

Maritime Domain Awareness System
Multiplication of Radar Modules for Tracking Silent Vessels

Midterm Report
EEL4914 - Senior Design I

Group 4



University of Central Florida
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
CREOL

Jet Chen, CpE
Alexander Drew, EE
Derek Florer, CpE
Gianna Montevago, PSE
Marco Plasencia, CpE
Garrett Miller, CS
Devin Parham, CS



Sponsored by United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM)

Reviewers: Dr. Q.Z. Sun, Dr. Yannick Salamin, Dr. Heinrich,
and Mr. Wubker

Mentors: Dr. Chan, Dr. Kar & Dr. Gerber

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Executive Summary	7
Chapter 2: Project Description	9
2.1 Background	9
2.2 Review of Prior Related Work	10
2.3 Goals and Objectives	11
2.3.1 Basic Goals:	11
2.4 Project Features and Functionalities	13
2.4.1 Hardware	13
2.4.2 Software	14
2.4.3 Required Specifications	15
2.4.4 Hardware Block Diagram	17
2.4.5 Software Block Diagram	18
2.4.6 Optical System	19
2.5 Prototype Illustration	20
2.6 House of Quality	21
Chapter 3: Research and Part Selection	22
3.1 Radar Systems	22
3.1.1 Fundamentals of Radar Systems	22
3.1.1.1 Wavelength and Frequency Considerations	23
3.1.1.2 Sea State, Clutter, and Environmental Effects	24
3.1.1.3 Radar Mounting Height	24
3.1.2 Types of Radar	26
3.1.2.1 Comparison of Radar Technologies	26
3.1.2.2 Radar Form Factor Comparison	28
3.1.3 Current Radars on the Market	28
3.1.3.1 Furuno DRS6ANXT	29
3.1.3.2 Garmin GMR Fantom 126	29
3.1.3.3 Raymarine Cyclone Pro 6ft	29
3.1.3.4 Simrad HALO® 2006 Open Array	30
3.1.3.5 Raymarine Cyclone 6 ft	30
3.1.3.6 Comparison of Radar Models and Selection	31
3.2 Maritime Environmental Challenges	32
3.2.1 Stainless Steel (316)	33
3.2.2 Aluminum Alloys (5083 & 6061)	34
3.2.3 Fiber Reinforced Polymers	34
3.2.3.1 Fiber Reinforced Plastics Study	35
3.2.3.2 Epoxy-glass FRPs	35
3.2.3.3 Fiber Glass Reinforced Polyurethane	36
3.2.4 Material Comparisons	38

3.2.4.1 Weight vs Strength	39
3.2.4.2 Corrosion Resistance	39
3.2.4.3 Maintenance and Durability	39
3.2.4.4 Formability and Cost	39
3.2.5 Material Selection for MDAS Components	40
3.2.5.1 Main Outer Frame	40
3.2.5.2 Electronics Enclosure	40
3.2.5.3 Turbine Mounting Bracket Support	40
3.2.5.4 Base Plate	41
3.2.6 Protective Coatings	41
3.2.6.1 Epoxy Coatings	41
3.2.6.2 Polyurethane Coatings	42
3.2.6.3 Anti-fouling Coatings	43
3.2.6.4 Protective Coating Material Comparisons	43
3.2.7 Mounting Hardware	45
3.2.7.1 Flanged Mount	45
3.2.7.2 Cantilever Mount	46
3.2.7.3 Deck-penetrating Mount (Through-bolt Mount)	46
3.2.7.4 Mounting Hardware Comparisons	47
3.3 Optical Technology Substitution Feasibility	48
3.3.1 LiDAR Imaging System	48
3.3.1.1 LiDAR Imaging vs. Radar Imaging	50
3.3.2 Camera System	52
3.3.2.1 CCD Camera Sensors	53
3.3.2.2 CMOS Camera Sensors	56
3.3.2.3 CCD vs. CMOS Sensors	59
3.3.2.4 Camera vs. Radar	62
3.3.3 Fiber Optics Communication	62
3.3.3.1 Fiber Optics Communication vs. Radar	63
3.4 Additional Ship Identification System	63
3.4.1 Camera Sensor Selection	63
3.4.2 Lens System	65
3.4.2.1 Keplerian Telescope System	67
3.4.2.2 Galilean Telescope System	67
3.4.2.3 Keplerian vs. Galilean	67
3.4.3 Adaptive Optics	68
3.4.4 Gimbal	70
3.5 Embedded Systems	71
3.5.1 Single Board Computer	71
3.5.2 Programming Languages	73
3.6 Technology Stack	74

3.6.1 Frontend	75
3.6.1.1 Vue	75
3.6.1.2 Angular	76
3.6.1.3 React	76
3.6.2 Backend	77
3.6.2.1 Django	77
3.6.2.1 Nest	78
3.6.2.1 Express	78
3.6.3 Database	78
3.6.3.1 Redis	79
3.6.3.2 PostgreSQL	79
3.6.3.3 MongoDB	80
3.6.4 Server	80
3.6.4.1 AWS	81
3.6.4.2 DigitalOcean	81
3.6.4.3 Azure	82
3.6.4.4 Google Cloud	82
3.6.4.5 Network-Attached Storage	82
3.6.5 Internal API's	83
3.6.5.1 REST API	83
3.6.5.2 WebSockets	83
3.6.6 External API's	83
3.6.6.1 Leaflet.js	83
3.6.6.2 Raymarine SDK	84
3.6.6.3 MarineTraffic	84
3.6.7 Authentication Methods for Maritime Web App	84
3.6.7.1 Password Hashing	84
3.6.7.2 JSON Web Token	85
3.6.7.3 OAuth 2.0	85
3.6.7.3 Multi-Factor Authentication	85
3.7 Communication Protocols	86
3.7.1 NMEA 2000 and Marine Communication Protocols	86
3.7.2 Starlink Communication	89
3.7.3 Wired Communication	91
3.7.4 Wireless Communication	91
3.8 Analysis of the Power System	91
3.8.1 Implementation of a Wind Powered System	93
3.8.2 Comparison of Vertical and Horizontal Wind Turbines	95
3.8.3 Wind Turbine Part Selection	97
3.8.3 Charge Controller Selection	101
3.8.4 Power Storage and Battery Selection	103

3.8.5 Identification and Selection of Regulators	107
Chapter 4: Standards and Design Constraints	109
4.1 Standards	109
4.1.1 FCC 47 CFR Part 80 - Maritime Services and Radar Compliance	110
4.1.2 IEEE C95.1-2019 - Electromagnetic Radiation Safety	111
4.1.3 IEEE 1547 - Standard for Interconnecting Distributed Resources with Electric Power Systems	113
4.1.4 Code of Federal Regulations - Automatic Identification System	113
4.2 Constraints	117
4.2.1 Environmental Factor Constraints	117
4.2.2 Weight and Form Factor Constraints	118
4.2.3 Raspberry Pi Constraints	119
4.2.5 Budget Constraints	119
Chapter 5: Comparison of ChatGPT with other Similar Platforms	120
5.1 LLM Comparison	120
5.1.1 Case Study - ChatGPT	121
5.1.1.1 Embedded Systems Perspective	121
5.1.1.2 Optical System Perspective	121
5.1.2 Case Study - Gemini	122
5.1.2.1 Radar Perspective	122
5.1.2.2 Material Section Perspective	123
5.1.3 Case Study - Deep Seek	124
5.1.3.1 Turbine Perspective	124
5.1.3.4 Mobile App Perspective	125
5.1.4 Case Study - Claude	125
5.1.4.1 Web App Perspective	125
5.2 Project Impact	125
5.2.1 Benefits	126
5.2.2 Detriments	127
5.3 Conclusion	128
Chapter 6: Hardware Design	130
6.1 Power System Design	130
Chapter 7: Software Design	133
7.1 Dark Vessel Classification Algorithm	133
7.1.1 Automatic Identification System	133
7.1.2 Parsing and Formatting of Data	134
7.1.3 Retrieving AIS Data	134
7.1.4 Subtracting Known Vessels	135
7.1.5 Classifying Dark Vessels	135
7.1.6 Known Challenges	135
7.1.7 Alternative Applications	136

7.2 Use Case Diagram	137
7.3 UI Design Goals	138
7.3.1 Login Display	139
7.4 Security Design Goals	141
Chapter 8: System Fabrication/Prototype Construction	142
Chapter 9: System Testing and Evaluation	142
9.1 Optoelectronics Feasibility Study and Testing	142
9.1.1 Midterm Demo Outcome	142
9.1.2 CMOS Camera Feasibility	142
Chapter 10: Administrative Content	143
10.1 Budget	143
10.2 Bill of Materials	143
10.3 Distribution of Workload	145
10.4 Project Milestones	146
Chapter 11: Conclusion Appendices	147
Appendix A - References	147
Appendix E - ChatGPT prompts	152

Chapter 1: Executive Summary

Modern maritime law enforcement is confronted with a growing challenge: vessels operating outside of legal oversight by turning off or simply not having Automatic Identification System (AIS) transponders. These "dark ships" are being utilized more frequently for purposes such as narcotics trafficking, unauthorized immigration, and illegal fishing, and their communications unavailability renders most conventional surveillance techniques futile. Though AIS was established to enhance navigation safety and situational awareness, it is by design contingent on the voluntary cooperation of the vessel. When such collaboration falters, visibility also falters. Accordingly, huge areas of the open sea become blind spots where illicit activity flourishes. The issue is not one of insufficient technological resources; it is one of the fact that the technologies we depend on were not created to handle non-compliance well.

To overcome this, our team set out to develop the Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS), a standalone, low-cost, and scalable system that modernizes maritime surveillance. Unlike conventional approaches, which rely on government-run patrols and large-scale infrastructures, MDAS uses available commercial maritime traffic to its advantage. Instead of adding fleet capacity or buying expensive infrastructure, we propose to install small, weather-tolerant radar nodes on commercial ships and cargo vessels navigating the seas. The modular nodes will be completely powered off-grid from wind energy and onboard energy storage systems, with long-term performance and low maintenance. The system consists of an advanced marine radar unit that detects vessels over a large area of operation, together with a low-power processor unit dedicated to radar preprocessing and filtering, as well as satellite communication unit that enables data to be transmitted in real time even in remote maritime locations.

When it receives returns from radar, the information is routed to a base station and an AIS subtraction algorithm is employed to remove cooperative traffic. The outcome is an improved list of likely silent ships which by intention or design, do not broadcast their identity. Those targets, when found, would be updated on a web application almost immediately and following action to shore-based operators can take their ideal next step. The ability to screen and classify suspect ships remotely cuts down the incidence of false positives considerably and dispenses with the necessity for constant patrol. Equally significant, every radar unit possesses the capability for remote configuration via software command. Operators at the base station have the ability to modify scan intervals, power settings, or place a unit in a standby mode, all while conserving energy within a resource-limited context. This implies that during periods of inactivity, the system conserves energy but can be activated at will.

The power of MDAS lies not so much in what it does, but how it does it. It is self-sustaining. It is portable. It hopes to convert the global merchant fleet into an active network of peer-to-peer radar units, with each unit contributing to a better overall picture of real-time maritime activity. As the number of MDAS units deployed grows, so does the degree of coverage, fidelity of information, and reliability. In a context in which unlawful maritime activity is ever more difficult to detect, MDAS does not try to outmatch the sophistication of the problem; rather, it tries to work around it. The system

we aim to develop does not require the utilization of a naval vessel for target identification. It does not even depend on satellites being utilized to find irregularities. Instead, it needs no more than wind from maritime travel, an open horizon, and snug mounting to become active.

This following report presents design, goals, and implementation plan for MDAS. We begin by describing the current status of maritime security, pointing out the limitations of existing AIS-based systems. We then review similar systems and industry practice to place where MDAS fits in and how it improves on what already exists. We then break down the hardware and software architecture that makes the system possible, including sensor fusion, real-time filtering algorithms, and Starlink-based communication protocols. The paper also discusses the methodology of our power system design, detailing the component selection and management parameters for realizing optimum energy efficiency, and the mechanisms implemented to facilitate remote-access command and control of several units. The report also discusses possible future endeavors, such as field testing and developments, such as artificial intelligence-powered target classification, adaptive scan modes, and a scalable fleet. Ultimately, MDAS represents a major leap in the deployment of maritime security strategies, moving from a paradigm of reactive enforcement to one marked by proactive and distributed situational awareness.

Chapter 2: Project Description

2.1 Background

The Importance of Maritime Border Security

The security and stability of the United States depend heavily on protecting its maritime borders. With over 95,000 miles of coastline and extensive shipping routes, the nation's waters serve as vital channels for trade, transportation, and national defense. However, these same waters are also exploited for illicit activities such as drug trafficking, human smuggling, illegal fishing, and unauthorized vessel entry. Traditional maritime security efforts rely on government-operated naval assets, but these resources are often stretched thin across vast oceanic regions, creating blind spots where illegal activities can go undetected.

To address these challenges, the U.S. has implemented Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) initiatives, integrating surveillance technologies to monitor vessel activity in real time. The Maritime Domain is defined as *"All areas and things of, on, under, relating to, adjacent to, or bordering on a sea, ocean, or other navigable waterway, including maritime-related activities, infrastructure, people, cargo, and vessels and other conveyances."* The Maritime Security Policy established the first-ever Maritime Security Policy Coordinating Committee to oversee the development of NSMS and eight supporting plans—the main one being a national plan to achieve MDA. This plan lays the foundation for all matters related to the maritime domain that could impact the security, safety, economy, or environment of the United States and also focuses on identifying threats as early and as distant from our shores as possible. A key component of MDA is the Automatic Identification System (AIS), which requires vessels to transmit their identity, position, speed, and course to prevent collisions and enhance navigational safety. AIS allows port authorities, coast guards, and naval forces to track legitimate vessels; however, ships engaging in illicit activities frequently disable or manipulate their AIS transponders to evade detection. This creates a significant gap in maritime security, as vessels without AIS cannot be easily identified or tracked using conventional methods.

Project Motivation and Cost-Saving Measures

Given the limitations of current MDA strategies, there is a critical need for a cost-effective, scalable solution to detect and monitor non-cooperative vessels operating without AIS. Our project aims to deploy self-sustaining maritime surveillance units that integrate radar technology to track and transmit data on vessels operating without AIS transponders. These units will filter out compliant ships and focus on identifying unregistered or suspicious vessels, relaying this information to an inland server for analysis and military response.

A major innovation of this approach is leveraging commercial vessels as hosts for these radar systems. Rather than relying solely on government ships or satellite-based coverage, which are costly to operate and limited in number, deploying radar-equipped units on commercial vessels expands the military's radar network while significantly

reducing operational costs. This not only increases the density of surveillance coverage but also ensures a more persistent and widespread monitoring capability. A critical aspect of this system is its ability to function independently from the host vessel. The radar unit is designed to be self-powered, ensuring minimal impact on the host's regular operations. The radar system is designed to be non-intrusive, increasing the acceptance from commercial operators to allow radar integration on maritime vessels. By integrating advanced radar systems with existing commercial fleets, this project enhances border security, resource efficiency, and military intelligence capabilities seamlessly without requiring additional government-operated vessels.

2.2 Review of Prior Related Work

To learn more about this project, research was conducted online to understand the requirements of similar solutions and gain insight into how to complete the objectives. This research led to a notable example of another commercial off-the-shelf (COTS)-based radar system. A surveillance systems company, Surface Search Radar Engineering, designed the AN/SPS-78 radar system to replace the aging AN/SPS-73 systems aboard U.S. Coast Guard vessels. Their project addresses reliability and obsolescence issues and details commercial requirements for the International Maritime Organization, along with capabilities necessary for tactical missions required by coast guards and navies. The new AN/SPS-78 is fully compatible with the U.S. Coast Guard's SeaWatch—an enterprise command, control, and navigation system—and other naval systems. This prior work was extremely helpful in explaining how to create a radar processing and tracking system that meets commercial and tactical needs. Open-source information from this project will assist in development efforts.

Another discovery was ThayerMahan's 'SeaPicket' system, an energy-harvesting, autonomous surveillance platform that integrates acoustic, radar/EW, video, and AIS sensors. SeaPicket is designed for long-term deployment and offers persistent maritime domain awareness by collecting and processing data on vessel movements. This system uses artificial intelligence and machine learning to analyze sensor data and provide real-time insights to port security organizations and field commanders. Overall, this project illustrates the integration of multiple sensors in a modular design with autonomous operation, which has been beneficial in understanding the goal of developing a plug-and-play MDA system. Similar energy-harvesting techniques and data analytics methodologies will be incorporated into the design to enhance system autonomy and efficiency.

Lastly, Kelvin Hughes' SharpEye S-Band Radar was examined due to its relevant characteristics. This commercially available solid-state radar system is designed for MDA and navigation. It is used on a variety of naval, Coast Guard, and commercial vehicles due to its low power consumption, high reliability, and advanced tracking capabilities. SharpEye uses Doppler processing, which detects and classifies targets based on their movement patterns, helping differentiate between stationary, slow, and high-speed vessels. As a result, clear radar imaging can be achieved even in heavy rain or rough seas, making it ideal for persistent MDA applications. The system also eliminates the need for high-voltage components, significantly reducing maintenance requirements.

Studying this work provided valuable insights into how radars process data, optimize power efficiency, and operate in challenging conditions. Additionally, it highlighted the potential for Doppler-based tracking to enhance real-time detection of non-AIS vessels. These techniques establish a strong baseline for design choices in the development of a radar-based MDA system.

2.3 Goals and Objectives

The self-contained radar system is designed to enhance maritime domain awareness by addressing critical challenges such as detecting non-AIS vessels, operating independently in harsh marine environments, and maintaining reliable long-range communication. By prioritizing portability, self-sustainability, and affordability, the system will enable continuous monitoring and real-time data transmission.

Through a combination of hardware and software innovations, the MDAS aims to create a durable and efficient solution for vessel detection and tracking in remote maritime regions. The following goals and objectives outline the key functionalities required to bring this system to completion.

2.3.1 Basic Goals:

- Develop a self-sufficient radar system that does not rely on the ship's power supply.
- The system must detect vessels transmitting AIS, and vessels without AIS transmission.
- Establish a reliable method for transmitting data from the radar system to the base station.
- Design the system to operate autonomously for long periods with minimal maintenance.
- Make the system lightweight and easy to install on various maritime setups.
- Provide on/off power control for the radar via a physical switch and remotely through Starlink from a remote device.
- Develop a user-friendly interface that integrates radar overlays with AIS Marine Tracker.
- Attach an enhancing optical system to a camera to increase overall performance at distance.
- Use a gimbal-mounted camera system to take long-distance photos of potential threats.

Advanced Goals:

- Enable continuous data transmission from radar ensuring live updates without delay.
- Reduce power consumption by turning off the radar when ported.
- Allow the radar to operate intermittently rather than continuous operation.
- Improve the lens attachment for better overall performance of the optical system.

Stretch Goals:

- Ensure expandability by allowing multiple modules to connect, improving load balancing and synchronized data processing.
- Obtain processable images in addition to the visible light camera for operation in moonlight conditions.
- Research and integrate adaptive optics into the system.

Hardware Objectives:

- Construct a self-sustaining power source with integration capabilities for wind energy.
- Utilize a microcontroller to analyze radar data and process it for transmission back to base station via Starlink protocol.
- Integrate a GPS module with the microcontroller to accurately slew the camera towards targets.
- Configure the radar to enter a low-power standby mode when not actively in use.
- Ensure the use of sturdy, waterproof, and corrosion-resistant materials to protect the radar module and connecting wires.
- Include a physical power switch that allows the module to be turned on or off by the operator.
- Select a CMOS sensor optimal for the operating distance and ambient conditions.
- Design and implement a Galilean lens system for fixed magnification.
- Integrate a gimbal into the optical system to provide a larger range of motion.

Software Objectives:

- Develop an algorithm to process radar data and subtract AIS transponder information, isolating non-AIS targets.
- Create a user-friendly interface for monitoring and control, integrating AIS Marine Tracker with radar overlays.

- Develop a server accessible via Starlink to send commands that remotely power the radar module on and off.
- Enable the server to remotely send commands to the mounted camera for capturing images on demand.
- Enable automatic radar shutdown when the vessel is docked and restart upon departure.

Stretch Goal Objectives:

- Sustain a scalable module database with intra-connected communications allowing for radar proximity efficiency.
- Integrate an additional infrared camera capable of operating with low light for target identification.
- Integrate adaptive optics technologies to be able to see targets clearly at the horizon.

2.4 Project Features and Functionalities

In this chapter, we describe the inherent qualities and processes that facilitate the standalone and dependable operation of the radar unit in remote maritime conditions. By explaining the hardware, software, and optical subsystems, we demonstrate how each of the components plays a role in the overall efficacy of the system ultimately delivering sensing functionality, power efficiency, and effective data communication. The subsequent subsections offer an overview of how these components integrate to form a compact, autonomous radar solution that is ideal for long-term marine environment deployment.

2.4.1 Hardware

The hardware components of the self-contained radar unit are carefully selected to meet the project's requirements of compactness, low power consumption, and minimal maintenance. Each component plays a crucial role in ensuring the system's functionality, self-sufficiency, and long-term reliability in a marine environment.

At the core of the system is the marine radar, which provides the primary sensing capability, detecting objects and mapping the surrounding environment. Complementing this is a camera mounted on a gimbal, which captures visual data of either the radar unit itself or nearby objects of interest using its gimbal. Together, these components allow for a comprehensive understanding of the surroundings, with the radar providing detection and the camera offering visual verification.

To power the system sustainably, a wind turbine is employed to generate renewable energy. This energy is regulated by a charge controller, which ensures that the current fed into the battery remains within safe limits, protecting the battery from overcharging or

damage. The battery serves as the central energy storage unit, supplying power to all system components when renewable sources are insufficient or unavailable.

To meet the diverse voltage requirements of the system, DC-DC regulators are used to step up or step down the battery's output to provide stable power to each component. This includes powering the microcontroller, which serves as the system's brain, and managing data from the radar, camera, and other peripherals. The microcontroller is also responsible for facilitating communication between the radar data and external devices via cellular connectivity, ensuring that the data is transmitted to both servers and mobile devices for remote monitoring and analysis.

Additionally, the system includes a mobile device paired with the radar apparatus, acting as a local on-off switch for the entire system. This allows for on-site control and rapid deployment adjustments. To enhance adaptability, a versatile mounting system has been designed to house all components in a relatively compact manner while ensuring compatibility with various ships, allowing for flexible installation across different marine vessels.

Each of these components interacts seamlessly to create an efficient system. The wind turbine and charge controller feed renewable energy into the battery, which acts as a central hub of power distribution. The DC-DC regulators ensure that each component receives the appropriate voltage for operation. The microcontroller acts as the central coordinator, handling data processing and communication while the radar and camera perform their respective sensing tasks. This carefully designed interaction between components ensures that the radar unit remains operational over extended periods, even in remote locations, while maintaining its self-contained nature.

2.4.2 Software

The software for the self-contained radar unit is designed to enable remote monitoring, control, and data processing while ensuring seamless operation with minimal user intervention.

At its core, the system continuously transmits the GPS location of the radar node to a central server, allowing users to track its position in real time. When needed, users can send commands from the server to turn the radar on or off, enabling remote control of power usage and system operation. The system is integrated with a bay station database that plays a crucial role in managing radar operations and data storage.

The bay station database is responsible for issuing instructions to radar units to turn on or off as required for data collection, allowing for efficient control over the system. Once activated, the radar collects raw radar data and transmits it to the server via a Starlink connection, ensuring low-latency and reliable data delivery, even in remote maritime locations. The software then employs an AIS subtraction algorithm to filter out all vessels that are broadcasting AIS signals, ensuring that only non-AIS vessels remain in the collected data set. This improves detection accuracy and operational efficiency while reducing false positives.

The processed radar data is then securely stored in the database for further analysis, long-term tracking, and potential integration with other maritime monitoring systems. Users can remotely trigger the system to capture a camera image for additional verification. The image can be used to visually inspect either the radar unit itself—confirming operational status—or the area where an unidentified vessel was detected, providing potential visual confirmation of the target.

The software integrates these functions into a streamlined workflow, ensuring efficient communication between the radar node and the bay station database while enabling users to monitor and control the system remotely with minimal latency.

2.4.3 Required Specifications

The specifications for the MDAS are divided into subsections each detailing specific aspects of the system’s requirements and implementation.

Table 2.1 - Engineering Specifications

Portability	
Total Weight	≤ 25kg
Enclosure Volume	6.5” by 6.5” by 5”
Radar	
Detection Range	50 to 60 nautical miles (57.5 to 69 miles)
Data Transmission Rate	2 to 12 times per minute
Maximum Targets Tracked	40 to 60 Vessels
Full System	
Total Wind Energy Production	400 to 500 Watts
Power Consumption	≤ 275 Watts
Maximum Voltage	48 V
Cold Start Time	≤ 120 seconds
Operating Temperature	5°C to 50°C
Response Time (Radar Module to Base Station PC)	≤ 3 minutes
Maintenance Interval	~6 months

Total Cost	$\leq \$15,000$
Software/ Communication	
AIS Filtering Algo Accuracy	$\geq 99\%$ accurate
Remote Shutdown Latency	≤ 1 second
Optical System	
Angular Resolution of the System	1.987 arcseconds per pixel
Optimal Operating Distance	~ 5 km
Magnification	7.5x

2.4.4 Hardware Block Diagram




Figure 2.1 - Hardware block diagram [1]

2.4.5 Software Block Diagram




Figure 2.2 - Software block diagram [1]

2.4.6 Optical System

In addition to the included radar system, we are also integrating an optics system. We are implementing a long-distance camera system that can help with the identification of neighboring ships that may be encountered on the open ocean. The camera will be a commercially available CCD camera, mounted on a gimbal for an increased field of view. An optical system will be attached to the front of the camera to increase performance. This system will consist of multiple lenses to create a stationary beam expander, with AR coatings. This beam expander will help increase the performance at longer distances. The type of expander will be a Keplerian beam expander, utilizing three lenses.




Figure 2.3 - Optical Sensor Concept Diagram

2.5 Prototype Illustration

The Computer-Aided Design (CAD) model in Figure 2.5 displays the current prototype configuration of the Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS). The compact, self-contained unit combines a number of important components to provide correct operation in isolated maritime locations. A Raymarine Cyclone radar is situated at the top of the assembly, guarded by a radome that encloses the radar and protects it from the elements without compromising signal integrity. Beneath the radar is a vertically mounted wind turbine, housed in a mesh cylindrical structure that provides ongoing airflow, while simultaneously shielding the turbine from potential debris.

Mounted on the side of the frame is a sealed protective cover that encloses major electronic components. This includes a Raspberry Pi, battery for power storage, and other electrical components necessary for operation. The design highlights durability and simplicity ultimately ensuring that the system can operate autonomously in various maritime conditions.




Figure 2.5 - MDAS Prototype CAD [93]

2.6 House of Quality

Table 2.2 - House of Quality

Correlations			
Positive		+	
Negative		-	
No Correlation			
Relationships			
Strongly Positive		↑↑	
Positive		↑	
Moderate			
Negative		↓	
Strongly Negative		↓↓	
Direction of Improvement			
Maximize		▲	
Minimize		▼	

Column #		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Engineering Requirements Marketing Requirements	Direction of Improvement	Weight	Size	Detection Range	Data Transmission Rate	Concurrent Targets Detected	Total Energy	Power Consumption	Maximum Voltage	Cost	Cold Start Time	ISO Range	Operating Temperature	Response Time	Maintenance Interval	Algorithm Accuracy	Latency
	Direction of Improvement	▼	▼	▲		▲		▼		▼	▼	▲		▼	▲	▲	▼
Portability		▲	↑↑	↑↑			↓		↓	↑					↓		
Ease of Use		▲				↑					↑	↑		↑↑		↑	↑↑
Affordability		▼	↓↓	↓	↓↓		↓↓	↓↓		↓↓	↑	↓↓	↓	↓			
Reliability		▲			↑	↑↑	↑			↑	↓	↑↑	↑↑	↓↓	↑	↑↑	↓
Energy Efficiency		▲			↑		↑↑	↓↓		↑							
Weather Resistance		▲								↑		↓			↑		
Safety		▲	↓↓	↓↓					↓				↓		↑		
Target Values		≤ 25kg	6.5" by 6.5" by 5"	50 to 60 nautical miles	4 to 10 times per second	40 to 60 Vessels	400 to 500 Watts	≤ 275 Watts	48 V	≤ 15,000	≤ 120 seconds	100 to 3200	5°C to 50°C	≤ 3 minutes	~6 months	≥ 99% accuracy	≤ 1 second

Chapter 3: Research and Part Selection

Developing our Maritime Domain Awareness System requires both deliberate planning and in-depth investigation. Before settling on any final design or starting the prototyping phase, we first laid out our specific requirements, surveyed potential solutions, and measured how each one would align with our overall project goals. This chapter looks at the step-by-step research that guided our technological choices. We divided this chapter down into key subcategories involved in the MDAS project. The discussion is broken into key subcategories of the MDAS project: radar systems, power and energy considerations, materials and structural design, electronics, and base station AIS-related information.

Throughout this process, cost, performance, and durability played significant roles in selecting power-management solutions and peripheral components. Our objective throughout this process was to find a balanced blend of reliability and adaptability which are essential for maritime surveillance. By explaining our decision-making criteria and how each piece fits into the larger system, we show how even the smallest parts contribute to maintaining consistent vessel tracking and reliable data transfer over long distances at sea.

3.1 Radar Systems

As part of our broader goal of maritime domain awareness, radar technology provides a straightforward and powerful method for detecting both cooperative and non-cooperative vessels. Many modern solutions rely on satellite tracking or the Automatic Identification System (AIS), but vessels looking to avoid detection often disable AIS or are not equipped with AIS transponders. In contrast, radar technology does not depend on the voluntary transmission of identifying data by a vessel. Instead, it relies on electromagnetic waves to find and follow targets based on reflected energy. This makes radar especially important for naval surveillance, where security resources might be thin at the coast or the area to be monitored is vast, like the open ocean.

3.1.1 Fundamentals of Radar Systems

Radar, or Radio Detection and Ranging, is one of the most important aspects of maritime surveillance because it has the capability to actively scan and probe the environment, unlike depending on cooperative emissions such as AIS signals. In practical terms, a radar system emits pulses of electromagnetic energy and calculates returning echoes to identify and follow targets in maritime scenarios, including vessels that may be operating “silently” without AIS transponders [6]. The two-way time between pulse transmission and echo reception identifies the range of the target, and signal-processing techniques can interpret speed and bearing.

Within the framework of this project, the Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS), having the capacity to detect both cooperative and non-cooperative vessels is essential. Solid-state pulsed radar technology, through the utilization of techniques such as pulse

compression and Doppler filtering, provides improved clutter rejection and increased resolution without necessitating unrealistically high transmit power levels [6]. Solid-state pulsed radar brings a key benefit to off-grid maritime systems: it significantly lowers the peak power needed for operation. This is especially valuable when the system draws from renewable energy sources, where power availability is often limited. Equally important, next-generation radar architectures commonly include integrated networking and remote-control interfaces, giving operators real-time command over parameters like gain, clutter filters, and range scales, even from a distance. These adaptive features are crucial in an off-grid, wide-area surveillance setting, since they allow the radar to respond to changing conditions while ensuring reliable performance under constrained power budgets.

3.1.1.1 Wavelength and Frequency Considerations

Operating frequency, which is also wavelength, significantly affects a radar's performance in maritime applications. Common marine radars fall into two primary bands: S-band (approximately 3 GHz, ~10 cm wavelength) and X-band (9–10 GHz, ~3 cm wavelength).

S-band radars, operating at a wavelength of approximately 10 centimeters, are particularly utilized for having a very fine capability to penetrate heavy rain, thick fog, and other forms of atmospheric obscurants which can affect the visibility. They often maintain detection ranges even during severe weather, although their longer wavelength typically results in less fine resolution and broader beamwidth. These characteristics make S-band radars primarily the radar technology of choice, for large-ship installations or where strong precipitation is the dominant factor [6].

X-band (~3 cm wavelength) radars provide excellent detail on small and closely spaced targets. This makes them particularly effective for detecting low-profile craft or distinguishing multiple vessels in congested waters. The inherent shorter wavelength of X-band radars allows for the creation of narrower beamwidths and narrower resolution cells, a characteristic which often results in higher accuracy in terms of monitoring on-the-move targets. However, it must be noted that a significant drawback comes into play, as the propagation of X-band is much more susceptible to attenuation when faced with heavy precipitation conditions, a factor which could then result in a reduction of the maximum distance at which these types of radars can effectively transmit.

In modern shipboard practice, bigger ships that travel transoceanic routes often carry both bands. S-band is carried for improved performance in heavy rain, and X-band is used for high-resolution scanning. For an MDAS intended to detect illegal "silent" ships and with a desire to minimize the hardware footprint, an X-band system offers a great compromise on size, power, and target discrimination.

3.1.1.2 Sea State, Clutter, and Environmental Effects

Beyond electromagnetic propagation, maritime radars must contend with the dynamic conditions of the sea surface. Sea clutter develops when radar pulses reflect off waves, whitecaps, and turbulent water, producing random echoes that can mask genuine targets [12]. Higher sea states, especially those with breaking waves, have more severe clutter and demand sophisticated filtering techniques in order to be sensitive to small vessels.

- Clutter Suppression Algorithms:

Doppler-based techniques, such as Moving Target Indication (MTI) and pulse-Doppler processing can be particularly effective in discriminating between moving targets and stationary or slowly moving reflectors that are typically found on the surface of the sea [6]. By isolating echoes with distinct Doppler shifts, the radar processor is able to emphasize the returns from vessels and, simultaneously, suppress the backscatter from the waves.

- Weather and Rain Clutter:

Heavy rain works to introduce another source of clutter to the radar systems because the raindrops are capable of scattering the transmitted radar pulses. Even though it is true that S-band radars tend to have superior rain penetration because they operate at a lower frequency, the fact must not be lost that even X-band systems can reduce the impact of rainfall clutter. They do this by using shorter pulse widths, the use of pulse-compression waveforms, and by employing adjustable gain controls to enhance their performance during rainfall.

- System Settings for Changing Conditions:

According to Furuno's basic radar guidelines, operators must make frequent adjustments to gain, sea clutter filters, rain clutter filters, and range scale to maintain consistent situational awareness [11]. Automated or remotely configured filter profiles, which are particularly relevant for our untouched MDAS, enable the radar to adapt on the fly to rapidly changing sea states and is of great importance for optimizing maritime domain awareness.

Taking into account frequency band selection, wavelength-specific propagation characteristics, and clutter management makes a radar-equipped MDAS a powerful tool for detecting and tracking silent vessels. The integration of such complex signal processing, controlled transmit power, and adaptive clutter filtering ensures that a system can maintain reliable vigilance over maritime domains despite harsh sea states.

3.1.1.3 Radar Mounting Height

Aside from frequency selection and clutter mitigation, antenna height is a key factor in maritime radar performance. Mounting the radar antenna higher up on the ship's mast extends the line-of-sight horizon [11], enabling detection of low-flying ships at greater

ranges. Ship roll and pitch, on the other hand, can momentarily tilt the radar beam, creating a "bobbing" blind zone during rough sea states. However, putting a radar up on the mast can bring a host of practical issues. Beyond the structural reinforcements needed to handle the added weight and wind loading, maintenance and vessel impact also become greater factors. Mast mounted setup becomes less desired and mounting to the pilot house is far more practical. Even a modest increase in elevation can result in a significantly larger surveillance area, which is important when trying to spot smaller, low-profile vessels on the open sea.

- Extended Detection Range

Line-of-Sight Geometry: The distance to the radio horizon generally increases with the square root of the antenna height. In practical terms, a radar mounted higher on a vessel's mast can see farther over the Earth's curvature, which means it can pick up targets that would be invisible to a deck-level antenna [6].

Obstacle and Surface Clutter Clearance: Raising the radar's altitude helps reduce reflections due to nearby obstacles as well as mitigate the effect of sea-surface clutter produced by subsurface waves. As a result, this adjustment can produce more distinct target returns and reduce the processing load on the signal processor responsible for eliminating unwanted echoes.

