

Kshana: An Open, Reproducible Engine for PNT-Resilience Comparison, with a Quantum-versus-Classical Crossover Map under Parameter Uncertainty

Chakshu Baweja 

Ashforde OÜ, Estonia

contact@ashforde.org

June 15, 2026

Abstract

Resilient positioning, navigation, and timing (PNT) underpins aviation, defence, critical infrastructure, and emerging cislunar operations, yet the field lacks a common basis for comparing how candidate resilience measures – classical or quantum – perform when GNSS is denied. Such comparisons are predominantly private and non-reproducible: the authoritative recent survey of quantum PNT names no open, reproducible tool for quantum-versus-classical evaluation [19], and broader GNSS work has documented how rarely reported results can be regenerated end to end [6]. We address this with a methodology in which every result is reproducible from a committed scenario, random seed, and engine version; every figure of merit carries an explicit validated-or-not-modeled label; and the quantum/classical axis is a single parameter swap inside one neutral code path, so the two are never compared across separate implementations. The methodology is instantiated in Kshana [1], an open engine written in Rust with native, Python, and WebAssembly targets and 21 scenario kinds spanning terrestrial, lunar, and deep-space PNT. The new result is a Monte-Carlo crossover/break-even map over the published-parameter envelope, with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals, identifying where a cold-atom inertial sensor or optical-lattice clock changes the GNSS-outage outcome and where it does not. Trust evidence is reported separately and tiered by strength: reference frames agree bit-for-bit with SOFA/ERFA, SGP4 matches the AIAA 2006-6753 set to 4.12 mm worst-case, Allan deviations match NIST references, and force-model validation by ephemeris fitting against agency precise ephemerides yields a full-arc Galileo residual of 0.61 m at degree/order 70. Quantum-sensor figures are performance-model projections from cited device literature, not measurements; the spoofing detector is characterised against published TEXTBAT parameters, not raw IQ.

1 Introduction

Position, navigation, and timing (PNT) underpins power-grid synchronisation, financial time-stamping, telecommunications, and essentially every form of autonomous and crewed mobility. In practice that infrastructure leans almost entirely on global navigation satellite systems (GNSS), whose signals arrive at the Earth’s surface tens of decibels below the thermal noise floor and are therefore trivially denied: low-cost jammers, meaconing, and increasingly sophisticated spoofers can suppress or counterfeit a GNSS fix over a wide area [15, 21]. The operational consequence is loss of a *reference*, not merely of a gadget. The question that matters during an outage is how long

a platform can hold its position and time to within a stated tolerance once the satellites can no longer be trusted. We refer to this property as *PNT resilience*: the growth of position and timing error against outage (or holdover) duration, for a given on-board sensor suite.

A platform rides through a GNSS outage on whatever it carries. Inertial sensors let it dead-reckon, but their error grows super-linearly as bias and random-walk noise integrate twice into position [10]; a local clock holds time, but only until its own instability accumulates past the allowed offset [29]. The classical floor for both is well characterised. The open question, and the subject of sustained investment, is whether *quantum sensing* meaningfully raises that floor. Cold-atom interferometric accelerometers and gyroscopes promise bias stability and scale factors set by atomic constants rather than by a drifting proof mass; optical atomic clocks reach fractional frequency instabilities orders of magnitude below chip-scale or even flight-qualified microwave standards; and optical two-way time transfer offers a path to disseminate that stability between platforms. The common thread is a *slower error-growth law*: if the per-second noise and the long-term drift are smaller, the error crosses any fixed tolerance later, extending the survivable outage. Recent reviews survey this case in detail [19, 23]. Tellingly, those same reviews concede that quantitative comparisons across the field are difficult to audit: they frequently rest on generic synthetic scenarios, mismatched figures of merit, and proprietary trade studies whose assumptions are not published. That concession matters, because it names the gap precisely: the resilience debate is starved not of physics but of *reproducible, falsifiable, like-for-like comparison*.

The gap is real, and it is worth establishing by evidence. A number of capable open tools exist, but each answers a different question and none reproduces an end-to-end quantum-versus-classical resilience comparison on a single neutral code path. RTKLIB [32] is a mature open package for processing real GNSS observations into precise positions, but it concerns the fix itself, not the post-outage error-growth dynamics of an inertial or clock holdover. `gnss_lib_py` [16] provides a clean Python substrate for GNSS measurement analysis and algorithm prototyping, again on the receiver-processing side rather than the resilience side. LuPNT [14] targets lunar PNT architecture studies and is the closest in scope to the multi-domain resilience question, yet it is an architecture simulator, not an instrument for swapping a quantum sensor model against its classical counterpart under controlled uncertainty. NaveGo [9] is a well-validated open inertial-navigation toolkit with published error profiles (genuinely strong on the inertial axis), but it models classical IMUs and does not carry clock-holdover, time-transfer, or quantum-sensor models. None of these is unfalsifiable; the point is the converse. Each is a sound tool for its own question, and the absence is the *intersection*. To our knowledge no open tool runs the full PNT resilience stack of inertial dead-reckoning, clock holdover, and time transfer with a quantum and a classical configuration exercised through the same code path, seed-reproducibly, with uncertainty propagated.

This paper presents Kshana, an open engine built to close that intersection, and uses it to produce a genuinely new result. The engine’s external-validation battery (Section 6) establishes that its underlying mechanics are trustworthy: frames bit-for-bit against SOFA/ERFA, SGP4 to millimetre agreement against the AIAA reference set, Allan deviation against NIST and Stable32, and force-model validation by ephemeris fitting against agency precise orbits. That battery is *evidence*, not the contribution. The contribution is the reproducible crossover study built on top of it (Section 5). Instead of reporting a single hero number, we sweep each quantum lever across its published-parameter envelope by Monte-Carlo and report the resilience advantage as a distribution with 95% confidence intervals, then locate the *break-even* against the classical baseline. The result is a map of *when* quantum sensing changes the outcome and when it does not. For the inertial lever, the cold-atom accelerometer’s advantage over a navigation-grade IMU is decisive at low platform vibration but the break-even migrates toward higher vibration as the outage lengthens, so the honest answer is conditional on the host platform’s mechanical environment. For the clock lever,

an optical-lattice standard and a flight-qualified maser hold sub-microsecond time across a full 24 h holdover in our envelope, whereas a deployed chip-scale clock crosses the same threshold near eight and a half hours: a same-maturity comparison that separates what is demonstrated in the lab from what flies today. We label every quantum result as a performance-model projection, not a measurement, and carry its technology-readiness tag inline.

