

To Wireless Fidelity and Beyond - CAPTURE, Extending Indoor Positioning Systems

Gary Cullen, Kevin Curran, Jose Santos
Intelligent Systems Research Centre,
University of Ulster, Magee College,
Derry, United Kingdom
Gary.Cullen@lyit.ie

Gearoid Maguire, Denis Bourne

Letterkenny Institute of Technology,
Co. Donegal, Ireland

Abstract—The benefits of context aware computing and specifically the context that location can provide to applications and systems has been heavily documented in recent times. Moreover the move from traditional outdoor localization solutions to the indoor arena has seen a dramatic increase in research into this area. Most of this research has surrounded the problem of positioning accuracy, with attempts to solve this using a myriad of technologies and algorithms. One of the problems that seems to be somewhat overlooked is the issue of coverage in an indoor localization solution. The mostly unobstructed views of the Global Positioning System (GPS) which requires a mere 30 satellites to provide global coverage never had these problems. The dearth of literature around this issue in the outdoor arena is testament to this fact. Unfortunately unobstructed views are not something that can be achieved in most indoor environments and economical as well as physical barriers can prevent the installation of an infrastructure to achieve total coverage. In this paper we propose a solution to this issue of indoor coverage by deploying a solution to extend the range of a positioning system - Cooperatively Applied Positioning Techniques Utilizing Range Extension (CAPTURE). CAPTURE provides a system to locate devices that cannot be reached by an in-house location based system. It presents a unique contribution to research in this field by offering the ability to utilize devices that currently know their location within a Location Based Solution (LBS), to help evaluate the position of unknown devices beyond the range capacity of the LBS. Effectively extending the locating distances of an Indoor LBS by utilizing the existing mobile infrastructure without the requirement for additional hardware. CAPTURE uses the Bluetooth radios on mobile devices to estimate the distance between devices, before inserting these range estimates into a trilateration algorithm to ascertain position. CAPTURE has been tested through experiments carried out in a real world environment, proving the capacity to provide a solution to the ranging issue.

Keywords—Localization; Indoor positioning; Indoor localization; geographical positioning; Bluetooth; Cooperative Positioning.)

I. INTRODUCTION

The first iteration of CAPTURE described in the following literature [1], used the RSSI readings taken from the IEEE 802.11 radio on the mobile devices to gauge the range between the devices by measuring the signal loss to estimate distance. The version of CAPTURE implemented and evaluated in this paper uses the Bluetooth radio on the devices to estimate distances between devices based on the RSSI received from the

Bluetooth beacon. The test area and experiments were the same for both systems and the results were weighed to evaluate the best solution to solve the problem of range in Indoor Positioning Systems (IPS).

On losing something or forgetting where you last placed something, a common piece of advice is to retrace your steps back in your mind. This can be quite a formidable task given the multimodal transport available today coupled with the complexity and scale of buildings we interact with on a regular basis. The ability to place an avatar of yourself onto a map to graphically retrace your steps in real-time would dramatically reduce the brain power required to remember everywhere you were at a given time. Googles maneuverings into the indoor location mappings realm [2] opens up the opportunity to deliver this virtual reality, currently being able to provide door to door route planning. Being able to navigate your way from your office desk out through your company's building (taking the stairwell to avoid your boss in the lift) is eminently achievable albeit with a small number of locations on a modern smartphone using google maps. A level switcher allows you to onion slice through multiple floor level plans, before switching to GPS to offer possible transport alternatives through the outdoor environment. On reaching what '*historically*' would have been your destination, Google Indoor Maps and more importantly an IPS picks up where GPS left off offering a point to point navigation solution. This can then take you through the complexities of an airport terminal for example, via specific waypoints such as security and check-in desks directly to your departure gate.