- Impact on Small Target Detection:

Low-Profile Boats: Small boats run lower in the water and often come in just above the top of the waves. By placing the radar at a sufficient height, operators can maximize their detection range for these vessels, thus increasing overall situational awareness [11].

Wave Masking: In high sea states, a beam from an elevated position is less likely to be completely absorbed by breaking waves due to which targets are still detectable despite the occasional rise of wave crests between the radar and the sea surface.

- Manufacturer Recommendations and Practical Limits:

Optimum Mounting Heights: Radar makers, such as Furuno, generally provide minimum and optimum mounting height recommendations. These considerations include extended range along with practical concerns like wind loading and stability [11]. Extremely high installations can compromise vessel balance and contribute to center-of-gravity problems, especially on small platforms.

Antenna Size Implications: The larger the antenna array, the narrower the beamwidths at a specific height but with greater windage and weight. The site chosen for installation will need to be sufficiently robust to take this load and clear of obstructions from items like masts, funnels, or sensors.

- Compromises and Operations Modifications:

Vessel Dynamics: Elevating the radar on a mast or the wheelhouse produces added motion due to roll and pitch, which can lead to transient blind sectors. Electronic or mechanical stabilization can minimize these [6].

Maintenance and Accessibility: An elevated mounting location might introduce additional inconvenience when carrying out on-site maintenance. This is an important factor as these will be going on commercial vessels and there will not be a crew on deck to correct anything that is wrong with the system.

In summary, the height of a maritime radar antenna is crucial for maximizing detection range and ensuring consistent performance. This is especially important for an autonomous system designed to track dark vessels. By paying close attention to the structural and operational implications of antenna elevation, along with considerations of frequency band, power settings, and clutter control, an MDAS can become more robust and capable of delivering wide-reaching maritime domain awareness [12]. As previously explained, this benefit comes with many hesitations which leads to mounting on the pilot house which remains high enough while making installation and maintenance significantly more reasonable.

3.1.2 Types of Radar

In order to select the most suitable radar system for the Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS), it becomes highly necessary to possess thorough knowledge of all the various types of radar technologies currently in use, along with the varied physical form factors available in the maritime industry. Different radar systems yield variation not just in the way they generate and process signals, but also greatly in their physical composition, total power consumption requirements, detection range, and their durability under different environmental conditions [6]. In order to facilitate the design selection process for maritime surveillance mission sets such as MDAS, this section classifies radar technology into various operational types and structural form factors.

3.1.2.1 Comparison of Radar Technologies

Radar systems are broadly categorized by the specific internal operating mechanisms which they employ. There are several tradeoffs to be considered for each different radar system, including the power consumed, the detection fidelity, the total cost, and the maintenance demands, these latter ones being particularly critical to the functionality and performance of remote and autonomous systems.

Table 3.1 - Radar Technology Comparison

Radar Type	Description	Key Advantages	Limitations	Typical Cost
Magnetron Radar	Traditional radar type using vacuum tubes to emit high-powered microwave pulses	Long range, mature tech, inexpensive upfront	High power consumption, short life span, requires warm-up, poor low-speed perf.	Low
Solid-State Radar	Uses transistor-based circuits to generate pulses; often employs pulse compression	Low power, compact, long life, better with Doppler & signal processing	More expensive initially than magnetron; lower absolute peak power	Moderate to High
CHIRP Radar	“Compressed High-Intensity Radar Pulse” that sweeps through frequencies	High resolution, better clutter rejection, clearer images	Typically more complex to implement and integrate	High
Pulse-Doppler Radar	Measures target motion via Doppler shift; often integrated into solid-state sets	Excellent target separation from sea clutter; detects speed/direction	Computationally intensive, benefits from advanced processors	High
Dual Range Radar	Allows simultaneous display of short and long-range scans	Operator sees near and far targets without manual switching	Requires more powerful processors and slightly higher power draw	Moderate to High

These radar types are typically coupled, for example, solid-state radar with Doppler and CHIRP, to achieve better performance while keeping cost and power in check. For MDAS, the use of solid-state pulse-Doppler radar with CHIRP technology offers the most desirable balance between effectiveness, detection integrity, and environmental compatibility.

3.1.2.2 Radar Form Factor Comparison

Alongside signal technology, the physical design or form factor of a radar plays a vital role in its suitability for maritime deployment. Dome and open-array are the two dominant structural styles used in commercial marine radar systems.

Table 3.2 - Radar Form Factor Comparison

Form Factor	Description	Advantages	Limitations	Ideal Application
Dome Radar	Enclosed radome, often with shorter antenna arrays (12–24")	Enclosed radome, often with shorter antenna arrays (12–24")	Enclosed radome, often with shorter antenna arrays (12–24")	Enclosed radome, often with shorter antenna arrays (12–24")
Open-Array Radar	Exposed rotating array (3–6 ft), higher gain antennas	Superior range (up to 96 nm), narrow beamwidth, better separation of targets	Heavier, higher power use, larger footprint, requires robust mounting	Larger vessels, ocean crossings, wide-area surveillance
Hybrid Modular	Less abundant, customizable radar units with removable/expandable elements	Tailored size/weight/ power tradeoffs	More expensive, complex integration	Military/commercial custom integrations

The MDAS project requires a radar system that is powerful enough to identify tiny vessels at a distance and small enough to be easily installed on a variety of commercial vessels. This critical balance is particularly well-served by open-array radars, particularly the 6-foot solid-state models. Especially when advanced technologies like Doppler processing and CHIRP are included into their architecture, they offer enhanced detection without requiring unduly high power needs.

3.1.3 Current Radars on the Market

In order to select a suitable radar for an overseas maritime surveillance project, we must consider performance in heavy weather, power demands for off-grid or wind-based power systems, integration flexibility for custom software, and of course, cost and range specifications. Below are five leading solid-state X-band radars commonly found on commercial vessels. Each system operates with pulse compression for improved detection and minimal maintenance, but they differ in how much power they require, how

readily they integrate with custom applications, and how extensively they support cost-effective deployments.

3.1.3.1 Furuno DRS6ANXT

Furuno's DRS6ANXT uses the company's "NXT" pulse-compression technology, designed to enhance target detection while containing overall power draw and weight. Its range performance varies depending on whether you opt for a smaller dome or a larger open-array antenna, with the dome version typically reaching out to around 36–48 nautical miles, while open-array setups can push farther, closer to 72 nm [7] In terms of cost, the DRS6ANXT can start around \$3,000 for dome models and rise to over \$8,000 for open-array configurations, making it a solid mid-tier option. Despite its moderate wattage draw (about 45 W nominal, peaking around 100–120 W in certain modes), it remains feasible for wind or solar power installations if properly sized. Furuno primarily uses NavNet TZtouch MFDs and can see packaged data via their SDK. Still, from a weather-resilience standpoint, Furuno radars are widely respected in commercial shipping and typically handle salt spray, heavy rains, and moderate gales with no issue.

3.1.3.2 Garmin GMR Fantom 126

Garmin's GMR Fantom 126 is well-known for its powerful doppler-based MotionScope technology, delivering excellent short- to medium-range target discrimination. With a six-foot open array, it can detect targets at distances up to around 96 nautical miles, which satisfies the requirements for broad-area maritime domain awareness. The purchase price often falls in the \$7,000–\$8,000 range, placing it in a higher bracket once you factor in the array hardware. In exchange, users gain robust detection of high-speed or distant vessels—an advantage if wide coverage is a priority. However, the radar's power usage can climb to nearly 200 W under higher rotation speeds and transmit power, which poses challenges if your system must remain self-sustaining on wind power alone. Its open-array design also demands extra deck space and careful mounting at suitable height for best performance. Though Garmin provides user-friendly interfaces for end consumers, there is no official software development kit (SDK) for developers aiming to extract or process raw radar data. As a result, those wanting custom software integration face some hurdles.

3.1.3.3 Raymarine Cyclone Pro 6ft

The Raymarine Cyclone Pro is a top-tier open-array radar featuring a transmit power rating near 170 W. This higher power, along with its advanced pulse-compression signaling, enables reliable detection ranges up to around 72 nautical miles and more robust resolution in challenging weather. Cost-wise, the Cyclone Pro setup usually exceeds \$6,000, sometimes reaching \$8,000 or more depending on antenna length and accessories. Because it is a solid-state design, average power consumption remains lower than a traditional magnetron-based radar, but it can still climb above 150 W when scanning at higher speeds. That said, many overseas operators appreciate its heavy-duty construction, sleek footprint for minimal wind loading, and proven operation in high seas. Another critical benefit is the availability of Raymarine's LightHouse SDK, which allows

direct software-level access to radar data and controls, a significant advantage in a project requiring custom detection or remote management. For an energy-constrained MDAS platform, though, the Pro model's higher wattage output may strain a smaller wind-powered solution, making it better suited to scenarios with ample energy or bigger vessels.

3.1.3.4 Simrad HALO® 2006 Open Array

Simrad's HALO® 2006 radar delivers a capable 6-foot open-array solution for mid- to long-range detection, typically up to about 72 nautical miles. Its pulse compression and VelocityTrack doppler technology help operators distinguish actual moving vessels from clutter like waves or precipitation. Pricing is comparatively competitive in the open-array category, averaging in the \$4,000–\$5,000 range, though additional costs for accessories may apply. Power draw generally hovers around 65 to 130 W depending on rotation speed, which is relatively moderate for a large open array. This level of consumption is still a notable factor when using only wind power, but intermittent or scheduled scanning modes can help conserve energy. Simrad does not offer an official open SDK, so more advanced integrations often rely on partial open-source efforts or custom reverse engineering. Still, for standard “drop-in” commercial deployments, HALO radars have proven weather resilience and reliability at sea.

3.1.3.5 Raymarine Cyclone 6 ft

Raymarine's Cyclone (non-Pro) 6 ft open array offers a balance of performance and energy efficiency that makes it particularly attractive for the MDAS concept. Its typical output hovers closer to 110 W at peak, and many scanning modes operate below that figure, which significantly eases the burden of off-grid power generation using a wind turbine. The cost generally falls below \$10,000, inclusive of the 6-foot antenna kit, placing it at the high end of dome radars but within reach for robust maritime security needs. It shares the same sealed, low-profile design as the Cyclone Pro, featuring an aerodynamic, weatherproof enclosure that withstands salt spray, heavy rains, and higher wind loads which is critical when mounting on external structures. Coupled with Raymarine's LightHouse SDK, integrators can directly manipulate scanning parameters, retrieve raw or semi-processed returns, and feed the data into custom tracking algorithms that filter out AIS targets. This level of software flexibility aligns perfectly with a self-contained, overseas-deployed MDAS platform that must autonomously detect silent vessels. Although its maximum range is slightly below that of some high-power open arrays, the Cyclone still comfortably meets the ~60–72 nm target range for mid-size maritime surveillance, making it an excellent tradeoff between coverage, cost, and operating power.

3.1.3.6 Comparison of Radar Models and Selection

Table 3.3 - Radar Part Comparison

	Furuno DRS6ANX T-XN13A	Garmin GMR Fantom™ 126	Raymarine Cyclone Pro	Simrad HALO® 2006	Raymarine Cyclone
Frequency Band	X-band (~9.4 GHz)	X-band (~9.4 GHz)	X-band (~9.4 GHz)	X-band (~9.4 GHz)	X-band (~9.4 GHz)
Form Factor	Solid-Sate, Open Array	Solid-State, Open Array	Solid -State, Open Array	Solid -State, Open Array	Solid -State, Open Array
Antenna length	6 ft	6 ft	6 ft	6 ft	6 ft
Output Power	25W	120W	110 W	50 W	55 W
Max Range	72 Nm	96 Nm	96 Nm	72 Nm	72 Nm
Supply Voltage	12, 24 VDC	10, 32 VDC	12, 24 VDC	12, 24 VDC	12, 24 VDC
Nominal Power (Standby / Typical)	45W / N/A	45W / N/A	35W / 95W	N/A / 50W	30W / 70W
Cost	\$5,295.00	\$8,999.00	\$9,749.99	\$7,499.00	\$8,250.00
Rotation Speeds	24, 36, 48 rpm	24, 48 rpm	12, 24, 36, 48, 60 rpm	16 - 48 rpm	12, 24, 36, 48, 60 rpm
Horizontal Beamwidth	1.35°	1.25°	1.32°	1.2°	1.32°
Vertical Beamwidth	22°	23°	25°	25°	25°
Minimum Detection Range	6 m	6 m	6m	6 m	6 m
Weight	64.25 kg (41 lbs)	23kg (50.7 lbs)	19 kg (41.85 lbs)	31.6 kg (69.7 lbs)	28 kg (61.73 lbs)

Software Development Key	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Additional Key features	-Pulse compression -Doppler target analyzer -Beam sharpening	-”MotionScope” Doppler tracking -Pulse compression	-CHIRP pulse compression -RangeFusion and beam sharpening -Advanced Doppler target tracking	-”VelocityTrack” doppler tracking -Dual range mode -Beam sharpening	-CHIRP pulse compression -RangeFusion -Doppler target tracking

After evaluating multiple radar models, we chose Raymarine’s Cyclone 6 ft Open Array for its excellent range, performance, and integration capability in our Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS). Although Garmin’s GMR Fantom lacks an official SDK, disqualifying it for custom data extraction and control. Furuno’s DRS6ANXT does offer an SDK but it requires more extensive configuration and integration effort compared to Raymarine’s more accessible LightHouse Developers SDK, which is designed for smoother third-party application support. Simrad’s HALO® 2006 also has minimal documentation, making necessary reliance on reverse-engineering for more extensive integration which lags from it being a COTS plug and play system.

In contrast, Raymarine provides an official SDK to enable third-party software to control radar functionality. Being able to do so is valuable for collecting data on vessels in foreign waters to subsequently transmit for AIS subtraction. The Cyclone’s 60–110 W power consumption is considerably lower than the Cyclone Pro’s 150+ W, a valuable benefit for off-grid installations run on renewables. Power to the system needs to be as little as possible and the improvements the Raymarine Cyclone Pro models offer are not achievable with self sustainment.

Using a 6 ft open-array antenna, the Cyclone can detect vessels at a theoretical range of 72 nautical miles, which is sufficient for monitoring small craft crossing transoceanic routes. Its aerodynamic design reduces wind resistance, thus easing stress on mounting points, while the corrosion-proof housing resists harsh maritime environments. All these features combined make Raymarine’s Cyclone 6 ft Open Array the perfect radar choice for our MDAS, offering a balanced combination of wide coverage, simple integration, and efficient power consumption.

3.2 Maritime Environmental Challenges

The MDAS is set to face several challenges out at sea. Issues such as salt spray, high winds, vibrations, fluctuating temperatures and moisture were of high concern, which can degrade materials over time. The primary issue we discussed was corrosion in the

materials going to be used to design the system's structure. Consisting of two parts, the radar system requires an open-air frame that houses the co-axial wind turbine and a sealed enclosure to protect the system's electrical components. Both of these parts require corrosion resistant material to fight against common maritime issues like pitting and crevice corrosion where metal deteriorates at certain points causing weak spots in the design's structure. Selecting materials that can survive over maritime travel is crucial towards the MDAS' ability to maintain operation for an extended period of time. The next phase involved looking at the most popular materials to house a project like this and ensuring its durability given marine conditions.

3.2.1 Stainless Steel (316)

Stainless steel is well known for its strong mechanical properties and high resistance to corrosion in salt-heavy maritime environments. The most common grades are 304 and 316. Each type differs slightly in their elemental makeup which greatly impacts their performance.

Type 304 stainless steel is composed of majority iron, part chromium, and part nickel while type 316 is essentially the same aside from an additional bit of molybdenum to help it achieve a robust oxide film on its surface which improves resistance to chlorides and harsh chemicals. [77] As a result, it develops a great resistance to pitting and crevice corrosion. Type 304 is more commonly used in kitchen equipment and industrial cases, and we will shift our focus towards type 316 being the preferred choice in maritime applications.

316 Stainless steel's yield strength, which measures how much force can be exerted on a material before it permanently deforms, is 30 kilopounds per square inch (ksi). Its tensile strength, which measures how much force can be exerted on a material before it breaks, is 80-90 ksi. It has a density of 0.29 pounds per inch cubed. [84] These properties ensure that stainless steel can provide reliable structural performance under substantial loads.

Stainless steel offers long-term durability and low maintenance in specific maritime conditions. Its resistance to rust and corrosion allows structures to withstand the continuous exposure to saltwater, moisture, and varying temperatures at sea with minimal upkeep. Commonly used for designing boat hulls, piping and fittings, it fulfills its role for a while which can save cost in the long run. Furthermore, it also is very structurally stable with how much weight it can withstand and is well suited for environments experiencing constant vibration and heavy winds like on a boat.

However, despite these advantages, stainless steel has some major drawbacks. The first one is cost, when compared to other materials like some aluminum alloys and fiber reinforced plastics. Its complex composition and manufacturing process drives up the price of materials and definitely influences how we approach a material leaving other options to be considered. The second drawback is the weight of the material, some projects focus on specific tasks that require minimizing weight and stainless steel wouldn't be a great pick as it is quite heavy. Extra weight may cause components and machines to work harder leading to compromised efficiency in exchange for stability.

Overall it is important as engineers to understand that although stainless steel is a viable option for its great durability and corrosion resistance, these factors must be balanced by its drawbacks.

3.2.2 Aluminum Alloys (5083 & 6061)

After our consideration of stainless steel, Type 316, with its great corrosion resistance in seawater environments, the second material that we looked at was aluminum. Aluminum alloys are widely used for marine applications due to their greater strength-to-weight ratio, corrosion resistance, and versatility in both structural and enclosure designs. Given the weight limit and environmental requirements of the MDAS, we examined 2 different marine-grade aluminum alloys like types 5083 and 6061 to see if they would fit our needs.

Starting with type 5083, this alloy is widely used in marine systems where corrosion resistance is a top priority. It's made mostly of aluminum with small amounts of magnesium and chromium, allowing it to perform especially well in saltwater.[76] It's not as strong as some of the other aluminum alloys, but it also develops an oxide layer on the surface when exposed to air and water which holds up well against pitting and crevice corrosion. It achieves a yield strength of 31 ksi, a tensile strength of 44 ksi and has the density of 0.096lb/in³. Type 5083 can retain good structural performance after welding which is useful when working with frames that require long sides which need to be created in sections. We can see the use of 5083 in many ship hulls, propellers, and pumps.

Type 6061 is another type of aluminum alloy examined and is mainly used in structural and architectural applications. While it is corrosion resistant, it doesn't perform as well as 5083 where the material is constantly exposed to saltwater. The addition of silicon in the elemental composition weakens its corrosion resistance but adds the benefits of higher overall strength and better machinability. It measures a yield strength of 40 ksi, a tensile strength of 45 ksi and density of 0.098 lb/in³. It is often used in making items that are mass producible like internal automotive components, brackets or small frames.

In addition to the performance of the materials, aluminum is affordable and easier to machine. It is also much lighter than other metals which can reduce strain on the system but at the tradeoff of structural less strength.

3.2.3 Fiber Reinforced Polymers

After examining traditional marine-grade metals like stainless steel and aluminum, we explored Fiber Reinforced Polymers (FRPs) as a viable option. FRPs are different from metals as they are composite materials created by combining two materials together: a resin (which is a type of plastic) and reinforcing fibers (commonly glass or carbon). The resin is what holds everything together while the fibers are responsible for the material's strength and stiffness.

The key advantage of FRPs is that they don't behave like metals. Instead of relying on the raw strength of a single material, FRPs can be engineered by changing the way fibers are arranged. This allows parts to be strengthened in a particular way where it's needed

most and fit in a multitude of projects. The flexibility that this material provides in its design is substantial and a valuable option worth considering.

3.2.3.1 Fiber Reinforced Plastics Study

To understand how FRPs perform under real marine situations, we analyzed a research study conducted in 2021 ‘Effect of Time-Real Marine Environment Exposure on the Mechanical Behavior of FRP Composites’. FRP samples were submerged in seawater for six to twelve months in real marine environments that had varying salinity, temperature, exposure to algae and microorganisms.

Over time, the samples absorbed moisture and their surfaces showed signs of biological growth. This had a direct effect on the strength of the material. The scientists observed that voids formed inside the resin which resulted in many samples losing up to 40-50% of their original tensile strength depending on the type of resin and fiber configuration used. [82]

As a result of this experiment, it was concluded that Epoxy-based FRPs reinforced with E-glass performed better than polyester. Their structure remained more intact and the epoxy matrix was better at keeping water out. Therefore we can consider epoxy-glass FRPs a viable option for the MDAS system.

3.2.3.2 Epoxy-glass FRPs

Epoxy-glass composites are a quite popular FRP category. They are highly regarded for their mechanical stability and corrosion resistance especially in humid marine environments.

One of the most significant advantages of epoxy as a matrix is that it has very good adhesion to fibers, facilitating efficient load transfer from resin to reinforcement. This improves tensile strength and structural integrity over time. Additionally epoxy resins rarely shrink as they cure, reducing the risk of internal cracks and warping of parts that can hurt the structural integrity of the FRP. Results from the previous study in section 3.3.3.1 show that when compared to vinyl-ester and polyester, epoxy resins are more water resistant and can be more reliable in marine applications where material degradation from moisture is a concern.

The tensile strength of some Glass-Epoxy composites research ranged from 20,000 - 60,000 psi, converted to around 20 to 60 ksi. The yield strength or flexural strength found in the data sheet ranged from 40 - 80 ksi. This helps portray it as a strong option not just because of its resistance to corrosion but great structural strength comparable to its metal counterparts. From the design perspective, epoxy-glass FRPs have good stiffness-to-weight ratios and are relatively easy to mold. They appear to be a shining option as parts of the support legs or frame on the MDAS as it needs to be lightweight and very stable.

Nevertheless, epoxy-glass composites are not perfect. They perform well in withstanding mechanical loads but are also brittle and will crack upon impact or excessive flexing. In

applications like on a boat where there is an abundance of vibration, it wouldn't be very viable. Another disadvantage of epoxy resins is that UV exposure caused by the sun can slowly degrade the FRPs epoxy matrix unless specific coatings are applied. Because of these negatives, epoxy resin may not be the best option and must require more research into FRPs.

3.2.3.3 Fiber Glass Reinforced Polyurethane

Another form of FRP materials that we also considered is fiberglass-reinforced polyurethane (FRPU). This composite uses a polyurethane resin, which is softer and more elastic than the stiffer epoxy or polyester resins. While this increased flexibility may at first seem to be a disadvantage for structural application, it can in fact be a tremendous benefit in dynamic applications where impact, vibration, and movement are constant conditions. As the project's structure will be exposed to dynamic winds, torque generated from the co-axial turbine and wave-induced motion, having a material that can absorb stress without cracking is highly desirable. While the fiberglass is responsible for structural support, the polyurethane resin matrix helps it fight fatigue over time.

In real-world marine applications, FRPU composites have already proven to be a viable material solution. A good example of this is evident in Coosa's line of structural panels. Their Bluewater and Nautical series consist of polyurethane-infused panels with continuous strand fiberglass reinforcement. These panels are used across the marine industry in boats, yachts, and other seafaring vessels, particularly in areas that are exposed to water and mechanical stress over extended periods of time. Many use cases include bulkheads, which are internal walls within the hull that divide the boat into different compartments to contain water in case of floods. This material is also used as a core in the boat's internals which increases its rigidity without adding much additional weight and is also reliable for reinforcing their hulls.

Weight also plays an important consideration. Coosa's Bluewater panels are available in three standard density choices: 20, 26, and 32 pounds per cubic foot, or approximately 0.011, 0.015, and 0.019 pounds per cubic inch. Coosa's Nautical panels are available in 15, 20, and 24 pounds per cubic foot density and are distinguished by being lightweight and economical, although they are generally more suitable for non-structural uses because of their lower fiberglass content.

We would look more into the Bluewater series due to its make up of a greater quantity of fiberglass reinforcement which adds stiffness and load-carrying capability. When compared to previous metal options, fiberglass seems a fraction of the weight.

When compared to traditional plywood, FRPU boards like Coosa's are highly resistant to rot, mold and water absorption. Because of its closed-cell polyurethane matrix, even if the surface gets damaged or scratched, water would not effectively enter the material and weaken it over time. With a tensile strength ranging from 500 - 560 pounds per square inch. It is much weaker structurally than metals; however in the scope of this project, much of the system would be above water and not affected by much weight aside from mounting a radar on top of the systems frame and a turbine inside. Its strong durability, longevity and lightweight abilities portray it as a viable option.

It has limitations like the previous FRPs as prolonged exposure to ultraviolet (UV) radiation will still cause degradation of the polyurethane resin, resulting in discoloration of the surface and eventual loss of integrity of the matrix. Thus, we must consider different applications of coatings to protect the material that is selected for the project. Additionally, its low stiffness makes it less suitable for components under heavy load without extra support.

In spite of these limitations, FRPU offers a great mix of advantages for marine operations. Its low-density, water resistance, and flexible nature allows it to be used for a variety of applications. If the correct supporting materials are used, Coosa FRPU boards might be a good choice for implementing onto the MDAS design.

3.2.4 Material Comparisons

Table 3.4 - Material Comparison for MDAS Structural Components

	316 Stainless Steel	5083 Aluminum Alloy	6061 Aluminum Alloy	Epoxy Fiberglass Reinforced Polymer	Polyurethane Fiberglass Reinforced Polymer
Density	0.29lb/in ³	0.096lb/in ³	0.098lb/in ³	0.065lb/in ³	0.011 - 0.019 lb/in ³
Yield Strength (kilopounds per square inch)	30 ksi	31 ksi	40 ksi	20-60 ksi	14-53 ksi
Tensile Strength (kilopounds per square inch)	70 ksi	46 ksi	45 ksi	40-80 ksi	~0.5ksi
Pitting / Crevice Corrosion Resistance	Excellent	Good	Fair	Excellent	Excellent
Maintenance	Low	Low	Low	Low (needs UV protection)	Low (needs UV protection)
Formability	Poor (hard to shape)	Good	Excellent	Good	Good
Cost	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium

Following a thorough analysis of stainless steel, aluminum alloys, and fiber-reinforced polymers, we needed to decide what the best options were in our design. Each material presented its own advantages and trade-offs across the multitude of metrics like weight, strength, corrosion resistance, formability, and overall cost. These factors greatly influence the development of the MDAS structure, especially when broken down into the main design components: the open air external frame, the electronics components enclosure, mounting hardware for radar on the frame and the mounting of the whole MDAS system to the naval vessel it would reside on.

3.2.4.1 Weight vs Strength

In mechanical strength testing, 316 stainless steel is the strongest with tensile and yield strengths of 70 ksi and 30 ksi, respectively. This is, however, traded off against a much denser 0.29 lb/in³, which disqualifies it from applications where weight is a factor. The 5083 and 6061 aluminum alloys, however, provide a high strength-to-weight ratio with densities between 0.096 and 0.098 lb/in³. Although not as high as steel, the aluminum alloys can be a possible option as structural materials. Epoxy-glass FRPs, having tensile strengths of 40–80 ksi and densities of approximately 0.065 lb/in³, are as strong as metal but much lighter. Polyurethane-glass FRPs like Coosa's panels are not very viable in supporting the whole system with the lowest tensile strength but instead are very corrosion-resistant and light which is ideal for lighter load-carrying tasks.

3.2.4.2 Corrosion Resistance

The most important factor to address in the marine environment is corrosion. Stainless steel 316 possesses excellent crevice and pitting corrosion resistance and thus is highly suitable for external frames that are exposed to seawater but the issue of weight disqualifies it from being applicable in much of this design. Aluminum alloys are comparatively good, with 5083 being the one that forms a similar protective oxide layer. However, it is outshined by the Fiberglass Reinforced Polymers, both the epoxy and polyurethane reinforced variants. Because they are non-metallic and chemically stable in nature in marine environments, this makes them ideal use cases for those components which are in direct contact with water or those components that must be sealed for extended periods.

3.2.4.3 Maintenance and Durability

Stainless steel and aluminum metals are low maintenance but stainless steel has a longer lifespan and better resistance to mechanical deterioration. Epoxy and polyurethane composites also have low maintenance requirements but their lifespan is highly dependent on UV protection as their resin matrices can deteriorate overtime under constant exposure to sunlight without protective coatings. They would require an outer protective layer like an epoxy or paint for long-term deployment with minimal or no maintenance.

3.2.4.4 Formability and Cost

By considering various manufacturing processes, 6061 aluminum stood out with its ease of machinability and convenience in shaping. On the other hand, while stainless steel is highly resilient and resistant, it turns out to be very problematic in the fabrication process and is very difficult to work with, thereby incurring high costs associated with its production. Composites turned out easier to mold and customize for specific shapes, especially for components that require high water resistance or enclosed configurations. Regarding cost, stainless was the most expensive material. both in terms of raw materials and fabrication processes. Aluminum is in the middle of the road with medium cost and acceptable performance. Composite materials like epoxy FRPs, are more costly initially

but can be cost-saving in terms of weight and corrosion maintenance. Finally, FRPU composites, such as Coosa boards, are competitively priced and find a balance between performance and price. They are also easily customizable for a multitude of tasks.

3.2.5 Material Selection for MDAS Components

One of the main key aspects of the MDAS system is its self enclosed vertical design with every component having a lightweight and compact design. All of this has to be structurally stable and mounted on the respective vessels where they will be tested. As a result, every element has to be particularly chosen with a specific purpose in mind and work together to be successful.

3.2.5.1 Main Outer Frame

In order to fulfill the critical role as the primary external structure that would effectively sustain both the radar and turbine and ensure system integrity overall, epoxy fiberglass reinforced polymer (Epoxy-GFRP) was selected. This material possesses a very high tensile strength of 40 to 80 ksi combined with a very low density of approximately 0.065 lb/in³. Also it is a materially strong, lightweight material, which is particularly helpful in avoiding top-heaviness and improving handling when facing unexpected sudden movements on water. Additionally, its excellent resistance to corrosion guarantees that it can withstand continuous exposure to the marine environment without serious degradation.

3.2.5.2 Electronics Enclosure

The enclosure for the electrical components is located in the bottom section of the frame and should be designed ideally with polyurethane fiberglass reinforced polymer. We were specifically recommended for the Coosa's Bluewater panel to be utilized in designing parts of the structure and it seemed like a good fit. As the enclosure does not experience severe mechanical stress, it is important that it has a proper seal to protect the internals from water and other marine environmental threats. FRPU's closed cell composition and high water resistance properties make it ideal. Although it is quite weak in the tensile strength department (~0.5 ksi), its environmental resistance, reliability and machinability compensate for its weakness. Also its low weight greatly benefits the system as it reduces unwanted stress on the bottom frame.

3.2.5.3 Turbine Mounting Bracket Support

For the mounting bracket that supports the turbine, it was determined that Coosa's Bluewater panel would be utilized again. Our decision was made not based on its water resistant capabilities but rather how we deemed the specific mechanical factors that might negatively impact the enclosed turbine. This component is subjected to cyclic loads and repeated vibrations generated from the torque of its co-axial nature. Unlike rigid materials which have the tendency to crack or deform when exposed to prolonged periods of oscillatory stress, the FRPU possesses flexible characteristics. These characteristics help absorb energy and redistribute stress throughout the material rather than a single

point. The polyurethane matrix in this composite plays an important role as a dampening factor to reduce fatigue-caused damage over time. The strength of this material is determined to be strong enough to support the co-axial wind turbine chosen. Not to mention again its light-weight capabilities, we deemed it a very useful part of our systems design where routine maintenance may be difficult and infrequent.

3.2.5.4 Base Plate

The base plate is the most important part of the whole design. As the anchor that attaches the MDAS to the ship's deck, dockside platform or other maritime structures, it needs to be made from the strongest and most durable material that was researched. Based on the research findings, 316 stainless steel appeared to be the most compatible based on the requirements we decided. Its appealing tensile strength reaching up to 70 ksi, ensures the reliability for withstanding not only the static load of the system but also the dynamic loads from the wind turbine, gusts of high winds, ship movements and sea-state vibrations. Not to mention it was the densest option researched when compared to our other corrosion resistant materials. The deployment surface is key in determining the success of the project as one major collapse can render the system useless.

Furthermore, coupled with its excellent resistance to pitting and crevice corrosion, a 316 stainless steel base plate can withstand coming in contact with salt spray and trapped moisture. Its ability to resist degradation over time can be great as long as it keeps its outer protective oxide layer from the added molybdenum in its chemical makeup. Although from the looks of it, one can see that having metal on a system that would be in maritime environments for a long while is a cause for disaster. However, if it is properly prepared with protective coatings, the drawbacks can be negated and its advantages can be utilized.

3.2.6 Protective Coatings

Even with the careful selection of corrosion-resistant materials, long-term exposure to the harsh maritime environment will have a significant and negative impact on the structural integrity of the components over time. Saltwater, UV radiation, and biological fouling are major factors that contribute to surface damage and performance loss. In order to enhance the durability and reliability of a material over time, there must be coatings applied, which serve to add additional layers of protection for both the metal and composite materials utilized in the design and construction of the MDAS.

Protective coatings have two important functions: corrosion protection and fouling resistance. Anti corrosive coatings work by establishing a physical barrier to protect materials against moisture, oxygen and salt ions. Antifouling coatings are designed to stop the buildup of marine organisms such as algae, barnacles and bacteria that stick to underwater surfaces. Without the protective layers, these factors can hurt the performance of structures that utilize compromisable material.

3.2.6.1 Epoxy Coatings

Epoxy coatings are primarily used as barrier coatings to protect materials against the

environment. As explained previously, an epoxy is the formation of a tightly connected polymer that helps prevent moisture, oxygen, salts and other corrosive elements from entering a material. This is especially prominent in marine environments where this protection is crucial.

The most significant advantage of epoxy coatings is their excellent adhesion to metal and composite surfaces. This is really important as a variety of materials can go into designing a structure and having the ability to choose the best fit for the situation at hand. The flexibility allows for other design aspects to be considered before applying a protective coating.

Another advantage would be its ability to add tensile strength and integrity to the applied material. In situations of high vibrations and winds which can cause mechanical stressing, applying an extra coating can combat these factors. A study confirmed that “high-performance epoxy coatings exhibit low permeability and high durability when applied at adequate thickness and with other surface preparation”.[59] Meaning that the coating’s characteristics reduce the chances of microcracks forming, increasing a material’s water resistance.

Moreover, epoxy coatings can also be utilized in multi-layered protective layer coatings. It can be paired with a polyurethane coating, which is going to be researched in the following section, and improve a material’s UV resistance alongside providing great resistance to corrosion. This can be a very viable option to apply to metal materials discussed previously.

3.2.6.2 Polyurethane Coatings

Polyurethane coatings are another popular type of protective finish for materials in marine environments. Typically applied as topcoats over epoxy primers. The difference is that epoxy coatings help establish a layer of corrosion protection and polyurethane provides UV protection, mechanical flexibility and extra durability.

Its UV protection is a key point as polyurethane has exceptional durability when subjected to sunlight. Epoxy coating, despite being chemically and mechanically superior, undergoes degradation in UV environments. It results in the surface breaking down which releases fine powder known as chalking and begins discoloration over time. On the other hand, polyurethane excels at UV stability, maintaining its color and protection.

Polyurethane coatings also allow materials to be more abrasion and impact resistant, qualities which are really appealing when deciding on finishes for components subjected to constant motion from winds and waves.

In real-world marine systems, polyurethane topcoats have seen widespread use on offshore platforms, ship hulls, coastal facilities and many more. Because of their low maintenance costs and longer periods between services which is an ideal condition for the MDAS that would probably be installed in remote areas and rarely serviced. Properly applied over a strong epoxy primer, polyurethane coatings can greatly extend the life and

functionality of system elements that are exposed to the severe conditions of the ocean environment.

3.2.6.3 Anti-fouling Coatings

Although epoxy and polyurethane coatings cover the corrosion and ultraviolet degradation factors that might impact maritime applications, they do not protect against the biological threats that come with prolonged exposure to seawater. Marine structures are very vulnerable to biofouling, which is the buildup of unwanted biological material, including algae, barnacles, and microbial organisms on their exteriors. This can cause material deterioration and decrease overall system performance. To combat this, an extra protection layer like other coatings is typically required.