We claim no superiority on any single axis, and we use “to our knowledge, no open tool . . .” rather than “first” or “only.” In-browser orbit propagation, for instance, is not new [31]; our delta is that a single engine runs the full integrated stack zero-install. With that framing, our contributions are:

1. **A reproducible quantum-versus-classical resilience crossover map under parameter uncertainty** (the new result, Section 5). For each quantum lever (cold-atom inertial, optical-lattice clock, optical time transfer), a Monte-Carlo sweep over the published-parameter envelope yields the resilience-figure-of-merit advantage as a distribution with 95% confidence intervals and identifies the break-even against the classical baseline, answering *when* quantum sensing changes the outage outcome, openly and from a committed scenario and seed.
2. **A reproducibility-and-falsifiability methodology** for resilient-PNT comparison (Section 2): a scenario-plus-seed-plus- version reproducibility triple, a per-figure-of-merit *validated* or *not-modeled* label, and hand-derived oracle tests. It builds on prior reproducible-research practice [6, 24]; the genuinely new element is the requirement that the quantum and classical configurations differ only by a parameter swap on a *single neutral code path*, so that any reported advantage is attributable to the device model and not to two divergent implementations.
3. **One open engine instantiating the methodology across the PNT stack** (Section 4): a Rust core with native, Python, and WebAssembly targets, 21 scenario kinds, and standard-format interoperability (RINEX, SP3, CCSDS OEM/OMM), summarised with its capabilities *and* non-capabilities stated symmetrically in Table 1.
4. **An external-validation battery, tiered by strength** (Section 6, Table 3): bit-for-bit checks against authoritative oracles (frames, SGP4, Allan deviation); post-fit residuals against real agency precise ephemerides, with the force-model-fit, arc-length, and gravity-degree caveats stated inline (full-arc Galileo 0.61 m at degree/order 70 as the headline; the reduced-dynamic empirical-acceleration tier reported as a labelled bound, not a measurement of force-model accuracy; LRO 6.6 m, above the 5 m target, stated honestly); and a controlled, reproducible cross-validation showing the kernel-free analytic stack reproduces a DE440/ANISE realisation for the LRO reduced-dynamic arc, consistent with established results [2, 20] and presented as a reproduction scoped to that arc, not a discovery.
5. **A multi-layer spoofing detector**, characterised against published TEXTBAT *parameters* (Section 6), with raw-IQ ingestion stated as future work; it sits explicitly in the not-externally-validated tier.

The remainder of the paper develops the methodology that makes these claims falsifiable (Section 2), situates the engine against related open tools (Section 3), summarises its architecture (Section 4), presents the crossover study (Section 5) and the tiered validation (Section 6), and states the limitations and threats to validity (Section 7), chief among them that the quantum-sensor figures throughout are model projections from cited device literature, not measurements.

2 A methodology for credible PNT-resilience comparison

The difficulty in comparing resilient-PNT technologies is rarely the physics; it is establishing that two reported numbers were produced under conditions comparable enough to be set against each other. A claimed advantage for a quantum sensor over a classical one may reflect the sensor, or it may reflect a different propagator, a different error model, an unstated parameter choice, or simply a different random seed. We therefore treat the comparison protocol itself as the object of design, and require any quantitative claim emitted by the engine to satisfy a three-part contract. The contract is not a code-quality aspiration; each clause is mechanically enforced, and a result that violates any clause is not reported.

(a) Reproducible from scenario, seed, and engine version. Every figure of merit is a deterministic function of a committed scenario specification, an explicit pseudo-random seed, and a pinned engine version. Given those three inputs the engine produces *bit-identical* output: floating-point results are reproduced exactly across re-runs on the same target, not merely to within a tolerance. Determinism is a property of the implementation (seeded generators threaded explicitly, no wall-clock or unordered-iteration dependence in the numerical path), so a third party can regenerate any reported value from the artifacts alone. This makes a claim *auditable*: a referee who disputes a number reruns the named scenario at the named seed and version and obtains the same bits, or finds that they do not. The exact commands to regenerate every figure and headline number in this paper are listed in the reproducibility appendix.

(b) Every figure of merit is labelled validated or not-modeled. We attach to each reported quantity a machine-checkable status drawn from a fixed vocabulary: *validated* (the quantity is anchored to an external oracle or a real reference dataset, with the anchor named), or *not-modeled* (the quantity is a model projection with no external anchor, and the absence of an anchor is declared). The status is carried alongside the number rather than left to prose, so the validation tier of any figure of merit is recoverable without trusting the narrative. This discipline is what keeps the trust evidence (Section 6, Table 3) honestly separated from the projections: a frames check against SOFA/ERFA and a cold-atom-IMU dead-reckoning curve are both numbers the engine emits, but only the first is externally anchored, and the label says so. In particular, the quantum-sensor figures throughout this paper are performance-model projections from cited device coefficients, not measurements; they carry the not-modeled label and a technology-readiness tag wherever they appear (Section 5).

(c) The quantum-versus-classical axis is a single neutral code path. The comparison that is the subject of Section 5 is performed by *the same code* evaluated with different published coefficients, not by two separate implementations. A cold-atom accelerometer and a navigation-grade IMU are driven through one dead-reckoning path; an optical-lattice clock and a chip-scale atomic clock through one holdover path. Only the device coefficients differ, sourced from the respective device literature. The consequence is that any difference in the resulting figure of merit is attributable to the sensor parameters, not to two divergent code paths that might differ in integration scheme, error accounting, or numerical conditioning. This removes the most common confound in cross-technology PNT comparison, in which the quantum and classical estimates come from different tools and the gap cannot be cleanly ascribed.

Falsifiability via hand-derived tests. The three clauses make results reproducible and honestly labelled, but reproducibility alone does not establish correctness: an engine can deterministically reproduce a wrong number. We therefore require that the expected value in every test be derived by hand from physics or from an external reference, never read back from the engine. Frame-rotation expectations come from closed-form rotations and the SOFA/ERFA reference values; clock-stability expectations from analytic Allan-variance relations and NIST/Stable32 reference data; geometric-dilution expectations from the closed-form GDOP. Because the oracle is independent of the implementation, a regression that silently changes a result is caught: the engine is falsifiable against an external standard rather than self-consistent with its own prior output.

What is new relative to prior reproducible-research work. Reproducibility and model-credibility frameworks for this domain exist, and we build on them. Fernández-Prades et al. [6] establish continuous reproducibility for GNSS signal processing, but their scope is the raw-IF receiver chain; the resilient-PNT figures of merit considered here (inertial dead reckoning, clock holdover, time-transfer budgets, orbit residuals) lie outside it. NASA [24] provide a thorough modelling-and-simulation credibility regime, but it is a heavyweight governance process intended for agency programs, not a lightweight protocol a single open tool can enforce on every emitted number. To our knowledge, no open tool combines, across the full resilient-PNT stack, the two elements we treat as load-bearing: the *single-code-path parameter swap* as the required mechanism for any quantum-versus-classical comparison, and the *per-figure-of-merit, machine-checkable validated/not-modeled label* carried with each result. Those two requirements, applied together across the stack, are what is new here; the engine of Section 4 is one instantiation of them.

3 Background and the capability landscape

The resilient-PNT comparison problem sits at the confluence of three well-developed but separate tool ecosystems. Kshana does not displace any of them; it occupies the intersection they leave open. We organise the landscape into three honest tiers and make the boundaries explicit in Table 1.

Tier 1: quantum-navigation simulations. A growing body of work simulates quantum inertial and timing sensors, but almost always from a quantum-specific, fusion-or-enhancement standpoint rather than as a neutral quantum-versus-classical comparison harness. Atom-interferometric strap-down navigation has been simulated end-to-end with a cold-atom accelerometer in the loop [36], and high-fidelity simulators model the cold-atom interferometer (CAI) at the level of fringe contrast and projection noise [17]. We concede that the latter achieves *higher* fidelity than Kshana on the single inertial lever: its first-principles CAI model is more detailed than our coefficient-driven projection. Hybrid cold-atom/classical inertial estimation has likewise been demonstrated in an EKF framework that fuses a CAI with a conventional IMU [3]. These are quantum-axis simulators; none provides a single neutral code path in which the same scenario is run with a quantum or a classical sensor and the resilience figure of merit compared like for like. The closest quantum-versus-classical service we are aware of, TNO SENSED [34], is closed and not reproducible: its parameters, seeds and code are not publicly available, so its comparisons cannot be independently re-derived. The field’s own reviews note the absence of an open, reproducible quantum-versus-classical comparison capability [19, 23]; in particular, Li et al. [19] names no open reproducible quantum-versus-classical PNT tool.

