

On the Feasibility of Using Wireless Ethernet for Indoor Localization

Andrew M. Ladd

Kostas E. Bekris

Algis P. Rudys

Dan. S. Wallach

Lydia E. Kavradi

Department of Computer Science

Rice University

Houston, TX, 77005

aladd|bekris|arudys|dwallach|kavraki@cs.rice.edu

Abstract

IEEE 802.11b wireless Ethernet is becoming the standard for indoor wireless communication. This paper proposes the use of measured signal strength of Ethernet packets as a sensor for a localization system. We demonstrate that off-the-shelf hardware can accurately be used for location sensing and real-time tracking by applying a Bayesian localization framework.

I. INTRODUCTION

The IEEE 802.11b wireless Ethernet standard is becoming increasingly popular and has been already deployed in many indoor environments [19]. Many mobile robots already make use of wireless networking for communication. Wireless Ethernet devices measure signal strength as part of their normal operation. We propose the utilization of off-the-shelf wireless Ethernet adapters on a mobile robot as a tool for global pose estimation. This paper is a feasibility study on the advantages and the difficulties of using this sensor for robot localization. We believe that there is a great potential for Wireless Ethernet to be applied as an additional input to a sensor fusion technique for robot localization.

Determining the pose of the robot from physical sensors is a key problem in robotics, since it plays a pivotal role in various successful mobile robot systems [4]. Outdoor localization can be achieved using GPS [18]. Using GPS for indoor localization, however, presents some significant challenges [20]. For the problem of indoor localization, a variety of other sensors have been used, such as vision, IR and laser range-finders. Mobile robots already employing wireless Ethernet for communication purposes could be retrofitted in software to make use of their adapter as a location sensor. Such a sensor might be very useful for a low-cost robot or team of robots wishing to execute global localization, navigation and exploration tasks. This is of particular interest for some multi-robot configurations; while communicating, the robots could measure signal strengths to each other and engage in collaborative localization.

The chief difficulty in localization with wireless Ethernet is predicting signal strength. RF signal strength measured indoors is non-linear with distance. In addition it has non-Gaussian noise resulting in multi-path effects and environ-

mental effects such as building geometry, network traffic, presence of people and atmospheric conditions.

This paper describes a set of experiments with a laptop carried by a human operator whereby localization with IEEE 802.11b wireless Ethernet is shown to be feasible. The focus of this work was to determine the usability of wireless Ethernet as a sensor. This was motivated by an application in wireless computing, that of locating an intruder using a laptop [16], [15]. However, it is also a minimalist approach which isolates the sensor we are testing and generates results applicable to mobile robotics. To compute position, we apply a scheme in the spirit of other Bayesian techniques that have been successfully employed in the context of robotics [23]. We show experiments demonstrating that off-the-shelf wireless hardware can accurately be used for location sensing and tracking with about one meter precision in a wireless-enabled office building.

Related Work. The simplest technique used for mobile robot localization has been dead reckoning. With dead reckoning errors are added to the absolute pose estimate and accumulated. Triangulation techniques were also used, in this case landmarks are extracted from the sensor input and then they are used to triangulate the robot's position. This works when the sensors are reliable but leaves several problems unaddressed [6]. Kalman filters were also applied for localization [22], [17], where various sensor data are fused to obtain a new position estimate. This method is provably optimal when noise distributions are gaussian but typically fails when these assumptions break down. The most powerful algorithms to date are based on Bayesian inference, in particular Markov models [13], [8] and Monte Carlo localization [7], [24]. Most often the workspace is represented by an occupancy grid.

Alternately, the environment can be modeled with a topological map, e.g., as a generalized Voronoi graph [2]; localization in this paradigm is based on identifying nodes in the graph from geometric environmental information [3], [14]. Our research uses the Bayesian approach. We sample the space, we measure the signal strength at regularly spaced locations and calculate the probability distribution.

