic Beam Steering	19
2.2.4.1	Time Delay Method	21
2.2.4.2	Phase Delay Method	22
2.2.4.3	Fast Fourier Transformation (FFT)	23
2.3	Ray Tracing	25
2.3.1	Vertical Incidence	26
2.3.2	Oblique Incidence	27
2.3.2.1	Layer with Constant Sound Speed	29
2.3.2.2	Layer with Constant Sound Speed Gradient	30
2.3.2.3	The Combination of Constant and Gradient Sound Speed Layer	35
2.4	Acoustic Wave	35
2.4.1	Characteristic of Acoustic Wave	36
2.5	Variation of Sound Speed in Ocean	37
2.5.1	Factors affect sound speed variation in ocean	39
2.5.1.1	Temperature	39
2.5.1.2	Salinity	41
2.5.1.3	Pressure	41
2.5.1.4	Density	42
2.6	The Sound Speed Equation	43
2.6.1	Leroy's Equation	44
2.6.2	Medwin's Equation	44
2.6.3	Mackenzie's Equation	44

2.6.4	Coppen's Equation	45
2.6.5	Chen-Millero's Equation	45
2.6.6	Del Grosso's Equation	48
2.7	Sound Speed Measurement	49
2.7.1	Surface Sound Speed (SSS) Measurement	50
2.7.2	Sound Velocity Profile (SVP) in the water column	50
2.8	Sources of errors in Multibeam Measurement	51
2.8.1	Error due to sound velocity	51
2.8.2	Error due to motion sensor	53
2.8.3	Error due draught, settlement, squat and relative position of the transducer	54
2.8.4	Error due to depth reduction	55
2.9	Summary	56
3	METHODOLOGY	57
3.1	Introduction	57
3.2	Survey instruments	57
3.2.1	Multibeam Echo Sounder (MBES)	57
3.2.2	Positioning system	58
3.2.3	Sound speed measurement	59
3.2.4	Motion Sensor	59
3.2.5	Tide gauge	60
3.3	Software for data collecting and processing	60
3.4	Methodology for the comparison of compensating sound refraction using Trigonometry, Curvature and Combined methods	61
3.4.1	Simulation	61
3.4.2	Real data	62
3.5	Data Processing	63
3.5.1	MRU and Gyro data	63
3.5.2	Ping Data	64
3.5.3	Point Position and Depth	65

3.5.4	Processing with proposed method	66
3.6	Development of Calculation Program	67
3.6.1	Development of program for Trigonometry Method	68
3.6.2	Development of program for Curvature Method	69
3.6.3	Development of program for Combined Method	69
3.6.4	Excel Visual Basic Developer	71
4	RESULT AND ANALYSIS	72
4.1	Introduction	72
4.2	Validation of the Excel Program	72
4.2.1	Validation of Easting and Northing	73
4.2.2	Validation of depth	76
4.2.3	Summary of the validation	77
4.3	Assessment of Trigonometry, Curvature and Combined methods	77
4.3.1	Lido Beach	78
4.3.2	Penang	80
4.3.3	Summary of the assessment	82
4.4	Calculation of refraction using Trigonometry and Combined methods	84
4.4.1	Simulation data	84
4.4.1.1	Profiles	84
4.4.1.2	Differences in various parameters	87
4.4.1.3	Summary of simulation results	90
4.4.2	Real data	91
4.4.2.1	Lido Beach	91
4.4.2.2	Lumut	94
4.4.2.3	Penang	97
4.4.2.4	Kota Bahru	100
4.5	Summary of the results	104

5	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	106
5.1	Conclusion	106
5.2	Recommendation	108
	REFERENCE	109
	APPENDIX	114
A	Location map of the surveyed site	115
B	IHO STANDARDS FOR HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS (S-44): Minimum Standards for Hydrographic Survey	117
C	Flow chart of the study	118
D	Program Validation – Difference in Easting (m)	119
E	Program Validation – Difference in Northing (m)	121
F	Program Validation – Difference in Depth (m)	123