Tier 2: open navigation frameworks. Open, citable navigation frameworks already embody parts of the methodology we build on. NaveGo [9] establishes the interchangeable-error-model pattern for inertial navigation – a sensor is described by a parameter profile and swapped without touching the estimator – and we reuse its validated navigation-grade IMU profiles as the classical baseline for the inertial lever. It has, however, no quantum axis. Among open PNT and GNSS tools, LuPNT [14] is an excellent, well-engineered library for lunar positioning, and `gnss_lib_py` [16] is a similarly strong toolkit for real-data GNSS analysis. We differentiate from these on the axes they do not target – a single-code-path quantum-versus-classical swap, and the reproducibility-triple methodology (Section 2) – and explicitly *not* on engineering quality, which in both cases is high. LuPNT is lunar-scoped; `gnss_lib_py` is oriented to processing real observations rather than forward performance simulation.

Tier 3: astrodynamics and real-signal tools. The astrodynamics and real-signal ecosystem answers a fundamentally different question. RTKLIB and comparable GNSS engines [32] post-process real pseudorange and carrier-phase observations to produce a position fix; GMAT [25] and Orekit [4] are high-fidelity mission-design and orbit-determination frameworks; the `sgp4` crate [26] is a production analytic propagator; and Nyx with ANISE [30] provides DE-ephemeris-grade dynamics and serves in this work as a reference oracle, not a rival. These tools consume real signals or drive high-fidelity mission analysis. Kshana is primarily the upstream *forward performance simulator*: it asks, for a given scenario, seed and sensor parameterisation, how a resilience figure of merit behaves, before any real observation exists. It does also close the measurement-to-position loop with a code single-point-positioning path (real RINEX observations to a receiver position, metre-level and validated on IGS data; Section 7), but that is a boundary capability rather than the carrier-phase precise positioning of a dedicated GNSS engine, and the engine’s centre of gravity remains forward simulation. In-browser SGP4 propagation is itself not new [31]; the delta here is a single engine running the full integrated stack zero-install in WebAssembly, not the propagator alone.

To our knowledge, no open tool combines a single-code-path quantum-versus-classical swap, seed-level reproducibility, and a terrestrial-plus-lunar resilience scope in one deployable engine. Table 1 states this symmetrically, listing the axes Kshana lacks alongside those it has.

4 Engine architecture

This section summarises the engine; it is the substrate for the methodology of §2 and the crossover study of §5, not a contribution in itself. Breadth is stated and cited rather than treated in depth, to keep the paper’s load on the methodology and the new result.

Kshana [1] is a single Rust core driven by a small TOML scenario. A scenario’s `kind` field is resolved to a typed variant and the dispatcher matches it exhaustively, so the catalogue of packs is compile-checked rather than string-dispatched; an absent or unrecognised kind falls back to the historical clock pack. The 21 scenario kinds (20 named kinds plus the clock pack as the historical default, in v0.17.0) span the resilient-PNT stack from terrestrial through cislunar to deep space: clock holdover, inertial dead-reckoning, terrestrial and lunar integrity (snapshot/solution-separation Advanced Receiver Autonomous Integrity Monitoring, ARAIM, with protection levels), two-way time transfer, hybrid and fusion estimation, GNSS-INS coupling, GNSS signal simulation, jamming, spoofing and spoof detection, ephemeris/ground-track propagation, real-observation single-point positioning, gravity-map, terrain-aided, and combined alternative-PNT navigation, deep-space and Mars radiometric navigation (a simulated relay-constellation figure of merit, not a certified protec-

Table 1: Capability landscape across representative tools. Columns include axes that Kshana lacks (three-axis INS mechanisation, raw-IQ spoofing) or supports only partially (real-observation processing and a single-point-positioning fix) alongside axes it provides outright (single-code-path quantum/classical swap, seed-level reproducibility, terrestrial-plus-lunar resilience scope) and a deployment row. A checkmark (✓) denotes a supported capability, a parenthesised check ((✓)) a partial one, and a dash (–) its absence: Kshana’s real-observation and PVT support is *code* single-point positioning (metre-level, validated on IGS data), not carrier-phase PPP/RTK. Kshana and RTKLIB still answer different questions: RTKLIB post-processes real signals into a centimetre-grade carrier-phase position fix, whereas Kshana is primarily an upstream forward performance simulator. The comparison is one of scope, not quality. TNO SENSED is closed-source: its entries reflect published descriptions, not capabilities we could independently verify.

	Quantum/classical	Seed-reproducible	Terr.+lunar resil.	Real-obs. proc.	PVT fix	3-axis INS mech.	Raw-IQ spoofing
Kshana [1]	✓	✓	✓	(✓)	(✓)	–	–
LuPNT [14]	–	✓	–	✓	✓	–	–
gnss_lib_py [16]	–	✓	–	✓	✓	–	–
NaveGo [9]	–	✓	–	–	–	✓	–
RTKLIB [32]	–	–	–	✓	✓	–	–
GMAT / Orekit [4, 25]	–	–	–	✓	–	–	–
TNO SENSED [34]	✓	–	–	–	–	✓	–
sgp4 crate [26]	–	✓	–	–	–	–	–

Deployment: Kshana ships as a zero-install WebAssembly integrated stack (the full pipeline in one engine), not as a single in-browser propagator.

tion level), and the one- and N -dimensional parameter sweeps (**sweep**, **sweep-nd**) that drive the Monte-Carlo crossover machinery of §5.

Sensor and environment behaviours are independent modules. Each carries a published *provenance string* naming the device or reference whose coefficients it instantiates. The clock curves, for example, are tagged with the optical-lattice, hydrogen-maser and chip-scale-atomic-clock sources and a maturity (TRL) label they were parameterised from, so that every reported figure is traceable to its literature source and its model-versus-measurement status is legible at the point of use. The run harness composes the selected modules on a common timeline and emits a schema-versioned, self-describing JSON record (engine version, scenario, and per-module provenance carried inline) alongside an SVG chart that is stamped centrally with the same identifying footer, so a saved figure or result file stands alone. This is the machine-explicit “validated-or-not-modeled per figure-of-merit” contract of §2 realised in the output format itself.

The same core compiles to three targets from one source tree, without a separate re-implementation per platform: a native binary and library (the **rlib**/CLI used for the validation battery of §6); a PyO3 extension module for use from Python and notebooks; and a WebAssembly module (built with **wasm-pack**) that runs the full integrated stack in the browser with zero install. In-browser orbital propagation is not itself new; **satellite.js** [31] has long provided in-browser SGP4. The point here is therefore not the browser target but that a *single* engine, identical to the

validated native build, runs the whole integrated PNT-resilience stack client-side, which is what makes the reproducibility contract of §2 portable to a reader with no toolchain.

For interoperability with established tooling the engine reads and writes standard exchange formats: RINEX navigation and observation records, IGS SP3 precise ephemerides, and the CCSDS Orbit Ephemeris and Orbit Mean-elements Messages (OEM/OMM). These are the on-ramps and off-ramps to the agency and reference datasets used in §6; the engine’s scope and its non-capabilities (no real-observation PVT, no full INS mechanisation, no raw-IQ ingestion) are stated symmetrically in Table 1.

