

## Decentralized Probabilistic World Modeling with Cooperative Sensing

## Workshop on Global Sensor Networks (GSN'09) 6 March 2009

#### Arjan Peddemors

Eiko Yoneki

INCA Group Telematica Instituut / Novay Enschede, The Netherlands

Computer Laboratory University of Cambridge Cambridge, United Kingdom





## **Mobile Phone Penetration**

- Nov. 2007 (according to Informa)
  - 3.3 billion subscriptions
  - 6.6 billion world population





Source: ITU, <u>http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/statistics/ict/index.html</u>, retrieved on 2008-09-02



### Interesting Times in the Mobile Device Market...



Instituut



## Mobile Phones – Open Platforms – Software getting more important

#### iPhone App Store

### Android Market









## Mobile Phones – More and more sensing capabilities

- Wireless (network) interfaces
  - Cellular
  - 802.11
  - Bluetooth
  - RFID / NFC
- Geographical location (GPS)
- Acceleration
- Temperature
- Light
- Audio
- Video
- Touch





## Large scale sensing

- High number of mobile device owners (on world scale)
- Device close to its owner most of the time
- New powerful devices
- Take off of mobile internet
- Many sensors per device

Great opportunity to sense the world around us on a very large scale!

- Continuously
- Collectively
- Individually





## What if...

- ...we store all information received from all the sensors on these personal mobile devices continuously?
- ...we use this data to build a probabilistic world model

   individually and collectively to capture static
   features (objects) and dynamic features (behavior) of our environment?





## Then we can...

- Know at which location resources are available
  - E.g. where a person has access to WLAN networks while traveling
- Know where and when people are likely to meet
- Detect unusual situations
  - E.g. sense that a person is close to people he has not met before or only in another setting
  - E.g. sense that a road is blocked
- Predict upcoming events





## **Bottom-up Modeling**

- Finding frequent patterns in the stream of data coming from the sensors that perceive our surrounding
  - General, not application specific
- Predefined structure
  - Incorporating primitives like roads, buildings, people, cars, artifacts, etc
  - Building and maintaining such a structure is a very large endeavor
  - Hard to identify unanticipated relationships between occurrences
- Bottom-up structure does not have these disadvantages





## Lots of data! Lots of processing!

• Example: CoSphere experiment (feb/march 2007)

| summary   |     |       |
|---|-----|-------|
|   | :== | ===== |
| number of participants: 12                            |     |       |
|   |     |       |
| global number of unique used cells                    | :   | 4120  |
| global number of different in-range operators         | :   | 18    |
| global number of unique in-range 802.11 access points | ;:  | 3787  |
| global number of unique in-range 802.11 networks      | :   | 1725  |
| global number of unique in-range bluetooth nodes      | :   | 6679  |

• Much more data expected from other types of sensors



CoSphere trial data: http://cosphere.telin.nl/trial/, retrieved on 2008-09-02

# Example: prediction of future network visibility (mobile device perspective)



- Forecasting visibility event based on already seen (other) visibility events
- These other events act as 'predictors'
- Use the best predictor when multiple are available



# Example: prediction of future network visibility (mobile device perspective)

 Does it help to take the visibility of other infrequently seen networks into account? YES

participant 5





# Example: prediction of future network visibility (mobile device perspective)

- Does it help to use information from one network interface (one sensor) to predict events on another network interface (another sensor)? YES, but...
  - The case for almost all participants
  - 'Inter-tech' prediction contributes more than 'intratech' prediction
- What do we learn from this?
  - Use as much sensor data a possible
  - Sensor data fusion works





#### Probabilistic World Modeling Example: compositional hierarchies



Figure taken from Karl Pfleger's PhD defense presentation, <a href="http://www.ksl.stanford.edu/people/kpfleger/">http://www.ksl.stanford.edu/people/kpfleger/</a>, retrieved on 2008-09-02





### Probabilistic World Modeling Example: compositional hierarchies







#### Probabilistic World Modeling Example: compositional hierarchies







## **Collective Effort**

- By sharing the models built on individual nodes (mobile devices), we may
  - Increase the overall model accuracy
  - Use the observations of others in environments unknown to individual nodes
- We propose to take a decentralized P2P approach
  - No centralized role that may interfere with privacy
  - Exchange of model data with those that are most relevant
  - Opportunistic data exchange, when nodes (peers) are near, using short range wireless networks





# **Discussion (many open issues)**

- Semantic 'gap': how can we bridge the gap between the probabilistic model and application logic
- Difference in sensor quality and calibration may interfere with collective model building
- Difference in hierarchy building between individual nodes may make model data exchange difficult
- Uncertain whether a generic model is capable of supporting a wide range of applications





# **Discussion (many open issues)**

- Temporal patterns evolve at widely varying rates
- Computing resources
- Opportunistic spread of model data
- Privacy





## Summary

- Personal mobile device
  - Exciting platform to do large scale sensing and modeling of the world around us
- Probabilistic world modeling
  - Open and promising field of research
  - Bottom-up , no need for predefined structure
  - Helping to find collective and individual patterns of behavior
- Opportunistic data exchange
  - P2P based
- This is a truly multidisciplinary effort!