Antifouling coatings are necessary to provide long-term efficiency and integrity of marine systems. There are two main choices of antifouling coatings and they include: biocide-based coatings (BCs) and foul-release coatings (FRCs). Biocide coatings operate by releasing active chemicals agents like copper or zinc compounds, it can help drive away marine growth by creating a toxic environment on the materials surface. Although it can be very effective, this approach raises environmental concerns and loses its effectiveness over time as the coating slowly deteriorates to release its chemical ingredients.

Foul-release coatings on the other hand can provide a non-toxic solution. It is commonly made from silicone or a fluoropolymer-base. Instead of using chemical deterrents, these coatings create a surface layer with very low adhesion possibilities. Together with the movement through water, any adhered material would gradually lose its grip and brush away. This was supported by a 2024 analysis that claimed foul-release coatings performed better in the long term in minimizing biomass and organic materials, especially in areas of heavy marine growth. Their drag and foul reduction applications make it extremely useful in maritime applications.

3.2.6.4 Protective Coating Material Comparisons

Table 3.5 - Protective Coating Comparisons

	Epoxy	Polyurethane	Anti-fouling
Primary Function	Barrier against moisture, oxygen and salts	UV resistance, abrasion and impact resistant	Prevents marine growth on structural components
Application Layer	Primer/base	Topcoat over epoxy	Topcoat

Advantages	Excellent adhesion and mechanical strength Water resistant	Durable under motion and weathering	Prevents biofouling Prevent material decomposition
Limitations	UV degradation without topcoat	UV stability depends on material quality. Expensive equals better	Needs reapplications
Cost	Moderate	High	Moderate/High

Given that the MDAS would be mounted to commercial ships sailing through marine environments, the use of protective coatings are essential in providing important layers of defense from extreme environmental threats. Though biofouling can be a concern, the MDAS is more of a surface-mounted surveillance system. Mainly placed on elevated positions where it can utilize its radar to the highest potential, it becomes more exposed to sunlight, salt spray and weather. Biofouling is more common in areas where components are constantly submerged underwater where algae and microorganisms are more of a threat to the object's exterior.

To address these issues, the design would prioritize the long-lasting corrosion and ultraviolet degradation rather than antifouling. Our coating design would most likely rely on the both epoxy and polyurethane working together as they have a great synergy when used in a multi-layer system. Epoxy is used as the base layer where needed, providing enhanced adhesion, mechanical strength, and corrosion resistance. Polyurethane is used as the topcoat, offering high UV protection, color retention, and weathering resistance. Antifouling coatings may be used sparingly to combat areas where water is prone to collect or where many crevices are found after designing.

Each structural element of the MDAS has to be customized with a set of coatings based on its material composition, mechanical function and environmental exposure. The primary outer framework, which is composed of epoxy fiberglass reinforced polymer (Epoxy-GFRP), offers great strength-to-weight properties and has natural corrosion resistance. The downside is that its epoxy matrix is prone to ultraviolet degradation over time. That being said, although it doesn't require a base coat, a topcoat in the form of UV-resistant polyurethane should be applied to all exterior surfaces to shield from prolonged exposure to sunlight as well as surface abrasion.

The electronics enclosure, situated at the bottom of the structure, is constructed from polyurethane fiberglass reinforced polymer (FRPU), specifically Coosa's Bluewater panel. Although the material provides improved water resistance and reduced weight, it does not have sufficient tensile strength and is prone to ultraviolet (UV) radiation. An

epoxy primer should be applied first to close the surface and ensure adhesion then topped with a polyurethane topcoat that will prevent UV and environmental degradation to the composite.

The turbine mounting bracket, also designed from FRPU, supports the co-axial wind turbine. The component is subjected to continuous torsional and vibrational stress. While the flexible characteristic of the composite diminishes fatigue, it still benefits from protective coatings. The material will be strengthened with a surface-sealing epoxy base coat, and a polyurethane topcoat will protect it from weathering and UV degradation.

The most structurally significant component is the base plate, which is suggested to be constructed out of 316 stainless steel. Despite the corrosion resistance of stainless steel, protective coatings will enhance its life and reliability even more. A high-build epoxy primer will be used to create a strong barrier to moisture and salt, followed by the application of a polyurethane topcoat to provide resistance to ultraviolet radiation. Possibly in areas where water can be trapped, specifically at bolt holes, crevices or brackets, antifouling coatings can be applied if needed.

Overall, by examining each material's strengths and weaknesses and analyzing which structural components they would be applied to, this coating process helps in properly ensuring some of the most critical performance goals of the MDAS system: long-term durability, structural integrity, and minimal maintenance in harsh marine environments.

3.2.7 Mounting Hardware

Initially when we were presented with this project, our team thought the MDAS was going to be mounted on top of the mast of a naval vessel. However after questioning existing captains of research vessels and receiving advice from our sponsor, it was clear that it was more appropriate on top of the captain's boathouse. This led to two different renditions of the MDAS structural design shown in Figure 2.5.

3.2.7.1 Flanged Mount

A flanged mount is a form of structural support that employs a flat plate, most commonly either square or circular, along with pre-drilled holes to offer stability to the equipment that gets fixed on top. This mounting method is commonly used in engineering applications where stability, simplicity of installation, and durability against environmental stresses are of the most important. The flange plays a similar role to the base plate of the MDAS as it is another point of structural stability. It offers several points of attachment, thus enabling weight and mechanical loads to be distributed over a large surface area, reducing the risk of localized stress that could damage the mounting surface. In areas where structures are exposed to wind, vibration and other environmental factors, flanged mounts present a strong and stable solution to preparing a piece of equipment to be mounted.

They are also particularly useful in applications where the mounted equipment experiences motion or generates torque as in the case of systems with rotating components like radar arrays or wind turbines. When bolted, the flange connection can

successfully resist displacement and are typically designed out of corrosion-resistant materials like stainless steel or anodized aluminum.

Within the context of the MDAS, the flanged mount is a great option if the system is meant to be placed on the roof of a marine boathouse. Through the use of a standard bolt pattern, the system can readily be installed on different commercial or naval platforms without the need for extensive modifications. This aligns with the project's goal of a scalable, plug-and-play marine surveillance system that can be relatively deployed.

3.2.7.2 Cantilever Mount

The flanged mount provides a solid method of attaching the MDAS system to flat surfaces, including rooftops or reinforced decks. However, there are certain deployment situations in which flat mounting surfaces are not available or are impractical. In these cases, some equipment must be attached to poles, masts or vertical structural supports to achieve stability. This is where the cantilever mount reveals itself to be a viable option, it offers both structural integrity but also spatial flexibility to install items with the stated constraints.

A cantilever mount creates a bracket-type support system extending outward horizontally from a vertically placed surface, strengthened by an angle brace diagonal for supporting off-center loads. This design offers the MDAS unit with its radar array, wind turbine and optical components to be positioned clear of potential obstructions. The radar can now with a greater unrestricted line of sight, can provide more accurate readings for our system. The wind turbine has access to uninterrupted airflow when up high. Therefore the system has improved visibility, performance, and power generation efficiency.

The cantilever mount also improves the modularity and scalable aspects of the MDAS system as it allows for a greater range of surfaces and orientations, increasing the range of possible deployable locations without compromising system stability. Typically the mounts are machined out of marine-grade aluminum or coated steel to prevent corrosion and stress. Which is required in these marine environments.

3.2.7.3 Deck-penetrating Mount (Through-bolt Mount)

A deck-penetrating mount, or through-bolt mount as more commonly referred to, is a robust and durable mounting technique used in naval applications where structural strength is the top priority. This type of mount involves securing the equipment by fastening bolts directly through the mounting surface, most often use cases revolve around ship decks, platforms or reinforced docks. Through this process, it allows loads to be distributed throughout the entire thickness of the structure instead of being limited to the surface. The bolts are secured from below using lock nuts and washers creating a mechanically solid connection that will resist shear, uplift and twisting motion. In marine environments where equipment can be exposed to high winds, wave impacts or vibrations, this method can effectively provide a foundational support. The deck-penetrating mount provides a higher level of mechanical security for the mounted equipment compared to the other options. It is intended for mounting equipment intended for extended high-performance operation over a long period of time.

3.2.7.4 Mounting Hardware Comparisons

Table 3.6 - Mounting Hardware Comparisons

	Flanged	Cantilever	Deck-penetrating
Portability	Semi-permanent - can be removed with tools	Semi-permanent - can be repositioned with effort	Permanent
Installation Complexity	Low - Requires access to top surface only	Moderate - Requires bracing and precise alignment	High - Requires access to underside and sealing
Vibration Resistance	Moderate	Moderate	High
Surface	Flat, reinforced rooftops or horizontal platforms	Vertical posts, masts, or side structures	Reinforced deck, dock, or platforms with underside access
Advantages	Simple to install, evenly distributes load	Maximizes clearance Good for radar visibility and wind turbine airflow	Strongest mount; ideal for high wind/wave environments Very secure
Limitations	Requires flat surfaces May transfer vibrations into surface	Higher stress on joints Requires rigid support structure	Difficult to relocate or service
Cost	Moderate	Moderate - High	Low - Moderate

After careful evaluation of the mounting options: flanged, cantilever, and deck-penetrating, along with the functional and environmental requirements specific to the MDAS system, the flanged mount was decided to be the most suitable option for

deployment. This decision was made from a combination of technical, practical, and operational considerations that follow the project's core goals of being lightweight, portable, and self contained. The system must also be self-sufficient and not rely on the vessel's power.

The main advantage of the flanged mount is its simplicity in design. As a simple plate of metal, it is suitable for mounting on flat surfaces which are often the roofs of naval boat houses or observation platforms. With already pre drilled holes, it allows for quick mounting using standard fasteners and requires access only to the top surfaces of areas. This greatly reduces installation time and complexity which is especially worthwhile in areas where knowledgeable people or complex tools may be needed.

Moreover, the flanged mount distributes the structural load of the equipment over a greater area which helps in decreasing stress on specific areas and provides the system another stable point of support during high winds and torque caused from the enclosed wind turbine.

When comparing the flanged mount with the other options, the deck-penetrating mount provides better structural support but it requires access to the underside of the mounting surface. This entails a lot of manual labor in its installation and makes it less ideal for simple or immediate use. Similarly when compared to the cantilever mount, which is suited for mounting on vertical poles or masts to offer more clearance, it too requires more work and setup. Specific mechanical stress points for attachment must be calculated and designed for the MDAS unit thereby complicating the whole process.

Finally, the flanged mount supports the modularity and plug-and-play capability demanded by the project's scope. It employs a standard bolt pattern which simplifies mounting the system on most platforms without the requirement for a custom adapter or part. Such flexibility is essential for a scalable solution that can be used across different maritime applications, from coastal structures and harbors to fixed on maritime vessels. Through these decisions, the flanged mount enables the MDAS unit to be easily deployable, have structural stability and be durable over some period of time out in maritime conditions with minimal maintenance.

3.3 Optical Technology Substitution Feasibility

For this project, the primary objective is to utilize radar technology to carry out our main goal of expanding maritime domain awareness. Overall, our team chose radar because of its proven reliability in harsh conditions. However, we also explored the option of using other optical technologies to accomplish the same goal.

3.3.1 LiDAR Imaging System

One of these options would be using a Light Detection and Ranging system or LiDAR system. In the case of our project, it is not feasible to replicate a system in the allotted time and budget, but the following details the ideal solution and its working principles (59). The LiDAR system has a wide variety of applications in different fields, including scientific, industrial, and militaristic. The main principle of LiDAR is that it uses laser

pulses fired into the atmosphere in which radiation is continuously scattered back toward the laser and then collected and measured by a telescope with a photomultiplier (57). This information is then processed and provides the distance traveled by the laser pulse. Laser pulses are optimal for this process because of their narrow bandwidth, which makes it possible to measure the concentration of molecules along the path. The main advantage of using LiDAR is that it can provide precise positioning over large areas, as well as the quick transmission timing of the laser pulses (60). The detail and speed that are accomplished using this system are almost otherwise unmatched. LiDAR works using a

principle called the lidar equation, or $P = \frac{E_0 T A \beta(r)}{2r^2} \exp\left[-2 \int_0^r a(r') dr'\right]$ which is

derived from the energy, dE , received at the telescope after the backscatter is given by

$$dE = E_0 T A \frac{\beta(r) dr}{r^2} \exp\left[-2 \int_0^r a(r') dr'\right].$$


In these equations, E_0 is the initial laser pulse

energy, T is related to the optical efficiency of the receiver, A is the telescope area, $\beta(r)$ is the volume backscatter coefficient of the atmosphere at range r , and $a(r')$ is the volume extinction coefficient at range r' (57). For the basic working principles, two measurements need to be taken into account, the position of the system and the distance of the object. There are two main types of LiDAR imaging: airborne and terrestrial. For airborne LiDAR the system is normally installed at the bottom of the aircraft looking downwards. Within this category, there are two subtypes: topographic and bathymetric. Topographic systems are mainly used for landscapes, while bathymetric systems are used for measuring elevation and depth of water. Terrestrial LiDAR systems can either be one- or two-dimensional and scan in either 180 or 360 degrees. There are two subtypes for topographic modeling as well, static and mobile modeling, which relates to whether the scanning system is mounted on a stationary tripod or a moving vehicle. For the case of our project, we would most likely be looking at a mobile terrestrial system that would be mounted on the mast of the ship. With this system there are some drawbacks, especially with the conditions we require it to function under. With the conditions of the open ocean, an incredibly precise system is required in order to stabilize the laser pulse. There are also issues of impeded operation due to precipitation in the atmosphere, given that the added water particles increase scattering and absorption and degrade the accuracy of receptors. Especially for using the Starlink satellite system as specified in the constraints, there is an incredibly small target that needs to be hit, which requires a multitude of corrective measures in both software and hardware. For a LiDAR detection system, there are some advantages over a radar-based or visual-based detection method. When looking at the current market options, there is usually a camera system for distances less than a kilometer, or radar for distances greater than a kilometer. The camera-based method can be quite capable in the near field but suffers from light distortion from the surface of the water. There is also the fact that real-world positioning cannot be provided without a third-party system running code and doing data analysis. Overall, research relating to LiDAR systems on maritime vessels is quite limited at the current moment, but it has been shown that object detection for both camera and LiDAR systems is heavily influenced by the motion of the vessel. This increased and erratic motion leads to misfires and discontinuities from the detection system (59). Another disadvantage of LiDAR

imaging systems is that there is a higher cost of equipment and maintenance since the parts are more complex, which is something we are trying to avoid in our project.

3.3.1.1 LiDAR Imaging vs. Radar Imaging

The basic purpose behind LiDAR and Radar are the same, detecting the presence and volume of distant objects (61). However, the process behind how they each work is very different. While LiDAR uses infrared laser beams, radar uses radio waves to generate an image. Using the infrared laser, a 360-degree scan is made and then a point cloud of the surrounding environment is created. This point cloud is then manipulated by software to create an accurate 3D map of the environment with high resolution. Since radar is less precise, it is more useful for larger object detection (i.e. ships and aircraft).



Radar vs LiDAR data comparison (61)

While LiDAR may be more precise and have higher resolution, radar has the great advantage of being able to operate in adverse weather conditions, which is imperative for our project. In order for our system to work properly, the signal must be able to transmit through intense waves, salt spray, thunderstorms, and high wind conditions.

Table 3.7 - Radar vs LiDAR comparison


Category	LiDAR System	Radar System
Operating Principle	Uses short laser pulses to measure distances using time-of-flight calculations	Uses radio waves to detect an object's range, speed, and angle

Operating Wavelength	Typically 905-1550 nm (near infrared)	Radio Waves: HF (0.003 - 0.03 GHz) VHF (0.03 - 0.3 GHz) UHF (0.3 - 1 GHz) L (1 - 2 GHz)
Resolution	High spatial resolution; produces detailed 2D and 3D maps	Lower spatial resolution; more adept at detecting larger objects
Active or Passive Sensor?	Active	Active
Accuracy	Very accurate distance measurements (within 1-3 cm)	Accurate, but less precise measurements (10-30 cm)
Effective Range	Short to medium range (up to approx. 250 m)	Long range (500+ m); size of antennae limits lateral resolution
Weather Sensitivity	Affected by any precipitation, as well as dust	Still performs well in deteriorating weather conditions
Light Sensitivity	Direct sunlight can affect performance; reflections from the surface of bodies of water can impede imaging	Unaffected by lighting conditions
Object Detection	Good for detecting smaller shapes and textures	Good for larger objects and motion tracking
Data Output Formatting	High-density point cloud	Lower resolution but includes movement data
Processing Requirements	Higher due to complex data	Lower since data isn't as complex
Cost Analysis	More expensive to build and maintain	More affordable and developed technologies are available
Size and Form Factor	Larger system, specifically with rotating types	Smaller systems are available

LiDAR vs. Radar Comparison Chart

3.3.2 Camera System

Another optical technology that was considered was the use of cameras to create the tracking overlay. Cameras make use of a passive sensor to create images. Passive sensors detect the natural radiation (in this case sunlight) from the environment to produce the output (62). The nature of the passive sensor prevents it from functioning perfectly in both direct sunlight and total darkness and therefore requires extra lighting or add-ons to correctly process images. Cameras only capture images in two dimensions, meaning there is no depth to the produced images. This lack of depth perception can be a bit challenging when analyzing images, as it can often identify false positives. The two main kinds of image sensors that cameras use are Complimentary Metal Oxide Semiconductor (CMOS) and Charge-Coupled Device (CCD) sensors. The sensor itself is a semiconductor that converts optical images into digital signals for further processing (63). The imaging process itself begins when the input light passes through the lens and hits the sensor. In order to convert the light into an electrical signal, the photoelectric effect is used for the conversion, which is proportional to the intensity of the incoming light source. The electrical signals from all the photosites in the sensor are passed to the camera's image processor, which interprets all the information to determine each pixel's individual color and brightness (64).



How cameras create a digital image (64)

While a sensor's megapixel count is important for image resolution, the physical size of the sensor is also important. For example, if two sensors have the same total pixel count but one is physically larger than the other, then each photosite on the larger one must be bigger. While cameras are great for creating clear visuals of the surrounding environment, for our project's distance requirements radar is the clear choice moving forward. However, we will still be integrating a camera system into our project. This imaging system will be used to take pictures of identifying features of ships encountered offshore for surveillance purposes.

3.3.2.1 CCD Camera Sensors

The CCD sensor was the first advancement that allowed images to be captured without using film, which revolutionized photography at the time. The CCD sensor is comprised of a silicone surface on which an integrated grid of semiconductor capacitors that are capable of holding an electric charge are etched (64). The capacitors act as photosites, with the charge being directly proportional to the light that hits it. The photoactive region of the pixel is known as the depletion region, in which the photons are converted to electric charges (63). The charge from each photosite is then held in a series of potential wells by gate electrodes and then transferred from well to well through the sensor grid. The charge collected in each pixel is relayed from pixel to pixel in columns first and then converted to a horizontal register using clock pulses. The optimization of a single readout has a uniformity advantage, but this also causes the speed at which the image is acquired to be limited. In terms of image accuracy, the image maintains order by reading the electrons as they arrive at the output node, which can lead to a few limitations which in turn slows down the image acquisition process. The first of which is there is only one output node per sensor, meaning each pixel passes through the one node. The second is if the electrons are transferred too fast they end up repelling each other, which can easily be prevented by slowing the transfer speed but this further delays the readout. The third is that the entire sensor must be cleared of all electrons before the next exposure to light.

- Time Delay and Integration (TDI) Operation

The Time Delay and Integration, or TDI, is a method of image acquisition that achieves high speed, high resolution, and high sensitivity scanning over a wide area. This method of scanning has evolved from line scanning, in which a camera captures line after line of single rows of pixels. These cameras are plagued by low resolution, while TDI cameras maintain high resolution by scanning multiple lines. These lines are integrated from a single pixel row onto the next as the object passes through the sensor. The resulting image quality is greatly improved and does not have as concrete lighting requirements.

- Front and Back Illuminated CCD

The main difference between a front and back-illuminated CCD imaging sensor relates to how the incident photons travel to the photoactive region of the sensor. In a front-illuminated sensor, the photons strike the same side of the device as the gate electrodes. This design leads to a limitation on how many photons reach the photosensitive region, due to there being a chance of gate electrodes absorbing or reflecting the present photons. Since there are fewer photons reaching the photosensitive region, this can typically limit the Quantum Efficiency (QE) to around 50% - 60%. In contrast, the back-illuminated CCDs have the photons striking the back side of the device. In order for this to work properly, the silicone substrate is thinned which allows access to the photosensitive region. Since there is no direct contact with the gate electrodes, there is less of a possibility of the electrons reflecting or absorbing, which results in a QE of up to 95%. These sensors are often characterized by a higher sensitivity and low noise (63).

- Multiport CCD

One main disadvantage of using a CCD sensor is related to the limited readout speed as discussed above. The multiport CCD is a way to remedy this setback, designed for higher resolution cameras. This multiport (or multi-tap) technology divides the camera sensor into several different image areas which can be processed in parallel for increased readout speed. While this decreased processing time is enticing, this also comes with a trade-off of needing additional amplifiers and ADCs per additional sensor.

- Thermoelectrically Cooled CCD

Within the CCD sensor, there is a linear relationship between increasing temperature and dark current. This in turn increases noise in the image and can lead to decreased image quality unless the heat is dissipated. An effective way to dispel heat from the sensor is using a built-in thermoelectric cooler. These coolers come in single- and multi-stage models and can maintain temperatures down to -70 degrees Celsius, depending on the amount of stages present. It is imperative the number of stages reflects the ambient temperature conditions.

- Full-Frame CCD

In a full-frame CCD (FF CCD), the semiconductor region functions as both a photoactive element and a charge-transfer device. During the process of integration, the pixel location accumulates the electric charge in response to incident photons. After integration has been completed, the charge packets are vertically transported through the pixel locations toward a horizontal shift register. This specific sensor allows the entire surface of the CCD to be light sensitive, which in turn maximizes the number of pixels that are included, and therefore also maximizes the portion of each pixel that is capable of converting the photons into electrons. While this is a pretty big advantage, a major limitation of this system is a mandatory mechanical shutter to block the incoming light after the completed exposure period. This is due to the fact that all light must be drained from the photoactive areas, or else the charge packets would corrupt between readouts.

- Frame-Transfer CCD

The Frame-Transfer (FT) CCD allows the camera to reap partial benefits of the FF CC, while almost entirely eliminating the need for a shutter. This can be accomplished by dividing the CCD into two equal sections, comprised of a normal light-sensitive imaging array and a storage array shielded from the incident light. After initial integration, the pixels' charge packets are quickly transferred to the storage array where the readout occurs. As the readout is processed, the active pixels can begin accumulating the charge for the next image. This leads to a higher frame rate compared to the full-frame CCD. Although these are functional without the shutter, they are subject to an effect called vertical smear, which comes from the transfer of charge packets not being fast enough, therefore leaving the image slightly altered. While this model comes with

advantages, a pretty major disadvantage is that the image quality is decreased, since the number of pixels is essentially cut in half.

- **Interline-Transfer CCD**

This type of CCD camera builds on the FT CCD, except it aims to reduce the vertical smear as much as possible. This system works to eliminate the vertical smear by providing a more thorough storage network of regions that are adjacent to each photoactive region. After the initial exposure is complete, every charge packet in the sensor is simultaneously transferred to a non-light-sensitive vertical shift register (65). This system type creates an electronic shutter rather than a mechanical one and produces a very minimal smear. Additionally, integration occurs in tandem with the readout, maintaining a higher frame rate. Although these do not require the larger and more expensive storage options of the FT CCD, they are overall less efficient in the means of converting photons to electrons. This is due to each pixel location now having both a photodiode and a portion of a vertical shift register. This is because the pixel is now not entirely light-sensitive, and less electric charge is generated.

Table 3.8 - CCD Comparison

CCD Sensor Type	Key Features	Spectral Range	Applications
Back-Thinned	Visible, UV, Near IR; Line and area sensor options; High-speed type; Low noise type	Visible, UV, Near IR, DUV	Line scan cameras, spectrometers, image readout
Back-Thinned TDI	TDI gives high sensitivity; high-speed, continuous image acquisition; back-thinned structure ensures high sensitivity from UV to IR; multiple ports for high-speed line rate	UV to Near IR	Sequential imaging of moving objects; flow cytometry; semiconductor inspection; inspection tasks
Front-Illuminated	Line and area sensor options; high-speed response; high sensitivity; TDI operation	Visible, UV, Near IR, DUV	Foreign object screening; high-speed imaging; industrial inspection; low light level detection; spectrometers
Back-Illuminated	Enhanced NIR sensitivity; low readout noise	Enhanced NIR	Space telescope

X-Ray	100% fill factor; TDI operation; Low dark current; wide dynamic range; fiber optic plate with/without scintillator	X-Ray	X-ray imaging; non-destructive inspection; dental panorama
Multiport	Built in high speed readout amplifier; TE-cooled options; line rate 1000-10000 lines/s; data rate 5 - 40 MHz	Visible, UV, Near IR, DUV	Foreign object screening; machine vision; DNA sequencing; Raman Spectroscopy
Thermoelectrically Cooled	Single and multi-stage options	Visible, UV, Near IR, DUV	Intensive imaging systems
Full-Frame	Larger photoactive area, high image quality, mechanical shutter	Visible to Near IR	Astronomy, low-light imaging
Frame-Transfer	Resistive gate structure for high-speed transfer; low image lag	Visible to Near IR	Spectrophotometry
Interline-Transfer	Reduces vertical smear; fast non-mechanical shutter; high frame rate, lower fill factor	Visible	Consumer cameras, surveillance video

3.3.2.2 CMOS Camera Sensors

Unlike CCD sensors, the CMOS sensor converts charge into voltage directly in the pixels, where the voltage amplification and quantization create the digital output (66). These camera sensors are known for high frame rates and excellent image quality and have often replaced CCD sensors since they can typically achieve these results with a lower required power. These sensors can read the electric signals much quicker, which is imperative for high-speed shooting sequences (64). In terms of manufacturing, CMOS sensors have the same basic structures found in computer microprocessors allowing for more efficient mass production efforts at a lower cost.

The CMOS sensor itself is made up of a grid of millions of small pixels, or photosites. Each pixel has different capacity levels that correlate to the amount of electrons that can be stored in it. At full-well capacity, this means that the maximum amount of electrons that can be held are stored within the pixel. This in turn produces the maximum amount of photons and a higher amount of electrons. When the pixel is at saturation capacity, this is the optimal level of photons and electrons to produce a quality image. When the image is oversaturated, it contains unnecessary information which can degrade the image

quality. The absolute sensitivity threshold of the pixel is the minimum number of photons that produce an image that can be distinguished from the noise gathered from the background. The lower this threshold is the more sensitive the camera sensor is, which can be helpful for low-light situations. With most electronic sensors, there is still a value the sensor picks up when there is no light present. This is called temporal dark noise, and as exposure and time increase electrons are generated without the presence of light. For most applications, a lower dark noise value is preferred. Once photons from incident light enter the photosite, the photodiode converts the light into an electrical current corresponding to the intensity of the detected light. After the signal is amplified, it is sent to an analog-to-digital converter (ADC), and the resulting digital information is sent to an image processor. The processor takes all of the digital signals and translates them into a cohesive final image, which is in part due to each pixel having an assigned value. This value correlates to the amount of light and the resulting electric charge. In order for color images to be created, a color filter array must be added, since the sensor only detects light, not color. The filter array contains a pattern of RGB filters in a grid formation, with one filter for each pixel. The filters are laid on top of the photosensitive areas so that each pixel is only exposed to red, green, or blue light.

- Front illuminated sensor

In terms of illumination, there are two types of basic CMOS sensors. For the front-side illuminated (FSI) CMOS sensor design, all of the wiring and circuitry that is necessary for the electronic functions are on top of the photodiode. This was one of the original designs and was proven to be not as effective when designing newer models. The incident light has to travel between the wires to get to the photodiode beneath, which creates more noise in the images due to the interference.


- Back illuminated sensor

In order to increase the image quality and overall effectiveness of the CMOS sensor, the back-illuminated (BSI) sensor was designed. By flipping the original FSI design, the need for the light to work its way through the wires is eliminated. Since there is no longer to obstacle of circuitry, there is a much greater surface area exposed to the incoming light. This results in a quicker readout speed and makes the most of an electronic shutter. This leads to much higher image quality, lower noise readout, and maximizes efficiency from the sensor.

- Stacked sensor

Another variation of the CMOS camera sensor is the stacked sensor. While the BSI greatly increased the quality of the produced images, the goal of the stacked sensor is to increase the speed at which the images are produced. In original CMOS designs, the signal readout from each individual pixel must travel the strips of wiring to the other side of the sensor for proper processing. By introducing the stacked processors, the distance that the signals need to travel is drastically decreased which results in faster processing speeds. These stacked sensors consequently have better autofocus due to the faster readout and

heightened processing power. These qualities all result in the stacked sensors outperforming the BSI CMOS sensors in almost all basic performance functions.



Front v back illumination v stacked (68)

- Global shutter

The global shutter system is normally added onto a stacked CMOS camera sensor. It has all of the benefits of heightened resolution and accuracy, and also has almost instantaneous scanning speed. The shutter comes close to having a 1/80,000-second capture speed, resulting in crisp photos at incredibly high resolutions. The tradeoffs for such high speed is a louder shutter noise, which in comparison is not as big a deal compared to low quality (68).

Table 3.9 - CMOS Comparison

CMOS Sensor Type	Structure Description	Speed / Frame Rate	Noise Performance	Best Uses
Front-Illuminated	The light must pass through internal wiring before reaching the photoactive area	Moderate	Moderate	General photography ; common in phone cameras
Back-Illuminated	Light directly hits the photoactive area; the inverse of the FSI system	High	Good	Low-light settings; astrophotography

Stacked	CMOS sensor and circuitry are stacked	High	Very Good	High-speed video settings; more advanced photography
Global Shutter	The image frame is captured simultaneously	Very high	Excellent	Fast motion capture; machine vision

3.3.2.3 CCD vs. CMOS Sensors

The CCD and CMOS camera sensors complete the same function quite similarly, but they both have distinct differences which can cause either one to excel in various applications. Both of the sensors convert light to an electric charge as the basic function. In the CCD sensor, all of the pixels' charges in the photoactive zone are sent into limited output nodes. More often than not, there is only one output node for voltage transfer into an analog signal (69). Output uniformity is a key component in achieving the high image quality. In regards to the CMOS sensor, each pixel undergoes the charge-to-voltage conversion, with add-ons built into the sensor to maximize the quality of the output digital bits. The addition of the other functions (amplifiers, noise-correction, digitization, etc.) makes the CMOS sensor more complicated, and therefore less of the photoactive region is available for the light capture process. Also since each pixel does its own conversion process, the uniformity is not present like in the CCD sensor but the parallel functionality still allows for effective high-speed processing. When these two sensors were introduced to the photography market in the late 1960s - early 1970s, the CCD sensor became the dominant method because of the higher quality images it produced with the available technology. Currently, CMOS and CCD sensors are both mainstream technologies each producing excellent results. For our project, we will be integrating a stacked CMOS camera sensor. The CMOS sensor is more compact, cheaper, and has better power consumption.

- Consumer Availability

In the case of consumer applications, such as cell phone cameras, the majority of research has been focused on fine-tuning the performance of smaller camera sensors that can produce high-quality results. This development resulted in vast improvements in image quality along with decreased pixel size. Due to the ever-growing population as well as ever-evolving smartphone technology the demand for better camera quality has also increased. This intense demand increase has led to a high volume of imaging systems being put into production for smartphones and other camera equipment. With lower power consumption and higher integration capabilities, CMOS imaging sensors outperform CCD sensors in almost every performance parameter.

- Machine Vision Systems

In terms of machine vision, many of the advancements that made consumer cameras excel have been invested in current technologies. This means that the majority of CCD sensors have also been passed up for more streamlined CMOS sensor technologies. Key factors in this selection are capture speed and noise production. In the case of CMOS sensors, the parallel linescan data pathway allows the amplifiers to maintain a low bandwidth. Once the signal reaches the interface between the imager and off-chip circuitry all of the data is digitized (69). High-speed CCD sensors do have parallel performance capabilities, but since they do not perform at this same level the resulting bandwidth is high which leads to a higher noise level.

- Near Infrared Imaging Systems

To obtain images in the near-infrared (NIR) wavelength (700 nm to 1000 nm) the image sensor needs to have a thicker photon absorption region. This is due to the infrared photons absorbing deeper into the semiconductor's silicone than visible light photons. In this case, the CCD models specifically made for near-infrared capabilities are more sensitive to infrared photons than CMOS models. Since CMOS sensors are fabricated to high volume processes, they are designed to be mainly insensitive to the NIR range. Increasing the thickness of the photoactive sensor region degrades the ability to resolve spatial features if the thicker layer isn't paired with a higher pixel bias or a lower epi doping level. When you change the voltage or the epi doping level however, this affects the operation of the CMOS sensor in both the analog and digital circuitry.

- UV Imaging System

When it comes to the UV spectrum, both options come with considerable trade-offs, however, the CMOS sensor is a slightly better option than the CCD sensor. Unlike the NIR sensor, ultraviolet photons are absorbed very close to the surface of the silicone image sensor. This means that a UV imaging system must not have thicker silicone layers, such as polysilicon, nitride, or thick oxide layers that would prevent proper photon absorption. In order to combat this, modern UV imaging systems are normally back-thinned with a thin AR coating on top of the imaging surface. Unfortunately, there is a very fine balance between an effective back-thinned model and a working UV imaging system. In order to produce a quality UV response, the surface of the imager must be carefully crafted and require specialty treatments, regardless of the sensor type. Back-thinned imaging sensors often have thicker oxide layers, which is not suitable for the production of UV images. Another option is the back-thinned surface is passivated with a highly doped boron layer, which goes too deep into the silicone layer (69). This in turn leads to most of the UV photons being lost in recombination, leading to a very poor image quality. As a general rule of thumb, a UV imaging response can be achieved in all varieties of line scan imaging systems, but not in all area imaging systems. When it comes to global shutter systems, the CCD sensor can not be back-thinned while the CMOS sensor can. This doesn't come without drawbacks,

unfortunately, as the storage node must be shielded when in a back-thinned sensor but only if the system is computing both visible and UV images. This shielding is not effective in protecting all parts of the pixel from the incident illumination without negatively affecting the sensor's fill factor ability. The other options for back-thinned global shutter CMOS sensors do not produce high-quality images, due to high noise, rolling shutter, or a lower full-well capacity.

- **Time Delay and Integration Imaging System**

When it comes to time delay and integration (TDI) imaging systems, typically CMOS sensors produce higher-quality images. These image sensors are most commonly used in machine vision systems and work very similar to line scan sensors, but they often have hundreds of lines. These sensors are often implemented when signals are weaker since the multiple snapshots can be superpositioned to create a stronger signal. CCD TDI sensors have great sensitivity, but they eventually reach a speed limit. CMOS sensors have the speed advantage, but the voltage-domain TDI sensor is more complicated and therefore more costly to produce on a reasonable manufacturing level. Overall, the voltage-domain centered CMOS cameras provide the highest quality images.

- **Cost Considerations**

In terms of the project, it is important to consider the cost breakdown of the two types of camera sensors. Camera sensors that are already available on the market are always cheaper than custom options. If there are customizations that are imperative to the system function, it is generally cheaper to develop a CCD sensor. Since CMOS sensors use more expensive components and typically have more circuitry, they are more expensive as a result. Since the goal of our project is to be consumer-friendly, we will be choosing an already existing camera sensor to keep costs more reasonable.