Localization is a problem that has been also explored in the wireless community for a wireless device like a laptop computer, usually carried by a human operator. Many systems have been implemented that use specialized hard-




Fig. 1. Two examples of signal strength distributions, measured over time at a constant location.

ware [25], [21]. The RADAR system [1], however, uses only the 802.11b wireless networking for localization and applies nearest neighbor heuristics and triangulation techniques. The authors report accuracy of 3 meters with about fifty percent probability. While our work has similar design goals to RADAR, we have taken a very different approach.

RF Signal Propagation in Wireless Ethernet. The IEEE 802.11b standard uses radio frequencies in the 2.4GHz band, which is license-free around the world. Accurate prediction of signal strength from location is a complex and difficult task since the signal propagates by unpredictable means [5], [19]. In the 2.4GHz frequency band, microwave ovens, Bluetooth devices, 2.4 GHz cordless phones and welding equipment can be sources of interference. Signals of this frequency are absorbed by water and consequently people will also absorb signal since human bodies are almost 70% water. Due to reflection, refraction, scattering, dependence on atmospheric parameters and absorption of radio waves by structures inside a building, the transmitted signal most often reaches the receiver by more than one path, resulting in a phenomenon known as multi-path fading [11]. Signal multi-path effects cause the observed signal strength to vary in unpredictable ways as the receiver position varies, but signal profiles tend to remain approximately the same over short distances [11].

Many efforts have been made to model radio signal distribution in an indoor environment [9], [19]. Although it has been suggested that the signal propagates according to a log-normal function [10], [9], different experiments have arrived at different distributions and a general model remains unavailable. Our experiments verified this; we concluded that log-normal fits were only feasible when line-of-sight between transmitter and receiver existed. In our experiments, the noise distributions of signal strength measured at a fixed location varied greatly. In Figure 1, we show two typical examples of the signal. The two distributions correspond to measurements taken over time from the same position. Although there is a dominant mode in both of them, we observe that the distributions are asymmetric and multi-modal, (i.e., non-Gaussian).

II. METHODOLOGY

Hardware. Our experiments were conducted by a human operator carrying a HP OmniBook 6000 laptop with a

PCMCIA LinkSys wireless Ethernet card. This particular card uses the Intersil Prism2 chip set. We modified the standard Linux kernel driver to use the base station probe facility of 802.11b [12] to request packets from the base station to obtain the necessary signal strength measurements. The normal usage of this facility is for determining which base station has the strongest signal and should be chosen as the home station for the card. The card firmware logs and reports 8-bit signal strengths and hardware addresses (MAC addresses) for each response packet received. Each probe returns between 0 and 4 responses from each base station within range of the card. Probes can be made safely at frame rate of between 3 and 6 times per second which will vary with network traffic and location. We remark that this signal is quite thin when compared to other sensors such as sonar or a laser range finder. We estimate that in our setup, there are roughly 5 meaningful bits of information from each packet and these bits are noisy.

Our Model. The localizer that we implemented operates in the general framework of Bayesian inference localization [23], [8], [13]. We chose a state space and observation space. Position is represented as a probability distribution over the states. The inference calculation consists of conditioning on the observations and then selecting a representative point from the resulting distribution.

We chose points in four hallways of the building our experiments took place in, spaced roughly 1.5 meters apart from each other, at two orientations. A point for our experiments was represented as a tuple (x, y, θ) . To summarize, our state space consisted of a set of n points $S = \{s_1 = (x_1, y_1, \theta_1), \dots, s_n = (x_n, y_n, \theta_n)\}$.

Our observation space consisted of the observations that occurred in a single measurement from our base station scanner. A packet consists of k pairs of base station MAC address and signal strength. The number of replies k is different from the number of base station, which in our experiments is 14. This is due to the fact that some base stations may not reply at all or some of them may reply up to four times. We are assuming that the number of times a base station is replying to a probe is independent from the signal strength of the reply. As a result, a single measurement consists of a count k of the number of base station replies, a summary of the frequency counts (the number of times each of the N base stations was seen in




Fig. 2. Map of Duncan Hall. There are 5 base stations marked on this map as enumerated small circles (larger circles in the picture are the pillars). Two of them are located at Hallway 1 and Hallway 2. Overall 14 different base stations were used, they were located in two different floors.

this measurement) and then the k pairs. We denote this as a vector $o = \langle k, f_1, \dots, f_N, (b_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (b_k, \lambda_k) \rangle$, where k is the count, N is total number of base stations, f_i is the frequency count for the i th base station, b_j is the base station index of the j th measurement and λ_j is the signal strength at that point.