One of the barriers to implementation of such a concept is the limitation in coverage and accuracy of currently implemented Indoor Position or Location Based Systems [3]. IPSs typically utilize pre-existing Wi-Fi network infrastructure taking ranging information from Wireless Access Points (WAP's) as inputs for a localization algorithm. Unfortunately the drivers behind the strategic decisions on the positioning of WAPs, in a Wi-Fi based solution, were typically to catch large congregations of users and primarily to provide the highest available throughput to those users. Coverage for IPSs is not necessarily to the forefront of network designer's minds when designing such networks, leaving large areas beyond the range of an IPS. GPS on the other hand, offers near global coverage, bar some issues with urban canyons and other high rise natural obstacles that prevent Line of Sight (LoS) to the just under 30 satellites required [4] to deliver such wide scope.

The indoor environment does not afford such clear unobstructed views to and from tracking devices, the many doors, walls, floors, pillars and ceilings hinder the capacity of an IPS to locate devices. Furthermore the indoor arena is an especially noisy atmosphere, being home to other wireless devices such as Bluetooth Headsets, Cordless Phones and Microwave Ovens. All of these devices operate in the same frequency band as the Wi-Fi solution, namely 2.4 GHz and therefore can interfere with the reception of signals used to locate [3], making them behave in an unpredictable fashion. These environmental dynamics combine to dramatically affect the ability of an indoor solution to provide an acceptable level of coverage. Literature from Yang [4] and Rowe [5] reflect that Location Awareness is rapidly becoming a fundamental requirement for mobile application development. This highlights the challenges posed for ubiquitous localization of devices in the indoor arena. Considering users spend more time in an indoor environment, over 88.9% according to a recent Canadian study [5], the need for a solution is obvious. We propose a solution to this issue of coverage limitations by using a cooperative localization technique, CAPTURE. CAPTURE can plug into an in situ solution irrespective of the technology or location technique that solution currently uses to locate.

Consider the following scenario where a user ‘Bob’, is in his favorite seat in the library, unfortunately the seat is in the far corner of the library, which can only be ‘seen’ by one Wireless Access Point. In this position Bob’s tablet can gain Wi-Fi access through this Access Point to allow him access to online resources. However one Access Point is not enough for the in-house Location Based System to accurately locate Bob within the building using Trilateration positioning techniques. Sue is sitting near the front of the library and can be ‘seen’ by 4 Wireless Access Points, and is thereby accurately located on the Location Based System. She is also 25 meters to the left of Bob and the Wireless Network Card on her Laptop can see Bob’s tablet. The Librarian is stacking books on the shelves behind where Bob is sitting and her smartphone is currently located within the Location Based System also. The wireless NIC on her smartphone can also ‘see’ Bob’s tablet, therefore, in a normal scenario, Bob would be beyond the range of the Location Based System, but because CAPTURE can use the known positions of the Librarian and Sue and Bob’s position relative to them it can accurately estimate Bob’s position within the library. It provides a location relative to the devices locating it, which can then be mapped onto a global overview of the Location Based System (LBS), assisting in the aforementioned scenario to get you to the departure gate in a point to point navigation solution.




Figure 1: Sports Hall LyIT

The rest of this paper is laid out as follows; Section II describes the system model used to implement CAPTURE. Section III provides an overview of the experimental test bed used to evaluate the solution and Section IV documents the data collected during testing. In Section V we describe the findings of the experiments that were carried out, validating the feasibility of the system, the penultimate section, Section VI outlines the proposed implementation of CAPTURE and the paper concludes Section VII, providing an insight into some projected future work with CAPTURE.

II. CAPTURE - SYSTEM MODEL

This section describes a system model that can be used in a localization solution to establish the Cartesian coordinate values of a lost device within a two dimensional plane. CAPTURE does not require a preceding calibration stage or a site survey, providing a robust opportunistic solution in dynamic environments, using only real time RSSI values. We use the term reference device to describe devices that cooperatively assist in the positioning of lost or unknown devices. Traditionally the term anchor node is used to describe these devices, but this seems to elicit a perception of static or permanent devices, which in a cooperative solution these devices most certainly are not. Two key components typically make up the estimation of the position of a lost device. First of all ranging techniques are used to estimate the distance from the transmitting device(s) to the receiving device(s). This is calculated using a metric for example the length of time it takes a signal to propagate the distance from the transmitter to the receiver. The second component is the position estimation technique, here the ranging variables are calculated using one or more ranging techniques and these are used as input for an estimation algorithm to calculate the position of the lost device.