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	NAME OF FIGURE	PAGE
2.1	Observation geometry of MBES.	9
2.2	Diagram of transducer.	10
2.3	Transmit main lobe and receive main lobe intersection as projected onto the seafloor.	11
2.4	The curved array transducer.	12
2.5	Transmit and receive arrays for Mill's Cross.	13
2.6	The combination of transmit and receive arrays.	13
2.7	Example of flat array transducers.	14
2.8	Wave fronts striking a transducer at angle θ .	15
2.9	Stave selection for beam steering in curved transducer array.	15
2.10	Beam forming in a curved array transducer configuration. Steering is performed only beyond a certain angle.	17
2.11	Outer beams steered using the physical shape of the transducer combined with time delays that increase towards the upper staves.	17
2.12	Intersection of physically steered transmit and receive beam.	18
2.13	Electronic Beam Steering. (a) No delays - Parallel beams. (b) Applied delays to each element to achieve desired steering direction. (c) Applied delays for different beams from both side of the transducer. (d) How all the beams in	19

	the swath are generated simultaneously by beam steering.	
2.14	Applied delays to individual transducer elements to detect oblique beams.	21
2.15	A virtual array created by phase delay added to each of the transducer element.	22
2.16	The angle of incidence θ is determined by the frequency of the signal coming from the hydrophones.	25
2.17	Outer beams are refracted when travel through water columns.	26
2.18	The oblique incidence of sound wave.	28
2.19	Refraction in multi water column.	29
2.20	Constant sound speed profile.	31
2.21	Positive sound speed profile.	31
2.22	Negative sound speed profile.	31
2.23 (a)	Sound speed profile in w coordinates.	32
2.23 (b)	Circular ray path for liner dependence of speed on dept between z_n and z_{n+1}	32
2.24	Variation of sound speed in ocean.	37
2.25	Sound speed error at (a) oceans and (b) estuarine area due to the change of temperature and salinity.	38
2.26	The external influences toward the variation of sound speed at estuarine area.	39
2.27	Variation of sound speed in water corresponding to temperature.	40
2.28	Variation of temperature according to water depth at different latitude.	40
2.29	Variation of salinity in water corresponding to depth.	41
2.30	Variation of various parameters against depth.	42
2.31	Change of density against temperature, pressure and salinity.	43
2.32	Beam steering error due to sound velocity variation.	52

3.1 (a)	The mounting of multibeam transducer over the side of the boat.	58
3.1 (b)	The multibeam data collection unit.	58
3.2 (a)	Trimble DSM 212H DGPS.	58
3.2 (b)	DGPS antenna.	58
3.3 (a)	SVP-15 velocimeter,	59
3.3 (b)	Preparation for SVP casting.	59
3.4	TSS MAHRS motion sensor.	59
3.5 (a)	Tide gauge.	60
3.5 (b)	Valeport 740 pressure sensor.	60
3.6	Sound velocity profile obtained from different area.	62
3.7	The inspection window of QINSy Replay.	63
3.8	The extracted MRU and Gyro parameter for each ping.	64
3.9	Before and after Butterworth smoothing process.	64
3.10	The profile view and plan view of the comparison survey line.	65
3.11 (a)	Trigonometry method interface.	66
3.11 (b)	Curvature method interface.	66
3.12 (a)	Analysing interface.	66
3.12 (b)	Plotting interface.	66
3.13	The interface of the computation worksheet.	67
3.14	The interface for Trigonometry Method.	68
3.15	Merging of adjacent layer with same sound speed.	69
3.16	The customised coding for Excel Visual Basic Developer.	71
4.1	Comparison of Easting coordinates between QINSy and the Excel program.	73
4.2	Comparison of Northing coordinates between QINSy and the Excel program.	74
4.3	Comparison of coordinates between QINSy and the Excel program.	75

4.4	Comparison of depths between QINSy and the Excel program.	76
4.5	Comparison of Easting profile between 3 methods at Lido Beach.	78
4.6	Comparison of Northing profile between 3 methods at Lido Beach.	79
4.7	Comparison of Easting profile between 3 methods at Penang.	80
4.8	Comparison of Northing profile between 3 methods at Penang.	81
4.9	Difference in Easting obtained from Simulation 1 dataset.	85
4.10	Difference in Northing obtained from Simulation 1 dataset.	85
4.11	Difference in Easting obtained from Simulation 2 dataset.	86
4.12	Difference in Northing obtained from Simulation 2 dataset.	86
4.13	Difference between both methods in Simulation 1 dataset at Beam 60.	88
4.14	Difference between both methods in Simulation 1 dataset at Beam 80.	88
4.15	Difference between both methods in Simulation 2 dataset at Beam 60.	90
4.16	Difference between both methods in Simulation 2 dataset at Beam 80.	90
4.17	Difference in Easting obtained from Lido Beach dataset.	92
4.18	Difference in Northing obtained from Lido Beach dataset.	92
4.19	Difference between both methods in Lido Beach at Beam 60.	93
4.20	Difference between both methods in Lido Beach at Beam 80.	93
4.21	Difference in Easting obtained from Lumut dataset.	95
4.22	Difference in Northing obtained from Lumut dataset.	95
4.23	Difference between both methods in Lumut at Beam 60.	96