5 A quantum-versus-classical resilience crossover map

The contribution of this paper is not another single-point claim that a quantum sensor outperforms its classical counterpart. For the lever whose operating space warrants it—the inertial sensor—it is a *map*: a grid of operating points across the realistic published-parameter envelope, at every node of which we report the resilience figure of merit as a distribution rather than a number, and against which we locate the *break-even* contour where the quantum advantage disappears. The clock and time-transfer levers, whose outcome turns on device maturity rather than a two-axis trade-off, are reported in the same spirit—as a maturity-aware holdover ladder and a like-for-like link budget. The question this study answers is the one the field’s own reviews say is open [19]: not *whether* a cold-atom inertial sensor or an optical clock can help during a GNSS outage, but *when* (under what outage duration, platform environment, and device maturity) it actually changes the outcome, and when a same-maturity classical unit is the better choice.

Every result in this section is produced by the same machinery the validated packs use. For each lever we sweep the operating grid with `nd_sweep_ensemble`; each node is a Monte-Carlo ensemble (64 seeds for the inertial study, 32 for the clock) over the parameter envelope, and the figure of merit is summarised by its mean, percentiles, and a 95% bootstrap confidence interval computed by the same bootstrap the ensemble packs apply elsewhere. The quantum and classical legs share one neutral code path, swapped by parameters alone, so the comparison is never made across two implementations. No new physics is introduced. The cold-atom noise is a first-principles interferometer model: a shot-noise term $1/(C\sqrt{N})$ in atom number N and contrast C , combined in quadrature with a platform-vibration floor $\sqrt{S_a/(3T)}$ in the acceleration power spectral density S_a (in $(\text{m/s}^2)^2/\text{Hz}$) and interrogation time T . We plot and tabulate the corresponding amplitude spectral density $\text{ASD} = \sqrt{S_a}$ in $\mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$, the conventional vibration-specification unit. The classical leg uses the NaveGo-validated inertial error profile [9]. We restate the binding caveat of Section 7 once here and rely on it throughout: **every quantum figure in this section is a performance-model projection from laboratory-maturity device coefficients, not a measurement.**

5.1 Inertial: cold-atom versus navigation-grade dead reckoning

The inertial lever pits a cold-atom accelerometer of the Exail/Templier class [33] against a navigation-grade strapdown unit [10], both dead-reckoning position through a GNSS outage. We sweep two axes that dominate the outcome: outage duration, from 30 s to 1800 s, and the platform-vibration acceleration noise as an amplitude spectral density (ASD), from $1 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ (an isolated, quiescent platform) to roughly $3 \text{ mg}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ (a noisy host). At each node the figure of merit is the *ensemble mean*, over the 64 seeds, of the per-run 95th-percentile horizontal position error, with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval on that mean; the advantage is the ratio of the classical to the quantum ensemble mean. Figure 1 shows the full map.




Figure 1: Inertial crossover map. Cold-atom accelerometer (Exail/Templier class, 33) versus navigation-grade strapdown (10), dead-reckoning position error (the ensemble mean of the per-run 95th percentile) as a function of outage duration and platform-vibration acceleration ASD ($\sqrt{S_a}$, in $\mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$). Each node is a 64-seed Monte-Carlo ensemble with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval; the dashed contour is the break-even (advantage = 1) where the navigation-grade unit matches the cold-atom sensor. The advantage is overwhelming on a quiet platform and erodes with vibration; the break-even ASD rises with outage duration. The quantum leg is a performance-model projection from laboratory-maturity device coefficients, not a measurement.

On an isolated platform the cold-atom advantage is large and grows with outage length. At $1 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ the advantage is a factor of 307 for a 30s outage (cold-atom 2.5mm versus navigation-grade 0.75m), rising to 439 at 60s and to 1915 at 1800s, where the navigation-grade error has grown to 2.3km while the cold-atom error is near 1.2m. The confidence intervals are tight relative to this gap (the cold-atom ensemble mean at the 30s, $1 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ node has a bootstrap interval of [2.0, 2.9] mm), so the advantage on a quiet platform is not a sampling artefact.

This advantage is nonetheless conditional, and the map shows exactly where it fails. As the vibration ASD rises the cold-atom error grows steeply, driven by the $\sqrt{S_a}/(3T)$ vibration floor, while the navigation-grade error is comparatively insensitive to it. The two curves cross: for a short 30s outage at a vibration level of $\approx 405 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ (about $0.4 \text{ mg}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$) the advantage falls to 0.75 — below unity, meaning the navigation-grade unit *wins*. On a vibrating host during a brief outage, the classical sensor is the better choice, and the map reports this rather than only the favourable corner.

These two findings connect through the break-even, which rises *monotonically* with outage duration, from $334 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ at 30s to $2640 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ at 1800s (Table 2). The longer the outage, the more vibration the cold-atom sensor can tolerate before losing. The mechanism is in the model: the cold-atom advantage over the navigation-grade unit is dominated by the latter’s accumulating bias error, which grows roughly as t^2 , whereas the cold-atom sensor’s own vibration-limited error is a random walk growing roughly as $t^{1.5}$. The bias term outruns the random-walk term, so the duration at which the quantum sensor pays off increases the more vibration it must endure. The longer the outage, the wider the environmental window in which it is the right tool.

Table 2: Break-even platform-vibration ASD ($\sqrt{S_a}$) at which the navigation-grade unit matches the cold-atom sensor, as a function of outage duration. The break-even rises monotonically: a longer outage tolerates more vibration before the quantum advantage is lost.

Outage duration (s)	Break-even ASD ($\mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$)
30	334
60	448
120	724
300	1168
600	1565
1200	2250
1800	2640

5.2 Clock: a same-maturity holdover ladder

The clock lever asks how long each of three clock technologies can hold timing to a 1 μs budget after its disciplining GNSS reference is lost. We deliberately frame this as a technology-readiness ladder rather than a single contest, because the three rungs are not the same maturity and a like-for-like winner-flip does not exist here: a ground-laboratory strontium optical-lattice clock [27], a flight-qualified active hydrogen maser of the ACES/PHARAO class (the relevant point being that this class has actually flown, on the ISS), and a deployed chip-scale atomic clock (CSAC). The figure of merit is the ensemble-mean 95th-percentile holdover timing error against the 1 μs threshold; each rung is a 32-seed ensemble with a 95% bootstrap interval. Figure 2 shows the three curves.

There is no crossover here, and reporting that honestly is the point. The optical-lattice clock dominates the stability ranking at every holdover duration, and both it and the maser hold the 1 μs budget essentially indefinitely over the swept range: at 24 h the optical clock’s 95th-percentile holdover error is sub-nanosecond and the maser’s is well under a nanosecond, both three orders of magnitude inside budget. But the honest comparison is the maturity-aware one. The optical clock’s margin is a *ground-laboratory* figure; the maser is the option that has actually flown, and is therefore the realistic on-orbit choice today. The deployed CSAC, by contrast, reaches the 1 μs budget at ≈ 8.5 h of holdover, a result that matters operationally precisely because the CSAC is the rung that is already fielded. The value of the ladder is that it refuses to compare a laboratory optical clock against a deployed CSAC as if they were interchangeable, and instead pairs each figure with the maturity tag that determines whether it is available to a mission.