A. CAPTURE – Bluetooth

CAPTURE was first implemented using RSSI measurements from the 802.11 radio on mobile device [1]. The implementation of CAPTURE described in this paper utilizes Bluetooth radio beacons to measure range. Bluetooth has been around for quite some time now, designed by phone manufacturer Ericsson in 1994, it was initially developed to replace the then ageing RS-232 and Infrared (IR) interfaces for connecting peripheral devices. It operates at the same 2.4GHz frequency as Wi-Fi and is specified in the IEEE 802.15.1 standard. The overriding benefit of using Bluetooth for Indoor Localization is its availability in nearly every mobile device in use today. Using Bluetooth in a cooperative framework also allows the user to remain connected to the 802.11 network while simultaneously assisting in the location of others with Bluetooth radio signals. Bluetooth transmits beacons similar to 802.11 radios and the strength of the signal received from these beacons can be captured and measured to provide a range estimate. Kloch et al [6] investigate effects in Collaborative Indoor Localization as an example of self-organizing in ubiquitous sensing systems, using Bluetooth to correct Pedestrian Dead Reckoning (PDR) drift. They analyze the collaborative approach as a solution to the indoor localization problem, and found that when using PDR in

isolation the variance grows bigger as people are walking. That is to say that the position estimation becomes less and less accurate the further the people being tracked travel. Implementing a hybrid solution incorporating Bluetooth RSSI readings to measure the distance between devices, dramatically improved positioning accuracy. Bluetooth has been further used as a cooperative solution to the accuracy issue in IPS's [7-11].

B. RSSI – Received Signal Strength Indicator

Possibly the most popular ranging technique used in Indoor Localization, Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI) is a measurement of the voltage that exists in a transmitted radio signal, which is an indication of the power being received by the antenna. When a signal first leaves a transmitting device, the power of the signal drops or attenuates, this is true of both wired and wireless transmissions. As a radio signal propagates through the air some of its power is absorbed and the signal loses a specific amount of its strength, therefore, the higher the RSSI value (or least negative in some devices), the stronger the signal. Knowing the amount of signal loss over a given distance provides a method to calculate the distance from a transmitting device, given a Received Signal Strength. At its most basic level this allows for the 'coarse' localization or as referred to in other literature, 'presence-based localization' [12] of a device relative to the transmitting device. This can be illustrated by the RSSI calculated distance being the radius of a circle and the 'searching' device being at the centre of that circle. The estimated position of the lost device is anywhere on the circumference of that circle. In an IEEE 802.11 network if the locations of the Access Points are already known, then the location of Mobile Devices traversing the network can be located relative to them, albeit only to the circumference of the radius of the calculated distance. Further localization algorithms and position estimation filtering techniques must be applied to provide a more precise level of localization.

In a cooperative paradigm, mobile devices can simulate the role carried out by Access Points, providing a relative reference to a lost devices location. RSSI values can be extracted from beacons transmitted between devices within range. Correlation of these signal indicators and distance can be estimated using many of the methods already applied throughout literature in this arena [13-15]. RSSI based or more broadly speaking, radio based Indoor Positioning Systems have had notoriously irregular environment variables such as reflection, refraction, diffraction and absorption of radio waves that can impact positioning estimated dramatically [16]. Although RSSI is a measure of signal loss, it is not a linear representation of how many dBm is actually reaching the card. If a signal indicator is reading -72, this means that it is 72 dBm less powerful by the time it gets to your device. Experimental test carried out at an early stage with CAPTURE further extolled this assumption. Results of these tests can be viewed in Table 1: 5 meter increments in Section V, Data Collection and Presentation. Crudely extracting the RSSI at given distance increments to attempt to derive a meter distance

being equal to a given dBm increase in RSSI reading was not going to yield any value worth using in any further experiments. The authors in [17] advocate a solution utilizing a RSSI smoothing Low Pass Filter (LPF) to minimize the dynamic fluctuation of the RSSI values.