At each point s_i , we take a sample of the observable. For each base station we build two histograms at that point. The first is a distribution of the frequency counts over the sampled observations. The second is a distribution of signal strengths. Based on this sample, we can calculate two kinds of conditional probability: $Pr(f_j = a | s_i)$, the probability that the frequency counts for the j th base station is a when we are at state s_i and $Pr(\lambda_j | b_j, s_i)$, the probability that the base station b_j has signal strength λ_j at state s_i . For $o = \langle k, f_1, \dots, f_N, (b_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (b_k, \lambda_k) \rangle$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and under the assumption that the signal strength is independent from the number of replies, we compute:

$$Pr(o | s_i) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^N Pr(f_j | s_i) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^k Pr(\lambda_j | b_j, s_i) \right).$$

By explicitly integrating a probability distribution of positions based on a received measurement and selecting a representative point we obtain a position estimate. After trying several possible schemes, we decided to solve a global localization problem for each measurement rather than keep a running estimate because each measurement usually contains enough information to get a good guess of our position. Initially, we assign equal probability to all possible states in the building of being the actual position. Iterating over all states, we compute which position is most likely to have resulted in the measured signal by selecting the point of maximum probability assuming that the

point exceeds a certain threshold probability. The resulting stream can be further processed to improve precision (see ‘‘Sensor fusion’’, below).

Training Process. Our system was trained by taking samples every 1.5m in the world by three different operators. Each operator, had to hold a laptop, to stand still for several seconds at each sample point to collect data. We assume that sampled data was operator independent, that is to say that we believed that measured distributions would be relatively unaffected by who took the data. The amount of data taken at each point is varied adaptively according to a simple heuristic which measures the rate of convergence to a stable distribution. Once the sampled distribution at each visible base station had converged beyond a threshold, we halt the process. This allowed us to train the system faster, spending more effort only in positions where it’s necessary to achieve an accurate measurement of the signal strength distribution. In our case, usual sampling times ranged from ten seconds to a minute, per position.

Sensor Fusion with a Hidden Markov Model. We implemented a filter that works on top of the Bayesian inference procedure. It takes the output of the inference engine as a stream of timed observations and tries to stabilize the distribution by noting that a person carrying a laptop typically does not move very quickly. This sort of calculation could be achieved with a much higher degree of precision using odometry from a mobile robot.

We model a moving operator trying to track her position as a hidden Markov model (HMM). We use a more finely discretized state space than the Bayesian inference engine and try to interpolate our position out of the stream of measurements coming from this filter. We observed that, by averaging our training measurements, taken at a 1.5

meter spacing, and using the average measurement for the points in between, we were able to localize the computer for points we had not taken any training samples at.

For our purposes, an HMM is a set of states $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, a set of observations $O = \{o_1, \dots, o_m\}$, a conditional probability $\lambda : S \times O \rightarrow [0, 1]$, and a transition probability matrix A . As in the Bayesian inference engine, each state is a point (x, y, θ) .

The transition probability matrix semantics describe how the system being modeled evolves with time. In this case, it describes how a person travels through the state space. If π is a probability distribution over S , then $\pi' = A\pi$ is the probability distribution after some discrete time step. The idea is that the random state change occurs “hidden” from the observer.

The observation function λ has semantics identical to observation in the Bayesian inference of position. $\lambda(s, o) = Pr(o|s)$, the probability of observing o while at s . As each observation arrives, λ is used to update the probability of being in a given state in S , and then A is used to transition states. λ is chosen to be a model of the behavior of the inference engine and A is chosen to heuristically model human motion.