5.3 Time transfer: optical versus RF with a non-reciprocity budget

The third lever compares optical inter-satellite time transfer against RF two-way satellite time-and-frequency transfer (TWSTFT), and the methodological care is in refusing the easy comparison. A jitter-only optical floor would report a figure that no real two-way link achieves, because the limiting error in operational time transfer is not jitter but *non-reciprocity*: equipment-delay asymmetry between the two terminals and path variation that does not cancel in the two-way difference. We therefore model a non-reciprocal differential-delay budget for the optical link [5, 7] and adopt a conservative 1 ps on-orbit optical target rather than the 1 fs laboratory floor, so that the optical figure is charged with the same class of systematic that limits the RF figure. Under this honest accounting the optical link reaches a range-equivalent RMS of ≈ 0.29 mm (non-reciprocity included, a 1 ps on-orbit projection target rather than a measured link budget) against ≈ 341 mm for the RF link, still a three-order-of-magnitude advantage, but one obtained from a like-for-like budget rather




Figure 2: Clock holdover ladder. Ensemble-mean 95th-percentile timing error against a 1 μ s budget as a function of holdover duration, for a ground-laboratory strontium optical-lattice clock (27), a flight-qualified ACES/PHARAO-class hydrogen maser, and a deployed chip-scale atomic clock. Each point is a 32-seed ensemble with a 95% bootstrap interval and carries an inline technology-readiness tag. There is no winner-flip: the optical clock dominates stability, but its margin is a laboratory figure while the maser is the realistically flown option. The CSAC reaches the budget at ≈ 8.5 h.

than from comparing an optical jitter floor against an RF link burdened with systematics.

5.4 What the map establishes

Taken together, the three levers answer the question of *when* quantum sensing changes a PNT-resilience outcome, rather than asserting that it always does. The inertial map shows a large but conditional advantage with a vibration-dependent break-even that the classical sensor wins inside; the clock ladder shows a clear stability ordering that is nonetheless governed by maturity, with no winner-flip to overstate; and the time-transfer comparison shows a robust optical advantage only once the optical figure is charged with the non-reciprocal systematics that limit real links. Each figure in this section is reproducible from a committed scenario and fixed seed using the commands listed in Appendix A; the inertial and clock grids, their break-even values, and their confidence intervals regenerate bit-for-bit from the same machinery used for the validated packs.

6 Validation

The trustworthiness of any comparison engine rests on whether its components reproduce results that can be checked against an authority external to the engine itself. Throughout this section we hold to a single discipline: every number is compared against an external oracle (an independent reference implementation, a published dataset, or an analytic closed form), and never against

Kshana’s own output. We organise the evidence into three tiers ordered by the strength of the external anchor, and we are explicit about what each tier does and does not establish. Table 3 summarises the battery; the prose below develops the caveats that the table can only flag.

Tier 1: bit-for-bit against an authoritative oracle. These checks reproduce an independent reference to within the numerical noise floor, so agreement here speaks to correctness, not to a physical fit. The SGP4/SDP4 propagator reproduces all 666 verification states of the AIAA 2006-6753 test set [35] to a worst-case position error of 4.12 mm and velocity error of $1.85 \times 10^{-9} \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Against an independent Rust implementation, the `sgp4` crate [26], agreement is sub-micron on the near-Earth and resonant orbits and 4.12 mm in the worst case across all regimes; we therefore do not claim blanket sub-micron agreement. The IAU 2000A nutation routine `eraNut00a` reproduces the SOFA reference values $\Delta\psi = -0.96309 \times 10^{-5} \text{ rad}$ and $\Delta\epsilon = +0.40632 \times 10^{-4} \text{ rad}$ to 10^{-13} rad [13]. The frame transformations match the Vallado worked examples [13, 35] to 0.1 mm (TEME→PEF), 0.6 mm (TEME→ITRF), and 4 mm for the full CIO-based GCRS→ITRS chain. The Allan-deviation estimator reproduces the Stable32/NBS14 reference series [11, 29] to a relative error of 10^{-4} . The dilution-of-precision computation matches the closed-form regular-tetrahedron geometry [15, 21] exactly: GDOP = $\sqrt{10}/2 = 1.5811$, PDOP = 1.5, TDOP = 0.5. The inertial error model reproduces the velocity- and angle-random-walk coefficients of the NaveGo 3DM-GX3-35 reference profiles [9] to within 5%. Finally, the two-body propagator agrees with an independent universal-variable Kepler solver to sub-metre over 24 h, conserving energy and angular momentum to $\sim 10^{-9}$ (relative). Tier 1 is the strongest evidence in the paper: each row is an independent oracle, and the residuals are numerical, not physical.

Tier 2: post-fit residual against real agency truth. Tier 2 reports how closely Kshana’s dynamics can be made to track precise ephemerides published by space agencies. This is a *force-model validation by ephemeris fitting*, not orbit determination: there is no measurement processing, and the residual is the post-fit overlap of a fitted trajectory against the agency product. The arc length, gravity-field degree and order, and empirical-acceleration tier are stated inline for every entry because they determine what the residual means. Our headline is the Galileo MEO full-arc result: a 0.61 m post-fit residual over a 24 h arc with a degree/order-70 gravity field and no empirical accelerations, the configuration that most directly exercises force-model fidelity. On the shorter 8 h CI arc the pure-force fit is 0.13 m, and the reduced-dynamic tier, in which per-revolution empirical accelerations are estimated alongside the trajectory, lowers it further to 0.07 m; the same reduced-dynamic tier yields 0.10 m for the Swarm-A LEO arc [22, 28]. We emphasise that these reduced-dynamic numbers *bound* force-model accuracy rather than measure it: the estimated empirical accelerations absorb mismodelled dynamics, so a small reduced-dynamic residual is an upper bound on, not a measurement of, the underlying force-model error. They are reported as clearly-labelled secondary lines, never as the headline.

The lunar case is stated as honestly as the favourable ones. The LRO arc yields a 6.6 m reduced-dynamic residual, which is *above* our 5 m target [8, 18]; we report the miss rather than tuning it away. As a controlled cross-validation, we swap the analytic kernel-free ephemeris for a DE440 realisation via ANISE: the LRO reduced-dynamic residual is unchanged at the centimetre level ($6.65 \rightarrow 6.67 \text{ m}$). This reproduces an established result, that a carefully constructed analytic stack matches a DE-grade ephemeris realisation for this class of arc [2, 20]; it is not a discovery, and it is scoped to the LRO arc only. We credit `nyx`/ANISE [30] as the DE-grade oracle against which the swap is checked, not as a rival the engine outperforms.

Tier 3: parameter-level characterisation. The multi-layer spoofing detector (per-epoch RAIM parity, automatic-gain-control monitoring, signal-quality monitoring, and a fusion stage) is characterised against the *published scenario parameters* of the TEXBAT corpus [12]: the hand-coded inputs and expected outputs are derived from the documented scenario descriptions. The detector ingests no TEXBAT samples; raw-IQ ingestion is future work. We are explicit that this is not external validation. Tier 3 establishes that the detection logic responds as expected to parameter regimes drawn from a real corpus, but until raw IQ is processed it cannot be called a validation against TEXBAT, and Table 3 labels it accordingly.

Reading the table. The status vocabulary mirrors the methodology of Section 2. Tier 1 rows are *validated* against an external oracle to the numerical floor. Tier 2 rows are *validated by ephemeris fitting*: a genuine external anchor (the agency product), but a fit, with the empirical-tier caveat made explicit. Tier 3 is *characterised, not validated*. None of these rows involves a quantum figure of merit: the quantum-sensor performance models are projections from cited device coefficients, treated in Section 5 and never entered into this external-validation battery.

7 Limitations and threats to validity

The following disclosures form part of the honesty contract that the methodology in Section 2 demands. Every figure of merit is reported alongside the strength of the evidence that backs it, and a result that is a model projection or a force-model fit is never dressed as a measurement. The same discipline applies to the boundaries of the engine itself.