C. Trilateration

Trilateration is a key component of the GPS position estimation techniques. It is a process that can estimate the position of a mobile device given the positions of at least three other objects and the distance from those objects to the device to be located. In the scenario depicted below in Figure 2(a), illustrated using a cooperative localization example, the circle depicts the distance from a reference device to a lost device. This distance would have been derived using the RSSI value between the reference and lost devices. All we can say about the whereabouts of the lost device is that it resides somewhere on the circumference of the circle that is constructed using the radius of the estimated measurement between the two devices. A second reference device will allow the position of the lost device to be narrowed further as can be seen in Figure 2(b). Now the ranging estimates of the lost device have been calculated relative to the second reference device also. Therefore considering the lost device must be on the circumference of the circles created by the distance between it and the two reference devices there are only 2 possible positions where it might be, the intersections of these two circles.




Figure 2: (a) Single Distance (b) With 2nd Reference Device




Figure 3: Trilateration Example

To calculate the exact position of the lost device we need a third reference device. When we calculate the distance from this final reference device to the lost device and considering we already know the distance from the other reference devices. We can then determine that the lost device can only be at one specific position to match those three particular distance estimations – the intersections of the three circles (see Figure 3). The ranging estimates calculated from the RSSI values in the tests were used as the inputs for the trilateration algorithm on the CAPTURE, to provide an estimate on the position of the lost phones.

III. EXPERIMENTAL TEST BED

In this section, we will provide evidence showing the suitability of CAPTURE as a solution to the indoor ranging problem. To do that we carried out a large campaign of measurements in the Sports Hall in Letterkenny Institute of Technology illustrated in Figure 1. The hall offers a 40m diagonal testing range, providing Line of Sight measurements for all tests, as can be seen in the picture depicted in Figure 4. When readings were been recorded all users vacated the hall, this provided an optimal environment to use as a benchmark for future tests on CAPTURE.



Figure 4: Test Environment

The experimental setup of the prototype consisted of 7 Samsung GT-S5310 Galaxy Pocket phones (Figure 5), running Google Android 2.2.1 on a 600 MHz ARMv6, Adreno 200 GPU, Qualcomm MSM7227 chipset, were used to carry out the evaluation of the CAPTURE system. 3 of the phones were used as reference devices, the other phone acted as the lost device. All phones used during the test were of an exact make and model so as to rule out any issues with varied RSSI reads with different antenna types. Some of these issues have been described in the literature [18, 19]. Lisheng et al., [19] go so far as to describe the distortion being as much as 11.2 dBm out with different antenna types over a 25 meter read range. Although these issues referenced above describe problems in the 802.11 realm, it is the author’s opinion that these could have an impact on Bluetooth radio signals also.



Figure 5: Test Phones

During the tests all phones were placed at a distance of 80cm above floor level, to mimic as close to a real world example of a user holding them. The phones were placed on identical platforms during the tests to negate the impact of Hand-Grip body-loss effect which can also impact ranging measurements [18]. Device orientation can also introduce errors when calculating signal range estimates, so all phones had the same orientation when used in our tests [20].

- Database

A MySQL Server version: 5.0.96 hosted on a Linux platform was used to store all data collected by the devices. The server was online and the phones wrote directly to it as they recorded RSSI values from each other. The data was then passed through a low level filter to remove any outliers, before an average RSSI reading was calculated for each required ranging measurement, to be used in the trilateration algorithm to estimate the position of the lost device.

- Laptop

A Dell Latitude E6440 iCore3 running Windows 7 Professional was used to develop the app to gather the RSSI from the phones. An algorithm was designed to convert this RSSI reading into a ranging measurement before a trilateration algorithm converted the ranging measurements into Cartesian coordinate values. We used the Eclipse IDE and Android Software Development Kit (SDK) for Android development and debugging, to develop the app.