4.24	Difference between both methods in Lumut at Beam 80.	97
4.25	Difference in Easting obtained from Penang dataset.	98
4.26	Difference in Northing obtained from Penang dataset.	98
4.27	Difference between both methods in Penang at Beam 60.	99
4.28	Difference between both methods in Penang at Beam 80.	99
4.29	Difference in Easting obtained from Kota Bahru dataset.	101
4.30	Difference in Northing obtained from Kota Bahru dataset.	101
4.31	Difference between both methods in Kota Bahru at Beam 60.	102
4.32	Difference between both methods in Kota Bahru at Beam 80.	103

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	NAME OF TABLE	PAGE
2.1	Coefficients of Chen-Millero Equation (UNESCO Equation).	47
2.2	Coefficients of the Del Grosso's Equation.	49
3.1	The configuration of simulated data for the testing of both compensation techniques.	61
4.1	Difference in Easting obtained from the comparison.	73
4.2	Difference in Northing obtained from the comparison.	74
4.3	Difference in horizontal position obtained from the comparison.	75
4.4	Difference in depth obtained from the comparison.	76
4.5	The summary of the comparison of Trigonometry method with Curvature method and Combined method.	83
4.6	Comparison of Trigonometry and Combined method for Simulation data.	90
4.7	Comparison of Trigonometry and Combined method for Lido Beach data.	94
4.8	Comparison of Trigonometry and Combined method for Lumut data.	96
4.9	Comparison of Trigonometry and Combined method for Penang data.	100
4.10	Comparison of Trigonometry and Combined method for Kota Bahru data.	103
4.11	The average differences for Lido Beach, Lumut, Penang and Kota Bahru.	104

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

ASCII	-	American Standard Code for Information Interchange
AUV	-	Autonomous Unmanned Vehicle
CTD	-	Conductivity Temperature Density
DGPS	-	Differential Global Positioning System
DoN	-	Department of Navy
DOSITS	-	Discovery of Sound In The Sea
FFT	-	Fast Fourier Transformation
GPS	-	Global Positioning System
IHO	-	International Hydrographic Organisation
MAHRS	-	Meridian Attitude and Heading Reference System
MBES	-	Multibeam Echosounder System
MRU	-	Motion Reference Unit
NDT	-	Non-destructive testing
NOAA	-	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPL	-	National Physics Laboratory
QINSy	-	Quality Integrated Navigation System
ROV	-	Remotely Operated Vehicle
RTK	-	Real Time Kinematic
SBES	-	Single Beam Echosounder
SSS	-	Surface Sound Speed
SVP	-	Sound Velocity Profile
UNESCO	-	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USACE	-	United States Army Corps of Engineers
3D	-	Three dimensional

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The evolution of multi-beam echo sounders (MBES) is leading to systems with enhanced capabilities in their traditional markets, but also provides features to allow the expansion of their use into new areas and applications. This short review highlights some of the features of the latest generation of systems. The attributes of an MBES system are traditionally described by technical specifications, such as operating frequency, pulse length, beam width, number of beams and coverage. It is also apparent that potentially cost-effective systems are now available to users who may previously have only considered a single beam echo sounder (SBES) solution (Mann, 2013). The MBES transducer is continuously transmitting acoustic sound toward seafloor. When the acoustic sound makes contact with the bottom, it will be reflected back to the transducer as to complete a round trip. The beam array of MBES is pre-determined at the certain angle deviated at both side from the nadir. Each beam is constantly separated by a fix angle (Gunathilaka, 2008).

As mentioned by Koomans (2010), MBES have speedily established their superior competencies over earlier systems used to attain complete seafloor coverage. The distinctive capabilities of the MBES allow it to provide high accuracy full coverage of the bottom, that exceeding International Hydrographic Organisation (IHO)

specifications. The fact that the MBES transducer is firmly mounted to the hull allows the user to compute its position as precisely as the current positioning system. Thus, MBES have become a widely accepted reliable system for various hydrographic tasks.

