Landscape(T): A Robust and Low-cost Sensor Positioning System Using the Dual of Target Tracking



Novelty and Contributions

Localization from a NEW Perspective

- Treat the sensor localization problem as the **dual of target tracking**.
- A moving location-aware location assistant (LA) periodically broadcasts beacons while it moves around the sensor field. Each sensor passively observes the beacons.
- Each sensor individually "tracks" its own position using a UKF (Unscented Kalman Filter) [1] based algorithm.

Performance Evaluation

- Use MDS-MAP[3] (the state-of-the-art localization approach) as the reference.
- The result reported here is for a sensor network with irregular topology, in which sensors are deployed around a lake.

Landscape vs. MDS-MAP(P.R)

(Results for 10% range error)





Advantages

- High accuracy, good scalability.
- ZERO sensor-to-sensor communication cost, low computation cost.
- Robust to node densities, network topologies, and ranging errors.



beacon. $\mathbf{w}_i(n)$ and $\mathbf{v}_i(n)$ are noise sequences.

Unscented Kalman Filter (UKF) based algorithm:

- The UKF [1] embeds Unscented Transformation (UT) into Kalman Filter's prediction and update structure.
- The basic idea of UT is to represent the state distribution by a minimal set of carefully chosen sample points (sigma points).
- Best choice for our system: UKF is able to elegantly resolve the above nonlinear problem with higher accuracy and/or less computation cost than other KF variants or Bayesian techniques.

Landscape(T) vs. Landscape:

- In our previous work Landscape [2], beacons contain LA's locations and transmission powers only, the RSS (received signal strength) measurement is utilized.
- Landscape(T) adds a new observation equation:

Summary

| | Neighborhood-measurement-based localization methods | Landscape | Landscape(T) |
|--|---|---|---|
| Accuracy | From low to high , depending on algorithms as well as node densities. A high accuracy is usually at the cost of high computation cost. | High. | Higher. |
| Scalability | Depends on algorithms, from low (centralized) to high (distributed). | High. | High. |
| Computation cost | From low to high, depending on algorithms as well as node densities. | Low. | Low. |
| Communication cost (sensor-to-sensor) | High to very high. | Zero. | Zero. |
| Robustness to densities/topologies | Weak. | Strong, independent of densities/topologies. | Strong, independent of densities/topologies. |
| Robustness to range errors | From weak to strong, depending on algorithms. | Strong. | Stronger. |
| Ranging techniques | RSS, ToA, TDoA, or AoA | RSS | RSS + TDoA |

$\Delta \mathbf{t}_{i}(n) = (\mathbf{y}_{i}(n) - \mathbf{y}_{i}(n-1))/c + \mathbf{v}_{it}(n),$

where $\Delta t_i(n)$ the difference between the traveling times (from the LA) to a sensor node) of two consecutive beacons. This TDoA (time difference of arrival) based new observation is delicately designed so that no time synchronization is needed.

References

[1] S. Julier and J. Uhlmann, "Unscented Filtering and Nonlinear Estimation", Proc. of the IEEE, Vol. 92, No. 3, March 2004

[2] L. Zhang et al., "A Novel Distributed Sensor Positioning System Using the Dual of Target Tracking", online technical report, http://www.cs.iusb.edu/~liqzhang/Liqiang_Landscape.pdf (A short version published in IEEE WiMob'05). [3] Y. Shang et al., "Localization from Connectivity in Sensor Networks", IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems, Vol. 15, No. 11, November 2004.