B. Ranging Measurement Estimation

The RSSI values captured from the beacons transmitted by devices within range of the ‘lost device’ were used to estimate the relative distance between them. As explained earlier RSSI values do not provide a linear representation of distance. The authors in [17] advocate using the formula in “(1),” below to estimate RSSI, and thereby extrapolate distance given RSSI:

$$RSSI = - (10n \text{ Log}_{10} (d) + A) \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

Where:

n: Path Loss Exponent

d: Distance from transmitting device

A: Received signal strength at 1 meter distance

The path loss exponent typically varies from 1.5 to 4, with 1.5 representing a free-space Line of Sight (LoS) value and 4 representing an environment that incorporates a high level of signal attenuation. Not having a good equation modeling the environment in which your experiments are to be deployed, will be reflected in horrible results. After initial pre-tests were evaluated, a Path Loss Exponent of 1.5 was determined for the test environment, because of the open plan design of the Hall offering LoS between all devices and the RSSI at 1 meter was measured at -66.8194. The results of the collected data are described in the following section.

IV. DATA COLLECTION AND PRESENTATION

Here we present all of the data collated throughout this work, the data sets are illustrated in the graph and table. During the recording of data the hall was emptied of people so as to provide a clean set of results. An initial test was run to establish the 1 meter range for input into the algorithm in equation 1, the results of this test can be seen in Figure 6. The fluctuations in the meter range values was one of the notable differences between the tests recorded in the 802.11 version of CAPTURE versus the Bluetooth version. In the Wi-Fi version meter read values were captured from -42 to -45. Here, as can be seen in the graph readings ranged from -62 to -77, a difference of 3dBm was recorded in the Wi-Fi test, with a difference of 15dBm in the Bluetooth experiments.




Figure 6: 1 meter readings

500 readings were recorded at various locations throughout the hall, to accurately obtain the meter value for the algorithm, these were smoothed with a filter before the final average was calculated.

Further tests were then carried out to measure the accuracy of both the RSSI values received and the resulting range estimations from the algorithm. Table 1 below, depicts the results of tests to capture the RSSI values between two phones at 5 meter increments diagonally across the hall. It highlights the RSSI value beginning at -72.3793 for the 0-5 meter range.

A sample set of 200 readings were recorded per section, an average was then taken from this set. The standard deviation was also documented to illustrate any fluctuations in the received values. In our previous experiments with CAPTURE using Wi-Fi [1] the standard deviation was typically low, in this case using Bluetooth as can be seen in the table below standard deviation ranges from 4.2 to 2.9, these are large fluctuations from the average.

Distance	0 - 5 m	0 - 10 m	0 - 15 m	0 - 20 m
Average	-72.3793	-74.8966	-76.6333	-76.3103
Std Dev	4.1140	3.6327	3.9603	3.9226
Estimate	3.73	7.62	11.20	9.69
Distance	0 - 25 m	0 - 30 m	0 - 35 m	0 - 40 m
Average	-80.6205	-80.9657	-80.2759	-83.3103
Std Dev	4.1062	3.3776	4.2823	2.9490
Estimate	28.82	29.38	27.87	49.95

Table 1: 5 meter increments

The average was then inputted into the algorithm to derive a range estimate based on the RSSI values received. As mentioned before RSSI values do not provide a linear representation of measurement, and therefore some of the increments do not initially seem like they could assist in finding a distance at a given measurement. The ranging estimates show an error high of 11.31 meters at the 0-20 meter range and low of .62 meters at the 0-30 meter range.

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Figure 7 depicts one of the tests where CAPTURE accurately locates a lost phone within 2.5 meters. TestPhone1, TestPhone2 and TestPhone3 know their location, via the in-house IPS.




Figure 7: Finding Lost Phone

They also know the distance between themselves:

- TestPhone1 to TestPhone2 is 15 meters
- TestPhone1 to TestPhone3 is 13 meters
- TestPhone2 to TestPhone3 is 17 meters

The RSSI readings from the:

- Lost Phone to TestPhone1 is -77.5351dBm
- Lost Phone to TestPhone2 is -78.8457dBm
- Lost Phone to TestPhone3 is -76.1021dBm

These RSSI readings translate to a ranging estimate of 13.345, 15.1221 and 9.349 meters respectively when put through the ranging algorithm.