Table 3.10 - CCD vs CMOS Comparison

Feature	CCD	CMOS
Image Quality	Good image quality	Superior image quality in multiple scenarios
Readout Speed	Slower compared to most CMOS models	Faster readout due to parallel functionality
Power Consumption	Higher power consumption	Lower power
Cost	Overall less expensive; faster discontinued models can lead to more expenses down the line	More expensive components for custom sensors; high production volume makes market sensors cheaper

Size	Sensor modules are larger	Compact models are more readily available
Shutter	Some models can avoid rolling shutter effects	Global shutter should be in place to prevent rolling shutter issues
Lighting	Back-thinned for low-lighting Daylight operation is optimal	Back-illumination for low light Daylight operation is optimal
Hardiness	With proper casing, general weatherproofing can be achieved	More compact module design makes weatherproofing easier
Motion	A frame-transfer model can help balance out the ship's constant movement	Global shutter is best for constant ship motion

3.3.2.4 Camera vs. Radar

The main difference between camera sensors and radar sensors is that cameras are passive technology while radar is active. The camera sensor detects the natural radiation from the environmental light and creates the resulting image (61). While radar can function perfectly fine in complete darkness, a camera sensor needs ambient light to perform basic imaging functions. In addition to lighting being a key component of the effectiveness of a camera system, weather also plays a big part in the quality of images produced. If rain beads up on the lens, it can affect the resulting image and prove ineffective for the main goal of the project. That being said, a camera system would be more energy efficient, but since it is not as effective in other crucial parts of this project we will be using a radar system.

3.3.3 Fiber Optics Communication

Another method that was considered for this project was using fiber optics for communication methods. Optical fibers are typically made from glass, and use transmitted light to convey information. Fiber Optic system are often regarded as being superior to their metallic-conductor counterparts due to much larger bandwidth capabilities (70). Additional advantages to fiber-based communication systems are electrical isolation, exemption from electromagnetic interference, low power loss, and being generally more lightweight compared to other transmission systems. Since fiber optics are a light-based system, a grounding connection does not need to be established. As a result, the transmitter and receiver are isolated from each other and do not experience the constraints of a ground loop. Some of the general applications of fiber optics systems are communications, sensing, power delivery, and illumination.

3.3.3.1 Fiber Optics Communication vs. Radar

The main difference between fiber optics and radar communications is the transmission medium. For radar communication, the signal is transmitted through space or the air. The transmission relies on the signal being reflected between the transmitter and receiver to function properly. In terms of fiber optic transmission, the visible light is internally reflected in the optical fibre. In terms of our project's goals, fiber optic transmission is not a feasible option. The main goal is to create the AIS system overlay using the radar sensor, and with fiber optics this is not possible. Radar is dependent on the signal reflecting off of surrounding objects, while fiber optic networks are based on total internal reflection. Also, since ships are not stationary, a fiber optic transmission network for communication would not be feasible either.

3.4 Additional Ship Identification System

The original desired outcome of optical integration into this project was the intention to reproduce the same outcome that was outlined by the radar system. However, with our time and budgeting constraints, as well as overall greater disadvantages, it is not feasible to recreate the system using optical technologies. In an ideal scenario, we could work to replace the radar with a LiDAR scanning system however this comes with an extensive amount of troubleshooting, specifically relating to weather-dependent functionality.

In an effort to still include optics in the project's design, we are adding an additional imaging system to the main system, in addition to the AIS tracking overlay. The goal of this secondary imaging system is to provide additional information to operators that highlight suspicious vessels while offshore. The purpose of the camera will be to identify and capture images of the names and physical attributes of ships that may be deemed suspicious or do not have AIS tracking enabled. This imaging system will be comprised of a stacked CMOS camera sensor and a stationary magnification lens system, similar to a telescope setup. This camera will be mounted on a motor for a greater horizontal range of motion, which allows for greater surveillance capabilities.

3.4.1 Camera Sensor Selection

As stated within the contents of section 3.4.2 there are different advantages and disadvantages to the multitude of camera sensors available on the market. When considering maritime environments, as well as mounting height, we must take into account a property called atmospheric turbulence. Similar to how heat waves create shimmering distortions above high-temperature surfaces, images of distant objects are distorted in telescopes due to variations of heat in the Earth's atmosphere (71). Due to the temperature variations, the light moves in slightly different directions in different places on the entrance aperture, otherwise known as random fluctuations of the refractive index of the light. These variations create distortions through the lens onto the final image. This effect must be kept in mind when taking into account the height of the imaging system and the operating distance we are aiming for. In terms of the sensor itself, there is no damage to the hardware, the distortion effect takes place as the light hits the lens, but this does still lead to the sensor capturing the distorted image.

The average height of a merchant marine vessel is around 35 meters. This height correlates to the ground layer of the atmosphere, where atmospheric distortion is the strongest (72). This means that it is incredibly important to keep the atmospheric turbulence in mind. In order to combat atmospheric turbulence, post-processing can be done using software, adaptive optics can be integrated into the sensor, or we can choose a sensor that operates in the NIR spectrum. For the optical system, it would be best to utilize a stacked CMOS sensor, due to the higher image quality and more compact design. In order to select a specific CMOS sensor, a few qualities need to be kept in mind: pixel size, sensor size, resolution, and camera mounts (73).

- Pixel Size

Each camera sensor is made up of individual pixels that all collect incoming photons. The sensor being made up of individual pixels also helps the sensor determine where the incident photon is coming from (74). Pixels come in different sizes, which has an effect on the sensitivity and resolution. For larger pixels, more photons are collected which increases the sensitivity of the sensor but this decreases the resolution. For smaller pixels, the sensor is able to obtain a higher resolution but does not have as high of sensitivity. Generally speaking, a higher pixel count does make better image quality.

- Sensor Size

Sensor size is determined by the number of pixels present. By taking the surface area of the sensor and dividing it by pixel size, you are able to find the size of the sensor. Similar to pixel size, the general rule of thumb for sensor size is also a larger sensor and better image quality. This is due to the fact that a greater surface area of the sensor normally correlates to larger pixel sizes, and more photons being collected.

- Resolution

The resolution of a camera is the ability of the imaging device to resolve two points that are close to each other (74). When the resolution is higher, the smaller the details that can be obtained in the final image. Resolution is affected by pixel size, magnification, the lenses, and the Nyquist limit. The following equation can help determine resolution: $Resolution = (\frac{pixel\ size}{magnification}) * 2.3$, where the 2.3 correlates to the Nyquist Limit. This limit determines whether a sensor can differentiate between two neighboring objects. This quality is going to be very crucial in choosing a sensor for our system design, since we are working with farther distances the resolution should be high to be able to make out smaller details on the ship.

- Camera Mount

There are different mounting methods when it comes to attaching a lens system to a camera sensor. The four main types are C-Mount, CS-Mount, F-Mount, and Mxx-Mount. The lens flange focal distance (FFD) and the camera mount flange distance must be exactly the same or else there could be focusing issues that arise within the system (73).

An important part of imaging through the telescope is understanding angular resolution. This refers to the smallest angle that can be perceived within an image [94]. This is incredibly important for the details that we are aiming to capture.

Table 3.11 - Mounting Camera Comparison

Mount Type	Structure Description	Mechanical Depth (FFD)	Diameter	Best Uses
C-Mount	The most common mount;	17.526 mm	12.54 mm x 32 TPI	Very common
CS-Mount	5 mm shorter than C-Mount	12.526 mm	12.54 mm x 32 TPI	Precise back focal distance
F-Mount	Bayonet-style mount; designed for 35 mm format cameras; no back focal adjustment possible	Varies	Varies	Cameras with bigger sensors
Mxx-Mount	MXX relates to the diameter, thread pitch, and FFD (i.e. M72)	Varies	Varies	Alternative to F-Mount for larger sensors

Mounting Bracket Comparison

3.4.2 Lens System

For the proposed imaging system, we are implementing a stationary lens magnification system. Our ideal parameters for this system are: 7.5x magnification, a telescope-based lens system, and an operating distance of 5 -7 km. The goal is to take pictures of ships that the system encounters while offshore as an additional safety net, so the system should be able to operate at a medium distance range, we are not looking to image the horizon. In order to effectively choose a lens system there are a few parameters we need to further explore: field of view, lens resolution, magnification, focal length, and working distance.

- Field of View

The field of view (FOV) references the viewable area that is able to be imaged by the lens system. This area is the portion of the object that fills the sensor of the camera (75). It can either be a horizontal/vertical distance (mm) or an angular distance [AFOV] (degrees). This viewable area is influenced by the focal length of the lens and the size of the sensor. The FOV can be determined using the following equations: $Horizontal\ FOV = 2 * WD * \tan(\frac{AFOV}{2})$ (76) $AFOV = 2 * \tan^{-1}(\frac{Sensor\ Horizontal}{2 * f})$ (76). Since our lens system will have a fixed magnification value, the equation to find FOV is $FOV = \frac{H}{M}$, where H is the sensor size and M is the fixed magnification value (75).

- Lens Resolution

While it is important to consider the resolution of the camera sensor itself, there is also the resolution of the camera lens that must be considered as well. A lens's ability to accurately resolve an image is limited by diffraction. As light travels through the lens aperture, it diffracts before hitting the sensor which creates a diffraction pattern. This pattern is known as an Airy pattern, with the bright spot in the middle being called the Airy disk. This disk has an angular radius given by $\theta = 1.22(\frac{\lambda}{D})$, where D is the diameter of the lens in meters. It is important to note that different points on an image produce different Airy patterns and the distance between points affects its ability to be resolved. If the angular separation between two points is greater than the angular radius of their Airy disk resolution is possible, otherwise the image merges (74). Consequently, the diameter of the lens determines resolution and has an inverse relationship to the angular radius of the Airy disk.

- Magnification

The magnification (M) of an optical system is defined as the ratio between the image (h') and object (h) size (73). Magnification plays a big part in enhancing image clarity and resolution which helps bring smaller details into focus. Our system will have a fixed magnification value of 7.5x which means the ratio of the two lenses will have to equal 7.5.

- Focal Length

The focal length of a lens is the foundation for a clear and focused image. It is defined as the distance over which collimated rays coming from infinity converge to a point along the optical axis (73). Lenses that have positive focal lengths (convex) converge the light while lenses with negative focal lengths (concave) diverge the light (75). A fixed focal length lens has a fixed AFOV. If the lens is focused with different working distances, different sized FOVs can be achieved but the viewing angle will always remain the same. Focal length can be typically

found by the following equation: $f = \frac{(H * WD)}{FOV}$ using working distance, the object size, and FOV.

- Working Distance

The working distance of a lens system is the distance from the object to the lens where the image is at its sharpest focus, often shown as s . There is a very useful relation between working distance, magnification, and focal length: $s = \frac{f(M-1)}{M}$ (75).

3.4.2.1 Keplerian Telescope System

Out of the two types of telescopes, the Keplerian system is normally the easier one to construct. The two lenses that make up the system are both convex, meaning they both have a positive focal length. Since both of the focal lengths are positive, the overall length of the system can be found by adding the two values together (91). In order to increase the length of the system, a biconvex lens can be added in between the eyepiece and objective lenses. This telescope is typically considered to be a combination of an objective and a magnifier. One downside of these types of lens systems is that they produce an inverted image. This can be remedied with software, by flipping the camera sensor, or adding a third lens. In terms of our project, the extended length due to the addition of the focal lengths may also be a disadvantage. On the contrary, an advantage to using a Keplerian system is that it can produce a higher system magnification, which can be helpful for the longer distances we are looking to cover.

3.4.2.2 Galilean Telescope System

In a Galilean model telescope, there are normally only two lenses; one with a positive focal length and the other with a negative focal length. As a result of the opposing focal length signs, the distance between the lenses becomes shorter than in the Keplerian model. In terms of our project, this will be the better option since we can get a shorter lens system overall (91). In addition to the advantage of the shorter system, the output image is upright meaning no additional lenses or post-processing have to be done. This type of lens system can also help reduce spherical aberrations introduced by the lenses.

3.4.2.3 Keplerian vs. Galilean

Table 3.12 - Keplerian vs Galilean Comparison

Feature	Galilean Telescope	Keplerian Telescope
Objective Focal Length	Positive	Positive
Eyepiece Focal Length	Negative	Positive
Field of View	Narrow	Wider

Relative Length	More compact	Longer
Magnification	Low magnification	Higher magnification
Image Orientation	Upright image	Inverted image
Aberrations	Chromatic (more at higher power); spherical	Chromatic; spherical
Exit Pupil Location	Inside of telescope	Outside of telescope
Common Lens Count	2	3 (additional lens for flipping image)

For our project, the Galilean-style lens system would be the most advantageous for the criteria we are aiming to fit.

3.4.3 Adaptive Optics

In order to clearly image boats along the horizon, we could implement incredibly sophisticated Adaptive Optics. The integration of these optics is a stretch goal of this project, as they are incredibly expensive and not easy to implement in a smaller system like ours. In an ideal scenario, these advanced technologies would be implemented into the Galilean telescope system to counteract atmospheric turbulence. Adaptive optics consist of deformable mirrors controlled by computers, which implement real-time correction for distortions caused by the Earth's atmosphere [92]. These corrective systems can produce images just as sharp as space telescope systems, allowing for much finer details to be analyzed. In order to get the incredibly detailed images, there must be a seamless integration of hardware and software systems. Different modes of adaptive optic technologies have been developed, each achieving a different goal.

- Single Conjugated Adaptive Optics (SCAO)

Standard adaptive optics performance is made possible by the Single Conjugated Adaptive Optics (SCAO) mode. In this format, the atmospheric turbulence corrected is limited to a specific cylindrical projection. This projection is the telescope aperture faced towards the guide star being viewed. This method produces a very high quality image, at the cost of a small field of view. Another downside of this method is the amount of the night sky you can clearly see is decreased, due to limitations on the amount of naturally available guide stars. SCAO can be combined with coronagraphy to achieve extreme spatial resolution as well as image contrast. This mode acts as a base for other modes of adaptive optics.

- Single Laser Adaptive Optics (SLAO)

By adding a laser “guide star” to the base SCAO mode, we get Single Laser Adaptive Optics (SLAO). This mode is overall better than the SCAO mode, but comes with its own limitations due to the introduction of the laser into the system. One of these setbacks is the cone effect, which is due to the laser only being projected for a finite distance. Another performance limitation is anisoplanatism, which comes from only one turbulence slice being sensed and corrected.

- Ground Layer Adaptive Optics (GLAO)

While the SCAO and SLAO modes employ turbulence correction along a single line of sight, the Ground Layer Adaptive Optics (GLAO) mode employs turbulence correction across the whole field of view at ground level. In the lower levels of the Earth’s atmosphere, the turbulence creates the most interference, making the GLAO mode very useful in image correction. In this mode, multiple off-axis wavefront sensors are used to obtain an average of the ground turbulence and this average is corrected by a single deformable mirror. With the advantage of a much larger field-of-view correction comes the trade-off of relatively low performance.

- Multi-Conjugate Adaptive Optics (MCAO)

To go a step further in correcting both ground-level and high-altitude turbulence, Multi-Conjugate Adaptive Optics (MCAO) comes into play. This setup uses multiple mirrors to achieve this goal, employing quite a few off-axis wavefront sensors to read the turbulence in several conditions. The collected measurements are given to a tomographic reconstructor to estimate the 3D turbulence value, which is then projected onto the deformable planes to generate control commands. The MCAO mode produces a medium field-of-view and medium-to-high performance values. This mode of adaptive optics is laser-guide-star-based, which means there is high sky coverage, but also a need for several natural guiding stars to stabilize the 3D turbulence.

- Laser Tomography Adaptive Optics (LTAO)

This technique is comparable to taking a CT-scan of Earth’s atmosphere, reassembling the image layer by layer. In Laser Tomography Adaptive Optics (LTAO) the telescope reconstructs the turbulence adjusted image above it piece by piece. This mode is a combination of the SCAO and MCAO modes, implementing several off-axis wavefront sensors but optimized to analyze the center data of the field-of-view. The main advantage in regards to the SCAO mode is increased field-of-view. This is so the on-axis turbulence cylinder can be better sampled and analyzed, providing a correction using a single deformable mirror. All of this results in high performance images across a smaller field-of-view, with a trade off of tomographic error and low order residuals.

- Multi Object Adaptive Optics (MOAO)

Similarly to the LTAO and MCAO methods, Multi Object Adaptive Optics (MOAO) uses the 3D turbulence to tomographically reconstruct the adjusted image. The overall goal of MOAO is to obtain multiple small-field turbulence corrections in an overall larger field-of-view. Compared to the other modes, in MOAO the turbulence is corrected for along the line of sight upon which the object is located. This is achieved using multiple wavefront sensors, natural and/or laser-guide-star, across the FOV. Each channel is corrected by its own designated deformable mirror which is closely conjugated to the ground level.

Table 3.13 - Adaptive Optics Comparison

Adaptive Optics Mode	Corrected FOV	Performance	Coverage
SCAO	Small (10 - 15 arcsec)	High	Small
SLAO	Small (10 - 15 arcsec)	Medium/High	Small
GLAO	Large (several arcmin)	Low	Large
MCAO	Medium (1-2 arcmin)	Medium/High	Large
LTAO	Medium (1-2 arcmin)	Medium/High	Large
MOAO	Large (several arcmin)	Medium/High	Large

3.4.4 Gimbal

In order for our optical system to be as effective as possible, we need to implement some range of motion for the camera. In order to do this, implementing a gimbal would be most effective. The gimbal can provide a sufficient range of motion, which is beneficial for the surveillance purposes of this system. While a gimbal with a full 360 degree rotation range would be incredibly useful in our project, finding one that fits the size of our camera sensor is incredibly difficult. These models are an exorbitant amount of money due to the precision they have to follow, and there are very few available at such a small size. Therefore, we can implement a pan-tilt gimbal mount bracket that can connect directly to the Raspberry Pi.

3.5 Embedded Systems

3.5.1 Single Board Computer

When selecting a single board computer (SBC) for our project, we needed to consider multiple factors, including processing power, connectivity, energy efficiency, and compatibility with the other hardware components. The SBC is essentially the central control unit for onboard operations, managing data transmission from the radar system, interfacing with Starlink for communication and optical system for visual data, and handling the necessary computations for data processing and storage. With the environmental and power constraints of our system, it was crucial to choose a board that is power-efficient and capable of running the required software.

To ensure we select the best option, we researched several SBCs that are commonly used in embedded systems and even maritime applications. There are a few options that we compared and considered for our project: the Raspberry Pi 4 Model B, the Arduino Uno, and the BeagleBone Black. Review the table at the end of the section to view the comparison of these options. Each of these SBCs can and have been used in many different applications and they offer several unique advantages in terms of processing power, ease of integration, and peripheral support.

The Raspberry Pi 4 Model B is known as a powerful and versatile single-board computer that is frequently used in IoT and embedded applications. It has a Broadcom BCM2711 quad-core Cortex-A72 processor, up to 8GB of RAM, and multiple USB and GPIO ports for hardware interfacing. This makes it excellent for handling communication protocols such as NMEA 2000, processing radar data, and managing the software required for data transmission via Starlink. This board has many built-in quality of life features, including 4 USB ports, 2 micro HDMI ports, and a USB-C power supply. The Raspberry Pi also has a strong developer community, so there is always access to extensive documentation and software support. One of the biggest advantages of the Raspberry Pi is its ability to run a full Linux operating system, so there is a lot of flexibility in software development.

Another SBC we looked into is the Arduino Uno. It is a microcontroller-based board that makes it very efficient for low-power applications and sensor interfacing. This MCU board operates using an ATmega328P microcontroller and provides a set of digital and analog input/output pins that can be used for reading sensor data and triggering hardware responses. While the Arduino is excellent for simple control tasks, it is much less powerful than the other options because it lacks the processing power and multitasking capabilities that we need for complex data processing and communication tasks in our system.

The board we considered was the BeagleBone Black that is comparable to the Raspberry Pi in terms of performance and capabilities. It has a Texas Instruments AM335x ARM Cortex-A8 processor, onboard eMMC storage, and extensive I/O options. One of the biggest advantages of this board is its real-time processing capability, making it useful for industrial and robotics applications. However, it has a much smaller community of engineers compared to the Raspberry Pi, limited software support, and lower processing

power. Since we are looking for a widely supported and powerful computing platform, we determined that the BeagleBone Black was not the best fit for our project.

Table 3.14 - SBC Comparison

	Specifications		
Parameters	Raspberry Pi 4	Arduino Uno	BeagleBone Black
Processor	Broadcom BCM2711 (Quad-Core Cortex-A72)	ATmega328P (8-bit Microcontroller)	TI AM335x (Cortex-A8)
Clock Speed	1.5 GHz	16 MHz	1 GHz
RAM	2GB, 4GB, or 8GB LPDDR4	2 KB SRAM	512MB DDR3
Storage	MicroSD	32 KB Flash	4GB eMMC + microSD
Connectivity	USB, HGMI, GPI, Ethernet, Wi-Fi, Bluetooth	GPIO, I2C, SPI, UART	USB, HDMI, GPIO, Ethernet
Power Consumption	3W - 7W	0.5W	2W - 3W
Operating System	Linux-based (Raspberry Pi OS, Ubuntu, etc.)	No native OS (runs on firmware)	Linux-based (Debian)
Cost	\$35 - \$75	\$20 - \$30	\$55 - \$80

After evaluating these three options, we decided to use the Raspberry Pi 4 Model B as the main single board computer for our system. Its combination of processing power, community support, and compatibility with Linux-based operating systems makes it the most suitable choice for our needs. The Raspberry Pi will be responsible for interfacing with the radar system, handling data processing, and managing communication with Starlink. This MCU board also supports various programming languages, including Python and C++, which gives us some flexibility in software development. This combination of accessibility and power made it the ideal choice for our project's needs.

3.5.2 Programming Languages

The selection of an appropriate programming language is crucial when designing the software architecture for our maritime domain awareness system. The software running on the onboard Raspberry Pi will be responsible for managing data communication between the Raymarine Cyclone Radar, NMEA 2000 interfaces, Starlink connectivity, along with the optical system. This means that the programming language we use should be efficient, well-supported, and compatible with embedded systems. It should also be able to handle network communication, process real-time data, and support the necessary libraries for hardware interfacing.

In order to determine the best programming language for our system, we considered multiple factors such as performance, ease of development, compatibility with embedded systems, and community support. We chose to compare four commonly used languages for embedded systems and Raspberry Pi applications: Python, C++, Java, and Rust. View the table in this section for a comparison of these options.

The first language we considered was Python. It is one of the most popular languages for embedded systems because of its versatility, extensive libraries, and strong community support. It is frequently used for prototyping, scripting, and high-level automation. Python is also very flexible, making it easy to interface with the Raspberry Pi since it supports GPIO manipulation, network communication, and serial connections. Python also has libraries like PySerial, PiGPIO, and CANard which will allow for easy integration with our NMEA 2000 interface and optical system. However, Python does come with some drawbacks. Since it is an interpreted language, it is generally slower than compiled languages like C++ or Rust. This can sometimes affect real-time data processing, but since our system does not require ultra-low latency responses, Python remains a viable choice.

The second language we looked into was C++. It is known for its high performance and efficiency, making it a good choice for embedded systems development. C++ is a compiled language that provides low-level hardware control and direct memory management, which can be useful when interfacing with radar hardware and NMEA 2000 devices. Unlike Python, C++ is a better fit for applications that require real-time data processing and optimized performance. On the other hand, C++ has a steeper learning curve compared to Python, and development generally takes longer because you have to manually manage memory. Also, debugging and maintaining C++ code can be more complex, especially in a project like ours with multiple software modules.

The third programming language we considered is Java. This is a platform-independent language that is often used for networking applications and large-scale software projects. One of the most useful features that Java provides is garbage collection, but also includes built-in multithreading, and high security, making it a good choice for networked systems like ours. Java also offers networking libraries that would help with Starlink communication and remote monitoring features. However, Java is not as efficient for embedded systems compared to C++ or Python. It requires a Java Virtual Machine, which would increase resource consumption. Since our project is running on a Raspberry Pi with limited power, Java may not be the most efficient choice.

The final programming language we considered was Rust. This is a newer language that has gained popularity for systems programming and embedded applications. It is designed for high performance, memory safety, and concurrency, which is great for low-level hardware interaction. Unlike C++, you can avoid common memory management issues with Rust because it enforces strict compile-time safety checks. While Rust stands out in performance and reliability, it has a smaller developer community compared to Python or C++ since it is newer. The learning curve is also steep, and there are fewer libraries available for Raspberry Pi development compared to other languages.

Table 3.15 - Comparison of Programming Languages

Parameters	Python	C++	Java	Rust
Performance	Low	High	Moderate	High
Ease of Use	Very High	Moderate	High	Low
Memory Safety	Automatic	Manual	Automatic	Enforced
Embedded Suitability	Moderate	High	Low	High
Library Support	Very High	High	Moderate	Low
Power Efficiency	Moderate	High	Low	High
Community Support	Very High	High	High	Moderate

After comparing all four programming languages, we selected Python as the primary language for our Raspberry Pi software development. While C++ would provide better performance, Python's ease of development, wide library support, and strong integration with Raspberry Pi hardware make it the best choice. Additionally, Python's compatibility with NMEA 2000 communication, Starlink API integration, and embedded control aligns well with the needs of our system. Using Python will allow us to rapidly prototype, test, and deploy our software while maintaining flexibility for future modifications.

3.6 Technology Stack

Developing a web-based system for maritime tracking requires selecting the right combination of technologies to ensure real-time data processing, reliability, and scalability. The choice of a full-stack framework influences how data is collected, transmitted, stored, and displayed within the system. With multiple options available, selecting a technology stack depends on factors such as performance, ease of integration, documentation support, and compatibility with external APIs.

For this project, the technology stack must support real-time radar and AIS data processing, allow for secure ship-to-shore communication, and provide an interactive dashboard for visualizing detected vessels. In the following sections, we will evaluate different frontend, backend, and database technologies before justifying our final selection. The goal is to ensure that the chosen stack not only meets the project's requirements but is also adaptable for future expansions and enhancements.

3.6.1 Frontend

The frontend serves as the user interface for the maritime tracking system, allowing visualization of real-time vessel data, interaction with maps, and monitor alerts. Because the frontend directly impacts the user experience, it is important to evaluate frontend technologies on both their usability and compatibility with our requirements. We focused on metrics that reflect development speed, visual performance, learning curve, and integration ease.

Table 3.16 - Frontend Technology Comparison

	Vue	Angular	React
Learning Curve	Low – beginner-friendly with clear documentation	High – steep curve due to TypeScript and framework complexity	Moderate – easier to start, but deeper concepts (hooks, state) add complexity
Scalability	Moderate – best for small to medium apps, scalable with effort.	High – full-featured and structured for enterprise-scale apps	High – flexible architecture supports large apps
Flexibility	High – can be used progressively or fully	Moderate – opinionated structure reduces flexibility	Very High – unopinionated, integrates with many tools

3.6.1.1 Vue

Vue is a popular frontend JavaScript framework known for its incremental adoption model, meaning it can be gradually integrated into an existing project or used for full-scale applications. Vue is designed to be lightweight, flexible, and intuitive, making it a strong contender for modern web development.

Vue supports routing through its official library called Vue Router. This is often included when setting up a project using Vue Command Line Interface or Vite. Vue Router allows

developers to define routes tied to specific components and supports features like nested routes, route guards, and dynamic route matching. In more advanced use cases, such as multi-user dashboards or analytics views. The Vue Router offers the flexibility needed for complex navigation structures.

However, our software team has no prior experience with Vue, which was something we took great consideration. While Vue showcases a vast community and extensive documentation, the learning curve and potential adaptation time played a role in our evaluation. Given the tight project timeline and the need for rapid development, we opted for a framework with which we had more familiarity.

3.6.1.2 Angular

Angular is a TypeScript-based frontend framework developed by Google. It is widely used for building large scale enterprise applications due to its built-in features such as two-way data binding, dependency injection, and structured architecture. Unlike React and Vue, which are more flexible and lightweight, Angular follows a strict Model-View-Controller architecture, making it better suited for projects requiring strong code organization and maintainability.

Angular includes a built-in routing module as part of the core framework. Routing is configured using route definitions in the application module, which map URLs to specific components. Angular's router supports lazy loading, route guards, and deeply nested routes, making it suitable for large scale applications. While Angular's routing is powerful, it can also be more complex to set up compared to lightweight libraries like React Router or Vue Router. In a project like ours with relatively simple navigation needs, Angular may be more than necessary for frontend routing.

While Angular provides a robust and scalable framework, it has a steeper learning curve compared to React and Vue. Our team considered Angular due to its built-in routing, state management, and form validation features, but ultimately decided against it because of its complexity and higher development time. Given our project's need for quick iterations and real-time updates, we prioritized a framework that allows for faster prototyping and flexibility.

3.6.1.3 React

React is a JavaScript library for building interactive user interfaces, developed by Facebook. Unlike Angular, React follows a component based architecture, which allows for reusable User Interface components that simplify development and maintenance. It also uses a virtual DOM, which improves rendering performance by updating only the necessary parts of the UI instead of re-rendering the entire page.

One of React's key strengths is its large community and extensive third-party libraries, making it an excellent choice for integrating real-time radar and AIS data. React also provides easy integration with backend APIs, allowing seamless communication between the frontend dashboard and the radar data processing system. React does not include

routing by default, so developers typically use a separate library like React Router to manage navigation between views.

Given our team's familiarity with React and its ability to handle real-time updates and dynamic UIs, we decided to use React as our frontend framework. Additionally, React's ecosystem includes Next.js, which could be useful for server-side rendering and performance optimization in the future.

3.6.2 Backend

The backend is responsible for handling data processing, API logic, and communication with the database. It must be capable of managing radar data flow and responding to user requests quickly and reliably. To guide our evaluation, we identified general metrics related to performance, simplicity, and how well each backend technology aligned with our team's technical background and project goals.

Table 3.17 - Backend Technology Comparison

	Django	Nest	Express
Learning Curve	Moderate – clear documentation but steep for those unfamiliar with Python	High – requires knowledge of TypeScript and Angular-style patterns	Low – very approachable for beginners familiar with JavaScript
Scalability	High – built in tools and structure make it well suited for large applications	High – modular architecture allows structured growth	Moderate – scalable, but requires more manual setup and structure
Flexibility	Moderate– opinionated and tightly integrated.	High – structured but allows flexibility via modules	Very High – unopinionated and highly customizable

3.6.2.1 Django

Django is a Python-based web framework that follows the Model-View-Template pattern. It is known for its built-in security features, scalability, and rapid development capabilities. Django is widely used in data-driven applications due to its built-in support for database management, authentication, and API development.

However, Django is more monolithic compared to lightweight backend frameworks like Express.js and Nest.js. While Django provides excellent data handling capabilities, it is less flexible for integrating with Node.js-based frontend frameworks like React. Given our team's preference for a JavaScript-based full-stack approach, we opted for backend frameworks that are better suited for handling real-time data transmission and RESTful API development.

3.6.2.1 Nest

Nest.js is a TypeScript-based backend framework built on top of Express.js. It provides structured architecture, dependency injection, and built-in support for microservices. Nest.js was considered for this project due to its scalability and TypeScript support, making it ideal for large applications that require strict type safety.

While Nest.js offers better code organization and maintainability, it adds additional complexity compared to Express.js. Express is lighter and simpler. Given our need for a lightweight backend to handle API requests efficiently, we opted for Express.js instead of Nest.js.

3.6.2.1 Express

Express.js is a minimalist and flexible backend framework for Node.js. It is widely used for building RESTful APIs and handling real-time communication between the frontend and database. Express.js allows rapid development, easy integration with MongoDB, and scalability, making it an excellent choice for our project.

Our decision to use Express.js over Django and Nest.js was based on its lightweight architecture that allows for quick request handling. And its Seamless integration with React which maintains a full JavaScript stack for both frontend and backend. Given these advantages, Express.js was chosen as our primary backend framework.

3.6.3 Database

The database plays a crucial role in storing both structured AIS data and semi-structured radar detections. Choosing the right database solution requires balancing flexibility, speed, and ease of use. For our project, we considered how intuitive the database technology is, how easily it supports our data model, how actively the technology is maintained by its developer community, and how pricing would impact our ability to scale the solution over time.

Table 3.18 - Database Technology Comparison

	Redis	PostgreSQL	MongoDB
--	-------	------------	---------

Ease of Use	Moderate - simple commands, but limited to key-value data	Moderate - requires understanding of SQL and schemas	High - flexible schema, easy with Mongoose for JavaScript developers
Documentation	High - concise, well organized, especially for caching use cases	Very High - mature and well documented	Very High-large community, great docs, and Mongoose guides
Data Flexibility	Low - stores only key-value pairs	Low - strict schemas, relational only	High - schema-less, supports structured and unstructured data
Real-Time Capability	Very High - in-memory and built for real-time data/pub-sub operations	Moderate - strong with triggers and pub/sub extensions	High - works well with real-time updates when paired with Web Sockets.

3.6.3.1 Redis

Redis (Remote Dictionary Server) is an in-memory data structure store often used for caching, real-time messaging, and session management. It offers high-speed data access compared to traditional databases and is ideal for applications requiring fast data retrieval.

For our project, Redis was considered as a caching mechanism to store frequently accessed radar and AIS data, reducing the load on the primary database. Additionally, Redis supports publish/subscribe (Pub/Sub) messaging, which can be useful for handling real-time alerts and notifications when a dark vessel is detected.

While Redis is not a primary database, it plays a crucial role in improving response time and system efficiency in maritime tracking applications.

3.6.3.2 PostgreSQL

PostgreSQL is a powerful relational database management system that supports SQL standards and offers advanced features like JSON support, spatial indexing, and ACID compliance. PostgreSQL remains a valuable option in cases that demand strict data consistency, complex queries, or long-term archival. Its schema-based structure makes it ideal for managing user accounts, authentication records, system logs, and historical vessel tracking. PostgreSQL excels at relational integrity, making it well-suited for

executing JOIN operations, aggregations, and capabilities that could support future features such as proximity alerts and zone violations. However, compared to MongoDB, PostgreSQL is less flexible with dynamic or semi-structured data and is more challenging to scale horizontally. Despite these trade-offs, PostgreSQL could provide a robust and reliable option for expanding the system's capabilities where relational consistency is critical.

3.6.3.3 MongoDB

MongoDB is a document-oriented database that stores data in a flexible, JSON-like format known as BSON (Binary JSON). Unlike relational databases that use structured tables, MongoDB's schema-less nature allows it to efficiently store unstructured and semi-structured maritime data, such as radar detections, AIS vessel tracking, and environmental conditions. This flexibility is particularly useful for our system, as vessel and radar data can vary significantly in structure and size.

To streamline data modeling and interaction with MongoDB, we looked at Mongoose, a JavaScript Object Data Modeling (ODM) library. Mongoose provides a schema enforcement allowing us to define structured data models. A built-in query functions, simplifying data retrieval and manipulation. And middleware support, enabling validation, pre-processing, and event-driven operations within our application.

Given that radar and AIS data accumulate rapidly, MongoDB's scalability and high-performance indexing ensure that our system can efficiently handle large volumes of incoming data. Additionally, its ability to support real-time queries aligns with the requirements of our web dashboard, which must continuously update vessel and radar detection information. By integrating Mongoose with our Express.js backend, we can maintain a structured yet flexible approach to database management, ensuring efficient data storage, retrieval, and real-time processing for maritime domain awareness.

3.6.4 Server

The web server is the deployment environment for both frontend and backend components. It must efficiently handle requests, scale as needed and be easy to configure. In our comparison, we looked at ease of deployment, community support, compatibility with our stack, general reliability, and particularly as our system may scale or require additional performance resources over time.

Table 3.19 - Server Technology Comparison

	AWS	DigitalOcean	Azure	Google Cloud
--	-----	--------------	-------	--------------

Ease of Deployment	Moderate - Easier with Lightsail; AWS overall is complex	Very Easy - simple UI, fast setup	Moderate-user-friendly but better for .NET developers	Easy - modern dashboard, fast launch process
Stack Compatibility	High - strong Node.js and MongoDB support	High - supports modern stacks (Node.js, MongoDB)	Medium -optimized for Microsoft stack	High - good for JavaScript based integration
Scalability	Very High - EC2, Lambda, ECS support flexible scaling	High -manual vertical/horizontal scaling with Droplets	Very High - full enterprise-grade auto-scaling	High -built-in scaling via App Engine and GKE
Documentation	Very High -extensive resources and community	High -developer-focused guides and active support	High – especially for Microsoft developers	Moderate – clear docs but smaller ecosystem

3.6.4.1 AWS

Amazon Web Services is one of the most widely adopted and versatile cloud platforms, offering an extensive suite of infrastructure tools for deploying scalable web applications. While AWS EC2, Lambda, and ECS provide powerful options for production environments, our team is currently evaluating AWS Lightsail for its simplicity and affordability during the prototyping phase.

