MonoPHY: Mono-Stream-based Device-free WLAN Localization via Physical Layer Information
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Abstract—Device-free (DF) indoor localization has grasped great attention recently as a value-added service to the already installed WiFi infrastructure as it allows the tracking of entities that do not carry any devices nor participate actively in the localization process. Current approaches, however, require a relatively large number of wireless streams, i.e. transmitter-receiver pairs, which is not available in many typical scenarios, such as home monitoring.

In this paper, we introduce MonoPHY as an accurate mono-stream device-free WLAN localization system. MonoPHY leverages the physical layer information of WiFi networks supported by the IEEE 802.11n standard to provide accurate DF localization with only one stream. In particular, MonoPHY leverages both the low-level Channel State Information and the MIMO information to capture the human effect on signal strength. Experimental evaluation in a typical apartment, with a side-by-side comparison with the state-of-the-art, shows that MonoPHY can achieve an accuracy of 1.36m. This corresponds to at least 48% enhancement in median distance error over the state-of-the-art DF localization systems using a single stream only.

Index Terms—Device-free localization, detection and tracking, physical-layer based localization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many localization systems have been proposed over the years including the GPS systems [1], RF-based systems [2]–[6], inertial-based systems [7]–[9], and infrared-based systems [10]. All these systems require that the tracked entity carries a device. On the other hand, device-free passive (DfP) localization [11] is based on using typical wireless networks to detect and track entities that do not carry any devices nor participate actively in the localization process. It depends on the fact that the RF signal strength is affected by human motion. DfP localization can be used in many applications including smart homes, intrusion detection, and traffic estimation. A typical DfP system consists of signal transmitters (such as standard access points (APs)), monitoring points (MPs) (such as standard laptops or APs themselves), and an application server for processing.

Current approaches for DfP localization include radar-based systems, e.g. [12]–[14], computer vision based systems, e.g. [15], [16] and Radio Tomographic Imaging (RTI), e.g. [17]. These systems, however, need special hardware and high installation cost. On the contrary, a number of DfP localization systems have been proposed that operate in standard WiFi networks, e.g. [18]–[28], without requiring any additional equipment. Therefore, these systems provide a value added-service on top of the wireless infrastructure, just based on the reported signal strength from the MAC layer. Nevertheless, they still require a large number of streams (a data stream is the data received from one AP at one MP), which limits their applicability and accuracy in a large class of scenarios, such as in homes, where usually a small number, typically one AP is installed.

In this paper, we introduce MonoPHY as a single stream DF localization system. To compensate for the reduced number of streams, MonoPHY leverages the available detailed physical layer information of WiFi networks. In particular, the IEEE 802.11n standard uses the OFDM modulation, where a wide channel is divided into several orthogonal subcarriers each arriving at the location of the receiver with distinct values of phase and magnitude (denoted as Channel State Information (CSI)). This provides rich information to detect the effect of human motion on the magnitude of each subcarrier, as compared to a single signal strength value that has been used with the current approaches. In addition, the IEEE 802.11n devices use the MIMO technology, which further provides more information about each antenna pair from the transmitter to the receiver.

MonoPHY captures the effect of the human standing at different locations in the area of interest on the CSI vectors that describe the channel performance at each OFDM subcarrier on each MIMO antenna pair at the receiver in a training phase. This CSI data at each location is modeled as Gaussian mixtures and stored in what we call an RF fingerprint. During the operation phase, few samples are collected at each MP, which are further compared with each entry in the fingerprint map to determine the closest location.

Experimental evaluation, in a typical apartment using a single access point and a single laptop with an Intel 5300 wireless card shows that MonoPHY can achieve a localization accuracy of less than 1.36m using a single stream. This corresponds to at least 48.1% enhancement in median error over the state-of-the-art DF localization systems using the same WLAN installation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II presents a brief background about the physical layer information used in MonoPHY and its properties that can be used to identify the human location based. Section III discusses
the system architecture and the proposed model. We evaluate MonoPHY in a typical WiFi testbed and compare it to the state-of-the-art DF WLAN localization techniques in Section IV. Finally, we conclude the paper and give directions for future work in Section V.

II. BACKGROUND AND CSI CHARACTERIZATION

In this section, we introduce the necessary background on the physical layer information we use along with the basic principles our system is based on.

A. Channel State Information (CSI)

Most WLANs, including IEEE 802.11a/g/n, use OFDM modulation in which signals are transmitted over several orthogonal frequencies called subcarriers. The OFDM channel is a wide channel divided into subcarriers where each signal, transmitted on a subcarrier, has a different signal strength and phase. Typical wireless cards provide received signal strength information as received from the MAC layer, which represents a fused value that captures the wireless channel between the transmitter and receiver, regardless of the number of antennas or subcarriers between them.

On the other hand, some of the common IEEE 802.11n standard based cards available in the market, e.g. the Intel 5300 card, provides detailed information about the physical layer of the RF channel represented as Channel State Information (CSI), which provides the signal strength and phase of the OFDM subcarriers between each pair of transmitter and receiver antennas. In particular, the Intel 5300 card reports the CSI for 30 groups of subcarriers, which is about one group for every 2 subcarriers for the 20MHz channels operating on the 2.4GHz frequency [29].