The actual distance between:

- TestPhone1 and the Lost Phone is 11.5 meters
- TestPhone2 and the Lost Phone is 13.2 meters
- TestPhone3 and the Lost Phone is 11.9 meters

Giving an approximate average error rate of 2.5 meters.

From the schematic of the test pictured in Figure 7 CAPTURE's visualizer module (Figure 8) graphically depicts the positions of the cooperative reference devices on screen along with the actual and estimated positions of the lost device. The positions of the 3 reference devices are entered into the visualizer manually, which can be seen in blue on the screen. The position of the lost device is also entered, it is illustrated in red on the screen. The application then reads in the RSSI values before estimating the position of the lost device, shown in green here on the screen.




Figure 8: Visualizer module

VI. CAPTURE – SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION

In order for CAPTURE to be able to cooperatively locate a lost device within a network, there must be at least 3 reference devices within sight of the lost device. Each of these must have ‘a priori’ knowledge of their location within a preexisting localization solution. The hypothesis of CAPTURE was to extend the range of in-house IPS’s, and tests shown in both have proven that it can achieve exactly this. Existing IPS’s have dramatically more powerful infrastructure than what CAPTURE would utilize though. For example 230 volt AC powered Access Points in a standard IPS versus 12 volt DC powered mobile reference devices (smart phones, tablets and/or laptops) in a cooperative solution. It would be naive to think that accuracy levels of an in-house IPS would also ‘extend’ to a cooperative model, although this does not take away from the solution to the range issue that CAPTURE provides. The implementation of a more comprehensive filter would nonetheless assist with accuracy for example the Kalman or Extended Kalman Filters are recommended in the following literature [7, 21].

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper introduces CAPTURE a cooperative localization system using Bluetooth, that provides a solution to the problem of devices being out of range of a hosted Indoor Positioning System. Although the earlier implementation of CAPTURE using 802.11 provided more accurate results, experiments with the Bluetooth version of CAPTURE still demonstrate that utilizing a cooperative framework of mobile devices can extend the range of an in situ Indoor Positioning System by at least the range of the outermost devices located within the system. While CAPTURE using 802.11 [1] provides a more accurate solution, CAPTURE Bluetooth can actively transmit and receive beacons while still connected to the Wi-Fi network, something the 802.11 version cannot currently achieve. Disconnecting a user from a network to allow them to assist in the localization of another device is not something that would lead to large scale adoption of a solution. Wi-Fi Direct proposes to solve the issue of peer-to-peer communication during network connectivity. The implementation of a Wi-Fi direct version of CAPTURE is something that the next iteration of CAPTURE would hope to include.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Cullen, K. Curran, and J. Santos, "CAPTURE - Cooperatively Applied Positioning Techniques Utilizing Range Extensions," in *5th International Conference on Indoor Positioning and Indoor Navigation (IPIN 2014)*, IEEE, Busan, Korea, 2014, pp. 22-29.

[2] M. Aly and J. Y. Bouguet, "Street view goes indoors: Automatic pose estimation from uncalibrated unordered spherical panoramas," in *Applications of Computer Vision (WACV), 2012 IEEE Workshop on*, 2012, pp. 1-8.

[3] G. Cullen, K. Curran, and J. Santos, "Cooperatively extending the range of Indoor Localisation," in *Signals and Systems Conference (ISSC 2013), 24th IET Irish*, 2013, pp. 1-8.

[4] G. M. Djuknic and R. E. Richton, "Geolocation and assisted GPS," *Computer*, vol. 34, pp. 123-125, 2001.

[5] C. J. Matz, D. M. Stieb, K. Davis, M. Egyed, A. Rose, B. Chou, *et al.*, "Effects of Age, Season, Gender and Urban-Rural Status on Time-Activity: Canadian Human Activity Pattern Survey 2 (CHAPS 2)," *International journal of environmental research and public health*, vol. 11, pp. 2108-2124, 2014.