Lightsail offers a more beginner-friendly interface than the traditional AWS console and storage. It allows developers to quickly spin up pre-configured environments for Node.js and MongoDB without the overhead of configuring VPCs, IAM roles, or complex load balancing setups. This makes it ideal for early testing and small-scale deployments.

3.6.4.2 DigitalOcean

DigitalOcean is a cloud infrastructure provider designed for developers who want a simpler and more affordable alternative to enterprise-level cloud services like AWS and Azure. It offers virtual private servers called “Droplets” that can be easily deployed to host web applications, databases, and backend APIs. For this project, DigitalOcean

represents a strong middle-ground option for deploying the Maritime Web Application due to its balance of control, performance, and cost-effectiveness.

DigitalOcean also supports scalable infrastructure, meaning the project can start with a single low-cost Droplet and scale vertically or horizontally as needed. It provides built-in monitoring, networking tools, firewalls, and storage solutions that make it suitable for small-to-medium production systems.

3.6.4.3 Azure

Microsoft Azure offers a robust cloud infrastructure and is especially effective for enterprises already using Microsoft tools. Azure's App Services and Azure Functions provide similar capabilities to AWS Lambda and EC2. It supports a wide range of backend technologies and has strong integration with Visual Studio and GitHub. However, its ecosystem can be more suited to .NET-based applications, and Azure's pricing and performance for small teams or startups may not be as competitive as AWS for our specific use case.

3.6.4.4 Google Cloud

Google Cloud Platform is a modern cloud provider known for its performance and tools related to big data and machine learning. It features services such as App Engine and Cloud Functions, which is similar to AWS and Azure. GCP also excels in simplicity of setup. However, GCP's community and third-party tool integration are less mature compared to AWS. GCP could serve as a viable alternative.

3.6.4.5 Network-Attached Storage

During project discussions, our sponsor highlighted the importance of a Network-Attached Storage (NAS) system as a potential solution for managing large-scale maritime data efficiently. Given the high volume of radar detections, AIS overlays, and vessel tracking logs, the need for a centralized and scalable storage solution became apparent. Our sponsor emphasized that NAS could provide better data accessibility, reliability, and security, ensuring that both onboard systems and shore-based operators could retrieve and analyze data without disruptions.

NAS is a dedicated file storage system that allows multiple devices to access and manage data over a network. Unlike traditional hard drives that are attached to a single machine, NAS functions as an independent storage unit with its own processing power and network-sharing capabilities. In this project, NAS would serve as a central repository for maritime tracking data, ensuring that data from onboard Raspberry Pi and Intel NUC devices can be securely transferred and accessed by the shore-based control station. Since NAS can be accessed remotely, it enhances ship-to-shore communication by allowing real-time data synchronization, ensuring that maritime surveillance and monitoring remain continuous and efficient.

Scalability is another major consideration. Since NAS supports high capacity storage and allows for storage expansion, it can accommodate growing data needs over time. This is particularly valuable for long-term historical storage, where vessel tracking patterns and radar detection logs may need to be stored for extended periods for analysis.

Additionally, NAS systems support Redundant Array of Independent Disks (RAID), which helps protect against data loss due to hardware failure. This ensures that even if one drive fails, data remains intact and accessible. NAS Also provides high speed read/write operations, which is essential for real-time data access and processing. This is especially beneficial for applications such as ours.

3.6.5 Internal API's

Our internal APIs handle communication between the frontend dashboard, backend services, and real-time data sources. REST and WebSockets provide different methods for retrieving and updating data efficiently.

3.6.5.1 REST API

Representational State Transfer is the primary method for standardized data retrieval and CRUD operations. It provides structured endpoints that allow the frontend to fetch, update, or delete vessel and radar data. For example, a GET request to `/api/vessels` might retrieve all known vessels from AIS data, while a POST request to `/api/radar-data` might upload new radar detections. REST is widely used due to its scalability, predictability, and ability to integrate with caching mechanisms, making it an ideal choice for handling the structured communication between the frontend and backend.

3.6.5.2 WebSockets

WebSockets provide a persistent, two-way communication channel between the client and server. Making them ideal for real-time data updates. Unlike REST APIs, which require the client to make repeated requests to receive new data, WebSockets allow the server to push new information to the frontend as soon as it becomes available. This is useful in the context of our maritime dashboard, where radar detections or dark vessel alerts may need to be displayed instantly without waiting for manual refreshes.

3.6.6 External API's

Our project integrates third-party APIs to provide mapping functionalities and radar data extraction.

3.6.6.1 Leaflet.js

Leaflet.js is a lightweight JavaScript library that allows us to display interactive maps within the web dashboard. It supports real-time plotting of vessels and radar detections, enabling maritime operators to visualize ship movements efficiently. By integrating geospatial overlays and customizable markers, Leaflet enhances our ability to identify

dark vessels within a given area. The library's flexibility and ease of use make it a suitable choice for this application.

3.6.6.2 Raymarine SDK

The Raymarine SDK provides a bridge between our software and the Raymarine radar system, allowing for real-time radar data extraction and processing. By interfacing with this SDK, we can analyze radar signatures, classify vessels, and trigger alerts for unidentified objects. Integration with our Node.js backend ensures that radar data is efficiently stored and transmitted to the dashboard.

3.6.6.3 MarineTraffic

MarineTraffic is a widely used AIS tracking service that provides real-time vessel positioning, movement history, and detailed ship data. By leveraging this API, our system can enhance maritime domain awareness by integrating real-time AIS transmissions with our radar detection data. This allows for continuous monitoring of both transmitting and non-transmitting vessels within a defined maritime zone. The MarineTraffic API provides structured AIS data, including vessel names, positions, and timestamps. Ensuring seamless integration with our dashboard.

3.6.7 Authentication Methods for Maritime Web App

Authentication is a critical aspect of any secure system, ensuring that only authorized users can access sensitive data and functionalities. Various authentication methods can be implemented based on security requirements, ease of use, and system architecture. This section explores four primary authentication techniques, including password hashing, JSON Web Tokens (JWT), OAuth 2.0, and Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA), and evaluates their advantages and trade-offs.

3.6.7.1 Password Hashing

Password hashing is a traditional yet effective authentication method in which user passwords are processed through a cryptographic algorithm before being stored in a database. Instead of saving plain-text passwords, the system applies a hashing function which converts the password into a fixed-length cryptographic string. Additionally, a unique value is added to each password before hashing to prevent attacks like rainbow table exploits.

The primary advantage of password hashing is that it is self-hosted, meaning it does not require reliance on external authentication services. It is also relatively simple to implement, making it an accessible option for systems that need basic authentication security. However, password hashing alone does not prevent brute-force attacks if an attacker gains access to the database. If an account recovery system is not implemented, users may also struggle with forgotten passwords, leading to potential access issues.

3.6.7.2 JSON Web Token

JWT authentication is a stateless authentication method that allows users to log in once and receive a cryptographic token, which is then sent with each subsequent request. When a user logs in, the server generates a JWT token, typically containing a user ID, expiration time, and permissions, and sends it back to the client. The token is then stored in the user's browser (either in local storage or HTTP-only cookies) and included in each request to authenticate the user without requiring database lookups.

One of the biggest benefits of JWT authentication is its scalability. Since authentication data is stored in the token itself, the backend server does not need to maintain a session state, reducing server load. JWTs are especially useful in API based systems and distributed architectures where multiple services need to verify a user's identity. However, one security concern with JWTs is token storage. If stored in local storage, an attacker could steal the token using Cross Site Scripting attacks.

3.6.7.3 OAuth 2.0

OAuth 2.0 is an authentication framework that allows users to log in using third-party accounts such as Google, Facebook, or GitHub, eliminating the need for the system to manage passwords. When a user chooses to log in through a third-party provider, they are redirected to the provider's authentication system. If authentication is successful, the provider issues a secure access token, which is sent back to the web application to verify the user's identity. OAuth provides a fast and secure login experience. It is particularly beneficial in systems where user account creation is frequent, as it eliminates the need for handling password security.

However, OAuth authentication does introduce external dependencies. If a third-party provider experiences downtime or restricts access, users may be locked out of the system. Additionally, privacy concerns arise as some third-party services track user logins across multiple applications.

For systems requiring seamless authentication with minimal password management, OAuth 2.0 is an excellent choice, especially when integrated with providers like Google. However, for security-sensitive applications, it may be preferable to use a self-hosted authentication system that does not rely on external identity providers.

3.6.7.3 Multi-Factor Authentication

Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) improves account security by requiring users to verify their identity using more than one form of authentication. Rather than relying solely on a password, MFA typically combines two or more factors: something the user knows (like a password), something the user has (such as a one-time code sent via SMS, email, or an authenticator app), and something the user is (such as a fingerprint or facial recognition). When MFA is enabled, users first enter their standard credentials and are then prompted to provide a second factor, such as a time-based one-time password (TOTP) generated by an app like Google Authenticator or a code sent via email or SMS.

This additional verification layer significantly reduces the risk of unauthorized access, even if a user's password is compromised through phishing or data breaches. While MFA greatly strengthens security, it can introduce usability concerns if users lose access to their second factor, such as losing their phone or changing numbers. For higher security applications, TOTP-based methods are generally preferred over SMS-based verification, as the latter can be vulnerable to SIM-swapping attacks.

3.7 Communication Protocols

3.7.1 NMEA 2000 and Marine Communication Protocols

A communication protocol, in technology, is a way for information and data to flow between different devices. When talking about communication protocols we would be using for our project, it is crucial to focus on standards built for and relevant to current marine technology. Considering the different elements of our maritime domain awareness system, we are looking for a standardized way to be able to successfully make communication smooth and flawless. These days, vessels increasingly rely on interconnected systems for navigation, monitoring, and situational awareness, which makes it essential to ensure seamless data exchange.

To develop our maritime domain awareness system, multiple electronic subsystems must communicate efficiently for uninterrupted collection, processing, and transmission of radar data. One of the primary components involved in this project is the Raymarine Cyclone radar system, which generates real-time surface vessel detections, and a GPS receiver to provide precise geolocation data to correlate with radar outputs. The system will also connect with Starlink to transmit processed information to a remote monitoring station to provide nearly constant real-time situational awareness. Each of these components operates using specific communication protocols: the radar and GPS systems are compatible with marine-specific standards such as NMEA 2000, while satellite communication relies on network protocols for long-range data transmission. We are looking to construct a unified framework of these different data streams to allow for efficient data exchange between the onboard processor, sensors, and external networks. Given that NMEA 2000 is the industry standard for modern marine electronics, we must understand its architecture and capabilities to successfully implement into our system.

To go into more detail about how the information is transferred, we will need to explain how multiple electronic devices communicate over a single, unified network. The National Marine Electronics Association (NMEA) has developed multiple protocols over the years to address these needs, with NMEA 2000 emerging as the modern industry standard for connecting marine sensors, displays, and control units. NMEA 2000 is designed to allow different marine electronics to share data using a standardized messaging framework. That way, there is no need for multiple independent wiring systems and overall will improve the efficiency and interoperability of marine networks.

NMEA 2000 is the upgraded version of NMEA 0183, an older protocol that operated on a point-to-point serial communication model. Now, the communication model is built on the Controller Area Network (CAN) protocol, which allows multiple devices to

communicate over a shared data bus instead of requiring a direct connection between each individual device. This means that all devices on an NMEA 2000 network can “talk” and “listen” to each other simultaneously, making it much more flexible and scalable than the previous version. The CAN protocol is used a lot in automotive, industrial, and aerospace applications so we know its a well-supported foundation for modern marine electronics.

The current NMEA 2000 version offers several major improvements like increased data speed and reliability. Currently, the protocol operates at a data rate of 250 kbps which is a big jump from NMEA 0183’s 4,800 bps standard rate. This higher bandwidth supports real-time data exchange which should prove to be useful for our monitoring systems. Another important feature of NMEA 2000 is its network topology, which follows a bus structure with a central backbone cable. Devices connect to this backbone using drop cables and T-connectors and makes installation much more simple because it reduces the amount of cabling needed. Each end of the network has terminating resistors to prevent signal reflections and maintain a stable connection.




Figure: NMEA 2000 Network Topology

To fully understand how NMEA 2000 communication works with marine electronics, it is important to examine how data is structured and transmitted across the network. Each NMEA 2000 message follows a standardized binary format based on the CAN protocol. In the past, NMEA 0183 used human-readable ASCII sentences, but now NMEA 2000’s binary format helps make it significantly faster and more robust for real-time data transmission.

A single NMEA 2000 message consists of multiple key fields:

Table 3.20 - Key Fields of NMEA 2000 Message

Key Field	Size (bits)	Description
Priority	3	Determines urgency of message
Parameter Group Number (PGN)	18	Identifies the type of data being transmitted (e.g., vessel speed, GPS position, or engine temperature)
Source Address	8	Specifies the sending device
Data Fields	0 - 64	Contains the actual sensor or control data being transmitted.



Figure: NMEA 2000 message (PGN and Data Fields)

The previous diagram explains the general structure of a message, but actual raw NMEA 2000 data appears as hexadecimal CAN bus frames when logged. The following figure is an example of real AIS (Automatic Identification System) messages captured on an NMEA 2000 network:

Timestamp (Epoch)	CAN ID	PGN (HEX)	PGN (DEC)	DataBytes	legend
1620692704.079450	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	001B127CEAD5123D	NMEA 2000 PGN
1620692704.080000	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	0131F3D0ACF2231A	(0x1F80F = AIS Class B Position Report)
1620692704.080600	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	0203FFFF00000000	#data bytes (0x1B=27)
1620692704.081200	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	0320FFFF0070FEFF	sequence counter
...					frame counter
1620692705.079500	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	201B127CEAD5123D	payload data (27 bytes)
1620692705.080050	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	2131F3D0ACF2231A	
1620692705.080650	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	2207FFFF00000000	
1620692705.081200	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	2320FFFF0070FEFF	
1620692704.079450	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	127CEAD5123D ... 20FFFF0070FEFF	
1620692705.079500	11F80F00	1F80F	129039	127CEAD5123D ... 20FFFF0070FEFF	

Figure: Real-world NMEA 2000 Data (Fast Packet Trace example)

In this example data log:

- The PGN value (0x1F80F) represents an AIS Class B Position Report.

- The CAN ID and PGN (HEX & DEC) fields help identify the type of message.
- The Data Bytes field contains encoded information related to vessel position, heading, speed, and other parameters.

Since NMEA 2000 messages use a binary CAN bus format, they require specialized software to decode into readable values. This is particularly important for our project because we will need to extract radar and GPS data from NMEA 2000 messages before processing it for vessel tracking.

For our project, we will hone in on integrating NMEA 2000 into our radar system and GPS receiver to allow the data to be efficiently transmitted and processed by the onboard Raspberry Pi. It is also important to take into account the harsh marine environments, so we can find the best way to implement and optimize real-time data sharing. Now we should have a reliable foundation for collecting and transmitting radar data before it is processed and sent through Starlink for remote monitoring.

3.7.2 Starlink Communication

One of the core features of this project is to be able to send information that our systems gather from anywhere on the planet to a remote monitoring station. The best COTS product designed for this exact task is Starlink, a low Earth orbit (LEO) satellite communication system that enables reliable and high-speed internet access from virtually anywhere. Since our system is designed for maritime surveillance, we need quick and low-latency communication that maintains this level of performance under any circumstances, especially when transmitting real-time data from remote locations. Other solutions that provide marine internet connection are usually slow, high in cost, and have coverage gaps. However, Starlink is a game-changing alternative that uses a dense network of satellites to provide reliable, high-bandwidth connectivity even in the middle of the ocean.

For our implementation, we are using a Starlink Mini terminal setup with unlimited Roam Access to provide in-motion, ocean use. This compact model works well in our plug-and-play system, while maintaining high-speed performance. Incorporating Starlink into our system allows us to efficiently transmit real-time radar and AIS data, video streams from the gimbal-mounted camera, and other vessel information to a remote monitoring station. Without a system like this, it would be nearly impossible or very expensive to have constant, high-speed communication from every corner of the ocean.

Outside of just providing an internet connection, Starlink also enables consistent data flow between our sensor network, the onboard processing unit, and the command center. This connectivity will let us relay alerts, transmit video feeds, and start or stop the process when needed. The Starlink Mini relatively consumes low power and is easy to set up right out of the box making it ideal for deployment on a self-harvesting power system.

Traditional satellite communications rely on high-orbit geostationary satellites, but Starlink actually orbits at around 550 km. This helps achieve much lower latency (20-40 ms) compared to conventional satellite internet that can be over 600 ms.

- Download Speed: Up to 100 Mbps, more than enough to handle radar data, AIS logs, and even video streams.
- Upload Speed: Around 10 Mbps, sufficient for transmitting alerts and tracking data.
- Latency: A low 20-40 ms, which keeps data transfer quick and responsive.
- Power Consumption: 20-40W, a key factor when designing our system's power supply.
- Connectivity: Supports Ethernet and Wi-Fi, allowing us to interface directly with our onboard Raspberry Pi.

This combination of low latency, fast speeds, and global coverage is exactly why we selected Starlink Mini over other satellite communication systems. Whether we're detecting dark ships in the middle of the ocean or transmitting alerts to a command center, Starlink gets data where it needs to go, instantly and securely.

There are other satellite internet options for maritime applications, but Starlink was the clear choice for our project. Here's how it stacks up:

Table 3.21 - Satellite Comparison

Feature	Starlink Mini	Traditional Satellite Internet
Latency	20-40 ms	600+ ms
Download Speed	Up to 100 Mbps	1-10 Mbps
Upload Speed	10 Mbps	<1 Mbps
Power Usage	20-40W	50W+
Coverage	Global	Limited (depends on provider)

Older satellite internet systems simply aren't fast enough for the real-time requirements of our project. The low-latency, high-speed, and low-power nature of Starlink makes it the best choice for transmitting our maritime surveillance data.

Now that we know that Starlink gives us a major edge in remote vessel tracking, it is also important to take into account some technical hurdles when implementing it into our system.

Because Starlink operates using a mesh of constantly moving satellites, our connection will occasionally switch between satellites overhead. This transition can cause brief latency spikes or packet loss, which could temporarily disrupt data transfer. To work around this, we need to optimize our transmission protocol. In case there are any critical alerts, they will always be prioritized and retransmitted if necessary.

LEO satellite internet is generally more resilient to bad weather than traditional satellite services, but it's not completely immune. Heavy rain, thick cloud cover, or extreme

storms can cause signal degradation. While this is unlikely to cause a total connection loss, it's something we need to keep in mind when transmitting large data packets, like full-resolution video from the gimbal camera.

The 20-40W power draw of the Starlink Mini means we need to plan for efficient power management. Our system will likely rely on a combination of wind energy and battery storage, so we must ensure Starlink doesn't drain power when not in use. One way to handle this is dynamic power scheduling—Starlink could turn on only when necessary, such as when a radar contact is detected and needs to be reported.

By integrating Starlink Mini into our system, we ensure fast, secure, and reliable communication for our radar, AIS, and gimbal tracking data. Without it, monitoring dark ships in real time would be impossible. While weather, latency spikes, and power management present some challenges, they can be mitigated with smart software optimizations.

3.7.3 Wired Communication

[Currently Working]

3.7.4 Wireless Communication

[Currently Working]

3.8 Analysis of the Power System

The maritime device that is being built has many parts and systems that need to be powered in order to function. The stipulation for the project, however, indicates that the device needs to be self-sufficient. To be more specific, the device should not use power from the boat or structure that it is placed on, and as a result, the problem of a power source is critical to the functionality of the maritime radar.

To solve the issues of self-sufficiency pertaining to power, many options were considered, the primary being gas, solar, and wind power. Some sort of generator was the first option that was proposed. The pros of a gas or diesel generator is the sheer amount of power that would be produced and there would be no concern for the maritime device being underpowered. A generator would be a great way to power the radar system, but it does lack the total self-sufficiency that is required for the project. When installing the maritime device on a vessel, the goal is to have a hands-off system for the crew of the ship. As a result, if the crew had to refuel a fossil fuel generator on behalf of the maritime system, the total self-sufficiency of the power system would be lost.

With self-sufficiency being the goal of the power system, non-renewable sources like fossil fuels were easily scrapped, leading to solar and wind being considered to power the maritime radar system. When considering renewable resources, one thing that must be acknowledged is the intermittent nature of such power sources. Solar can only be an option when the sun is out, and wind is determined by the weather. These renewable resources need to be analyzed to see if their reliability could potentially cause issues with

the maritime radar system as well as if the power systems are adequate to even power the components of the system sufficiently.

To continuously power the radar system, the implementation of both solar and wind energy was considered with the implementation of a solar array along with a maritime wind turbine. This solution was aimed at using 2 power sources to cover the weaknesses of both forms of power. To have continuous operation of the radar system, one renewable resource is not sufficient due to its variable reliability throughout the day. The combination of wind and solar allows for the creation of a more robust solution that would be more reliable, as the likelihood of both wind and solar energy collection being not sufficient to power the system is unlikely, and if that did come to pass, the inclusion of a backup battery would sustain the system until energy collection increased.

There are advantages to both solar and wind power but also a few negative things to consider. Having both sources of power complicates the system, requiring additional wiring, charge controllers, and brackets to mount things. The increased complexity makes the initial price higher and provides more opportunities for things to malfunction, so maintenance becomes even more critical. Solar panels require room to function properly with nothing in the way to shade them, which is difficult on commercial vessels where room is at a premium and cargo is shifting back and forth to cast shadows. Additionally, salt accumulation and rough sea conditions tend to impair the performance of the solar panels to a large degree, so they would need to be washed and serviced regularly, which really defeats the purpose of having a fully self-sufficient system.

Due to these constraints, another solution is to utilize wind power exclusively. Wind power does not rely on the weather and the hours of the day like solar power does. Vessels travel, so they generate their own wind. Even when the natural breeze is not strong, the motion of the ship generates airflow that is usable to produce power. This enables wind power to be utilized as a successful source of power without the use of direct sunlight.

Making the power system rely solely on wind power simplifies the power system and enables the maritime system to function independently. As a result, solar panels are not needed on the system. Wind turbines are placed in the most optimal spots, unbothered by shade or confined areas. Vertical-axis wind turbines (VAWTs) are particularly useful since they function optimally in heavy and fluctuating winds that prevail at the sea. VAWTs also contain fewer parts that move in comparison to the horizontal-axis turbines that are commonly employed. With fewer parts that move, the turbines require less maintenance and tend to be more durable.

The most effective aspect of the wind-only system is that it will utilize the movement of the ship to generate power at all times. Commercial vessels tend to travel either on their own engines or on ocean current, so wind power will likely always be available to utilize. This provides the constant power supply to the radar system that does not rely on the weather or time of day. Not utilizing solar panels also prevents issues of salt buildup on the panels and wear and tear on the panels due to maritime conditions, which would inhibit the radar system from receiving adequate power.

The largest concern with solely utilizing wind is if the ship is at rest for extended periods of time. At this point, the power system would not produce power for a while. This is easily rectified with the use of battery storage so it will continue to power even when no wind is present. The maritime radar system itself could also be designed to consume less power while not in use to conserve power when not producing much power. With commercial ships operating most of the time while moving, the appropriate amount of wind power with ample battery storage would be beneficial in patrolling the seas.

3.8.1 Implementation of a Wind Powered System

With wind power being the primary energy source, the power system must be designed to ensure stable and continuous operation. The system consists of a wind turbine, a charge controller, a battery storage unit, and a power regulation unit which work together to provide power to the maritime radar system and its supporting components such as the optical system. Each part of the system plays a critical role in maintaining self-sufficiency; precaution must be taken to ensure that power delivery remains uninterrupted, even in variable wind conditions such as when the vessel the system is on is docked or anchored at sea.

The wind turbine is the most important part of the power system, as it is the sole source of energy generation. Since the maritime device will be mounted on a moving vessel, the turbine will always have access to some level of airflow, whether from natural wind or the movement of the ship itself. This allows for a more consistent power source compared to land-based applications, but placement still needs to be optimized to avoid turbulent airflows caused by the vessel's superstructure or from a lack of airflow due to structures on the mast or helm of the ship. Ensuring the turbine is placed in an area where wind flow is as unobstructed as possible will maximize efficiency and reduce strain on the system which is imperative when wind is the sole power source being utilized. Additionally, since the turbine will be constantly exposed to salt spray and harsh marine conditions, it must be resistant to corrosion and built to withstand high wind speeds without suffering from excessive wear and tear.

Since wind speeds fluctuate, the power output from the turbine will not always be consistent. To manage these fluctuations and prevent damage to the system battery, a charge controller is necessary. The charge controller regulates the flow of energy from the wind turbine to the battery, ensuring that power is delivered safely and efficiently without the risk of damaging the battery. Without this, voltage spikes from strong gusts of wind could overload the battery or damage connected components, while low wind speeds could result in inefficient charging. The charge controller also prevents overcharging, which is critical for maintaining the longevity of the battery. When integrating the charge controller, care must be taken to place it in a protected area, as excessive exposure to moisture or salt can lead to failure of the power system.

Since wind power is intermittent in nature, there needs to be a battery storage system to ensure stable operation when production is low. The battery acts as a buffer, storing energy during times of high wind and delivering power when the turbine is not generating enough by itself. The capacity of the battery must be sufficient to maintain the system in

periods of prolonged low wind, particularly if the boat is moving or is positioned where airflow is non-uniform. But batteries can also be a potential point of failure if they are not serviced, as overcharging and deep discharge can drastically reduce their lifespan. A properly integrated battery management system will be monitoring charge levels and compensating for energy usage to prevent these issues. Battery placement must also receive serious attention to avoid subjecting it to the high temperatures, vibration, and corrosive chemicals, all of which have negative impacts on performance.

The final component in the power system is the power regulation unit, which delivers stable and proper power to the radar, communications equipment, and processing unit. System components demand different voltages and currents; thus, regulation must be carried out to prevent causing harm and allowing maximum operation effectiveness. Lacking this regulation, power delivery fluctuation can result in system failure or inefficiency, something that is not acceptable to a completely autonomous system. The power regulation unit must also possess protective mechanisms such as overcurrent protection and circuit isolation so that electrical faults are not allowed to propagate to the entire system. Insulation and good wiring also matter, as marine conditions pose certain challenges such as corrosion from salt, constant movement, and exposure to water.

All these features placed together allow the wind power system to provide constant and autonomous power to the maritime radar system. Employing only wind as a power source, the system avoids the maintenance and reliability issues of solar panels and uses the natural motion of the ship to generate power. Through meticulous design and integration, the system can maintain the radar in operation without external power supply, ideal for maritime surveillance applications.

Table 3.22 - Renewable Energy Comparison

Specification	Solar Power	Wind Power
Energy Source	Sunlight	Wind (natural or vessel-generated)
Availability	Daytime only, weather-dependent	Continuous with vessel motion, less weather-dependent
Power Consistency	Intermittent (sun-dependent)	More consistent (motion-enhanced)
Space Requirement	Large, unobstructed area for panels	Compact, flexible turbine placement

Space Requirement	Compact (smaller footprint)	Larger (wider blade span, taller structure)
Installation Complexity	High (wiring, brackets, panels)	Moderate (turbine mounting)
Maintenance Needs	High (cleaning, servicing for salt/wear)	Low (fewer moving parts in VAWTs)
Environmental Impact	Salt buildup, wear from sea conditions	Minimal (no shading or salt issues)
Cost Considerations	Higher (complexity, maintenance)	Moderate (simpler system)
Reliability in Maritime	Lower (shadows, degradation)	Higher (vessel motion ensures airflow)
Backup Needs	Essential (night/low sun periods)	Essential (stationary periods)

3.8.2 Comparison of Vertical and Horizontal Wind Turbines

Selecting the right wind turbine type for the maritime radar system requires understanding the core differences between vertical-axis wind turbines (VAWTs) and horizontal-axis wind turbines (HAWTs). Each design brings unique strengths and challenges to achieving a self-sufficient power solution in the harsh marine environment, shaping the foundation for subsequent component choices.

HAWTs, the conventional choice for wind energy, feature blades rotating around a horizontal axis, aligned perpendicular to the wind. This design excels in steady, unidirectional wind conditions, offering high efficiency and substantial power output—ideal for meeting significant energy demands. However, their reliance on wind direction necessitates a yaw mechanism to pivot the turbine, adding mechanical complexity. In a maritime setting, where salt corrosion and constant motion amplify wear, this increases maintenance needs and failure risks. HAWTs also require more space due to their larger blade spans and taller structures, posing challenges for installation on a vessel where room is limited and stability is paramount.

VAWTs, with blades rotating around a vertical axis, capture wind from any direction without adjustment. This omnidirectional nature suits the turbulent, variable winds at sea, enhanced by the vessel's motion-generated airflow. Their compact footprint fits constrained spaces, and a simpler design with fewer moving parts reduces

maintenance—a key advantage for an autonomous system. Yet, VAWTs typically deliver lower power per unit due to reduced aerodynamic efficiency, potentially requiring multiple units or larger designs to meet needs. As a newer technology, their long-term performance in marine conditions is less proven, adding some uncertainty.

For maritime use, HAWTs offer raw power but demand oversight and space, conflicting with self-sufficiency goals. Their size may interfere with equipment like radar, and mechanical complexity heightens vulnerability. VAWTs prioritize adaptability and resilience, leveraging dynamic winds and minimizing upkeep, though their output must align with system demands, likely paired with battery storage. This comparison guides the selection of specific turbine components, balancing efficiency, practicality, and environmental fit.

Table 3.23 - Wind Turbine Mounting Comparison

Specification	Vertical-Axis Wind Turbine (VAWT)	Horizontal-Axis Wind Turbine (HAWT)
Power Efficiency	Moderate (lower aerodynamic efficiency)	High (optimized for steady wind)
Wind Directionality	Omnidirectional (no alignment needed)	Directional (requires wind alignment)
Mechanical Complexity	Low (fewer moving parts)	Higher (yaw mechanism required)
Maintenance Needs	Low (simpler design)	Moderate to High (more components)
Space Requirement	Compact (smaller footprint)	Larger (wider blade span, taller structure)
Turbulence Tolerance	High (effective in variable winds)	Moderate (prefers steady flow)
Installation Complexity	Low (no yaw system needed)	Higher (requires stable, adjustable mount)
Typical Power Output	Lower per unit (scalable with multiples)	Higher per unit (single unit sufficient)
Marine Suitability	High (adapts to motion and turbulence)	Moderate (challenged by corrosion, space)
Technology Maturity	Emerging (less tested long-term)	Mature (extensively proven)

3.8.3 Wind Turbine Part Selection

The first wind turbine considered is the TESUP Magnum Horizontal Wind Turbine [15]. This wind turbine claims to generate 10 Kilowatts of power in a day inland which would be ample for the power of our system, and with the constant winds that are present on the open ocean, the TESUP turbine would likely generate more power than its advertised amount. In addition, “Rotation starts at a wind speed as low as 3 m/s, and from there, it continues spinning smoothly and effortlessly thanks to its large wind-catching surface area [15].” The ability for the turbine to rotate towards the direction of wind is essential for a maritime environment where wind can be turbulent and omnidirectional.

An additional benefit with the TESUP system is the ability to pair the wind turbine with the TESUP solar panels. Although wind turbines were decided to be the sole power generator on the maritime radar system, discussion on the inclusion of solar panels is still on the table and having the option for a plug and play solar panel would be plus when considering the TESUP vertical wind turbine. Additionally, this manufacture provides the ability to only purchase the fins of the wind turbines separate from the alternator. This is a nice convenience, especially for maintenance because if the wind turbine were to get damaged, we could replace only the damaged fins rather than having to purchase an entire new generation unit.

Some potential complications with this wind turbine include the form factor of the horizontal axis and the complications with mounting it along with the 6-foot RayMarine Radar that needs to be powered by the wind turbine. The horizontal-axis nature of the TESUP Magnum's design creates significant issues relative to its compatibility with marine radar systems. Unlike the vertical-axis wind turbines, whose field of wind collection is uniform regardless of wind direction and which do not require ongoing adjustment, a horizontal-axis machine has to be positioned relative to wind direction. This is particularly burdensome on a moving platform, whose wind directions change often and erratically. The need to incorporate a yaw mechanism to slew the turbine introduces mechanical complexity and additional sources of potential failure, especially in the harsh marine environment where concerns over corrosion and abrasion are high. Additionally, the large swept area of the TESUP turbine could result in interference with radar space, either blocking its field of view or requiring a mounting location that is less than ideal for effective collection of energy.

Another consideration is the physical size and installation requirements. While highly efficient, the large size of the TESUP turbine requires a heavy, vibration-damping mount to maintain balance when mounted on a vessel. Such an addition creates a higher total weight and load on the structure, which could impact the balance and operational efficiency of the boat. Due to the need for a light, low-maintenance solution that is efficient over a wide range of wind conditions, other wind turbine designs, particularly vertical axis designs, could be a better solution to this particular situation.

When looking at the TESUP line-up of devices and power generators, a vertical axis turbine came up and potentially could be a better fit to the form factor that we are trying to achieve with the design of our maritime radar system.

The Atlas Vertical Wind Turbine Generator [16] is another style of generator that is available by TESUP and, unlike the Magnum Horizontal Wind Turbine, the Atlas has a much smaller footprint due to its horizontal design. Something that is a plus is that the vertical design also allows for multiple blade orientations. TESUP has 3 sets of blades, blades for high wind, moderate wind, and low wind. For our design, we expect high wind due to the maritime environment. Although this is what we expect, actual environmental tests may differ than our expected values. Having this in mind, the multiple fan blade orientations allow us to be prepared for any possible unexpected discrepancies in environmental conditions.

Like the TESUP magnum, the atlas has a projected daily generation of 10kW which would be ample to charge the onboard battery and maintain power to the radar, star link, and the MCU. The manufacturer claims that the wind turbine is “well-protected from weather damage” however, this claim may only pertain to inland installments as conditions in a maritime environment may cause weather related issues to arise. Unlike the magnum, the atlas “wind turbine requires 4 m/s of wind speed for rotation to start.” This is 1 m/s more than the magnum. This extra wind speed required causes the vertical axis to be a less efficient design than the horizontal axis wind turbine. As mentioned before, this will likely be a non-issue due to the excess wind in maritime environments but if needed, “by adding the optional low-wind blade set, Atlas can start rotating at just 3 m/s wind speed,” similar to the wind speed of the magnum. The low wind blade set does increase the profile of the wind turbine, but we expect to use the medium or high wind blades, so this will likely not come to pass.

Another plus of the TESUP system is the integrated phone application that can be paired with the wind turbine. This phone application is able to link up with the alternator to measure and control the voltage and current that the turbine produces. This nifty feature is essential to the maritime radar system as it can ensure the battery is being efficiently charged without the potential for damage by over charging the battery with excess or high voltage.

Continuing research for vertical mounted wind turbines. The Tulip or flower shaped wind turbines mounted on a vertical axis seemed to align with our design specifications.

During our research on wind turbines, we reviewed the paper "Comparison of Rose, Aeroleaf, and Tulip Vertical Axis Wind Turbines (VAWTs) for Alternative Electricity Generation.[17]" It is a review of three VAWTs marked by flower-like designs—Rose, Aeroleaf, and Tulip—all having varying strengths and weaknesses. Their efficiency when in operation and performance factors need to be studied in order to establish the appropriate turbine suitable for various uses, especially marine environments.

The Rose turbine is a newly designed vertical axis wind turbine (VAWT) that is optimized specifically for low wind speeds and high stability. In experimental tests, it showed the highest power producing capacity, generating 2.34 watts at a 9 m/s wind speed, outperforming the Aeroleaf and Tulip turbine designs. One of its greatest advantages is its ability to reach stable rotational speeds very quickly, making it highly adaptable to settings where wind conditions fluctuate. In addition, the Rose turbine also

has a shorter Energy Payback Period (EPP), which means that it recovers its energy input in manufacturing much more quickly than other models. However, its complex blade structure translates into a slightly bulkier design and could result in higher material costs. With its efficiency and reliability, it potentially could be a compelling design to utilize on our maritime radar installment. Something to be noted is that the maritime environment could be highly turbulent and as a result, the efficiency of the rose design could be disturbed due to this variability.