The implementation of Real Time Kinematic (RTK) Global Positioning System (GPS) has further improved the positional accuracy of MBES. By measuring the phase of the carrier wave of the RTK, centimeter level horizontal positional accuracy can be achieved (Yasuda, 1999). The accuracy of tidal measurement from electronic tide gauges has been proven reliable for many years. The accuracy of these real-time digital water level data is able to obtain centimeter level (Rabah, 2011). The sum of these errors is within the tolerance set by IHO. Therefore, the sound speed deviation and roll biases will be the critical factor in affecting the precision of absolute depth (Capell, 1999).

Sounding data from the MBES system is a product of processing information from numerous data sources. These comprise the heading of ship and attitude data from the gyrocompass and the motion sensor; vertical reference data (tidal data) from the tide gauge; horizontal positional data from the GPS unit and sound velocity data from the Conductivity Temperature Density (CTD) or Sound Velocity Profile (SVP) probe in addition to the basic MBES data itself. Data from each source are issue to singular errors which are contributing to overall data quality. To minimise these errors, system planners often have established error budgets for different components of the system (Gunathilaka, 2008).

1.2 Problem statements

Sound refraction artifacts are often present in multibeam swath bathymetry data. For a flat array, the artifacts are usually severe in outer beams than in inner beams. In a three dimensional (3D) topographical mapping they appear as along track ridges. To

minimise the survey time, the outer beams should be utilized. Therefore, the refraction errors should be removed. The sound speed of the two upper layers has a constant gradient, and the third layer has the same sound speed as the most bottom measured layer. The model parameters can be searched based on the principle of the minimum difference of depth between the overlap of two adjacent swaths. The horizontal position and depth of each beam can be accordingly recalculated using the model parameters (Yang et al, 2007).

Ports, harbours and marine bases are regularly located in estuaries, where river discharge and tidal stirring stoutly influence the sound velocity profile. Scales of temporal and spatial variability are frequently inadequate, resulting in unexpected variation to the acoustic environment. Such diminutive estuarine SVP and temporal changes have considerable influences on sound propagation and therefore must be described and enumerated in order to optimise sensor performance (Priestley and Thain, 2010).

Monitoring underwater environments is important for future near-shore exploration and port safety. The efficiency of underwater acoustic sensor systems is affected by the water environment, as sharp gradients in salinity and temperature cause sound to refract and reflect. Sound transmission can be impaired in estuaries where the salinity of the water is highly erratic in space, and tidal action causes water conditions to vary as a function of time. Thus, the correction of refraction is important for near shore location (Shi and Kruger, 2009).

Tides and an altering existence of salt and freshwater from river flow can cause significant variation of the water column SVP at the dynamic water environments, such as the estuaries, harbours and ports. It is important to sufficiently compensate bathymetric data for sound refraction effects in the face of limited SVP information. In practice, refraction correction can be hindered by insufficient knowledge of the water-column SVP at the time and place of MBES measurement (Jeroen, 2007).

The research on the effect of refraction and compensation of propagation path is inadequate in Malaysia. According to Kammerer (2000); Yang et. al (2007); Plaa, Snellen and Simons (2008), the depth uncertainty due to refraction can be eliminated via interpolation of adjacent swath. Moreover, Imahori and Hiebert (2008) cited that the total depth uncertainty can be estimated using Combined Uncertainty and Bathymetry Estimator (CUBE) algorithm. However, the monitoring of the propagation path was not mentioned. Cartwright (2003) and Medwin (2005) stated about the ray tracing techniques that can be used to monitor the effect of refraction towards propagation path, but the comparative study regarding the techniques is not performed.

This study discussed about the comparison of compensation approach of Layer with Constant Sound Speed (Trigonometry method) and Layer with Constant Sound Speed Gradient (Curvature method). Both approaches are mentioned by Kammerer (2000), Cartwright (2003), Medwin (2005) and Andersson (2008) in previous. However, the comparison of both approaches was not carried out. In addition, the setback of the inability of Curvature method to handle continuous unchanged sound speed layer is not mentioned. In this study, Combined Method is designed to solve the inability of the Curvature method to compute the data consist of zero gradient sound speed layers.

According to the Gunathilaka (2008), the approach of constant SVP is common to remove uncertainty in refraction. In fact, the sound speed does not change abruptly from layer to layer, but it changes gradually from the water surface to seabed. Hence, the approach of assuming the sound speed change constantly per layer is unfeasible to handle all kind of refraction situation, as the beam does not propagate in the line of sight in that particular layer (Figure 1.2). However, the beam is expected to be propagated in the curvature line that bends gradually when heading towards the seabed. Thus, new approach should be considered to monitor the actual path of the beam.