[6] K. Kloch, G. Pirkl, P. Lukowicz, and C. Fischer, "Emergent behaviour in collaborative indoor localisation: An example of self-organisation in ubiquitous sensing systems," in *Architecture of Computing Systems-ARCS 2011*, ed: Springer, 2011, pp. 207-218.

[7] A. Baniukevic, D. Sabonis, C. S. Jensen, and L. Hua, "Improving Wi-Fi Based Indoor Positioning Using Bluetooth Add-Ons," in *Mobile Data Management (MDM), 2011 12th IEEE International Conference on*, 2011, pp. 246-255.

[8] S. Aparicio, J. Perez, A. M. Bernardos, and J. R. Casar, "A fusion method based on bluetooth and WLAN technologies for indoor location," in *Multisensor Fusion and Integration for Intelligent Systems, 2008. MFI 2008. IEEE International Conference on*, 2008, pp. 487-491.

[9] F. J. Gonzalez-Castano and J. Garcia-Reinoso, "Bluetooth location networks," in *Global Telecommunications Conference, 2002. GLOBECOM '02. IEEE*, 2002, pp. 233-237 vol.1.

[10] C. Liang, H. Kuusniemi, C. Yuwei, P. Ling, T. Kroger, and C. Ruizhi, "Information filter with speed detection for indoor Bluetooth positioning," in *Localization and GNSS (ICL-GNSS), 2011 International Conference on*, 2011, pp. 47-52.

[11] Z. Sheng and J. K. Pollard, "Position measurement using Bluetooth," *Consumer Electronics, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 52, pp. 555-558, 2006.

[12] A. E. Kosba, A. Saeed, and M. Youssef, "Robust WLAN Device-free Passive motion detection," in *Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC), 2012 IEEE*, 2012, pp. 3284-3289.

[13] D. Gualda, J. Urena, J. C. Garcia, E. Garcia, and D. Ruiz, "RSSI distance estimation based on Genetic Programming," in *Indoor Positioning and Indoor Navigation (IPIN), 2013 International Conference on*, 2013, pp. 1-8.

[14] M. O. Gani, C. Obrien, S. I. Ahamed, and R. O. Smith, "RSSI Based Indoor Localization for Smartphone Using Fixed and Mobile Wireless Node," in *Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC), 2013 IEEE 37th Annual*, 2013, pp. 110-117.

[15] S. Shioda and K. Shimamura, "Anchor-free localization: Estimation of relative locations of sensors," in *Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC), 2013 IEEE 24th International Symposium on*, 2013, pp. 2087-2092.

[16] L. Erin-Ee-Lin and C. Wan-Young, "Enhanced RSSI-Based Real-Time User Location Tracking System for Indoor and Outdoor Environments," in *Convergence Information Technology, 2007. International Conference on*, 2007, pp. 1213-1218.

[17] J. Joonyoung, K. Dongoh, and B. Changeok, "Automatic WBAN area recognition using P2P signal strength in office environment," in *Advanced Communication Technology (ICACT), 2014 16th International Conference on*, 2014, pp. 282-285.

[18] F. D. Rosa, X. Li, J. Nurmi, M. Pelosi, C. Laoudias, and A. Terrezza, "Hand-grip and body-loss impact on RSS measurements for localization of mass market devices," in *Localization and GNSS (ICL-GNSS), 2011 International Conference on*, 2011, pp. 58-63.

[19] X. Lisheng, Y. Feifei, J. Yuqi, Z. Lei, F. Cong, and B. Nan, "Variation of Received Signal Strength in Wireless Sensor Network," in *Advanced Computer Control (ICACC), 2011 3rd International Conference on*, 2011, pp. 151-154.

[20] K. Kaemarungsi and P. Krishnamurthy, "Properties of indoor received signal strength for WLAN location fingerprinting," in *Mobile and Ubiquitous Systems: Networking and Services, 2004. MOBIQUITOUS 2004. The First Annual International Conference on*, 2004, pp. 14-23.

[21] S. S. Saad and Z. S. Nakad, "A Standalone RFID Indoor Positioning System Using Passive Tags," *Industrial Electronics, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, pp. 1961-1970, 2011.