III. RESULTS

In our experiments, we can measure and track position robustly. Over 70% of our localization attempts, we return either the closest trained position or an adjacent trained position, i.e. we achieved 1.5 meters accuracy. Although this may seem as a large error for indoor localization, it must be noted that errors are not accumulated as in the case of odometry and that this sensor comes almost for free since we achieved this level of accuracy in a complex indoor environment by employing commodity 802.11b Ethernet equipment. The map of the building we operated in can be found in Figure 2, it had fairly complicated geometry and the base stations were laid out more than a year before we began our work. We did not make any changes to the original base station locations in our building.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 show tracking experiments that took place in hallways 1 and 3 of our building correspondingly. The operator walked down the hallway, indicating the exact time that certain milestones were passed, giving us an accurate measure of the operator’s true position to compare against the localization results. In the figures, we report both the Bayesian inference static localization results and the HMM fused results. In figure 3, a significant improvement is obtained and, overall, the results are excellent. In Figure 4, the signal was much noisier due to a relatively poor base station placement. Note that in both cases, errors of 1.5m are still roughly within one standard deviation.

IV. SUMMARY

Bayesian techniques applied to signal strength measurements from 802.11 Wireless Ethernet allow for real-time and accurate localization. Our work provides a strong indication that both human and robot agents can use their

existing wireless network interfaces, that currently serve only as communication devices, as a low-cost localization sensor. The infrastructure for such networks already exists in many real-world environments and consequently our scheme can be implemented as a software-only solution.

The experiments were conducted by human operators which introduced error due to signal absorption and lack of odometry. Nevertheless, the results are valid for localization carried with different hardware or with a mobile robot. In fact, similar experiments carried out with a robot would likely be significantly more precise as we avoid absorption errors induced by the operator and have odometry as an additional sensor. Furthermore, there was no effort to improve the quality of the localization procedure by placing the base stations so as to better cover the area where the experiments took place. In an indoor environment, the multi-path fading phenomenon, interference, absorption, reflection and refraction can not be avoided. However, our results suggest that signal strength measurement from the 802.11 Wireless Ethernet devices are useful cues for localization.

There are many interesting open problems related with the use of wireless Ethernet as a localization sensor such as the behavior of the signal in dynamic environments. Most of our experiments were taken during the night. During daytime, new problems in localization arise both from the absorption of signal strength from human bodies and from the heavier network traffic. Furthermore, the framework we have proposed is not restricted to corridor localization where the laptop operator or the robot is forced to walk almost on a straight line. Experiments in large open rooms and on multiple floors can provide further insights on the functionality of wireless Ethernet as a sensor for localization. Last but not least is the issue of base station location. Poor initial placement of base stations can severely decrease the efficiency of localization attempts. Techniques that can provide suggestions for the number and the placement of base stations in order to efficiently cover an environment can significantly improve the performance of localization methods.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Guillaume Marceau for his valuable suggestions, Moez Abdel-Gawad and Skye Schell for helping to take measurements, Scott Crosby for his comments and Dave Johnson for his advice and comments. Thanks also to the anonymous MOBICOM’02 and IROS’02 reviewers.

Andrew Ladd is partially supported by FCAR and NSF-IRI-970228. Kostas Bekris is partially supported by NSF-IRI-970228. Algis Rudys and Dan Wallach are supported by NSF-CCR-9985332, a Texas ATP grant, and a gift from Schlumberger. Lydia Kavradi is supported by NSF Career Award IRI-970228, a Whitaker grant, a Texas ATP award and a Sloan Fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Bahl and V. Padmanabhan. User Location and Tracking in an In-Building Radio Network. Technical Report MSR-TR-99-12, Microsoft Research, 1999.
- [2] H. Choset and K. Nagatani. Topological Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM): Toward Exact Localization Without Explicit Localization. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 17(2):125-137, April 2001.




Fig. 3. Measured error for walking up and down hallway 1, shown on the right graph, is within one meter with probability 0.64, an improvement of 45% over static localization. This improvement is illustrated in the actual tracking performance, shown in the left graph.




Fig. 4. While sensor fusion provided some improvement, it was not significant due to pathological behavior of static localization in certain regions, like hallway 3.