The Aeroleaf turbine has been particularly designed to be integrated into urban environments, often in the forms of wind trees where several small turbines mimic the leaf-like aesthetic. The turbine is moderately efficient, requiring a wind speed of at least 7 km/h (1.94 m/s) to start power generation. While its power generation is less than that of the Rose turbine, where it delivers 2.27 W when wind speed is 9 m/s, the Aeroleaf is highly compact and performs exceptionally well when subjected to turbulent airflow. The Aeroleaf turbine is highly suitable for low-scale energy harvesting and could be highly valuable in maritime environments where space is critical. However, its comparably low power generation, in addition to the high wind speed required to trigger operation, might be limiting in its potential application where large-scale offshore power generation is required. This design could possibly suit the needs of our maritime system as we expect both ample wind and turbulent conditions in the maritime environment. There is no real benefit to having excess power in the radar system, and therefore, maximizing efficiency is energy production is not necessary. The wind turbine needs only to be as efficient as is needed by the power demand of the system and if the Aeroleaf can provide a formfactor that better suits the system requirements and functions better under turbulent conditions, then it could potentially be a viable choice for our power generator.

The Tulip turbine shows expertise in handling turbulent wind conditions that are most likely to occur at sea. However, in spite of its turbulence-handling ability, it has the lowest power output of the three models with a very small 1.76 W at 9 m/s wind speed. A big advantage of this turbine is that it produces minimal noise, making it suitable to be used in residential areas; however, it takes a longer time to reach a stable rotational speed compared to other models. The longevity and ability to withstand turbulence of the Tulip turbine might make it suitable for use in our project, especially since lowering the maintenance is very desirable in our system; however, its low efficiency makes it less desirable for open sea conditions or energy-demanding maritime activities.

For our maritime use, these flower based wind turbines provide a new perspective on finding a balance between efficiency as well as tolerability to turbulent conditions that will likely be the norm on the open ocean where we plan to implement our radar installment. From the paper, the tulip and the rose style wind turbine seemed to potentially meet some design aspects that we are looking for in the wind turbine. The adaptability to turbulent conditions is a major concern that needs to be addressed in our design requirements and the utilization of a flower design as the blades for the wind turbine could allow for the creation of a more robust power generation system.

From flower turbines[18], the smaller tulip style turbine seemed to potentially be a viable turbine for our maritime radar system. Within the research on flower shaped wind

turbines, the tulip design was described as an excellent option for turbulent locations but not necessarily being the most efficient design. The expected Watt production of the flower tulip turbine is 62.2 w/h or around 1500 Watts in a day. This expected generation is with a steady wind of 27 miles per hour. Although this wind speed is unlikely to occur inland, when placed on a maritime vessel, we expect to get at least this wind speed or possibly more, especially when the vessel is in transit. Something that is concerning is the height of the wind turbine as the blade comes in at 1.14 meters tall. This large of a blade could pose issues in mounting as we plan to mount the wind turbine in an inverted manor beneath the Ray Marine 6-foot radar.

Table 3.24 - Wind Turbine Comparison

Specification	Small Tulip Wind Turbine	TESUP Magnum Wind Turbine	TESUP Atlas Wind Turbine (High Wind Blades)
Model Number	FT 1.15M Turbine	Magnum	Atlas
Type	2-Bladed Vertical Axis	Horizontal Axis	Vertical Axis
Rated Power	100 W at 14.5 m/s	10 kW	10 kW
Expected Production	≈62.2 Wh at 12 m/s, scalable with bouquet effect	Up to 240 kWh/day	Not specified
Generator	High Efficiency Permanent Magnet	Permanent Magnet	Permanent Magnet
Blade Material	Thermoplastic	Composite Materials	Aluminum
Turbine Diameter	0.55 m (1.79 ft)	2.35 m (7.71 ft)	0.46 m (1.50 ft)
Blade Length/Height	1.15 m (3.77 ft)	2.35 m (7.71 ft)	1.5 m (4.92 ft)
Total Height	1.4 m (4.58 ft)	Not specified	1.5 m (4.92 ft)
Total Weight	≈20 kg (44.1 lbs)	20 kg (44 lbs)	20 kg (44 lbs)
Cut-In Wind Speed	0.7 m/s (1.57 mph)	3 m/s	3 m/s

Cut-Out Wind Speed	Inverter controlled	Not specified	Not specified
Max Survival Wind Speed	54 m/s (120.8 mph)	50 m/s	50 m/s
Operating Temperature Range	-15°C to 50°C	-25°C to +40°C	-25°C to +40°C
Warranty Period	5 years (Flower Turbines parts)	2 years standard	2 years standard
Price	\$1,214.06 (Off-Grid)	\$899.00 (Generator only)	\$899.00 (Generator only)

3.8.3 Charge Controller Selection

For this project we will be needing to power a RayMarine Radar, a Pi microcontroller, and a Star Link Mini along with any peripherals that we may add to the project. To power these items, a battery will be used to store the energy collected by the wind turbine. The process to store energy in this battery, however, needs to be regulated for the health of the system. This regulation can be implemented through the use of a charge controller which can prevent the overcharging of a battery, or a battery being damaged from too much current being transferred at one time. Having this controller is imperative, especially due to the variable power output that comes with wind power.

When finding a charge controller for a maritime radar system, there are some things that we must keep in mind. The waterproofing of the system is important as well as the size of the charge controller. We do not want something that is intolerant of water or a device that is too large as to not be practical to implement in our system.

The first charge controller that was investigated was a charge controller by TESUP[19]. Since we have investigated TESUP products before when looking into wind turbines, continuing to use TESUP products could potentially lead to a more seamless integration of parts into the power system of the maritime radar system. The TESUP charge controller is compatible with all TESUP turbines, however compatibility varies with other manufacturer turbines. The charge controller can manage up to 9000 Watts of power and can be used with 24V- 48V batteries which comply with the type of battery that we will be utilizing in our build. The voltage can be easily adjusted and there is connectivity through the TESUP app which can be highly beneficial when getting metrics while testing. Some things to note are the dimensions of the controller, with the controller taking up about .5 feet cubed. The space that the controller would take up is significant and housing such a component would need to be considered as a potential issue if we were to choose this charge controller.

The next charge controller that was considered was the ATO-WTCMPPT-500[20] which is a charge controller rated up to 500W with an output of either 12 or 24 volts. This charge controller is a more simple design compared to that of the TESUP as there is no LCD display or app connectivity. This lack of connectivity, however, is made up with the price of the component as it is cheaper than the TESUP charge controller. This may be a benefit as the charge controller is only in place to ensure the proper charging of the battery, and if it is known that the controller outputs the desired voltage, then no other information is needed. Another benefit is the profile of the controller. The dimensions of the controller are 100*80*15mm which is substantially smaller than the TESUP and there for, the installation and housing of the controller is likely to be a non-issue when incorporating into our design.

The final controller that was looked at was the Pikasola Wind Turbine Charge Controller[21] which also has the capability to handle DC inputs of both 12 and 24 Volts. This charge controller has a rating of IP67 which entails its waterproofing. This is an essential characteristic because in a maritime environment, waterproofing is essential and with this rating, the controller may not have to be enclosed in a weatherproof box which could save on space and material cost. This charge controller can take up to a 600W wind turbine which would be sufficient to our maritime radar system design.

Table 3.25 - Wind Turbine Comparison

Specification	TESUP Magnum Charge Controller	ATO-WTCMPPT- 500 Charge Controller	Pikasola Wind Turbine Charge Controller
Model Number	Not Specified	ATO-WTCMPPT-500	B07ZKN1C76
Voltage	24V/48V	12V/24V (Auto Recognition)	12V/24V (Auto Recognition)
Weather Rating (IP)	Not Specified	IP67	IP67
Power Rating	Up to 9 kW (9,000 W)	500W	400W/500W/600W
Dimensions (H x W x D)	32.7 cm x 20 cm x 8.5 cm	100 mm x 80 mm x 15 mm	3.1" x 2.5" x 1.2" (7.87 cm x 6.35 cm x 3.05 cm)
Weight	2 kg	0.4 kg	10 Ounces
Price	\$199	\$99.82	\$35

Compatibility	All TESUP Wind Turbine models	Not Specified	Suitable for 400W, 500W, 600W Wind Turbines
IoT Connectivity	Yes	Not Specified	Not Specified
Manual Brake Function	Yes	Not Specified	Not Specified
Dump Load	Included	Not Specified	Not Specified
Adjustable Voltage	Yes, via front panel knob	Not Specified	Not Specified
Material	Aluminum casing	Not Specified	Aluminum alloy
Braking Voltage	Not Specified	Not Specified	DC15V-30V

3.8.4 Power Storage and Battery Selection

As mentioned before, the design of our maritime radar system will include a battery of sorts to store the power that is being produced by the wind turbine. Things that we must consider with the battery is the environment that it will be placed in as well as the nature of the charge it will receive. In a maritime environment, salty ocean spray will be a common occurrence and will induce a faster rate of corrosion on metal parts. In addition, the jostling of the waves created an unstable environment which could disrupt or even damage a battery which typically operates in a stable environment. Along with the environment, the battery will be charged intermittently, in proportion to the wind that the wind turbine receives. This type of charging can cause complications with certain type of batteries that require a steady charge and discharge of power. All of these factors must be considered when choosing a battery for our system because a battery failure would cripple the maritime radar system and require extensive cost when having to repair the damage to the system.

When searching for a battery we also came to find battery systems with integrated components such as charge controllers as well as regulators that could fit the components that we must power, those being the Star Link, the Ray Marine Radar, the PI MCU, and potentially a camera system. The Star Link mini runs 12 to 48 Volts and has an included power supply, so a battery that would have a plug to support this would be ideal. In addition the Ray Marine Radar supports 12 to 24 Volt power so that power connection would also be nice to have native on the battery. Finally the 5 Volt connection for the PI MCU will likely be included on the battery as a USB port.

Having an integrated charge controller could save space on the maritime radar system and also minimize the components which we will have to waterproof. If the battery contains the charge controller, a single waterproof box may be sufficient to house components that

cannot get wet.

When researching these batteries, we made sure that they were primarily for maritime use and therefore, rated for the salty and turbulent nature of the ocean environment. One battery that is being considered is the Dakota Lithium 12V 100AH Deep Cycle Heated LiFePO₄ Battery[22]. One of the biggest advantages of this battery is its long cycle life compared to typical lead-acid batteries. With a lifespan of 3000–5000 cycles, it is a durable and reliable choice for long-term use in a marine environment. Its deep cycle capabilities allow it to handle frequent charging and discharging without significant performance loss, which is ideal when paired with an intermittent energy source like a wind turbine. The built-in heating feature is another major benefit, ensuring the battery performs well in cold conditions where lithium batteries typically struggle. Additionally, LiFePO₄ batteries are significantly lighter than lead-acid alternatives, making them easier to install and transport. This battery also maintains a steady 12.8V output, providing consistent performance for sensitive electronics. From a safety perspective, LiFePO₄ chemistry is thermally stable, reducing the risk of overheating or fire, which is crucial for maritime use. Another key advantage is that it can work with DC-DC converters, allowing voltage adjustments to power devices requiring 5V or 48V.

However, there are some drawbacks to this setup. Since the battery operates at 12V, devices like the Raymarine radar and Starlink Mini, which typically require 24V or 48V, will need DC-DC step-up converters. This adds extra cost and potential inefficiencies to the system. Another challenge is that charging efficiency depends on wind conditions. If the wind is too weak, the battery may not charge sufficiently, and if it's too strong, a charge controller is needed to prevent overcharging. The Battery Management System (BMS) inside some LiFePO₄ batteries may also have limitations on handling high surge currents, which could impact the performance of the radar system. Additionally, using a 12V battery instead of a 48V system means extra hardware like converters and charge controllers are necessary, increasing complexity and potential failure points. While LiFePO₄ batteries are lightweight for their capacity, if a higher voltage is required, multiple batteries would need to be connected in series, increasing space requirements.

Another battery type that we considered was a battery meant more for of a survivalist, where things such as power connections are available of the battery itself, where by DC regulators may not be needed to power our system components.

The battery that could possibly meet these requirements is the PREDATOR 350-Watt Power Station, 294 Wh Capacity[23]. This battery truly embodies the plug and play system that we wish to implement in our design. The battery itself has outputs that would be able to power the majority of our components from. The battery includes two 120V-350W AC outlets. These ports would be able to power both the Star Link mini as well as the Ray Marine Cyclone radar. The DC conversions would not be a problem since the radar comes with its own native voltage controller and the Star Link mini also has its own power supply which would regulate the power output from the battery. Additionally, the inclusion of a 5V-12W USB type A port would be perfect to power the PI MCU without the need to regulate the output from the battery. These plug and play supports drastically cuts down on the components necessary to power the maritime radar system.

Some things of note for this battery system is the way that it is charged. The battery has the ability to be charged by solar which is a huge plus since solar may be used in variations of our radar system. The drawback, however, is that the battery only takes AC charge rather than a DC charge which is a dilemma for us since we will primarily be using wind turbines, a DC source, as power generation. To combat this, the use of an inverter will have to be considered to properly charge the predator battery and avoid damaging it whilst charging. The inverter would take the place of the charge controller because we would no longer need to regulate the voltage that the wind turbine outputs. This inverter would allow the battery to be charged by the wind turbine and there would no longer be an issue with using the battery as our main power source.

Another battery that we considered is the Amped Outdoors 24V 50Ah LiFePO4 battery[24] which presents a strong solution for our maritime power needs, particularly given its lightweight design (26.75 lbs) and high energy density. This makes it well-suited for powering the Starlink Mini, Raymarine Cyclone radar, and Raspberry Pi MCU while keeping the system portable and efficient. Its marine-grade construction ensures it can handle the harsh conditions of a boat environment, resisting vibrations, moisture, and corrosion, which are all crucial factors for longevity and reliability. Additionally, its built-in Battery Management System (BMS) provides protection against overcharging, over-discharging, and short circuits, which helps maintain safety and extend the battery's operational lifespan. The added Bluetooth monitoring feature allows for real-time tracking of battery health and performance via a smartphone, which is a valuable feature when managing an off-grid power system.

However, integrating this battery with our wind turbine requires careful planning. Since wind energy generation fluctuates due to varying wind speeds, the battery must be charged through a compatible 24V wind charge controller to regulate and stabilize the power input. A wind turbine's output is highly variable, meaning the charge controller must efficiently handle power surges and prevent overvoltage damage to the battery. Additionally, wind turbines tend to generate wild AC power, which needs to be rectified into DC before charging. If the turbine's output doesn't match the optimal charge voltage and current for the Amped Outdoors battery, charging inefficiencies or even battery damage could occur.

Another consideration is whether 24V is the ideal voltage for all our components. While the Raymarine Cyclone radar and Starlink Mini can operate at 24V, we may need DC-DC converters to step the voltage down to 5V for the Raspberry Pi or up to 48V if any future components require it. While, unlike the predator battery, we would need a regulator for the Pi MCU, the added power and efficiency of the Amped Outdoors battery could possibly be a better fit for the power demand of our system.

Table 3.26 - Battery Comparison

Specification	Predator 350W Power Station	Amped Outdoors 24V 50Ah LiFePO₄ Battery	Dakota Lithium 12V 100Ah LiFePO₄ Battery
Nominal Voltage	12V DC	24V	12V
Capacity	294Wh	50Ah (1,200Wh)	100Ah (1,280Wh)
Continuous Power Output	350W	50A (1,200W at 24V)	100A (1,280W at 12V)
Peak Power Output	700W	80A (1,920W at 24V)	200A (2,560W at 12V)
Weight	8.8 lbs	26.75 lbs	31.9 lbs
Dimensions (L×W×H)	9.3" x 8.1" x 7.7"	10 1/8" x 6 1/2" x 8 1/4"	12.99" x 6.77" x 8.66"
Battery Type	Lithium-ion	LiFePO ₄	LiFePO ₄
Lifespan (Charge Cycles)	3500+	2000+ cycles	3000-5000 cycles
Operating Temperature Range	Not specified	Charge: 0°C to 45°C Discharge: -20°C to 60°C	Charge: 0°C to 45°C Discharge: -20°C to 60°C
Integrated BMS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bluetooth Monitoring	No	Yes	No
Warranty	Not specified	10 years	11 years
Price	\$199	\$619 (battery only) \$749.99 (with charger)	\$799

3.8.5 Identification and Selection of Regulators

The use as well as the system Voltage that we will be running at. If the system were to run off of 12 Volts, then a voltage regulator may be needed to ramp up the voltage to 24 Volts for the Star Link mini as well as a regulator to step down the voltage of the system to 5 Volts for the Pi MCU. These regulators would make it possible for the maritime radar system to utilize batteries such as form Dakota Lithium(12V) or the amped outdoors 24V battery.

In the case of the Star Link mini, the standard input for the system would be AC such as from a wall socket. When pairing the Star Link with a battery that can only output at a single Voltage, some sort of conversion needs to take place to adapt the output to a useable form for the Star Link mini. A prominent solution that is available on the market is a Starlink Mini PoE DC Power Conversion Kit with 12v Accessory Output by MOBILEMUSTHAVE[25]. This device takes the place of a voltage regulator as instead of having to rely solely on the proprietary Star Link mini power supply, this device would take its place and allow for power to be consumed from a DC source such as the 12V or 24V battery options that we have selected. This conversion kit would function for both a 12V or 24V system as it is rated for between 9V and 30V as the input Voltage. This is a really nice feature because modeling our system around only one battery or one voltage can limit the possible expansion of the maritime radar system and with this converter, we gain flexibility to increase or decrease the battery voltage to possibly change to higher power batteries in the future if needed by our system requirements.

The converter is capable of delivering up to 100W at 48V to the Star Link mini which will ensure that the connection is secure and uninterrupted or slowed by poor power output by a cheaper converter. In addition to the output regulation to the Star Link, the converter also comes with two USB type A ports. One is rated for 12V while the other is a standard 5V port. This is a really important inclusion on this device as it means that a regulator would not be needed to power the Pi MCU since we can power the MCU directly from the regulator that manages the Star Link. We would need to be careful with which USB we plug the Pi into as the MCU could be fried if plugged into the 12V USB port instead of the 5V port.

Another regulator that is more budget friendly is the Starlink Mini Step Up Power Cable 12V/24V to 30V 3.5A Converter with DC Power Cable, 9V to 28V Input DC Step-Up Power Adapter Cord for Starlink Mini[26]. Unlike the previous regulator, this regulator solely applies to the Star Link mini and has no other outlets that could possibly power the Pi MCU or any other peripherals. With this in mind, the lower cost that this regulator offers does ease some financial burden. This DC regulator boosts up to a 30V output to power the Star Link mini. This voltage is less than the 48V that the regulator from MOBILEMUSTHAVE provides, but the loss of performance from the under voting of the Star Link mini may not affect the scope of transmissions that we expect to be sending over the Star Link network.

Using the cheaper Star Link regulator would also require the additional use of a DC regulator specifically for the Pi MCU. The PlusRoc Waterproof 12V/24V to 5V Converter DC-DC Step Down Module Power Adapter Compatible with Raspberry Pi [27] would be sufficient and with a price under ten dollars, would not infringe on the cost saving from avoiding the adapter from MOBILEMUSTHAVE. This adapter is capable of stepping down the voltage from a 12V or 24V battery to power a 5V device and comes with the USB type C connector which would power the Pi MCU that will be implemented in our design. The drawback to using these two regulators is the complexity of the system and the worry of waterproofing in our maritime environment. Having multiple regulators will increase the maritime radar system and could potentially incur cost when transporting or dealing with extra waterproofing that may be required.

Table 3.27 - Regulator Comparison

Specification	PlusRoc Waterproof 12V/24V to 5V Converter	Starlink Gen 3 12V to 56V DC Step-Up Adapter	Starlink Mini PoE DC Power Conversion Kit
Input Voltage Range	8V to 35V DC	9V to 35V DC	9V to 30V DC
Output Voltage	5V DC	56V DC	56V DC
Output Current	Up to 5A	Up to 2A	Up to 2A
Power Output	Up to 25W	Up to 112W	Up to 112W
Efficiency	Up to 96%	Approximately 90%	Approximately 90%
Waterproof Rating	IP68	Not specified	Not specified
Dimensions	1.85 x 1.38 x 0.67 inches	3.5 x 2.5 x 1.2 inches	3.5 x 2.5 x 1.2 inches
Weight	1.59 ounces	4 ounces	4 ounces
Price	\$9.99	\$29.98	\$99.99

Chapter 4: Standards and Design Constraints

Engineering systems operating in real-world environments have to perform extremely well but do so safely, reliably, and in compliance with industry standards. For maritime systems such as the MDAS, this responsibility is no different. The MDAS must be capable of operating in rapidly changing environmental conditions, minimizing any impact on host vessel operations, maintaining secure and reliable communications, and complying with a broad range of regulatory domains. These include radio frequency emissions, electromagnetic radiation safety, equipment interaction, and long-term environmental durability.

Standards are required as they establish the exact rules and detailed specifications that are significant in ensuring compatibility among various types of equipment, safe usage, and adherence to legal requirements. Design constraints, however, are the physical limitations within which the engineering team has to operate successfully. These include a variety of factors, but are not limited to limited costs, weight, size requirements, and power, as well as environmental concerns and safety issues.

Within the MDAS program, there is the need to ensure compliance with relevant standards and recognize corresponding limitations in order to ensure that the system performs well, meets the maritime installation specifications, supports potential scalability, and finds acceptance by the regulators and stakeholders such as NOAA and government agencies.

4.1 Standards

Standards form the pillars that govern the development of complex systems such as the MDAS by outlining the specifications, criteria, and optimum practices that ensure the safety, synchronization, and lawfulness of systems in varied environments and applications. Standardized components enable the linking of innovation and compatibility by describing the performance standards that the equipment must meet, the transmission protocols for the transmission of data that manage the communication between systems, and the interfaces between components that cross multiple platforms.

Several bodies, such as the IEEE, FCC, IEC, IMO, and ITU, define them as the functional standards that govern the implementation of technologies like radar, wireless communications, and satellite transmission in different industries and global borders. The standards ensure that devices like MDAS function well on ships without interfering with the operation of installed navigation systems, communication equipment, and safety equipment.

Besides meeting technical requirements, standards are essential to safeguard the well-being of users and the general public. These standards often include limits for power output, radiation exposure, resistance to environmental stresses, and stability of operation. Compliance with these regulations goes beyond legal conformity; it is essential to promote confidence in the system's ability to perform under adverse or uncertain conditions. For a system like the MDAS, which may operate independently in remote

locations or aboard commercial vessels, conformity to these standards is crucial to successful integration, acceptance, and continued use.

4.1.1 FCC 47 CFR Part 80 - Maritime Services and Radar Compliance

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is the U.S. government body responsible for overseeing the nation's electromagnetic spectrum, which encompasses radio and microwave frequency ranges used in commercial and governmental systems. Among its many responsibilities, the FCC regulates rules for maritime communication and navigation systems under Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 80. This section of the code establishes the legal requirements for marine communication services, such as those utilizing radar, AIS, VHF radios, and emergency position-indicating radio beacons (EPIRBs), all of which are widely utilized in the maritime sector for efficient and safe vessel operation.

The Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS) makes use of radar technology as a key element for the immediate identification and tracking of vessels and targets in the nearby marine traffic. As such, adherence to FCC 47 CFR Part 80 is not a procedural formality; rather, it forms the underlying basis for the lawful operation of the system, safety standards, and compatibility on U.S. vessels. The MDAS design entails the fitting of a Raymarine Cyclone radar unit operating on the X-band range of 9.3 GHz to 9.5 GHz, the specific band assigned for use in maritime radar in Part 80 requirements. The radar is pre-certified with FCC ID PJ5-953MPSSR and therefore meets technical specifications like frequency allocation, emission bandwidth, peak power, and pulse characteristics.

This standard not only prescribes the frequencies on which a marine radar system can operate, but also its permitted power output, the extent of its emission bandwidth, and how the radar must interact with other systems on a ship. These are not abstruse considerations, each one has influenced particular engineering choices in terms of antenna choice, spatial location relative to other communications modules, shielding mechanisms, power management, and signal filtering within the context of MDAS. For example, due to the demands laid out in Part 80, under which radar emissions must be confined to a particular spectral band, caution must be exercised during integration so that the radar either overlaps or interferes with adjacent modules. These include things like Starlink Mini terminals, GPS receivers, or Wi-Fi access points, all of which might be operating in nearby bands.

Equally important, FCC Part 80 sets certification standards for radar equipment used on vessels. Any radar product that lacks certification to this standard is not allowed to operate legally in the United States. waters, particularly on government research vessels like those operated by NOAA, who have had early interest in the MDAS platform. This consideration alone drove the choice to utilize pre-certified COTS hardware over custom radar development, which would have entailed a long and costly certification process.

Further, the FCC Part 80 standard specifies the guidelines for installation and operating procedures. For MDAS, this calls for the radar to be installed in a manner that will prevent interference with other sensitive electronic devices, along with having all RF cabling correctly routed to avoid coupling or leakage. The rule also requires that

procedures for startup and shutdown be secured so that signal flooding or transients emitted that could affect onboard navigation or communications systems are minimized. Moreover, the MDAS must also follow emission duty-cycle limits, which govern how frequently the radar would transmit and the duration of individual pulses—factors directly related to power utilization, thermal capability, and image quality in the radar.

It quickly became apparent through initial project briefs with the technical consultants and with NOAA stakeholders that compliance with purely FCC-sanctioned maritime standards was a requirement if prototypes were ever to appear on real maritime vehicles. This not only guarantees the lawful usability of MDAS but also provides room for follow-on evolutions to more sophisticated deployment setups, e.g., integration with port authorities, the Coast Guard, or even utilization of multi-sensor fusion systems on board autonomous surface vehicles (ASVs) or uncrewed surface vessels (USVs). All of these prospective areas of utilization fall under the same Part 80 standard, further indicating its significance.

In conclusion, FCC 47 CFR Part 80 is not merely a licensing requirement but is, in fact, a holistic technical, structural, and strategic framework that has had far-reaching influence on the MDAS project in its various phases, ranging from hardware selection through software control protocols, system-level electromagnetic compatibility, to future deployment planning. By aligning its design with the specifications of this regulation, the MDAS project guarantees that it is legally, safely, and functionally capable of providing vessel detection services in the actual environments it was designed for.

4.1.2 IEEE C95.1-2019 - Electromagnetic Radiation Safety

The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, commonly referred to as IEEE, is among the most well-known organizations in the world. The premier organization has a key role in the development and publication of essential standards that ensure safety, facilitate interoperability, and enhance performance across a wide variety of technology fields. One such standard that has seen the most extensive use and implementation throughout the industry goes by the designation IEEE C95.1-2019, with the official title being "Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Electric, Magnetic, and Electromagnetic Fields, 0 Hz to 300 GHz." The primary objective of this important standard is to provide comprehensive protections for the general public as well as for workers engaged in professions where exposure to such fields may occur, protecting them from the potential biological effects that may arise from exposure to electromagnetic fields. This includes those fields that are generated by high-power systems, more specifically radar systems, which are designed to emit high amounts of electromagnetic radiation. Since the Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS) is using a commercial radar that works in the X-band frequency range of 9.3 GHz to 9.5 GHz, it is clear that the relevance of this standard is not just timely but absolutely essential under the present circumstances.

The basic aim of IEEE C95.1-2019 is to set and specifically define the maximum permissible exposure (MPE) levels that are acceptable over a broad range of frequencies along with various use cases. These MPE values are given in terms of electric field

strength in volts per meter (V/m), magnetic field strength in amperes per meter (A/m), and power density in watts per square meter (W/m²). These are arrived at through a comprehensive study and analysis from scientific and medical research, and these are focused on major points such as tissue heating, nerve stimulation, and hazards from prolonged exposure to such fields.

Specifically, for X-band radar frequencies, the power density limit is set at 50 W/m² for occupational exposure and 10 W/m² for general public exposure, averaged over a six-minute time period. These are set to avoid having personnel or bystanders in the area of operating systems exposed to hazardous levels of non-ionizing radiation, either in open-air environments or in enclosed structures where reflections and accumulation can occur. In the MDAS application, this standard has a serious role in influencing not just the physical design, but also the procedures for installation and the overall control system architecture. One of the earliest challenges that was planned out and taken into account was the physical location of the radar, more specifically in terms of areas that are within human reach. Unlike commercial vessels that mount radar arrays tens of feet above deck level, MDAS is intended for mounting on small to medium-sized platforms, e.g., research vessels, patrol craft, and commercial vessels. In most of these cases, the radar can be mounted only 5 to 10 feet above deck level, putting the emission zone in potential proximity to individuals.

In order to successfully satisfy this particular requirement, the MDAS system incorporates a variety of features that have been directly derived from the best practices established in IEEE C95.1-2019 guidelines. To begin with, the system effectively employs a fan-beam radar antenna pattern, which is specifically designed to project energy mainly within the horizontal plane. This intentional design choice significantly minimizes any vertical dispersion of the energy, thereby greatly reducing the likelihood of any exposure at ground level. Along with the essential aspect of physical placement, it is interesting to note that the MDAS radar system also includes an innovative component known as the "Standby" mode. This particular mode is software-based but serves a very significant purpose: it effectively shuts down radio frequency emissions under particular circumstances such as maintenance, docking procedures, or when personnel are known to be present in very close proximity to the antenna itself. This essential function is addressed with accuracy, being managed both locally at the site and remotely via the system's microcontroller unit (MCU). By incorporating this functionality directly within the system firmware, the design as a whole greatly reduces the risk of emitting during docking or when maintenance is being done to other hardware on the pilothouse. Along with this, it should be mentioned that the startup sequence of the system is expressly designed to default to a non-radiating state, which works to ensure a safe default configuration right at power-up.

The other important aspect that can be understood from the standards set in IEEE C95.1-2019 is the duty cycle, along with the averaging time that is utilized in the radar system's emission profile. While pulsed radar systems, such as the Raymarine Cyclone, carry low average power levels since each pulse is brief and transient, their ability to transmit high peak power can constitute significant short-term hazards in instances where personnel unknowingly enter the path of the beam. The MDAS, or Marine Dynamic

Antenna System, thus employs refined time-based emission control techniques and sophisticated feedback systems to diligently track and adjust pulse rates in such a way that the time-averaged exposure of individuals is always maintained well beneath the safety threshold, even under more demanding edge case scenarios such as when low-speed scanning missions are being conducted or during diagnostic test procedures.

In short, the incorporation of IEEE C95.1-2019 in the design process of MDAS prioritizes electromagnetic radiation safety as a primary imperative instead of an add-on requirement. By including important features such as controlled emission profiles, non-radiating states, physical mounting design considerations the MDAS system clearly demonstrates adherence to current safety standards in the industry. The part selection choices made not only maintain the maximum allowable exposure levels for both occupational and general environments but also instill confidence in stakeholders and end-users on the operation of the system with a high level of safety and reliability. As the MDAS progresses to full implementation, ongoing adherence to IEEE C95.1-2019 will be significant in maintaining its rightful utilization in various maritime environments.

4.1.3 IEEE 1547 - Standard for Interconnecting Distributed Resources with Electric Power Systems

[Currently Working]

4.1.4 Code of Federal Regulations - Automatic Identification System

As stated in the Code of Federal Regulations in Title 33, Navigation and Navigable Waters, § 164.46 Automatic Identification System , Automatic Identification Systems or AIS means a maritime navigation safety communications system standardized by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), adopted by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), that—

(1) Provides vessel information, including the vessel's identity, type, position, course, speed, navigational status and other safety-related information automatically to appropriately equipped shore stations, other ships, and aircraft;

(2) Receives automatically such information from similarly fitted ships, monitors and tracks ships; and

(3) Exchanges data with shore-based facilities.

Gross tonnage means tonnage as defined under the International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships, 1969.

International voyage means a voyage from a country to which the present International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea applies to a port outside such country, or conversely.

Properly installed, operational means an Automatic Identification System (AIS) that is installed and operated using the guidelines set forth by the International Maritime

Organization (IMO) Resolution A.917(22) and Safety of Navigation Circulars (SN/Circ.) 227, 244, 245, and SN.1/Circ.289; or National Marine Electronics Association (NMEA) Installation Standard 0400-3.10 in lieu of SN/Circ.227 and 245 (incorporated by reference, see § 164.03).

(b) AIS carriage —

(1) AIS Class A device. The following vessels must have on board a properly installed, operational USCG Type-approved* AIS Class A device:

(i) A self-propelled vessel of 65 feet or more in length**, engaged in commercial service.

(ii) A towing vessel of 26 feet or more in length** and more than 600 horsepower, engaged in commercial service.

(iii) A self-propelled vessel that is certificated to carry more than 150 passengers.

(iv) A self-propelled vessel engaged in dredging operations in or near a commercial channel or shipping fairway in a manner likely to restrict or affect navigation of other vessels.

(v) A self-propelled vessel engaged in the movement of —

(A) Certain dangerous cargo as defined in subpart C of part 160 of this chapter, or

(B) Flammable or combustible liquid cargo in bulk that is listed in 46 CFR 30.25–1, Table 30.25–1.

(2) AIS Class B device. AIS Class B device in lieu of an AIS Class A device is permissible on the following vessels if they are not subject to pilotage by other than the vessel Master or crew:

(i) fishing industry vessels;

(ii) Vessels identified in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section that is certificated to carry less than 150 passengers and that—

(A) Do not operate in a Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) or Vessel Movement Reporting System (VMRS) area defined in Table 161.12(c) of § 161.12 of this chapter, and

(B) Do not operate at speeds in excess of 14 knots; and

(iii) Vessels identified in paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section engaged in dredging operations.

vessels, and fish tender vessels as defined in 46 U.S.C. 2101.

(c) ***SOLAS provisions.*** The following self-propelled vessels must comply with International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), as amended, Chapter V, regulation 19.2.1.6 (Positioning System), 19.2.4 (AIS Class A), and 19.2.3.5 (Transmitting Heading Device) or 19.2.5.1 (Gyro Compass) as applicable (Incorporated by reference, see § 164.03):

(1) A vessel of 300 gross tonnage or more, on an international voyage.

(2) A vessel of 150 gross tonnage or more, when carrying more than 12 passengers on an international voyage.

(d) ***Operations.*** The requirements in this paragraph are applicable to any vessel equipped with AIS.

(1) Use of AIS does not relieve the vessel of the requirements to sound whistle signals or display lights or shapes in accordance with the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (72 COLREGS), 28 U.S.T. 3459, T.I.A.S. 8587, or Inland Navigation Rules, 33 CFR part 83; nor of the radio requirements of the Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act, 33 U.S.C. 1201-1208, part 26 of this chapter, and 47 CFR part 80.

(2) AIS must be maintained in effective operating condition, which includes—

(i) The ability to reinitialize the AIS, which requires access to and knowledge of the AIS power source and password;

(ii) The ability to access AIS information from the primary conning position of the vessel;

(iii) The accurate broadcast of a properly assigned Maritime Mobile Service Identity (MMSI) number;

(iv) The accurate input and upkeep of all AIS data fields and system updates; and

(v) For those vessels denoted in paragraph (b) of this section, the continual operation of AIS and its associated devices (e.g., positioning system, gyro, converters, displays) at all times while the vessel is underway or at anchor, and, if moored, at least 15 minutes prior to getting underway; except when its operation would compromise the safety or security of the vessel or a security incident is imminent. The AIS should be returned to continuous operation as soon as the compromise has been mitigated or the security incident has passed. The time and reason for the silent period should be recorded in the ship's official log and reported to the nearest Captain of the Port or Vessel Traffic Center (VTC).

(3) AIS safety-related text messaging must be conducted in English and solely to exchange or communicate pertinent navigation safety information (analogous to a SECURITE broadcast). Although not prohibited, AIS text messaging should not be relied upon as the primary means for broadcasting distress (MAYDAY) or urgent (PAN PAN) communications. (47 CFR 80.1109, Distress, urgency, and safety communications).