B. MIMO Technology

The IEEE 802.11n nodes also use another technology which is Multiple-Input Multiple-Output (MIMO). In MIMO, there are multiple transmitter and receiver antennas, where each combination of receiver and transmitter antennas can be considered as a separate stream. This facility provides multiple virtual streams between a transmitter-receiver pair and hence should lead to better accuracy.

C. CSI Properties

In this section, we show some of the properties of CSI that can be used to identify the human location based on changes of the CSI. Due to space constraints, we focus on the CSI magnitude in this paper and leave leveraging phase information to a future paper.

Figure 1(a) shows the probability density function (pdf) for the CSI magnitude for a single virtual stream (signal strength of one subcarrier of one link). The figure shows that this pdf fits a Gaussian distribution mixture nicely, which confirms to previous analysis [30].

Figures 1(b) and 1(c) show the CSI magnitude for one stream over different packets (each packet is represented by a line) for the 30 subcarriers. We can notice from the figure that the CSI values for each stream form clusters. In Figure 1(b), two clusters are formed while in Figure 1(c) the CSI values form only one cluster. Although the number of clusters for each location in the fingerprint map is variable, we found that it does not exceed three clusters. This observation simplifies the clustering operation and allows the usage of efficient techniques in terms of running time (e.g. k-means algorithm).
Figure 2 shows the CSI magnitude for the silence case as well as the presence of the human at two different locations for one stream. The figure shows that the CSI magnitude information can be used to identify the human presence as well as determine her location.

III. THE MONOPHY SYSTEM

In this section, we give the details of MonoPHY. We start by an overview of the system architecture, the system model, and the system details.

A. Overview

Figure 3 shows the system architecture. We have two phases of operation, offline and online phases:

The **Offline training phase** is used to build a clusters-based fingerprint. During this phase, a person stands at different locations in the area of interest. For each location, CSI values are recorded for all transmitter-receiver pairs and used to construct clusters to discriminate this location from others.

The **Online localization phase** is used to estimate the entity location based on the currently collected CSI for each transmitter-receiver pair and the clusters-based fingerprint prepared in the offline phase.

The **CSI Preprocessing** module extracts CSI values from sent packets for each stream and filters outlier values.

The **Clusters Builder** module constructs discriminative clusters for locations using the \( k \)-means algorithm. Each subcarrier at every fingerprint location is represented by up to three clusters as discussed in Section II-C. Clusters with members below a threshold are filtered out.

The **Location Estimator** module calculates the minimum distance between the currently collected CSI in the online phase and the stored clusters, selects a set of candidate locations, and estimates the most probable location. It has two modules: one for the discrete-space estimation and the other for the continuous-space estimation.

B. System Model

Assume a DF system installed in an area with \( l \) fingerprint locations. This area is covered by only one AP (with \( n \) MIMO antennas) and one MP (laptop with a card with \( m \) MIMO antennas). This leads to \( n \cdot m \) virtual links between the transmitter and receiver. Using the OFDM modulation, each transmitted packet is sent using \( f \) subcarriers on each of the \( n \) antennas. This leads to a total of \( n \cdot m \cdot f \) virtual signal strength streams at the receiver, where each stream corresponds to one carrier for each virtual link.

Based on the discussion in Section II-C, the signal strength of each virtual stream can be mapped into \( k \) clusters, \( k \leq 3 \).
where each cluster is represented by a mixture of up to k Gaussian random variables (see e.g. Figure 1a). Let R represents the entire fingerprint. Therefore, the fingerprint at each radio map location (R_l) can be represented by a vector \( R_l = (U, V) \), where \( U = U_{a,b} \) and \( V = V_{a,b} \) represent the mean and variance (respectively) of the Gaussian random variable representing the signal strength received from transmitter antenna \( i \) at receiver antenna \( j \) on subcarrier \( a \) of cluster \( b \).

Therefore, the problem becomes, given a received packet with an associated signal strength vector \( S = (s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, \ldots, s_{i,m}) \), where \( s_{i,j} \) represents the CSI magnitude of the packet received from transmitter antenna \( i \) at receiver antenna \( j \) on subcarrier \( a \), we want to estimate the most probable entity location. In the next subsection, we assume a discrete space while in Section III-D we handle the continuous space case.

C. MonoPHY Discrete-Space Estimator

Given the received signal strength vector \( S \), we want to find the location \( l^* \) in the fingerprint that maximizes the probability \( P(l|S) \). That is:

\[
l^* = \arg \max_l P(l|S)
\]

Using Bayes’ inversion, this can be represented as:

\[
l^* = \arg \max_l \frac{P(S|l)P(l)}{P(S)}
\]

Assuming all locations are equally likely\(^2\) and noting that \( P(S) \) is independent of \( l \), Equation 2 becomes:

\[
l^* = \arg \max_l P(S|l)
\]

\( P(S|l) \) can be estimated from the constructed fingerprint, \( R \), as:

\[
P(S|l) = \max_b \prod_{a=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^m \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} V_{a,b}^2} \exp \left( -\frac{(x - V_{i,j})^2}{2(V_{a,b})^2} \right) \right]
\]

where \( U_{a,b}^r \) and \( V_{a,b}^r \) are the mean and variance vectors of the Gaussian mixtures as defined in the system model and the constant \( \frac{1}{2} \) represents the quantization interval of signal strength.