- [3] H. Choset, S. Walker, K. Eiamsa-Ard, and J. Burdick. Sensor-Based Exploration: Incremental Construction of the Hierarchical Generalized Voronoi Graph. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 19(2):126–148, February 2002.
- [4] I. Cox. Blanche - an Experiment in Guidance and Navigation of an Autonomous Robot Vehicle. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 7(2):193–204, 1991.
- [5] T. Cutler. Wireless Ethernet and how to use it. *The Online Industrial Ethernet Book*, Issue 5, 1999.
- [6] G. Dudek and M. Jenkins. *Computational Principles of Mobile Robotics*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [7] D. Fox, W. Burgard, F. Dellaert, and S. Thrun. Monte Carlo Localization: Efficient Position Estimation for Mobile Robots. In *Proc. of the Sixteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-99)*, pages 343–349, Orlando, Florida, 1999.
- [8] D. Fox, W. Burgard, and S. Thrun. Markov Localization for Mobile Robots in Dynamic Environments. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, (JAIR), 11:391–427, November 1999.
- [9] P. Harley. Short Distance Attenuation Measurements at 900MHz and 1.8GHz Using Low Antenna Heights for Microcells. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications (JSAC)*, 7(1):5–11, January 1989.
- [10] H. Hashemi. Impulse Response Modeling of Indoor Radio Propagation Channels. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications (JSAC)*, 11:967–978, September 1993.
- [11] H. Hashemi. The Indoor Radio Propagation Channel. *Proc. of the IEEE*, 81(7):943–968, July 1993.
- [12] Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. *ANSI/IEEE Standard 802.11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications*, 1999.
- [13] K. Konolige and K. Chou. Markov Localization using Correlation. In *Proc. of the Seventeenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 1154–1159, Seattle, Washington, August 1999.
- [14] B. Kuipers and Y. T. Byan. A robot exploration and mapping strategy based on a semantic hierarchy of spatial representations. *Journal on Robotics and Automatic Systems*, 8:47–63, 1991.
- [15] A. M. Ladd, K. E. Bekris, G. Marceau, A. Rudys, L. E. Kavraki, and D. S. Wallach. Using wireless ethernet for localization. In *Proceedings of the 2002 IEEE/RJS International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS 2002)*, Lausanne, Switzerland, October 2002. IEEE Press.
- [16] A. M. Ladd, K. E. Bekris, A. Rudys, G. Marceau, L. E. Kavraki, and D. S. Wallach. Robotics-based location sensing using wireless ethernet. In *Proceedings of the Eight ACM International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking (MOBICOM 2002)*, Atlanta, GE, September 2002. ACM Press.

- [17] J. J. Leonard and H. Durrant-Whyte. Mobile Robot Localization by Tracking Geometric Beacons. *IEEE Transactions Robotics and Automations*, 7(3):376-382, June 1991.
- [18] T. Logsdon. *Understanding the Navstar: GPS, GIS and IVHS. Second edition.* Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1995.
- [19] A. Neskovic, N. Neskovic, and G. Paunovic. Modern Approaches in Modeling of Mobile Radio Systems Propagation Environment. *IEEE Communications Surveys*, Third Quarter 2000.
- [20] E. Olsen, C.-W. Park, and J. How. 3d formation flight using differential carrier-phase gps sensors. In *Proceedings of the ION-GPS Conference*, pages 1937 - 1946, September 1998.
- [21] N. Priyantha, A. Chakraborty, and H. Balakrishman. The Cricket Location Support System. In *Proc. of the 6th Annual ACM/IEEE International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking (MOBICOM 2000)*, pages 32-43, Boston, Massachusetts, August 2000.
- [22] R. Smith and P. Cheeseman. On the Representation of Spatial Uncertainty. *Journal of Robotics Research*, 5(4):56-68, 1987.
- [23] S. Thrun. Probabilistic Algorithms in Robotics. *AI Magazine*, 21(4):93-109, 2000.
- [24] S. Thrun, D. Fox, W. Burgard, and F. Dellaert. Robust Monte Carlo Localization for Mobile Robots. *Artificial Intelligence*, 101:99-141, 2000.
- [25] A. Ward, A. Jones, and A. Hopper. A new location technique for the active office. *IEEE Personal Communications*, 4(5):42-47, October 1997.