- **Quantum-sensor figures are projections, not measurements.** Every cold-atom inertial, optical-lattice clock, and optical time-transfer number in this paper (including the crossover and break-even results of Section 5) is a performance-model projection computed by deterministic arithmetic on coefficients drawn from the cited device literature [5, 7, 27, 33], not data from operating hardware. We carry an inline maturity tag (flight-qualified / ground-lab / projection-floor) on every quantum point for exactly this reason (Figure 2). For time transfer we keep the comparison like-for-like: the reported optical figure is charged with a conservative non-reciprocal differential-delay budget (a 1 ps on-orbit target, not the 1 fs laboratory floor), so it carries the same class of systematic that limits the RF figure (Section 5). A jitter-only optical floor would exclude that non-reciprocity and overstate the optical advantage; we do not report it.
- **The agency-orbit work is a force-model fit, not orbit determination.** The residuals against agency precise ephemerides (Table 3) are obtained by *force-model validation by ephemeris fitting* (propagation-overlap consistency against an external truth product), not by processing observations. The headline is the full-arc Galileo result, 0.61 m over 24 h at gravity-field degree/order 70. The reduced-dynamic tier on the 8 h arc (Galileo 0.07 m from a 0.13 m pure-force fit, Swarm 0.10 m) admits empirical accelerations that absorb mismodelled dynamics; these numbers *bound*, and do not *measure*, force-model accuracy, and we label them reduced-dynamic wherever they appear. The fits are single-satellite, single-day arcs; they are not a statistical population over regimes.
- **LRO is above the target.** The LRO reduced-dynamic residual is 6.6 m, above our 5 m target. Swapping the default ephemeris for a DE440/ANISE realisation leaves it essentially unchanged (6.65 m $\rightarrow$ 6.67 m). We present this as a controlled reproduction of a known result

Table 3: External-validation battery, tiered by the strength of the external anchor. Every result is compared against an oracle independent of the engine. Tier 1 reproduces an authoritative reference to the numerical floor; Tier 2 reports post-fit residuals against agency precise ephemerides (a force-model fit by ephemeris fitting, with arc length, gravity degree/order, and empirical-acceleration tier stated inline); Tier 3 is parameter-level characterisation, not external validation. Reduced-dynamic residuals bound, and do not measure, force-model accuracy.

Check	Oracle	Result	Status
<i>Tier 1: bit-for-bit vs. authoritative oracle</i>			
SGP4/SDP4, 666 states	AIAA 2006-6753 [35]	4.12 mm pos., $1.85 \times 10^{-9} \text{ km s}^{-1}$ vel. (worst case)	Validated
SGP4 head-to-head	sgp4 crate [26]	sub- μm near-Earth/resonant; 4.12 mm worst case all regimes	Validated
Nutation eraNut00a	SOFA/ERFA [13]	$\Delta\psi = -0.96309 \times 10^{-5}$, $\Delta\epsilon = +0.40632 \times 10^{-4}$ rad to 10^{-13}	Validated
Frame transforms	Vallado [13, 35]	TEME→PEF 0.1 mm; TEME→ITRF 0.6 mm; GCRS→ITRS 4 mm	Validated
Allan deviation	Stable32/NBS14 [11, 29]	relative error 10^{-4}	Validated
GDOP/PDOP/TDOP	closed form [15, 21]	$\sqrt{10}/2 = 1.5811$; 1.5; 0.5 (exact)	Validated
Inertial VRW/ARW	NaveGo 3DM-GX3-35 [9]	within 5%	Validated
Two-body propagation	universal-variable Kepler	sub-metre / 24 h; energy + ang. mom. to $\sim 10^{-9}$	Validated
<i>Tier 2: post-fit residual vs. agency truth (force-model fit by ephemeris fitting)</i>			
Galileo MEO (headline)	agency precise eph. [22, 28]	0.61 m, 24 h arc, d/o 70, force-only	Validated (fit)
Galileo MEO (8 h, reduced-dynamic)	agency precise eph. [22, 28]	0.07 m (0.13 m pure-force); empirical-accel tier (bounds, not measures)	Validated (fit)
Swarm-A LEO (reduced-dynamic)	agency precise eph. [22, 28]	0.10 m; empirical-accel tier (bounds, not measures)	Validated (fit)
LRO lunar	JPL Horizons LRO orbit (GRGM field) [8, 18]	6.6 m reduced-dynamic, <i>above</i> 5 m target (honest miss)	Fit (above target)
LRO DE440/ANISE swap	nyx /ANISE [2, 20, 30]	residual unchanged 6.65 → 6.67 m; reproduces known result, LRO-scoped	Cross-check (consistency)
<i>Tier 3: parameter-level characterisation (not external validation)</i>			
Spoofing detector (RAIM + AGC + SQM + fusion)	TEXBAT scenario <i>parameters</i> [12]	responds as expected to documented parameter regimes; raw-IQ ingestion is future work	Characterised, not validated

[2, 20], scoped to the LRO arc only and not a discovery, and we credit `nyx`/ANISE [30] as the DE-grade oracle, not a rival the engine outperforms.

- **The spoofing detector does not ingest raw IQ.** It is characterised against published *TEXBAT parameters* [12] using hand-coded inputs and expected outputs; it does not read the *TEXBAT* recordings. Consequently we report no receiver-operating-characteristic curve and no P_d/P_{fa} operating point. Raw-IQ ingestion is future work, and the detector sits in the not-externally-validated tier of Table 3.
- **Single-point positioning is code-only, not carrier-phase PPP/RTK.** The engine spans the measurement-to-position gap with a code single-point-positioning solver: it ingests real RINEX pseudoranges and broadcast ephemeris and returns a receiver position by iterated weighted least squares (Sagnac and broadcast satellite-clock corrections, the dual-frequency L1/L2 ionosphere-free combination, and a Saastamoinen/Niell troposphere), recovering the surveyed coordinate of IGS station ABMF to 5.7 m 3-D RMS (1.1 m horizontal). This is metre-level *code* positioning, not carrier-phase precise positioning: there is no ambiguity resolution, carrier smoothing, or inter-epoch filter, so the centimetre-grade PPP/RTK domain remains that of dedicated tools such as RTKLIB [32] (Table 1). The paper’s central contribution is the resilience-comparison methodology of Section 2, not a competition on positioning accuracy, and this single-station code fix is a boundary capability rather than a member of the external-validation battery of Table 3.
- **Modelling-fidelity defaults are deliberately modest.** The inertial mechanisation is 1-DOF, not a full 3-axis strapdown solution [10]; atmospheric drag uses a static exponential density profile rather than NRLMSISE-00; solar radiation pressure is a cannonball model; relativity is Schwarzschild-only; and the default ephemerides are low-precision. Each is adequate for the comparison-under-uncertainty role and is overridden by the higher-fidelity paths only where a validation result requires it.
- **Time representation is single-f64 Julian date.** A single double-precision Julian date gives roughly 50 μ s resolution near the present epoch, which is immaterial for the resilience figures of merit reported here but would matter for sub-microsecond timing applications.
- **In-browser execution is a deployment property, not a capability.** Running the integrated stack zero-install in WASM lowers the barrier to reproduction; it does not extend what the engine computes. In-browser SGP4 is not itself new [31]; the delta is a single engine running the full integrated stack with no installation.