To improve the robustness of the localization output, we apply Equation 4 on a sequence of packets during a time window \( w \). A voting process is applied on all location candidates obtained during the window, where the fingerprint location with the highest vote is returned as the most probable location.

\(^1\)Note that the silence case (i.e. when no entity is present in the area of interest) can be treated as a special location with its own fingerprint.

\(^2\)If the probabilities distribution of \( P(l) \) is known, it can be used directly in Equation 2.

D. MonoPHY Continuous-Space Estimator

The previous estimator will always return one of the fingerprint locations, even if the entity is standing in between. To enhance accuracy, the continuous space estimator estimates the location as the weighted average of the most probable \( r \) locations, where each location is weighted by its probability normalized by the sum over all probabilities.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section, we analyze the performance of MonoPHY and compare it to the state-of-the-art DF WLAN localization systems [20, 31]. We start by describing the experimental setup and data collection. Then, we analyze the effect of different parameters on the system performance. We end the section by a comparison with the state-of-the-art.

A. Testbed and Data Collection

We evaluated MonoPHY in a typical apartment with an area of approximately 100m\(^2\) (about 1077 sq. ft.) as shown in Figure 4. The area was covered by a single Cisco Linksys X2000 AP and a Dell Adamo XPS laptop as a MP. The laptop has an Intel 5300 card that can provide CSI information [29]. The fingerprint is constructed for 35 different locations, uniformly distributed over the testbed area. An independent test set of 17 locations are chosen randomly between the training locations at different times of day using different persons from the training set.

Table I shows the default values for the different parameters.

B. Effect of Different Parameters

1) Effect of the number of receiver antennas (m): Figure 5 shows the effect of changing the antennas combinations on the median distance error. The figure shows that different combinations lead to different accuracy. This is due to the noisy wireless channel and the different multipath effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Default value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Num. of receiver antennas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Num. of transmitter antennas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Num. of averaged locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Window size for votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Num. of subcarriers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I: Default parameters values.**

![Median distance error (m) vs Combination of antennas](image1)

**Fig. 5: Effect of different combinations of receiver antennas (a, b, c).**

encountered by the packets received at the different antennas. This means that using more antennas does not necessarily lead to better accuracy. The good news is that the SNR associated with the antennas can be used to determine the best combination. For the rest of this section, we use antennas a and c (i.e. $m = 2$) as they lead to the best accuracy.

2) **Effect of the time window size for voting ($w$):** Figure 6 shows the effect of increasing $w$. The figure shows that as the window size used for voting increases, the accuracy increases. However, increasing $w$ increases the latency. Therefore, there is a tradeoff that a designer needs to balance based on her needs. Using $w = 20$ gives high accuracy of $1.36m$ with reasonable latency.

3) **Effect of processed subcarriers ($f$):** Figure 7 shows the effect of increasing the number of subcarriers on the median distance error. The figure shows that increasing the number of subcarriers leads to better accuracy until it saturates at about 20 subcarriers.

4) **Effect of number of averaged locations ($r$):** Figure 8 shows the effect of increasing the number of averaged locations ($r$) for the continuous-space estimator. The figure shows that increasing the number of averaged locations reduces the median distance error until it saturates around $r = 6$.

**C. Comparison with the State-of-the-Art**

Figure 9 shows the CDF of the distance error for the discrete-space and continuous-space estimators of MonoPhy as compared to the Deterministic [20] and Probabilistic Nuzzer [31] traditional DF systems. Table II summarizes the results. The results show that MonoPhy has the best accuracy with an enhancement of at least 48.1% in median distance error over the best state-of-the-art techniques **using only a single stream.**
Percentage applications. the-art techniques. can achieve MonoPHY
Information (CSI) from the physical layer as well as the MIMO information to achieve its high accuracy with limited enhancement of MonoPHY-Cont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Median distance error</th>
<th>Percentage enhancement of MonoPHY-Cont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determin. Nuzzer</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>56.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob. Nuzzer</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>48.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MonoPHY-Discrete</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>60.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MonoPHY-Cont</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Comparison between MonoPHY and the state-of-the-art techniques.

V. CONCLUSION

We presented the design, analysis, and implementation of MonoPHY: an accurate device-free WLAN localization system based on a single stream. MonoPHY leverages Channel State Information (CSI) from the physical layer as well as the MIMO information to achieve its high accuracy with limited hardware.

Experimental evaluation in a typical WiFi testbed shows that MonoPHY can achieve 1.36m median distance error, which is better than the state-of-the-art techniques by at least 48%. This highlights the promise of MonoPHY for real-time DF tracking applications.

Currently, we are expanding MonoPhy in multiple directions including integrating the CSI phase information, multiple entities detection and tracking, and entity identification.
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