1.3 Research objectives

The objectives of this research are:

- 1) To develop algorithm to calculate the fittest curvature gradient for refracted sound velocity profile.
- 2) To compare the point position of the refracted beam on the seabed obtained from Trigonometry method, Curvature method and Combined method.

1.4 Scope of study

The SVP does not experience great change in open sea, as the physical characteristic of water column is approximately similar. However, the dynamic fluctuation of seawater and freshwater at estuary area or at port will cause the SVP to vary erratically and inconsistently. Therefore, for this study, the research is carried out at Lido Beach, Lumut, Penang and Kota Bahru. In addition, simulation data are used for the study as well. Information on the data are discussed thoroughly in Chapter 3.

The MBES is used in this research is RESON SeaBat 8124 which is Mill's cross type with flat array. The system consists of 80 beams with swath coverage that can exceed 120 degrees. Each beam is separated 1.5 degree from each other. In addition, the accuracy of the system is compliant International Hydrography Organisation (IHO) standard.

SVP probe is used to measure the sound velocity profile throughout the water column. Meanwhile, the SSS is measured using the surface sound speed-measuring

probe located at the face of the transducer. The rate of sound velocity recording is set to 0.25 meter or 0.5 meter depth interval depends on the requirement of the study.

Tidal reading is collected using automatic tide gauge, Valeport. Motion sensor and positioning system are installed onboard. The embodiment of all instruments is measured. MBES bathymetry data gathering and processing is completed using QINSy Version 7.5.

The SVPs under both circumstances are obtained and compared correspondingly. The profile obtained from both methods is generated for evaluation. Additionally, the difference in depth is compared as well.

In order to process and analyse the refraction information, a computational program is developed using the Microsoft Excel. Filtered data is inserted in the program, and the required parameters will be calculated using the developed program.

1.5 Significant of research

Since the development of MBES, refraction of acoustic ray in water column frequently leads to errors in depth. The estimation of ray path in the industry is usually using the step gradient approach, which less compromises to the refracted path. Thus, the accuracy of the most feasible distance travelled may be degraded, hence, influence the depth and position measurement.

The research will provide an overview on the influence of variation of sound speed and profile toward bathymetric measurements. The variation will cause the disputation over depth and horizontal position. In addition, the risk of grounding can be reduced, if the depth and position is measured properly.

In Malaysia, the research on the effect of refraction in beam propagation is inadequate. The knowledge is very important for hydrographers to take into account when survey is being conducted. Thus, proper study has to be carried out, as the MBES has become the mainstream hydrography survey instrument in the sector. This study will provide the information regarding the comparative study of the different techniques for compensation of refraction at propagation path.

The comparison on Trigonometry, Curvature and Combined methods is yet to be carried out in any previous study. As we all know, the variation of ocean characteristic is unpredictable. It is impractical to handle all scenarios with single approach. Hence, this study can offer the novel information for the approach to be taken on refraction study.

Reference

- Andersson, S. (2008). *Modelling of Wave Propagation in Shallow Water Environment*. Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Norwegian University of Science and Technology: M.Sc. Thesis.
- CalSpace (2002). *Glossary: Climate Change*. Retrieved on 10th March, 2011, from http://earthguide.ucsd.edu/virtualmuseum/Glossary_Climate/gloss_g-l.shtml#top
- Capell, W. J. (1999). Determination of Sound Velocity Profile Errors Using Multibeam Data. *IEEE Oceans' 99 "Riding the Crest into the 21st Century" Conference Proceedings*. 3: 1144-1148.
- Cartwright, D. S. (2003). *Multibeam Bathymetric Surveys in the Fraser River Delta, Managing Severe Acoustic Refraction Issues*. University of New Brunswick: M.Eng. Report.
- Chaplin, M. (2010). *Water Structure and Science*. Retrieved on 2nd January, 2011, from <http://www.btinternet.com/~martin.chaplin/explan2.html>
- Department of the Navy (DoN) (2009). *Final Oversea Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Statement: Undersea Warfare Training Range*. Volume 1 and 2. Department of the Navy. Norfolk, Virginia.