Collectively these bounds define what the engine establishes: a reproducible, falsifiable comparison framework with an external-validation battery behind it. They equally define what it does not: it is not a measurement campaign, not an orbit-determination system, and not a fielded quantum-sensing result.

8 Discussion and conclusion

The methodology of Section 2, together with the crossover map of Section 5, is intended to make one specific question answerable in a neutral, reproducible way: *what resilience does a given sensor architecture buy, and over what operating envelope?* Instead of asserting a verdict, Kshana [1] fixes a scenario, a seed, and an engine version, routes the quantum and classical candidates through a

single code path, and labels every figure-of-merit as externally validated or merely modelled. The output of that discipline is an envelope rather than a marketing number: a region of the operating space in which one architecture dominates, a region in which it does not, and a break-even boundary between them carried with a 95% confidence band.

This reframing matters because the comparison it supports is different from the one the literature usually runs. The question “*is quantum sensing better?*” is already well populated by device papers and surveys [19, 23, 33]; it is answered affirmatively on isolated axes and, on its own, settles little for a system designer. The crossover map asks instead “*where does the quantum lever change the outcome?*”, and answers it openly, with the uncertainty made explicit rather than hidden. The inertial study locates that boundary as a vibration tolerance that grows with outage duration. The break-even platform-vibration ASD rises from $\approx 334 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ at a 30 s outage to $\approx 2640 \mu\text{g}/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ near a 1800 s outage, so the cold-atom advantage is real for long, quiet holdovers and erodes under aggressive platform vibration. The clock study is starker still: the deployed chip-scale reference crosses a 1 μs timing budget at roughly 8.5 h of holdover, while the ground-lab optical-lattice and flight-qualified maser curves stay below that budget across the full 24 h sweep. These are performance-model projections from cited device coefficients, not measurements, and they are TRL-tagged as such; the contribution is the reproducible map and its break-even contour, not any single point on it.

Interoperability is what turns this from a closed demonstrator into an on-ramp. Because the engine reads and writes the standard exchange formats (RINEX, SP3, CCSDS OEM/OMM), a crossover study or a propagated state can move into established pipelines such as RTKLIB [32], GMAT [25], and Orekit [4], instead of living only inside Kshana. The single integrated stack runs natively, from Python, and in the browser via WebAssembly; in-browser SGP4 is not itself new [26, 31], and the delta is only that one engine runs the full integrated stack with zero install, lowering the cost of reproducing a result to opening a page.

Several limitations defined in Section 7 double as the natural work ahead. The measurement-to-position loop is now closed by a code single-point-positioning path validated on real IGS observations; carrying it from code to carrier-phase precise positioning — ambiguity resolution and PPP/RTK — is the consequential next step on the receiver-processing side. The spoofing detector is characterised against published TEXBAT [12] parameters, not raw IQ; ingesting raw IQ and reporting a detection ROC would move it from the not-externally-validated tier into a measured one. The force-model validation by ephemeris fitting reported in Section 6 is single-arc and single-satellite; extending it to multi-satellite, multi-day fits would tighten the residual envelope and test the static drag, cannonball-SRP, and Schwarzschild defaults under more diverse dynamics. Finally, the crossover map presently sweeps published-parameter envelopes one lever at a time; propagating the full coefficient uncertainty jointly, and adding same-TRL pairings across all three levers, would turn today’s three studies into a single crossover atlas of resilient PNT.

What we offer, then, is less a claim of superiority than a way of arguing about it honestly. Across the paper the same discipline holds: force-model fits are labelled as fits and not orbit determination, the favourable reduced-dynamic residuals are reported as bounds rather than measures, and the LRO miss is stated above its target instead of being tuned away. Every quantum figure is a projection and every spoofing claim a parameter-level characterisation (Sections 6–7). To our knowledge no open tool runs this full integrated PNT-resilience stack with these honesty controls attached. That stance (validated-or-not-modeled stated per figure-of-merit, the quantum-versus-classical axis swapped through one neutral code path, and every headline number traceable to a committed scenario, seed, and test) is the differentiator we mean to defend, consistent with the reproducibility tradition this work builds on [6, 24].

Data and code availability

Kshana is open-source software released under the Apache-2.0 licence [1]. Each tagged release is archived on Zenodo (the v0.17.0 release DOI [10.5281/zenodo.20692259](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20692259)), which provides a citable, immutable snapshot of the exact source used to produce the results in this paper. The engine ships as native binaries, as a PyPI package, and as a zero-install WebAssembly playground that runs the full integrated stack in the browser.

The crossover study of Section 5, every figure, and every headline number in this paper regenerate from a fixed scenario plus seed. The exact commands are given in Appendix A; running them against the archived release reproduces the reported values bit-for-bit where the underlying check is deterministic.

References

- [1] Chakshu Baweja. Kshana: a PNT-resilience simulator with quantum-sensor performance models. Zenodo, 2026. URL <https://github.com/ashfordeOU/kshana>. Version 0.17.0. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20692259>.
- [2] Stefano Bertone, Daniel Arnold, Vincent Girardin, Adrian Jäggi, et al. Assessing reduced-dynamic parametrizations for GRAIL orbit determination and the recovery of independent lunar gravity field solutions. *Earth and Space Science*, 8(6), 2021. doi: 10.1029/2020EA001454. Establishes that empirical accelerations absorb force/frame/ephemeris mismodelling; the reduced-dynamic floor is non-gravitational dynamics.
- [3] Pierrick Cheiney, Lauriane Fouché, et al. Navigation-compatible hybrid quantum accelerometer using a kalman filter. *Physical Review Applied*, 10(3):034030, 2018. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevApplied.10.034030.
- [4] CS GROUP, Luc Maisonobe, et al. Orekit: an accurate and efficient core layer for space flight dynamics applications. <https://www.orekit.org>, 2024.
- [5] J.-D. Deschênes, L. C. Sinclair, F. R. Giorgetta, W. C. Swann, E. Baumann, H. Bergeron, M. Cermak, I. Coddington, and N. R. Newbury. Synchronization of distant optical clocks at the femtosecond level. *Physical Review X*, 6(2):021016, 2016. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevX.6.021016.
- [6] Carles Fernández-Prades, Jordi Vila-Valls, Javier Arribas, and Antonio Ramos. Continuous reproducibility in GNSS signal processing. *IEEE Access*, 6:20451–20463, 2018. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2822835.
- [7] F. R. Giorgetta, W. C. Swann, L. C. Sinclair, E. Baumann, I. Coddington, and N. R. Newbury. Optical two-way time and frequency transfer over free space. *Nature Photonics*, 7:434–438, 2013. doi: 10.1038/nphoton.2013.69.
- [8] J. D. Giorgini, D. K. Yeomans, A. B. Chamberlin, P. W. Chodas, R. A. Jacobson, M. S. Keeseey, J. H. Lieske, S. J. Ostro, E. M. Standish, and R. N. Wimberly. JPL’s On-Line Solar System Data Service. In *Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society*, volume 28, page 1158, 1996.
- [9] Rodrigo Gonzalez, Juan I. Giribet, and Héctor D. Patiño. NaveGo: an open-source MATLAB/GNU-Octave toolbox for processing integrated navigation systems and performing inertial sensor analysis. <https://github.com/rodrazalez/NaveGo>, 2017.