(4) AIS application-specific messaging (ASM) is permissible, but is limited to applications adopted by the International Maritime Organization (such as IMO SN.1/Circ.289) or those denoted in the International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities' (IALA) ASM Collection for use in the United States or Canada, and to no more than one ASM per minute.

(e) **Watchkeeping.** AIS is primarily intended for use by the Master or person in charge of the vessel, or by the person designated by the Master or person in charge to pilot or direct the movement of the vessel, who must maintain a periodic watch for AIS information.

(f) **Portable AIS.** The use of a portable AIS is permissible only to the extent that electromagnetic interference does not affect the proper function of existing navigation and communication equipment on board and such that only one AIS device may be transmitting on board a vessel at any one time.

(g) **AIS Pilot Plug.** The AIS Pilot Plug on any vessel subject to pilotage by other than the vessel Master or crew must be readily available and easily accessible from the primary conning position of the vessel and permanently affixed (not an extension cord) and adjacent (within 3 feet) to a 120-volt 50/60 Hz AC power receptacle (NEMA 5-15).

(h) **Exceptions.** The following vessels may seek up to a 5-year deviation from the AIS requirements of this section by requesting a deviation under § 164.55.

(1) Vessels that operate solely within a very confined area (e.g., less than a 1 nautical-mile radius, shipyard, or barge fleeting facility);

(2) Vessels that conduct only short voyages (less than 1 nautical mile) on a fixed schedule (e.g., a bank-to-bank river ferry service or a tender vessel);

(3) Vessels that are not likely to encounter other AIS-equipped vessels;

(4) Vessels whose design or construction makes it impracticable to operate an AIS device (e.g., those that lack electrical power, have an exposed or open cabin, or are submersible);
or

(5) Vessels denoted in paragraph (b)(2) that seek a deviation from requirements in paragraphs (d)(2)(ii) and (e) of this section because their AIS Class B device lacks a display.

(i) **Prohibition.** Except for maritime support stations (see 47 CFR 80.5) licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), broadcasts from AIS Class A or B devices on aircraft, non-self propelled vessels or from land are prohibited.

4.2 Constraints

The development of the Maritime Domain Awareness System (MDAS) is not only driven by technological advances and operational demands but also by a set of pragmatic limitations previously identified as design constraints. These are caused by various factors: economic limitations, environmental factors, availability of power, and available technologies.

In contrast to standards, which establish the regulatory or safety standards that a design must satisfy, constraints are project-specific problems or limitations arising from stakeholder requirements, resource constraints, and technical considerations. Constraints are not inherently bad but are actually critical parameters that compel the creation of a viable and workable system. The MDAS project, being charged with delivering an economically feasible, autonomous, and deployable marine detection and monitoring platform, is confronted with numerous such constraints. Three significant limitations are discussed in the sections that follow:

4.2.1 Environmental Factor Constraints

Environmental factors place a number of critical restrictions on the development and deployment of the MDAS unit. Working in marine environments is far more challenging than in inland or controlled environments. The system should be capable of performing even after being exposed to continuous salt spray, high humidity, intense solar radiation, harsh winds, and fluctuating temperatures which are conditions that pose issues for both the structural and operational longevity of the unit. These environmental conditions provide harsh constraints on the types of materials, mechanical designs, and electronic components that can be used in the system, because only certain arrangements are capable of withstanding prolonged exposure in harsh marine environments.

A significant challenge is exposure of the system to water. Constantly surrounded by water, the high humidity and salt filled air contribute to corrosion and degradation of structural components and electrical contacts over time. This places a critical restriction on the MDAS to incorporate waterproofing techniques and tightly seal all enclosures so that water cannot penetrate. Electrical failure due to corrosion and short-circuiting could endanger the functionality of important systems such as the radar or communication modules. Because of this, we have to be more prepared in identifying, managing and reducing the possibility of water leaks by properly enclosing the design.

Another challenge the system may face is from temperature fluctuations out at sea. This can introduce stress on mechanical connections, housing parts, and internal hardware. Thermal cycling from day to night can cause the loosening of fasteners, weakening of adhesives or mechanical fatigue leading to a restraint on how parts are constructed together. Additionally, the system must withstand long term exposure to ultraviolet (UV) radiation, which causes materials like plastics and coatings to degrade and ultimately develop surface cracking, brittleness and discoloration. Thus another constraint is added further reducing to the range of materials appropriate for the MDAS configuration and introduces other needs to combat it. Leading to the discussion of protective finishes, UV resistant coatings and a robust mechanical design.

Wind exposure presents another major constraint, particularly since the MDAS features a vertical-axis wind turbine. While the idea of having as much wind as possible seems like a benefit for an off-grid power generating system, it also introduces aerodynamic loads for the structure to face. Harsh winds can impose torque on the wind turbine which in turn induces forces, vibrations and extra pressure upon the mounting implementation. All of these need consideration within the system engineering design because effectively mounting the equipment and reducing the factors that can negatively impact it greatly benefit the accuracy of data acquired and improve the life expectancy of moving components.

4.2.2 Weight and Form Factor Constraints

Another key constraint affecting the MDAS system is the limitation on its overall weight and physical dimensions. From the beginning, the system was introduced to be designed and installed without requiring heavy equipment or permanent structural modifications to the respective vessel it would reside on. This placed a constraint on weight and form factor as the system had to offer portability and be easy to manually set up. To achieve this goal, the weight and form factor was limited as it needed to be easily transportable, and mountable with a limited number of people with basic tools making the system suitable for deployment in a wide variety of maritime environments.

The weight constraint directly influences component selection and structural design. More dense materials, although generally much stronger, had to be avoided or used sparingly so as to not design a structure too difficult to transport. Therefore, each design section, made up of the outer open structure frame, radar, co-axial wind turbine, power storage and electronics enclosure had to be designed with a focus on reducing weight while also trying to be relatively stable. Any extra weight would compromise the structural strength of the unit once mounted on surfaces like the boathouse rooftops or mass-like structures.

In addition to the weight constraint, we also experienced a size/form factor constraint as well. The size of our system was highly dictated by the size of radar we selected. Choosing a large radar meant that the system needed to fully support the physical length and rotational clearance of the radar array without compromising on mechanical stability. This decision not only affected the dimensions of the MDAS frame but also the size and placements for the other components like the turbine, electronics, enclosure and especially the mounting structure.

Furthermore, the form factor imposed more constraints on the systems deployment methods and locations. It required a flat open area with enough clearance for the radar and turbine to function without obstruction. Having a large radar can rule out many mounting options like on masts or railings which wouldn't be able to operate due to obstacles. Certain mounting options would need to accommodate it by evenly spreading out weight and ensuring solid anchoring to the surface. On the other hand, for smaller radars, many different mounting options are available and wouldn't require much anchoring strength due to a smaller form factor of the design. Masts and railing would be an available option.

As a result, the system had to be carefully designed to ensure no part imposed more restrictions on another. The weight and form factor constraints led to more limitations on the design than expected to retain the goals of the MDAS project in terms of portability and simplicity of deployment.

4.2.3 Raspberry Pi Constraints

Another technical constraint in our project is how the Raspberry Pi will manage communication with several onboard hardware components and sensors that make up our Maritime Domain Awareness system. The Raspberry Pi board we are using has four USB ports and a 40-pin GPIO header. These interfaces will allow us to handle both incoming and outgoing data between the embedded system and connected devices like the radar, camera/gimbal system, GPS module, and power management components.

One of the main challenges with the interfaces is being able to efficiently allocate the limited GPIO and serial ports that are available. The Raspberry Pi will be able to receive data from the radar through the USB interface, while simultaneously controlling the gimbal system, which will require PWM or UART signals. We also need to manage communication with onboard sensors and modules via I2C or SPI. Since there is a limited number of pins available for each communication protocol, there is a constraint on how many components can be connected directly.

Another constraint to consider is how the system will transmit data back to the command center. This will be done via Starlink through a USB-based connection which will occupy yet another one of the available USB ports. We also need to monitor power consumption on the Raspberry Pi, since the system must remain operational in a remote environment where power is limited and supplied through a renewable source.

4.2.4 Time Constraints

[Currently working]

4.2.5 Budget Constraints

[Currently Working]

Chapter 5: Comparison of ChatGPT with other Similar Platforms

With the rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Large Language Models (LLM) in recent years, we have sought to transform a machine's ability to make decisions and learn as humans do. Machine Learning models have often been implemented in applications that require their decision-making capabilities in various real-world environments in a naturalistic and human-like manner. Now, with the ability to interact with humans as a chatbot, these LLMs have gained much attention with the assistance they provide everyday to not only technology professionals, but also the general public. This rapid rise of LLMs has had a profound impact with improving productivity and creativity, but it has also raised new challenges around accuracy, ethics, and over-reliance.

5.1 LLM Comparison

Large Language Models (LLMs) are deep-learning algorithms capable of “recognize[ing], summariz[ing], translate[ing], predict[ing], and generate[ing] content using very large datasets” [28]. Essentially, you submit a prompt (input) to an LLM and it predicts an appropriate response (output) based on patterns learned from all this text data. Modern LLMs are typically built on transformer architectures, which helps these models understand context and relationships between words very effectively. In fact, the ‘T’ in ChatGPT stands for transformer (“Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer”). This technology has unlocked AI's ability to have very human-like conversations with its users.

These AI chatbots can carry conversations with users, answer questions, and assist in many tasks using natural language. They have become widely accessible and increasingly popular in recent years. They will continue to grow as we see them available as mobile apps and integrated in our phones as AI assistants (e.g. Samsung's Galaxy AI and Apple's Apple Intelligence). Users can ask for explanations of various concepts, get help with coding, or prompt creative outputs like poems, stories and even drawings and videos. In all these cases, the LLM crafts a relevant response using its trained knowledge.

While more and more people find this technology incredibly useful and beneficial, it is important to understand the drawbacks and limitations that are present. There is a phenomenon associated with generative AI known as “hallucination,” meaning the models can sometimes produce false or misleading information. The critical point to remember here is that these LLMs do not truly know facts, they simply predict the most likely text. It is always a good idea to exercise caution and verify critical information when dealing with these models, as these tools can occasionally give answers that sound reasonable but are actually incorrect. As these AI assistants integrate further into our workflows, it's vital to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the various LLM platforms. Different platforms might excel at certain tasks, where some might be ideal for creative writing, while others are designed to assist in coding or for business productivity.

5.1.1 Case Study - ChatGPT

5.1.1.1 Embedded Systems Perspective

Throughout the development of the project, ChatGPT was used as a tool for researching technologies, organizing findings, and drafting documentation to support the design of the system. It quickly became a reliable way to gather sources to conduct research and get any technical clarification, especially in areas unfamiliar to the team. One of the most beneficial applications came during the research phase on marine communication protocols, where we learned about NMEA 2000 and its role in allowing the radar system to interface with other marine devices.

At first it was difficult to understand NMEA 2000 when going through typical search engines since it typically led to overly technical whitepapers or high-level summaries. ChatGPT was prompted to explain NMEA 2000 in context, including how it differed from NMEA 0183 and how it relates to the CAN protocol. The responses provided a solid conceptual foundation. This made it easier to dive deeper into details like baud rate, network topology, and physical layer connections. At this step, it was important to cross-verify using manufacturer documentation and trusted technical blogs considering AI ‘hallucinations’ previously discussed. In most cases, ChatGPT offered information that was either accurate or very close to correct. It would even provide sources at times which made it quicker to comprehend complex subjects.

ChatGPT also supported the research process when evaluating options for a single board computer and programming languages that could work for the embedded system. The most convenient use at this time was to prompt it to compare boards such as the Raspberry Pi, Arduino Uno, and BeagleBone Black and their key features including processing power, memory, and available interfaces. Similarly, it was useful when comparing several programming languages by asking ChatGPT to describe their advantages and limitations in embedded applications. These results were later confirmed using official datasheets and vendor websites. While certain specifications were double-checked, the ChatGPT helped quickly narrow down the best options for both hardware and software choices.

5.1.1.2 Optical System Perspective

In addition to using ChatGPT for assisting with research on embedded systems, we also utilized this LLM for research on the optical components of the project. Specifically, we used ChatGPT to compare different types of camera sensors and lens systems to help narrow down which ones would be the best for our project specifications. By using ChatGPT for research it helped quickly compile comparison data, while we could specifically choose parameters we were looking for. There are many factors that all come into play when comparing optical technologies, and ChatGPT helped to easily display the vast amount of options in an easy to read format.

One thing that we needed to be cautious about was the validity of the options that were provided in the outputs. For a majority of the output options, any provided links did not

result in valid products or reliable articles. Some of the links were to webpages that previously existed, while others led to nowhere in particular. While it is incredibly helpful for all of the outputs to be instantly presented, it is important to check the credibility of each piece of information to prevent incorrect information from being the foundation of our project. When beginning to research which camera sensor to use for the project, it was a bit overwhelming looking into all of the different models of both CCD and CMOS sensors. By using ChatGPT, it made it a bit easier to process all of the different options to determine what to research further.

In addition to providing comparisons of the camera sensors, we also used ChatGPT to provide basic comparison data of the different possible lens systems for the magnification portion of the project. The best use for this was generating a table with comparison data, which also providing equations for the basic working principles. By utilizing this, we were quickly able to narrow down and select the proper lens system, making sure to double check stated specifications.

5.1.2 Case Study - Gemini

5.1.2.1 Radar Perspective

To evaluate Google Gemini's ability to assist with technical research, we posed the following open-ended question to it: identify the most significant radar features for the detection of vessels in a maritime environment. This included understanding environmental conditions such as sea clutter and weather, specifying radar capabilities necessary for long-range surveillance, and suggesting radar technologies that can be embedded with systems. Additionally, we asked for comparisons among existing commercial radar models as well as a recommendation deemed most suitable for offshore vessel detection application.

Gemini demonstrated a strong capability in comprehending the operational environment. It rightly deduced that radar systems for maritime environments have to factor in considerations such as high humidity, corrosion from saltwater, intense rainfall, and fluctuating wave interference. The model identified the requirement for Doppler processing, pulse compression, and remote configuration capability for tracking small, non-cooperative vessels. It also acknowledged that energy efficiency and system ruggedness are paramount for off-grid platforms such as ours, which are powered by wind and need to be capable of independent operation. With that said, to uncover more specific comparisons and technical depth, we found it necessary to refine our original prompt several times. Follow-up queries were used to push for details on radar types, architectural differences, and integration challenges that were not included in the initial response.

Gemini's strongest point was its emphasis on software integration. It pointed out SDK availability as a tie-breaker for choosing a radar, a point that most product listings overlook. Gemini listed several commercial radar systems and rightfully excluded those

lacking integration tools. Its final recommendation supported the same radar we selected independently, reinforcing our decision with a sound technical rationale.

While Gemini was highly informative, it also showed some shortcomings. It lacked complete instruction on hardware interfacing and failed to include links to SDK documentation. Some suggestions also seemed to ignore pragmatic factors like component availability, physical constraints, or budgetary issues. Prompt refinement again played a role here, as we had to request clarification and additional context when its answers lacked practical grounding or skipped over implementation details. These lackings made additional manual exploration necessary in order to fully evaluate the possibility of integration.

In spite of these limitations, Gemini was a great resource to early radar investigations and validated major selection criteria. It was particularly useful for formulating technical trade-offs and identifying viable radar options for naval surveillance missions. In general, it acted as a solid foundation for subsequent analysis and assisted engineering decision-making.

5.1.2.2 Material Section Perspective

Google Gemini was prompted to generate a list of building materials capable of designing a maritime structure that is corrosion resistant and supports the radar system while also providing space for a wind turbine alongside other electronic components. Gemini responded with a list of requirements the materials would need, these being waterproof and corrosion resistant which were exactly what was a repeat of what it was prompted. It also gave very vague suggestions on their implementations. We were suggested to only use stainless steel for the mounting components, it didn't provide any specific materials for the structure at all. Due to the lack of options, more specific prompts were given to it which consisted of describing the different structural components, asking for a list of possible materials best suited for that structural component's task and providing the divide and conquer document to clarify the requirements of the project.

After these more specific prompts, Gemini responded with a list of material selections for each specific part of the system, the types of grades of material it recommends alongside some pros and cons of each material. For the frame it listed possible options of using aluminium alloys, stainless steel 316, and fiberglass reinforced polymers. For the top plate where the radar pedestal is mounted, Gemini suggested similar materials as the frame but included carbon fiber composites as well. The bottom plate was also mainly aluminum and steel. Lastly, the electronics enclosure mentioned some chemical and water resistant materials like high-density polyethylene.

Given the list of possible materials, their pros and cons and types of implementations. We considered these options as brainstormed ideas and researched more into them. We found many published reports that discussed the use of stainless steel, aluminum and fiberglass reinforced polymers in maritime environments each with their own purpose. Through this we discovered the different types of possible corrosion and hazards in maritime environments alongside ways to combat them such as pitting, UV resistance, and coatings

to prevent material deterioration. Overall, using the Gemini LLM, it was a great entry to learning all the different types of materials that are possible to use and how they can be implemented into the project's design.

5.1.3 Case Study - Deep Seek

5.1.3.1 Turbine Perspective

Our team employed DeepSeek to conduct thorough research on wind turbine components for the maritime radar system. The initial queries about vertical versus horizontal axis turbines provided only basic comparisons that lacked marine-specific details. We quickly realized these general responses didn't address critical factors like saltwater corrosion resistance, maintenance requirements at sea, or spatial constraints on vessels.

To improve the results, we refined our prompting strategy to focus on specific aspects. We asked targeted questions about marine durability, power output verification at different wind speeds, potential radar interference, and mounting requirements. This approach yielded much more actionable data. For the TESUP Magnum HAWT, DeepSeek helped uncover that its advertised 10kW daily output was based on ideal inland conditions rather than marine environments. It also identified potential radar interference issues from the rotating blades that weren't clearly stated in the product specifications.

The research on the TESUP Atlas VAWT proved particularly valuable. DeepSeek provided detailed information about its 4 m/s startup wind speed and the availability of optional blade sets for different wind conditions. However, we noticed the AI couldn't verify manufacturer claims about long-term marine durability without additional sources, highlighting the need for supplemental research.

DeepSeek's ability to generate comparison tables between turbine types significantly aided our evaluation process. These tables clearly outlined differences in power outputs, maintenance needs, and spatial requirements, serving as excellent reference points. However, we discovered some inconsistencies between sources that required direct follow-up with manufacturers to resolve.

A key limitation emerged in the AI's occasional reliance on unverified manufacturer claims. When examining the flower-style Tulip VAWT's turbulence tolerance, for example, DeepSeek could only reference the academic paper we provided rather than offer independent analysis. This reinforced the importance of complementing AI research with hands-on testing and expert consultation.

Ultimately, DeepSeek proved invaluable for accelerating our initial research phase and formulating precise technical questions for vendors. While it dramatically improved our efficiency in gathering and organizing information, we maintained a rigorous verification process to ensure all data met our project's demanding marine environment requirements. The AI served as a powerful research assistant, but final decisions required careful cross-checking against multiple reliable sources.

5.1.2.4 Mobile App Perspective

[Currently Working]

5.1.4 Case Study - Claude

5.1.4.1 Web App Perspective

During early frontend development of the maritime dashboard, the software team consulted Claude to better understand how to structure React components for a real-time data-driven web interface. The prompt provided to Claude was: *“How should I set up my React components for a dashboard application that displays live radar data and vessel overlays?”*. While Claude returned a component layout and code example, the response lacked clarity and contextual explanation. The code did not include comments or describe how the individual components were expected to interact within the broader application.

Additionally, the response relied on utility class names that were later identified as Tailwind CSS, but Claude never explicitly mentioned that Tailwind was being used. There were no instructions regarding installation, integration, or how styling would be handled, which caused confusion for the team, particularly since no CSS files were imported or referenced. Claude also used the native Canvas API for rendering data, but without acknowledging that it was Canvas. At first, this implementation appeared to be part of React-specific logic, but after further investigation, it became clear that the code was leveraging raw HTML5 Canvas methods without providing that important context.

This lack of explanation around technologies and dependencies proved to be a substantial barrier. The team had to independently research the Canvas API and clarify how it fit into a React-based architecture. Overall, while the code technically aligned with the intent of the prompt, Claude’s response demonstrated a major limitation. Which was the assumption of prior knowledge. The AI failed to provide instructional scaffolding or commentary suitable for a team still learning frontend best practices. Claude’s answer may have benefited more advanced developers, but it ultimately did not support the team’s learning objectives effectively in this context.

5.2 Project Impact

After reviewing these LLM and AI platforms, what they offer and how effective they are, we are going to consider how these tools can or cannot be applied in our Senior Design project. Just in the last few years, AI tools and assistants have created both opportunities and problems for engineering students. On one hand, having an AI that can answer any question, generate code, or summarize research is very powerful and can accelerate certain stages of the project. On the other hand, there are concerns regarding fully understanding best practices when using these platforms to avoid over-reliance that might take away from our core learning objectives or introduce errors that go unnoticed. For these reasons, we carefully discussed what parts of our project using LLMs would be beneficial and where it might be risky.

In a broad scope, LLMs can have a large impact on our project in areas like research, design, brainstorming, coding, and documentation. As we discussed, AI tools are easily accessible and students have found them useful for most academic tasks. For the most part, an AI assistant is like an extremely knowledgeable team member who is always available for questions and answers. However, as a project team we wanted to set some ground rules and best practices for any of us using AI. Our most important guideline is being extra positive that the information we get is accurate, especially since we hope to see our final product scaled and deployed in the real world where wrong information could be disastrous. We also have to consider the ethical guidelines of our course and school, since AI is meant to be used as a helper, not a source of plagiarized content and information.

In the context of Senior Design, time and resources are limited. An LLM can also serve as a force multiplier during the project's timeline. That being said, our team will decide when and how we want to integrate AI. Some teams might choose ChatGPT extensively for research or coding help. While we hope to take advantage of this ability, we also want to limit usage to a certain point to avoid dependency. In terms of this project, there are many benefits we could gain from these tools, as well as determinants that could impact the project's success. With this in mind, we are going to outline the positives and negatives and how they relate to our engineering project.

5.2.1 Benefits

As we mentioned, AI tools have become readily available and are extremely powerful at optimizing and impacting various tasks. In the context of our senior design project, using LLMs can offer several significant benefits, especially in the research and development phases.

One of the first challenges we faced was getting up to speed on unfamiliar topics since none of us have worked on maritime domain awareness systems before. LLMs like ChatGPT and Claude can help as quick research assistants. They are really good at explaining complex concepts, providing definitions, and summarizing materials in a way that is easy to understand. For example, in the research for this project, a team member can ask "How does Automatic Identification System (AIS) tracking work and what information is included in this broadcast?" With the help of AI, it will produce an in-depth explanation and might even compare different maritime safety technologies. As the user, you are able to construct your input and reform it to ask specific questions until you get the most helpful or understandable answer. In our experience, the LLMs have been very useful in the first stage of our project when we are trying to understand various new components and technologies. Instead of searching through dozens of websites and resources, it is much easier now getting a straightforward answer or overview right away, which also helps us know where to focus further reading.

As we know, our Senior Design project will also require a lot of documentation, mainly in the form of reports. LLMs can significantly speed up writing tasks. We see AI being most useful suggesting better wording or translating technical wording into layman's terms. For example, we might conduct an experiment and one of the team members could

ask the AI to “summarize these experiments results in an academic but conversational tone” to include in the report. Then you can just edit the response until it fits into your report. Moreover, we believe AI tools will help us outline what needs to be included in certain diagrams or pseudo-code. By offloading some of this work to the AI (while still reviewing and correcting it), we believe it can help us spend more time on actual design and testing.

One of AI’s biggest contributions to the space is its ability as a coding assistant. A tool like ChatGPT, can auto-complete code, suggest functions, and generate entire modules based on the user’s prompt. In our project, which involves developing an AIS-subtraction algorithm and embedded systems architecture, we expect to leverage AI to generate portions of the codebase. AI assistants are also very useful when stuck with a bug or error message, where asking AI can quickly provide an explanation of the error and possible fixes. The benefit here is not just speed, but sometimes also learning better coding practices from suggestions. However, it is worth noting while AI can help speed up the coding process, it’s still crucial that the team members fully understand the code.

Overall, the use of AI tools and LLMs will certainly make us more efficient. Tasks and processes that might usually take hours, can now be completed in minutes with AI’s help. It serves as a valuable resource for information and brainstorming. The key is to use it as an assistant, not an easy way out, for gathering information and speeding up routine tasks while maintaining control over final decisions.

5.2.2 Detriments

While these AI tools have many benefits, we are also aware of many detriments that may impact the reliability of these tools. Relying on LLMs without being careful could introduce risks that could impact the project’s success.

One of the biggest drawbacks of using an LLM in a project is the possibility of getting incorrect information. As discussed earlier, these models can produce answers that sound very convincing but are completely wrong. If we were to unknowingly use a false piece of information from ChatGPT in our design calculations or component selection, the project could very well face many setbacks or even fail. For instance, if the AI gave an incorrect formula for battery sizing and we designed with that, our system might not meet the requirements. That is why every critical piece of information from the AI needs to be reviewed and verified. To avoid this situation, we made it a rule that any data or fact in our design has to be cross-checked with a credible source like a textbook, datasheet, or reputable website. We understand that there will be times where time pressure might tempt a team member to copy-paste an AI answer, but know to resist that urge without validation. We figured that even with the convenience of saving time, misinformation leading to design failure could result in more lost time than we gained.

Another one of the leading disadvantages with using AI is actually a human factor risk. That is, the temptation to rely on it for every answer which skips learning crucial skills. Imagine a situation where a student uses an AI tool for every design idea or writes their entire report, they might get through the project and even get a good grade, but they will

certainly miss the learning that senior design is meant to provide. We were very cautious about this issue. While AI could be helpful, we won't become dependent on it to the point that if something went wrong, we wouldn't understand our own system. There's a known drawback that "increasing reliance on AI risks neglecting human skills and interpersonal interactions" [30]. In senior design or any engineering project, this could mean that team members are not developing debugging skills or not fully understanding the concepts behind the project because the AI is always handing over the answers. To avoid this, our team is treating AI responses as teaching tools, not always solutions.

An interesting detriment we realized is that if AI generates a piece of code or design that we use, and later there's a bug or issue, it might be harder for us to fix if we didn't develop it ourselves. There's a certain familiarity that comes from writing your own code or making your own designs. It is possible that using a function that AI wrote and then it breaks, we might find ourselves spending more time understanding and fixing the issue than the time saved from using AI-generated code. This poses too big of a risk to our project. With this in mind, we will not use AI to generate code for the system rather it will be a teaching tool.

While using AI tools can be very helpful and save a lot of time, it is important to be aware of these detriments. That is why we will remain cautious by cross-checking information, limiting reliance on AI for actual decision-making, and actively learning from AI outputs rather than accepting them as fact.

5.3 Conclusion

After conducting individual case studies on various AI platforms like ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Anthropic Claude, and DeepSeek, we've come to better understand capabilities that can significantly benefit, and sometimes hinder, engineering projects. As each platform continues to grow and advance within our society, it is important to understand the impact they may have on our projects and academic work. These tools have increased efficiency, creativity, and learning by quickly researching unfamiliar topics and almost instantly generating entire codebases and documentations.

However, with the benefits come important limitations. All LLMs share drawbacks in the accuracy of their responses. As we discussed, they can straight up produce incorrect or biased outputs that could severely impact our project if not kept in check. A large issue specifically with students is over-reliance on AI. Without understanding its responses, students will not develop skills the same way they would in normal learning processes. As these tools continue to become more common in industry and school environments, engineers and students will have to understand how to effectively leverage AI while also verifying and validating the information it gives you.

For our senior design project, we adopted a balanced approach. We did not rely heavily on any AI tool for the core engineering work, especially where any risk could impact the success of our project. We found the best way to use LLMs is as assistants to gather information while always cross-checking responses. This approach allowed us to enjoy the productivity gains of AI without exposing ourselves or the project to any unnecessary risks. In cases like code generation, LLMs were occasionally used to produce templates

or component layouts which led to gaps in documentation, unclear styling assumptions, or unverified logic. So, while we didn't avoid AI-generated code entirely, we learned that using it responsibly means reviewing every line, understanding the architecture, and not treating it as a drop-in solution.

Going forward, our recommendation for anyone using AI tools in their workflow to do so thoughtfully and transparently. These tools are amazing at fast computation and gathering information, but it is critical to always use your best judgement when interpreting and refining the responses. The most important thing to keep in mind is being up to date with best practices, as the technology and guidelines evolve quite fast. When used properly, these tools can drive innovation and efficiency. But like any powerful tool, they must be handled with care, considering the drawbacks that we discussed in this section.

Chapter 6: Hardware Design

6.1 Power System Design

The design of the power system of the maritime radar system needs certain aspects to be detailed in-order for components of the system to have seamless integration and not pose any issues when it comes to receiving adequate power.

The power system that we will implement will have to be uniform across the board, to either accommodate AC voltage or DC voltage and the implications of using one power form over another. Both designs have been considered and there are pros and cons to each.

When using AC system voltage, there are many things to consider from every aspect. Under the assumption that we utilize the TESUP vertical axis wind turbine, we will no longer need to make use of a charge controller that regulates the voltage output of the turbine. Rather, an inverter will need to be used to convert the variable DC output of a wind turbine into usable AC voltage. This item will not have to be acquired since the TESUP turbine comes standard with all turbines since they are designed to power a house by linking up with a homes internal AC system and relieving the load from the power company. The power generation of the wind turbine will need to be connected to the AC batter system to provide energy for components such as the Raymarine Cyclone radar and Starlink mini. The battery needs to be able to accept the AC charge from the wind turbine and at the same time be able to discharge an AC voltage to power components on the system. Using the onboard connections from an AC battery system like the Predator battery allows for a seamless distribution of power to the Raymarine radar and Starlink using the onboard, high watt power ports. The addition of five volt USB connections provide the regulated DC voltage that the Pi MCU needs to function and eliminates the need for an AC to DC converter.

The AC power system has the benefits of plug and play compatibility with most components that require power for the system to function. The ability to use the native power connections from the devices is greatly appreciated for ease of use and assembly as there is no potential risk for wiring issues that could cause short and damage or destroy the maritime radar system. The drawbacks of the system pertain mainly to the capacity of the battery. With the battery having many connections and is rated for high Wattage output, the battery life is not long especially when we have high demand components such as the radar and Starlink. This longevity issue could cause issues especially if the wind is not adequate to recharge the battery.

Additional issues arise when using the TESUP ecosystem of products as the TESUP inverter is much more expensive compared to that of their charge controller. This hike in price could potentially pose a block to using the AC power system depending on the budget restraint that is imposed on us by our sponsor.

Another consideration when using AC power is the efficiency losses associated with conversion. Since the wind turbine initially generates DC power, converting it to AC

using an inverter results in inherent losses due to conversion inefficiencies. These losses can be mitigated to some extent by using a high-efficiency inverter, but they still represent an unavoidable drawback. Additionally, reliance on an AC system means that any AC-dependent failures, such as inverter malfunction, could lead to complete system failure unless proper redundancy measures are in place.

The DC system has the benefit of using a larger battery but has the drawback of needing multiple regulators to distribute the correct voltage but with the added benefit of not needing an inverter to convert the input of the wind turbine.

In the DC system, we would likely use the Dakota Lithium 12V 100Ah LiFePO₄ Battery due to its compact size yet longer battery life than other options. Using this 12 volt DC source poses the issue of charging the battery. Depending on the wind turbine used, we would need to use a charge controller like the Picasola 12V Wind Charge Controller which would take the wile DC output of the wind turbine and convert it to a stable input at 12 volts or below depending on the wind speeds. This prevents damage to the battery that may be caused by voltage spikes from variable winds in the maritime environment.

From the battery, only one regulator is needed for the Starlink, that regulator being the Starlink Mini PoE DC Power Conversion Kit. This conversion kit would be able to take the output from the battery and step it up to power the Starlink. In addition, the USB port on the adapter would power the Pi MCU without the need for an additional regulator. One of the key advantages of the DC system is the improved energy efficiency due to the reduction in conversion losses. Since the wind turbine generates DC power, direct storage and distribution in DC form eliminate the inefficiencies associated with converting to AC and back to DC. This means a higher percentage of the generated power is effectively used.

Another benefit is the modularity of the DC system. The use of independent voltage regulators allows different components to receive their required power levels without impacting other subsystems. This flexibility is particularly useful in future upgrades or expansions, as additional DC regulators can be integrated without requiring extensive rewiring.

The downside to the DC system, however, is the complexity of wiring multiple voltage regulators. Unlike the AC system, which benefits from standardized power distribution, the DC system requires careful planning to ensure that each component receives a stable and appropriate voltage. Incorrect wiring or inadequate regulation can lead to performance issues or even damage to sensitive components. Additionally, while the DC battery may offer longer operational life, recharge times may still be a concern, particularly under low-wind conditions.

Both AC and DC power systems present viable solutions, each with distinct trade-offs. The AC system offers straightforward integration and compatibility with existing components but suffers from shorter battery life and higher equipment costs. The DC system, while requiring careful voltage regulation, provides extended operational time and reduced costs by avoiding the need for an inverter.

The final decision on which system to implement will largely depend on budget constraints and operational priorities. If cost-effectiveness and battery longevity are paramount, the DC system may be the better choice. However, if ease of integration and reduced wiring complexity are the main concerns, the AC system could prove more beneficial. Ultimately, thorough testing and evaluation will be necessary to determine the optimal solution for the maritime radar system.




Figure 6.1 - Power System to deliver DC Voltage to the Pi MCU and Starlink Mini Terminal

Chapter 7: Software Design

This project consists of two core software components that operate across different environments. The first is a command center application that runs the AIS Subtraction Algorithm. Its role is to process and compare radar data with AIS transponder information, removing known vessel targets and highlighting potential dark ships. This software will run on a dedicated system at the base station and provide a dashboard for analysts to monitor maritime activity. The second component is the embedded software developed for the Raspberry Pi onboard the vessel. This program is responsible for handling real-time sensor data, controlling hardware systems like the gimbal and camera, managing communication between systems, and ensuring that relevant data is sent back to the base station. Each of these software systems plays a critical role in enabling the Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) capabilities of our system and are developed with unique goals and constraints made for their respective platforms.

7.1 Dark Vessel Classification Algorithm

The AIS Classification Algorithm is the primary function for identifying and determining if a detected vessel is performing illicit or normal activity. The classification algorithm relies upon data collected and transmitted from the radar through a satellite transmission device, such as Starlink or a satellite phone, to an offsite bay station. The bay station must also receive the publicly broadcast Automatic Identification System (AIS) data which includes data such as ship name, course and speed, classification, call sign, registration number, Maritime Mobile Service Identity (MMSI), along with other information. Utilizing this information, we can create an algorithm that can utilize the publicly broadcast AIS information alongside the information for detected vessels from the on-board radar system to classify the detected vessel and determine if it may be performing illicit activity. The classification process includes parsing and formatting the data received by the radar, so that the radar data is comparable to incoming AIS data and can be used to compare, retrieval of the publicly broadcast AIS information, comparing the publicly broadcast AIS data to the formatted radar data and “subtracting” the vessels that are determined to be “known” (i.e. vessels that are publicly broadcasting AIS) to isolate determined “dark vessels” for classification, and classifying the dark vessels based upon the radar data received about the detected vessel and its patterns.

7.1.1 Automatic Identification System

The Automatic Information System is used for Maritime Vessel Traffic identification. As mentioned above, the AIS system delivers information including, but not limited to, ship name, course and speed, classification, call sign, registration number, and Maritime Mobile Service Identity (MMSI). Each AIS system consists of one Very High Frequency (VHF) transmitter, two VHF TDMA receivers, one VHF DSC receiver, and standard marine electronic communications links (IEC 61162/NMEA 0183) to shipboard display and sensor systems. Position and timing information is normally derived from an integral or external global navigation satellite system (e.g. GPS) receiver, including a medium frequency differential GNSS receiver for precise position in coastal and inland waters. Other information broadcast by the AIS, if available, is electronically obtained from

shipboard equipment through standard marine data connections. Heading information and course and speed over ground would normally be provided by all AIS-equipped ships. Other information, such as rate of turn, angle of heel, pitch and roll, and destination and ETA could also be provided. [36] As defined in section 4.1.4 of this document, vessels required to have AIS must operate it in U.S. navigable waters at all times that the vessel is navigating (underway or at anchor) and at least 15 minutes prior to unmooring.

