



Localization Tutorial

KU LEUVEN

Phoenix Project November 9, 2015







- 1 Localization Process in Phoenix
- 2 Localization techniques
- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints

(n)

1 Localization Process in Phoenix

- 2 Localization techniques
- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints

Inaccessible

Environment

Extraction

((.))

(())

Localization Process in Phoenix

Project goal

Insertion

 $((\bullet))$

- Explore underground systems with sensors
- Sensor measurements enable e.g. temperature or pressure profiles
- Sensor positioning needed for measurement mapping

(())

(())

(())

((•))

(()





1 Localization Process in Phoenix

2 Localization techniques

- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints

Localization techniques

(n)

- Anchor-based: A subset of the nodes have a priori known positions. Nodes with unknown position use positioning information from anchors to determine their <u>absolute</u> position
- Anchor-free: No a priori knowledge on the positions of any node. Only <u>relative</u> coordinates can be obtained

- Range-based: Relative distances to other nodes are measured
- **Angle-based:** Angle information to other nodes is measured
- **Range-free:** Only connectivity information available



- 1 Localization Process in Phoenix
- 2 Localization techniques
- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints



- 1 Localization Process in Phoenix
- 2 Localization techniques
- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints



Figure: RSS measurement

System model:

$$P_{r}(d) = P_{0} - 10\gamma \log_{10} d + S$$
$$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{d}) \ge \left(\frac{\ln 10\sigma_{s}}{10\gamma}d\right)^{2}$$

- S: shadowing with variance σ_s^2
- $\gamma:$ path-loss exponent



Figure: Two-way TOA ranging

System model:

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{r}(t) &= \sqrt{E}\mathbf{p}(t-\tau) + \mathbf{n}(t) \\ \mathrm{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) &\geq \frac{c^2}{8\pi^2\beta^2\,\mathrm{SNR}} \end{split}$$

 $\begin{aligned} & \text{SNR} \triangleq E/N_0 \\ & \beta \text{: effective bandwidth} \\ & \beta^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^2 |P(f)|^2 \ df / \int_{\mathbb{R}} |P(f)|^2 \ df \end{aligned}$



Figure: Two-way TOA ranging

- Bidirectional communication required
- Data stored by each sensor:
 - ID of node B
 - Time stamp
 - ToF or distance to node B (can be used for online sensor adaptation)



Figure: Example Network





- 1 Localization Process in Phoenix
- 2 Localization techniques
- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints



(v_1, x_1) Localization problems due to ambiguities • Consider simplified, noise-less case in 2D: V_3 • Two fixed nodes v_1, v_2 : known position $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3$? $\mathbf{x}_3?$ Localize v₃'s position same measurements \rightarrow different solutions (v_2, x_2) Figure: 3-connected graph with flex-ambiguity

- Realistic, noisy case:
 - Even more ambiguities present due to noise variance

Impact of noisy range measurements

- Three anchor (or already localized) nodes
- Fourth sensors to be localized
- Simplified case: noise only on measurements of *v*₃
 - By range measurement d₃₄, d₃₄: two possible solutions: x, x



Figure: Network with noisy range measurements



- 1 Localization Process in Phoenix
- 2 Localization techniques
- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints



Complexity of Localization in noise-less case

The localization of sensors by means of range measurements is \mathcal{NP} -hard and it's of combinatorial nature (Complexity $\stackrel{a.s.}{\sim} \exp(\# \text{sensors})$).

- Special cases
 - Trilateration (Quadrilateration) graphs: polynomial (or even linear) in # sensors
 - There exists an ordering for $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ in \mathbb{R}^d such that the sensors can be localized by $|\mathcal{V}| d$ consecutive trilaterations



- Unique localizability constraints for noisy case unknown
- For noise-less case in *d* dimensions
 - at least d+1 anchors in general position
 - corresponding graph must be globally rigid and (d+1)-connected
 - k-connectivity: removing any k-1 vertices doesn't render $\mathcal G$ unconnected
- Noise-less case in 2D:
 - Graph ${\mathcal G}$ 6-connected \Rightarrow global rigidity
 - Graph $\mathcal{G}(R)$ 2-connected $\Rightarrow \mathcal{G}(2R)$ globally rigid

R: sensor communication range

- Noise-less case in 3D:
 - Graph $\mathcal{G}(R)$ 2-connected $\Rightarrow \mathcal{G}(3R)$ globally rigid
- \Rightarrow High connectivity essential for sensor localizability



- 1 Localization Process in Phoenix
- 2 Localization techniques
- 3 Range-based Localization
 - Techniques & Notation
 - Localization ambiguities
 - Localization Complexity & Localizability Constraints

Summary

(n)

Steps obtain sensor positions

- Collect timing or distance measurements from all agents
- Perform joint localization
 - Estimate agent positions at each measurement instance

Unique localization requirements in noise-less 3D case

- Minimal requirements: at least 4-connectivity
- No constructive criteria known
- Conjecture: 12-connectivity \Rightarrow global rigidity





Davide Dardari

"Short-range Localization Techniques for Wireless Sensor Networks".

Anderson et. al.

"Graphical properties of easily localizable sensor networks".

Eren et. al.

"Rigidity, Computation, and Randomization in Network Localization".

Aspnes et. al.

"A Theory of Network Localization".