DOSITS (2009). *How fast does sound travel?*. Retrieved on 30th December, 2010, from <http://www.dosits.org/science/soundmovement/speedofsound/>

Fraser, J. and Lear, R. (2010). Multibeam Echo sounder: Trends in the Hydrographic Industry. *Position IT*. October 2010. EE Publishers.

Gunathilaka, M.D.E.K. (2008). *Reduction Of Refraction Effects Due To Inadequate Sound Velocity Profile Measurements In Multibeam Echo sounder Systems*. Faculty of Geoinformation and Real Estate, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia: M.Sc. Thesis.

Heath, R.A. (1973). *Present Knowledge of the Oceanic Circulation and Hydrology around New Zealand — 1971*. Tuatara: Volume 20, Issue 3, November 1973. Wellington. Retrieved on 4th January, 2011, from http://www.nzetc.org/tm/scholarly/Bio20Tuat03-fig-Bio20Tuat03_126a.html

Imahori, G. and Hiebert, J. (2008). An Algorithm for Estimating the Sound Speed Component of Total Depth Uncertainty. *Proceedings of the Canadian Hydrographic Conference and National Surveyors Conference, 2008*. Victoria, Canada.

International Hydrographic Organisation (2005). *Manual on Hydrography*. 1st ed. Monaco: International Hydrography Bureau.

International Hydrographic Organisation (2008). *IHO Standards for Hydrographic Survey*. Special Publication S-44. 5th ed. Monaco: International Hydrography Bureau.

- Jeroen, J.P. van den A. (2007). Improving MBES Measurement. *Hydro International*. Volume 11, Number 2, February 2007.
- Kammerer, E. (2000). *New Method for the Removal of Refraction Artifacts in Multibeam Echo sounder Systems*. The University of New Brunswick: Ph.D. Thesis.
- Koomans, R. (2010). Bathymetry Systems. *Hydro International*. Volume 14, Number 2, March/April 2010.
- Lewis, P. R. (1994). The Effect of Ray Curvature on Lloyd's Mirror Fringe Estimates and Source Localisation. No. *DSTO-TR-0064*. Defence Science and Technology Organization Canberra, Australia. Retrieved on 28th December, 2011, from <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a299146.pdf>
- Mann, D. (2013). Multi-beam Echo Sounders. *Hydro International*. Volume 17, Number 2, March 2013.
- Medwin, H. (2005). *Sounds in the Sea: From Ocean Acoustics to Acoustical Oceanography*. Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press.
- Neander, D. O. (2002). *Analysis of Temperature Variability between Davidson Seamount and Sur Ridge: The Tomographic Inverse Problem*. Department of Oceanography, Naval Postgraduate School: M.Sc. Thesis.
- NDT (2011). Piezoelectric Transducers. Retrieved on 15th February, 2011, from <http://www.ndt-ed.org/EducationResources/CommunityCollege/Ultrasonics/EquipmentTrans/piezotransducers.htm>

- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2011). Multibeam Echo Sounder. Retrieved on 1st March, 2011, from <http://www.nauticalcharts.noaa.gov/hsd/multibeam.html>
- National Physics Laboratory (2011). *Technical Guides - Speed of Sound in Sea-Water*. Retrieved on 30th March, 2011, from <http://resource.npl.co.uk/acoustics/techguides/soundseawater/content.html#UNESCO>
- Plaa, J. D., Snellen, M. and Simons, D. G. (2008). Correcting Bathymetry Measurements for Water Sound Speed Effects Using Inversion Theory. *Proceeding of Acoustic 08 Conference, 2008*. Paris.
- Priestley, D. and Thain, R. (2010). Sonar Propagation in Stratified Waters. *Hydro International*. Volume 14, Number 2, March/April 2010.
- Qi, N. and Tian, T. (2003). Ray Tracing in Multibeam Swath Bathymetry. *Journal of Harbin Engineering University*. 24(3), 245-248.
- Rabah, M. (2011). Enhancing The Feasibility Of Using RTK Tides In The Northern Coast Of Egypt Based On Performing Undulation Model Correction Derived From Earth Gravitational Model 2008 (Egm2008). Retrieved on 27th February, 2011, from <http://www.hydro-international.com/whitepaper/index.php>
- Raignaic, B. and Padley, J (1972). SHADZO: A Computer Program for Estimating the Position and Shape of the Surface Shadow Zone in Sonar Operations. *Saclantcen Technical Memorandum No. 183*. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Saclant ASW Research Centre, Viale San Bartolomeo, Italy. Retrieved on 3rd July, 2011, from <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/753443.pdf>