7.1.2 Parsing and Formatting of Data

As radar information is collected, it is processed and sent to an on-shore base station for processing. This radar data is, as described in section 7.1.4, compared with AIS information from compliant vessels to filter for dark vessels. The radar information may not directly match AIS information, so we must parse and format the data for that comparison.

[Details on Radar Data and AIS Data Format]

The mounted detection system includes a GPS module that can be utilized to transmit the vessel-being-mounted-upon location. The radar gives information such as the distance of detection (or range of the object), speed, direction (or azimuth), size and shape, altitude, etc. This information can help determine both the general area that a known vessel should be found and how it should be classified in AIS systems based upon its speed, size (and potentially weight based on size).

[Details on how the two can be formatted together]

7.1.3 Retrieving AIS Data

As noted in section 4.1.4, AIS is legally required to be publicly broadcast and allow users to collect information about all vessels transmitting their VHF signal. Collecting this information however, can be a challenge financially if requiring a large amount of AIS data. Detecting local vessels, within VHF range, can be done freely using an AIS receiver with software such as OpenCPN, SeaClear, or NMEA Reader to parse and visualize the data. However, this limits the user locating only vessels within VHF range, around 100 miles. Should vessels outside of the VHF range need to be detected, a subscription to a web service API, like MarineTraffic or VesselFinder, or access to a satellite-based service, such as Orbcomm or ExactEarth. As previously mentioned, a web service or satellite-based service can be expensive as many services require subscription access to the respective applications or API's to use in alternative applications. Since our mounted radar has a range of approximately 72 miles, it is feasible to utilize an AIS receiver mounted on-board the ship. Section 4.1.4 describes the vessels that are legally required to carry all AIS equipment.

In the case that a VHF receiver is used to retrieve AIS information, the data would need to be communicated Ship-to-Shore, utilizing the satellite-based communication system on-board the ship. The information would be sent to the base station and parsed for

comparison with the detected radar data. In the case that a web-based or satellite-based system is used, AIS information can be fetched from the system on request as the radar system detects a vessel. Implementation of the API and the service, however, can affect the exact details of the retrieval and accuracy of the data.

7.1.4 Subtracting Known Vessels

[Need more information on radar data and AIS data to write]

7.1.5 Classifying Dark Vessels

[Need more information on radar data and AIS data to write]

7.1.6 Known Challenges

Dark Vessel Detection seemingly comes with more challenges than easy solutions. Vessels that are legally compliant and broadcasting accurate information may be difficult to detect if a receiver, web-based, or satellite based provider is delivering out-of-date information. Vessels may be detected on the mounted radar system, but their deduced location may corresponded to one-to-many different vessels in an AIS system depending on the likelihood that the time between the last received transmission corresponds to a vessel being in a given area deduced from its course and speed or other variables. Smaller vessels, using Class B AIS systems, are also not legally required to transmit their information as quickly, as noted in section 4.1.4, therefore many smaller vessels (which would likely be more preferable for illicit activity due to their increased stealth) become harder to geolocate and classify as “known” or “unknown”. Known vessels may also be transmitting AIS, but unknowingly broadcasting the wrong information, such as an incorrect MMSI, the unique identifier assigned to each vessel. This flaw can lead to errors in classification, identifying the correct “known” vessel, or maliciously be used to spoof a known vessel to avoid detection. While AIS information is primarily relied upon to determine whether a vessel is known or unknown, the radar itself has its own challenges.

Given the radar's maximum range of around 72 miles and angles of detection, the radar is susceptible to detect not only marine vessels, but anything within range of the radar. This could include flocks of birds, airplanes, large surfaced sea animals, etc. The detection algorithm should be able to identify the sort of object that the radar is detecting. There are many methodologies for this classification, but many include alternative methods such as detecting the same object using LIDAR and performing image recognition or classifying based on its general location, size, speed, and other factors and using pattern recognition to predict the object and can be time and resource expensive in tuning the accuracy of the predictions. The radar is also susceptible to varying sea conditions. Conditions such as sea spray, tilt as the vessel rides the troughs and crests of a wave at sea, and the altitude as varying sea levels change can affect the ability to locate a vessel using the radar and calculate the on-board vessel's position relative to a detected object. The object that is being detected, for example a large ship, may also be detected with a different size based on which part of the ship the radar is detected. If the radar were to detect the bow or the

stern of the ship, it may appear much smaller on the radar than if it were to detect the starboard or port side of the ship.

7.1.7 Alternative Applications

Some of the challenges in implementing a Dark Vessel Detection Algorithm also give rise to some additional applications. The range of detection of the radar, at a sufficient distance is equally likely to detect air traffic as well as marine traffic. If a radar detection system is mounted in a fixed location, the radar could be used to detect aircraft that follow a regular pattern or compared with air traffic information (which is more robust than AIS for marine traffic) to similarly detect aircraft performing illicit activities. Another challenge is vessels broadcasting invalid AIS information, such as incorrect size of the vessel or a duplicate MMSI. Using the mounted radar, vessels could detect a ship that is much larger than the broadcast AIS information, but still matched the vessel using the Dark Vessel Detection Algorithm. In this case, the algorithm could be used to create flags for Coast Guard, Naval, or other authorities so ships can be requested (or mandated) to update their AIS information accordingly, providing a more robust system.

7.2 Use Case Diagram




Figure X.X - Use Case Diagram for XXXX

The Use Case Diagram for the Maritime Web Application illustrates how different actors interact with the system to control and monitor radar data. The primary actors include the User (Base Station Operator), who interacts with the web dashboard, the MCU (Microcontroller) onboard the ship, which executes radar commands, and MongoDB, which stores processed radar and AIS data.

To access the system, the User must first authenticate, as authentication is a prerequisite for all core functionalities. This is represented by the Authenticate User use case, which is included in both Turn Radar On/Off and Display Radar Data use cases, ensuring that only verified users can operate the system. Once authenticated, the user can toggle the radar on or off, sending commands directly to the MCU, which executes these operations on the ship. The Display Radar Data use case allows users to visualize real-time radar detections on the maritime dashboard. This use case automatically includes AIS Overlay and AIS Subtraction, meaning that whenever radar data is displayed, the system also

overlays AIS vessel locations and subtracts known vessels from the radar data to identify potential dark ships.

Additionally, all radar and AIS data processed through the system are stored in MongoDB, enabling future retrieval and analysis. The diagram effectively captures the relationship between user actions, system functionality, and external components, emphasizing security through authentication and automation in maritime monitoring.

7.3 UI Design Goals

The UI design of the Maritime Web Application emphasizes clarity, simplicity, and responsiveness, with the primary goal of supporting rapid decision-making in real-world maritime operations. Our design philosophy is rooted in the principle that users likely operators at a shore-based station must be able to quickly interpret data, identify threats, and take action with minimal friction. As a result, the dashboard avoids unnecessary visual clutter and focuses on delivering essential information at a glance.


A map-first layout places the radar and AIS data at the center of the screen, as spatial awareness is critical to the user's understanding of vessel locations and movement. Key actions, such as toggling radar status or enabling AIS overlays, are positioned within immediate reach on the sidebar or in the top-right corner, reducing the number of clicks required to access vital features. The design borrows from common control center interfaces, using familiar placement patterns to reduce the learning curve for new users.

Consistency and feedback are also core to the user experience. Visual indicators such as a live radar status badge, distinct vessel icons (e.g., AIS ships vs. dark vessels), and color-coded overlays are used to signal system status and alert levels in real time. These elements help ensure that users can spot unusual or critical activity at a glance in monitoring scenarios.

The UI is also designed with future extensibility and responsiveness in mind. While the initial version targets desktop display, the layout will adapt to different screen sizes to support mobile viewing. This ensures flexibility in deployment, especially as the system evolves or expands to other operational environments.

By grounding the design in usability best practices including visibility, consistency, and low cognitive load the Maritime Dashboard aims to enhance operator efficiency and support real-time maritime domain awareness with minimal training or confusion.

7.3.1 Login Display



The login display is a rectangular form with a light gray border. It contains the following elements from top to bottom: a label 'Username' followed by a rounded rectangular input field with the placeholder text 'Value'; a label 'Password' followed by a rounded rectangular input field with the placeholder text 'Value'; a dark gray rectangular button with the text 'Sign In' in white; and a text link 'Forgot password?' at the bottom left.

Figure X.X -

The login screen provides a simple and intuitive interface for users to securely access the Maritime Web Application. It features two primary input fields: Username and Password, where users can enter their login credentials. Below these fields, a “Forgot Password?” prompt is included to assist users who may need to reset their login information.

The design focuses on clarity and ease of use, allowing base station operators or authorized personnel to quickly log into the system without unnecessary distractions. This authentication step is essential for protecting access to sensitive radar and AIS data, ensuring that only verified users can interact with the maritime tracking dashboard.

7.3.2 Homepage Design




Figure X.X -

The Maritime Dashboard mockup presents a clean and focused interface for visualizing vessel and radar data in real time. At the center of the dashboard is an interactive map, which serves as the primary display area for radar detections and AIS data overlays. Users can view the geographic location of tracked vessels and dark targets as they are detected, updated dynamically on the map.

On the left side of the screen, there is a vertical toolbar labeled “Labels,” which is intended to house toggle switches and filters for features such as the AIS overlay and AIS subtraction. This will allow users to quickly enable or disable different data layers based on their operational needs.

In the top-right corner, a radar toggle switch lets users turn the radar system on or off remotely. Just above this switch is a live status indicator, which will turn red when the radar is actively scanning — serving as a quick visual confirmation that the radar system is online. To the right of the status indicator is a settings icon (cogwheel), which provides access to configuration options.

The top-left corner features a user icon that represents the currently logged-in operator, helping to track account access and provide session context. This layout is intentionally minimal to prioritize the live map and reduce distractions, ensuring the operator can stay focused on vessel tracking and radar alerts.

To improve clarity and situational awareness on the Maritime Dashboard, a variety of icons and visual indicators will be used to represent vessels and radar events. These icons serve as essential UI elements that help users quickly interpret the operational status of the system and identify important targets on the map.

Radar Icon: A radar wave or pulse symbol will represent the active radar system. This icon may animate or pulse when the radar is on and will be tied to the live status indicator in the top right of the interface.

AIS Ship Icon: Vessels broadcasting AIS data will be represented with a standard ship icon, likely in blue or green. These are considered "known" vessels and will include metadata (MMSI, name, flag) on hover or click.

Undetected Icon: If the radar is on but no vessel is present in a particular zone, a subtle gray placeholder or neutral icon may be used to indicate no detections.

Dark Vessel Icon: The most important symbol, this icon will represent a vessel detected by radar but not matched to any AIS data — a potential "dark ship." This icon will appear in red or orange to draw the user's attention and may trigger an alert or appear in the system log.

These icons not only provide quick recognition but also help guide user decisions and responses. Consistent color-coding and clear symbology ensure that operators can focus on critical detections without needing to analyze raw data in real time. As the interface evolves, additional icons may be introduced for alerts, zoom level markers, or vessel classifications.

7.4 Security Design Goals

Beyond basic user authentication, the Maritime Web Application requires careful consideration of broader security practices to protect sensitive vessel tracking data, prevent unauthorized access, and ensure system integrity across both shipboard and shore-based deployments. Because this system transmits radar detections and AIS data over public networks — including Starlink and cellular — protecting this communication pipeline is essential.

To prevent interception or tampering of data in transit, the system will enforce end-to-end encryption using HTTPS with TLS. All API calls between the ship's processing unit and the cloud backend will occur over secure protocols to prevent man-in-the-middle attacks and ensure data confidentiality. This applies to both telemetry data (radar/AIS) and API endpoints used by the frontend dashboard.

Internally, the application will employ role-based access control (RBAC) to ensure users can only access data and functionality appropriate to their role. For example, a general operator may have permission to view radar data, but only an admin may be allowed to activate or deactivate the radar system. These permission levels will be enforced both in the frontend and backend for defense in depth.

To further strengthen backend security, database credentials and API keys could be stored using environment variables rather than hard coded into the application. This prevents secrets from being exposed in version control or frontend bundles. Additionally, access to the MongoDB instance will be locked down using IP whitelisting and, if cloud-hosted, VPN tunnels or SSH certificates will be required for remote access.

In future versions of the system, we also plan to implement logging and auditing tools to track access. These logs will support post incident analysis in the event of a security breach or anomaly.

Overall, security in the Maritime Web Application goes beyond login credentials. From the protection of data in transit to the enforcement of access controls and proper handling of credentials, these measures are designed to safeguard maritime domain awareness operations as the system scales.

Chapter 8: System Fabrication/Prototype Construction

Chapter 9: System Testing and Evaluation

9.1 Optoelectronics Feasibility Study and Testing

9.1.1 Midterm Demo Outcome

9.1.2 CMOS Camera Feasibility

Chapter 10: Administrative Content

10.1 Budget

The tentative budget for the radar system is \$15,000. This is subject to change as budget restrictions can be negotiated depending on approval from SOUTHCOM.

The majority of the budget has been allocated to the core components, those being the radar unit and the Starlink module. The remaining budget has been primarily allocated to the creation of the power system to run the core components using renewable resources.

10.2 Bill of Materials

Table 10.1 - Bill of Materials

Bill of Materials (BOM)				
Component	Model / Description	Power Requirements	Additional Notes	Approximate Price
Raspberry Pi	Raspberry Pi 4 Model B (8GB RAM)	5V DC, 3A	Requires waterproof, vibration-resistant enclosure and passive cooling (heat sinks, thermal pads)	\$80
Starlink	Starlink Mini Kit	48V DC, 50-100W	Needs unobstructed mounting for optimal signal reception, a weather-resistant design	\$250/month
Cyclone Radar	Raymarine Cyclone 6-Foot Model with Development Kit	28V DC, 100-120W	Requires corrosion-resistant housing and must be mounted to minimize interference	\$8,250
Wind Turbine	Pikasola 400W Wind Turbine Generator	12V DC	Compact and lightweight, suitable for moderate wind conditions	\$269.99
Battery	Ampere Time 12V 200Ah LiFePO4	12V DC	Long lifespan, maintenance-free, reliable for continuous operation	\$539.99

Charge Controller	Victron SmartSolar MPPT 100/30	12V/24V DC	Maximizes solar energy harvesting, Bluetooth-enabled for monitoring	\$245
Power Distribution Unit (PDU)	Mean Well RSD-300 Series	Multi-output: 5V, 28V, 48V DC	Industrial-grade, high-efficiency, overcurrent, and thermal protection	\$135.85
DC-DC Converter	DROK 48V to 5V Step-Down Converter	5V DC Output	Powers Raspberry Pi efficiently from Starlink power source	\$19.99
Mounting Hardware	Stainless Steel Brackets and Fasteners	N/A	Corrosion-resistant, ensures secure attachment of components	Varies
Enclosure	IP67 Waterproof Electronics Box	N/A	Protects components from water and environmental damage	\$18.88
Camera	CMOS/CCD camera	12V DC	Protection from environmental damage, waterproof	Varies (Goal <\$100)
Gimbal	Swellpro GC1-S Waterproof 1 Axis 4K Camera Gimbal	12V DC	Non-corrosive material, waterproof/protected mechanical materials	\$459
Total:				\$10,369

10.3 Distribution of Workload

Table 10.2 - Workload distribution

Member Name	Discipline	Responsibilities
Alexander Drew	Electrical Engineering	Development of the power system that will power the main components of the device.
		Power Distribution
		Aid with MCU programming
Derek Florer	Computer Engineering	Project Lead
		Radar and Starlink Integration
		Embedded and Mobile Secondary
Jet Chen	Computer Engineering	GPS implementation using Starlink
		Design weatherproof enclosure and mounting hardware
		Help optimize Power Distribution
Marco Plasencia	Computer Engineering	Embedded Systems
		Software Integration & System Communication
		Documentation
Gianna Montevago	Photonics	Camera system
		Camera enhancement details
		Gimbal for cameras
Garrett Miller	Computer Science	AIS Algorithm Lead
		Database Manager
Devin Parham	Computer Science	Web Application
		AIS Algorithm Implementation

10.4 Project Milestones

Table 10.3 - Project milestone plan

Senior Design I Project Milestones: Spring 2025			
<u>Task</u>	<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Due Dates</u>	<u>Who's Responsible?</u>
Develop Project Idea	Weeks 1-3	1/10	Everyone
Team Formation	Weeks 1-2	1/14	Everyone
Bootcamp	Week 3	1/21 (assignment due 1/24 @ 12 pm)	Everyone
Divide and Conquer Document	Weeks 2-3	1/24 @ 12 pm	Everyone
Kickoff Meeting (with sponsor and other teams)	Weeks 2-3	N/A	Everyone
Divide and Conquer Meeting	Week 4	1/28 @ 1:30 pm	Everyone
Committee Formation	Weeks 1-3	1/24 @ 12 pm	Everyone
Optics Midterm Demo	Week 8	2/25 @ 9:30 - 11:00 am	Gianna
Midterm Report	Week 10	3/24 @ 12 pm	Everyone
Midterm Group Meeting	Week 11	3/28 @ 12 pm	Everyone
30-Page Paper Milestone	Weeks 4-7	N/A	Everyone
60-Page Paper Milestone	Weeks 8-12	N/A	Everyone
Final Paper Draft	Week 14	4/22 @ 12 pm	Everyone
Optics Final Demo	Week 15	4/15 @ 9:00 - 11:30 am	Gianna
ABET Quizzes	Weeks 8-12	3/7 @ 11:59 pm	Marco, Jet, Derek, and Alex

Chapter 11: Conclusion Appendices

Appendix A - References

- [1] National Plan to Achieve Maritime Domain Awareness,
https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/HSPD_MDAPlan_0.pdf
- [2] Shipboard Surveillance Systems - Surface Search Radar | SSR,
<https://ssreng.com/shipboard-surveillance-system/>
- [3] System: SeaPicket - ThayerMahan,
<https://www.thayermahan.com/systems/seapicket>
- [4] Commercial S Band Radar | HENSOLDT,
<https://www.hensoldt.net/products/92/commercial-s-band-radar-kelvin-hughes-sharpeye-radar>
- [5] United States Southern Command Website
<https://www.southcom.mil/>
- [6] Fundamentals of Radar Systems and Signal Processing
<https://ftp.idu.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/ebook/tdg/ADNVANCED%20MILITARY%20PLATFORM%20DESIGN/Radar%20Handbook.pdf>
- [7] Furuno DRS6ANXT (NXT Solid-State Radar, Dome or Open Array)
<https://www.furunousa.com/en/products/drs6anxt>
- [8] Garmin GMR Phantom 126 (6-foot Open Array)
<https://www.garmin.com/en-US/p/597049>
- [9] B&G HALO20+ Dome Radar (X-band)
https://www.simrad-yachting.com/simrad/type/radar/halo20simradradar/?gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjw-e6-BhDmARIsAOxxlxWzBPQIoLcsGD2gFC_jgzXuorcNzvCtkDPmYcBWYqFtvltg6XXLthUaAvM6EALw_wcB
- [10] HALO® 2006 Open Array Radar (X-band)
<https://www.simrad-yachting.com/simrad/series/halo-open-array-radar/halo-2006-radarw6-arrayri5020m-cbl/>
- [11] Furuno Radar Basics
<https://www.furuno.com/en/technology/radar/basic/>
- [12] Sea Clutter
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/sea-clutter>
- [13] Raymarine Cyclone Series
<https://www.raymarine.com/en-us/our-products/marine-radar/cyclone/cyclone-radar>
- [14] Raymarine Cyclone Pro Series
<https://www.raymarine.com/en-us/our-products/marine-radar/cyclone/cyclone-pro>
- [15] TESUP Tri-Blade Wind Turbine
<https://tesup.com/us/tesup-horizontal-wind-turbines-for-homes>
- [16] TESUP Atlas Vertical Wind Turbine
<https://tesup.com/us/tesup-vertical-wind-turbines-for-homes>
- [17] Paper: Comparison of Rose, Aeroleaf, and Tulip Vertical Axis Wind Turbines (VAWTs) for Alternative Electricity Generation
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590123024021285>
- [18] Flower Turbines - Tulip Vertical Axis Turbine
<https://www.flowerturbines.com/small-turbine>

- [19] Charge Controller - by TESUP
<https://tesup.com/row/spare-parts/charge-controller>
- [20] 500W Wind Turbine MPPT Charge Controller, 12V/24V
<https://www.ato.com/500w-wind-turbine-mppt-charge-controller?srsId=AfmBOopwpUIssZWVHBFVwPfAwn2wx23Y6WVB6UnCNcJB3Q5RblXGlf>
- [21] Pikasola Wind Turbine Charge Controller Mini Wind Turbine Generator Controller IP67 Waterproof 12V/24V Automatic Controller Suitable for 400Watt 500Watt 600Watt Wind Turbine System
https://www.amazon.com/PIKASOLA-Controller-Generator-Waterproof-Automatic/dp/B07ZKN1C76/ref=asc_df_B07ZKN1C76?mcid=95e805cb406932208159f1fe2d3f098d&hvocijId=12035651854486989549-B07ZKN1C76-&hvexpln=73&tag=hyprod-20&linkCode=df0&hvadid=721245378154&hvpos=&hvnetw=g&hvrnd=12035651854486989549&hvpone=&hvptwo=&hvgmt=&hvdev=c&hvdvcmdl=&hvlocint=&hvlocphy=9011548&hvtargid=pla-2281435177898&psc=1
- [22] 12V 100Ah Deep Cycle Heated LiFePO4 Battery
https://dakotalithium.com/product/dakota-lithium-12v-100ah-deep-cycle-lifepo4-marine-solar-battery/?srsId=AfmBOopd6wjso9_iQcgdzXqlTepdT0uWnR3D2QPXfSnRiNa7PCFWtHzB
- [23] Predator 350 Watt Power Station, 294 Wh Capacity
https://www.harborfreight.com/350-watt-power-station-294-wh-capacity-70082.html?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=21901739240&campaignid=21901739240&utm_content=171677809862&adsetid=171677809862&product=70082&store=3111&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjw4v6-BhDuARIsALprM328ljgO_d1BTJJrXbGQC7v2OK7GGoeRYNBBIs-KqysGdxqPSvqNVEaApNAEALw_wcB
- [24] 24V 50Ah Trolling Motor Lithium Battery (LiFePO4) - Bluetooth - Heated
<https://ampedoutdoors.com/products/50ah-24v-trolling-motor-lithium-battery-lifepo4>
- [25] Starlink Mini PoE DC Power Conversion Kit with 12v Accessory Output by MOBILEMUSTHAVE
https://mobilemusthave.com/products/starlink-mini-poe-dc-power-conversion-kit-with-12v-accessory-output-for-peplink?srsId=AfmBOoqvUDZkyTkoaep_mBbziN_sooMJf3UAhp0NEDskSjZW68xEfP6
- [26] Starlink Mini Step Up Power Cable 12V/24V to 30V 3.5A Converter with DC Power Cable, 9V to 28V Input DC Step-Up Power Adapter Cord for Starlink Mini
<https://www.amazon.com/Starlink-Power-Converter-Step-Up-Adapter/dp/B0DM5XBY4S?th=1>
- [27] PlusRoc Waterproof 12V/24V to 5V Converter DC-DC Step Down Module Power Adapter Compatible with Raspberry Pi
<https://www.amazon.com/PlusRoc-Waterproof-Converter-Compatible-Raspberry/dp/B09DGDO48H?th=1>
- [28] Large Language models explained
<https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/glossary/large-language-models/>
- [29] What is ChatGPT?
<https://help.openai.com/en/articles/6783457-what-is-chatgpt>
- [30] The advantages & disadvantages of Chat GPT

<https://www.appmatics.com/en/blog/vorteile-nachteile-chat-gpt#:~:text=1,the%20generated%20content%20remains%20limited>

[31] Introducing Microsoft 365 Copilot – your copilot for work

<https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2023/03/16/introducing-microsoft-365-copilot-your-copilot-for-work#:~:text=Microsoft%20365%20Copilot%20%E2%80%94%20your,productivity%20tool%20on%20the%20planet>

[32] Introducing Gemini: our largest and most capable AI model

<https://blog.google/technology/ai/google-gemini-ai/#sundar-note>

[33] What is Claude AI, and how does it compare to ChatGPT?

<https://www.pluralsight.com/resources/blog/ai-and-data/what-is-claude-ai#:~:text=Anthropic%E2%80%99s%20differentiator%20is%20AI%20safety,as%20uniquely%20safe%20and%20responsible>

[34] IEEE Standard C95.1-2019

<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8859679>

[35] § 164.46 Automatic Identification System

<https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-33/chapter-I/subchapter-P/part-164/section-164.46>

[36] Automatic Identification System (AIS) Overview

<https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/automatic-identification-system-overview>

[37] How AIS Works

<https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/how-ais-works>

[38] AIS Frequently Asked Questions

<https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/ais-frequently-asked-questions>

[39] "Angular vs ReactJS," GeeksforGeeks,

<https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/angular-vs-reactjs/>

[40] "Vue vs Angular," GeeksforGeeks

<https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/vue-vs-angular/>

[41] "REST," MDN Web Docs

<https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Glossary/REST>

[42] "WebSockets API," MDN Web Docs,

https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/API/WebSockets_API

[43] MongoDB Inc., "MongoDB Manual," MongoDB Documentation,

<https://www.mongodb.com/docs/manual/>

[44] PostgreSQL Global Development Group, "PostgreSQL Documentation,"

<https://www.postgresql.org/docs/>

[45] "About Redis," Redis.io

<https://redis.io/about/>

[46] Angular Team, "Angular v17 Documentation,"

<https://v17.angular.io/docs>

[47] "Express.js," GeeksforGeeks,

<https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/express-js/>

[48] "NestJS Documentation," NestJS,

<https://docs.nestjs.com/>

[49] "Django Documentation (v5.1)," Django Project,

<https://docs.djangoproject.com/en/5.1/>

[50] "Node.js API Documentation," Node.js,

<https://nodejs.org/docs/latest/api/>

- [51] "DigitalOcean Cloud Hosting," DigitalOcean,
<https://www.digitalocean.com/>
- [52] "What is Amazon Lightsail?" AWS Documentation,
<https://docs.aws.amazon.com/lightsail/latest/userguide/what-is-amazon-lightsail.html>
- [53] "Azure Developer Overview," Microsoft Learn,
<https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/developer/intro/azure-developer-overview>
- [54] "AlloyDB Product Page," Google Cloud,
<https://cloud.google.com/products/alloydb>
- [55] "Leaflet.js – JavaScript Mapping Library," Leaflet,
<https://leafletjs.com/index.html>
- [56] "Maritime Data Services," Kpler,
<https://www.kpler.com/product/maritime/data-services>
- [57] R. E. Sheriff and R. E. Geldart, *Exploration Seismology*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=oiEIBQAAQBAJ>.
- [58] C. Wang and J. Wang, *Lidar Remote Sensing and Applications*, Springer, 2022.
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=KxyuEAAAQBAJ>.
- [59] J. Gao et al., "Analysis of LiDAR point cloud denoising methods using deep learning," *Computers & Electrical Engineering*, vol. 114, 2024.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S002980182402626X>.
- [60] Pyroistech, "LiDAR Technology," <https://www.pyroistech.com/lidar/>.
- [61] YellowScan, "LiDAR vs. Radar: Understanding the Differences,"
<https://www.yellowscan.com/knowledge/lidar-vs-radar/>.
- [62] Outsight, "How does LiDAR compare to cameras and radars?,"
<https://insights.outsight.ai/how-does-lidar-compares-to-cameras-and-radars/>.
- [63] MeetOptics, "Image Sensors," <https://www.meetoptics.com/academy/image-sensors>.
- [64] Canon Europe, "Image sensors explained,"
<https://www.canon-europe.com/pro/infobank/image-sensors-explained/>.
- [65] R. Keim, "Types of CCD Image Sensors: Interline Transfer, Frame Transfer, Full-Frame CCD," *All About Circuits*,
<https://www.allaboutcircuits.com/technical-articles/types-of-ccd-image-sensors-interline-transfer-frame-transfer-full-frame-ccd/>.
- [66] Baumer, "Operating Principle and Features of CMOS Sensors,"
<https://www.baumer.com/us/en/service-support/function-principle/operating-principle-and-features-of-cmos-sensors/a/EMVA1288>.
- [67] Fujifilm, "Camera Sensors: What Are They and How Do They Work?,"
<https://www.fujifilm-x.com/en-us/series/fundamentals-of-photography/camera-sensors-what-are-they-and-how-do-they-work/>.
- [68] A. Muchmore, "What's the Difference Between CMOS, BSI CMOS, and Stacked CMOS?," *PCMag*,
<https://www.pcmag.com/how-to/whats-the-difference-between-cmos-bsi-cmos-and-stacked-cmos>.
- [69] Teledyne Vision Solutions, "CCD vs. CMOS: Key Differences,"
<https://www.teledynevisionsolutions.com/learn/learning-center/imaging-fundamentals/ccd-vs-cmos/>.

- [70] Photonics Media, "Fiber Optics: Understanding the Basics," https://www.photonics.com/Articles/Fiber_Optics_Understanding_the_Basics/a25151.
- [71] Photonics Media, "Adaptive Optics: Taming Atmospheric Turbulence," https://www.photonics.com/Articles/Adaptive_Optics_Taming_Atmospheric_Turbulence/a25129.
- [72] S. Correia et al., "Enhanced turbulence correction using adaptive optics," *Applied Optics*, vol. 63, no. 16, pp. E48–E59, 2024. <https://opg.optica.org/ao/fulltext.cfm?uri=ao-63-16-E48&id=549401>.
- [73] Opto Engineering, "Optics Basics," <https://www.opto-e.cn/basics/optics-basics>.
- [74] Teledyne Vision Solutions, "Pixel Size and Camera Resolution," <https://www.teledynevisionsolutions.com/learn/learning-center/imaging-fundamentals/pixel-size-and-camera-resolution/>.
- [75] Edmund Optics, "Understanding Focal Length and Field of View," <https://www.edmundoptics.com/knowledge-center/application-notes/imaging/understanding-focal-length-and-field-of-view/>.
- [76] B. Todd, *Nickel-Containing Materials in Marine and Related Environments*, presented at the 25th Annual Conference of Metallurgists, Edgbaston, Birmingham, England, 1986.
- [77] Ruvati USA, "304 vs 316 Stainless Steel: Manufacturing Insights," *Ruvati USA*
- [78] "Why 316 Stainless Steel is Ideal for Marine Environments," <https://www.resourcewebsite.com/316-marine-benefits/>
- [79] M. A. Wahid, A. N. Siddiquee, and Z. A. Khan, "Aluminum alloys in marine construction: characteristics, application, and problems from a fabrication viewpoint," *Mar. Syst. Ocean Technol.*, vol. 15, pp. 70–80, Dec. 2020. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40868-019-00069-w>
- [80] T. P. Sathishkumar, S. Satheeshkumar, and J. Naveen, "Glass fiber-reinforced polymer composites – a review," *Journal of Reinforced Plastics and Composites*, vol. 33, no. 13, pp. 1258–1275, 2014. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265346634_Glass_fiber-reinforced_polymer_composites_-_a_review
- [81] S. A. Takim and T. F. Okeoma, "Characterization of Glass Fiber Reinforced Epoxy Composites," *GUU-Journal of Interdisciplinary Research & Innovations*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2022. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373247517_Characterization_of_Glass_Fiber_Reinforced_Epoxy_Composites
- [82] G. Vizontin, D. Glujić, and V. Špada, "Effect of time-real marine environment exposure on the mechanical behavior of FRP composites," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, pp. 9934, 2021. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354406571_Effect_of_Time-Real_Marine_Environment_Exposure_on_the_Mechanical_Behavior_of_FRP_Composites
- [83] G. Tognan, "Study of steel-glass fibre-reinforced polymer (GFRP) bonded joints for the design of anchorage systems for flat bottom GFRP tanks subjected to seismic actions," Ph.D. dissertation, *Università degli Studi di Trieste*, 2020. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0950061824005622>
- [84] S. C. Dexter, *Handbook of Oceanographic Materials*, Krieger Publishing, Malabar, FL, 1985.

https://www.usna.edu/NAOE/_files/documents/Courses/EN380/Course_Notes/zAppendix_B_Material_Properties.pdf

[85] A. Pistone, C. Scolaro, and A. Visco, "Mechanical properties of protective coatings against marine fouling: A review," *Polymers*, vol. 13, pp. 173, 2021

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348299356_Mechanical_Properties_of_Protective_Coatings_against_Marine_Fouling_A_Review

[86] M. Santos-Simón, J. Ferrario, B. Benaduce-Ortiz, M. Ortiz-Zarragoitia, and A. Marchini, "Assessment of the effectiveness of antifouling solutions for recreational boats in the context of marine bioinvasions," *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, vol. 200, Art. no. 116108, 2024

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025326X24000857>

[87] P. A. Sørensen, S. Kiil, K. Dam-Johansen, and C. E. Weinell, "Anticorrosive coatings: a review," *Journal of Coatings Technology and Research*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 135–176, 2009

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225668165_Anticorrosive_coatings_A_review

[88] M. Santos-Simón, J. Ferrario, B. Benaduce-Ortiz, M. Ortiz-Zarragoitia, and A. Marchini, "Assessment of the effectiveness of antifouling solutions for recreational boats in the context of marine bioinvasions," *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, vol. 200, Art. no. 116108, 2024

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025326X24000857>

[89] Avantier Inc., "Understanding field of view (FOV) and angular field of view (AFOV) in camera lenses,"

<https://avantierinc.com/resources/knowledge-center/understanding-field-of-view-fov-and-angular-field-of-view-afov-in-camera-lenses/>.

[90] Lumen Learning, "Telescopes," *University Physics*, <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-physics/chapter/26-5-telescopes/>.

[91] Newport Corporation, "How to build a beam expander," <https://www.newport.com/n/how-to-build-a-beam-expander>.

[92] European Southern Observatory (ESO), "Adaptive optics," Extremely Large Telescope (ELT), [Online]. Available: <https://elt.eso.org/telescope/adaptiveoptics/>.

[93] CAD Models by Kevin Micelo - E4D MDAS Team

[94] J. Lodriguss, "Astrophotography Formulae," Astropix, [Online]. Available: <https://www.astropix.com/html/astrophotography/astrophotography-formulae.html>.

Appendix E - ChatGPT prompts

[1] Boat Image Generated Using Chat GPT

Prompt: Please generate a picture of a small ship overseas.

[2] Frontend help using Claude

Prompt: How should I set up my React components for a dashboard application that displays live radar data and vessel overlays?

[3] Material Selection Using Google Gemini

Prompt1: What structural building materials (give me a list of 5) would be best for designing a maritime structure that is corrosion resistant and can uphold and encapsulate the system in the divide and conquer paper.

Prompt2: My structure contains 4 components, 1. The structural frame that upholds the radar and encases a co-axial wind turbine within it. 2. The top plate on which the radar pedestal is mounted on top. 3. The bottom plate which gets mounted onto the boat. 4. The electronics enclosure which holds the technology to process data and the starlink module. Please provide me with a list of possible material selections for each component.

[4] Radar Features/ Selection Case Study Using Google Gemini

Prompt1: I am researching radar comparison, including features and specifications needed for a senior design project involving a maritime radar. This radar will be connected to a NUC/ raspberry pi computer and will collect vessel data overseas. I need to look into what factors are important for radar overseas, what kind of radars work best, and then compare say 5 different radars ultimately choosing the best option for this project. Attached is a document encasing our senior design plan thus far.

Prompt2: Do a much deeper analysis with more in depth information. Please pick the best radar option.

[5] Optical Case Study using ChatGPT

Prompt 1: Write an outline for comparing Keplerian and Galilean telescopes and include a chart with comparison features.

Prompt 2: Would a CCD or CMOS sensor be better for a camera system mounted on a boat? Which type of CCD or CMOS sensor would be best for this scenario?

Prompt 3: Create a table comparing a front-illuminated CMOS, back-illuminated CMOS, a stacked CMOS sensor, and global shutter CMOS system.