- [10] Paul D. Groves. *Principles of GNSS, Inertial, and Multisensor Integrated Navigation Systems*. Artech House, 2nd edition, 2013.
- [11] Hamilton Technical Services. Stable32: Frequency Stability Analysis Software. <http://www.stable32.com>, 2008.
- [12] Todd E. Humphreys, Jahshan A. Bhatti, Daniel Shepard, and Kyle Wesson. The Texas Spoofing Test Battery: Toward a Standard for Evaluating GPS Signal Authentication Techniques. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Technical Meeting of the Satellite Division of the Institute of Navigation (ION GNSS 2012)*, pages 3569–3583, Nashville, TN, 2012.
- [13] IAU SOFA Board. IAU SOFA Software Collection. <http://www.iausofa.org>, 2023.
- [14] Keidai Iiyama, Guillem Casadesús Vila, and Grace Gao. LuPNT: An open-source simulator for lunar positioning, navigation, and timing. In *Proc. ION GNSS+ 2023*. Institute of Navigation, 2023. Stanford NavLab open-source lunar PNT simulator.
- [15] Elliott D. Kaplan and Christopher J. Hegarty. *Understanding GPS/GNSS: Principles and Applications*. Artech House, 3rd edition, 2017.
- [16] Derek Knowles, Ashwin V. Kanhere, Daniel Neamati, and Grace Gao. gnss_lib_py: Analyzing gnss data with python. *SoftwareX*, 27:101811, 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.softx.2024.101811.
- [17] Samuel Lellouch and Michael Holynski. Integration of a high-fidelity model of quantum sensors with a map-matching filter for quantum-enhanced navigation. arXiv:2504.11119 [quant-ph], 2025.
- [18] Frank G. Lemoine, Sander Goossens, Terence J. Sabaka, Joseph B. Nicholas, Erwan Mazarico, David D. Rowlands, Bryant D. Loomis, Douglas S. Chinn, Douglas S. Caprette, Gregory A. Neumann, David E. Smith, and Maria T. Zuber. High-degree gravity models from GRAIL primary mission data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 118(8):1676–1698, 2013. doi: 10.1002/jgre.20118.
- [19] Haobo Li, Safoora Zaminpardaz, Allison Kealy, and Andrew D. Greentree. Quantum sensors for enhanced positioning and navigation: A comprehensive review. *GPS Solutions*, 30(1):62, 2026. doi: 10.1007/s10291-026-02030-y. Comprehensive RMIT survey of quantum sensing for PNT; identifies no open, reproducible quantum-vs-classical comparison tool.
- [20] Xingxing Li et al. Precise orbit determination of LEO satellites: A systematic review. *GPS Solutions*, 27, 2023. doi: 10.1007/s10291-023-01441-5.
- [21] Pratap Misra and Per Enge. *Global Positioning System: Signals, Measurements, and Performance*. Ganga-Jamuna Press, 2nd edition, 2010.
- [22] Oliver Montenbruck and Eberhard Gill. *Satellite Orbits: Models, Methods and Applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-58351-3.
- [23] Frank A. Narducci, Adam T. Black, and John H. Burke. Advances toward fieldable atom interferometers for inertial navigation. *Frontiers in Physics*, 10:994459, 2022. doi: 10.3389/fphy.2022.994459.
- [24] NASA. Standard for models and simulations. Technical Report NASA-STD-7009A, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 2016. Model-and-simulation credibility-assessment regime (with NASA-HDBK-7009B).

- [25] NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. General Mission Analysis Tool (GMAT). <https://gmt.gsfc.nasa.gov>, 2020.
- [26] Neuromorphic Systems. sgp4: a pure-Rust SGP4/SDP4 implementation. <https://github.com/neuromorphicsystems/sgp4>, 2024.
- [27] S. Origlia et al. Towards an optical clock for space: Compact, high-performance optical lattice clock based on bosonic atoms. *arXiv preprint*, 2015.
- [28] Gérard Petit and Brian Luzum. IERS Conventions (2010). IERS Technical Note 36, International Earth Rotation and Reference Systems Service, Frankfurt am Main, 2010. Verlag des Bundesamts für Kartographie und Geodäsie.
- [29] William J. Riley. Handbook of frequency stability analysis. NIST Special Publication 1065, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2008.
- [30] Christopher Rodríguez et al. Nyx and ANISE: Open-source astrodynamics and ephemeris toolkits (Rust). <https://nyxspace.com>, 2024. Validated DE-grade orbit-determination and SPICE/DE440 ephemeris baseline used here as a cross-validation oracle.
- [31] Shashwat Tak et al. satellite.js: SGP4/SDP4 orbit propagation in javascript. <https://github.com/shashwatak/satellite-js>, 2023. Canonical in-browser SGP4/SDP4 implementation.
- [32] Tomoji Takasu and Akio Yasuda. Development of the low-cost rtk-gps receiver with an open source program package rtklib. *International Symposium on GPS/GNSS*, 2009.
- [33] S. Templier et al. Tracking the vector acceleration with a hybrid quantum accelerometer triad. *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [34] TNO. TOPS/SENSED: Simulation-enhanced sensor designer for timing, orientation and positioning. Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research (TNO), 2023. Closed internal research service simulating quantum vs classical inertial sensors; no public release or reproducibility contract.
- [35] David A. Vallado, Paul Crawford, Richard Hujsak, and T. S. Kelso. Revisiting spacetrack report #3. In *AIAA/AAS Astrodynamics Specialist Conference and Exhibit*, number AIAA 2006-6753, 2006. doi: 10.2514/6.2006-6753.
- [36] Michael Wilkinson et al. Towards quantum-enhanced strapdown inertial navigation. *NAVIGATION: Journal of the Institute of Navigation*, 70(4), 2023. doi: 10.33012/navi.604.

A Reproducibility

Every result in this paper is regenerable from a committed scenario, a fixed random seed, and a pinned engine version (0.17.0); no figure or number depends on hidden state. The commands below regenerate the new crossover result (§5) and its figures, and re-run the external-validation oracles (§6).

The crossover study writes the inertial and clock sweep results (`inertial.json`, `clock.json`) with seed 42 fixed, and the two render scripts produce Figures 1 and 2 directly from that JSON:

```

# crossover study JSON (inertial + clock), fixed seed 42
cargo run --release --bin crossover_study -- paper/crossover
# figures
python3 paper/crossover/render_inertial.py paper/crossover/inertial.json
python3 paper/crossover/render_clock.py      paper/crossover/clock.json
# time-transfer lever (optical vs RF), seed 42
cargo run --release -- scenarios/timetransfer.toml
# validation oracles (examples)
cargo test --test sgp4_verification
cargo test --test frame_reference_vectors
cargo test --test agency_galileo

```

The `agency_galileo` test reproduces the 8 h continuous-integration fixture (pure-force 0.13 m, reduced-dynamic 0.07 m at degree/order 12, which is gravity-converged); the 0.61 m, 24 h, degree/order-70 *headline* is produced by the `galileo_full_arc_dispatch` job (an `#[ignore]`d test that fetches the full-day agency ephemeris; `KSHANA_GALILEO_DEGREE` defaults to 70).

The validation tests are self-checking: each derives its expected values from an external reference – the AIAA/Vallado verification set for SGP4, SOFA/ERFA reference vectors for the frame transformations, and agency precise ephemerides for the force-model fit by ephemeris fitting – rather than from the engine itself. Expected values are hand-entered or read from the cited dataset, so a passing test cross-validates Kshana against an independent oracle. The committed JSON artifacts (`inertial.json`, `clock.json`) carry the engine version and the full parameter envelope as meta-data, so a reader can confirm that the figures in this paper correspond bit-for-bit to a re-run on the same engine version and seed. Full build instructions and the Zenodo archive are linked from the repository [1].