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Abstract

Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) systems use commodity visible/near visible digital sensors coupled with processing units that detect, recognize and track image points in a camera stream. These systems are cheap, fast and make use of readily available camera technologies. However, SLAM systems suffer from issues of drift as well as sensitivity to lighting variation such as shadows and changing brightness. Beaconless SLAM systems will continue to suffer from this inherent drift problem irrespective of the improvements in on-board camera resolution, speed and inertial sensor precision. To cancel out destructive forms of drift, relocalization algorithms are used which use known detected landmarks together with loop closure processes to continually readjust the current location and orientation estimates to match “known” positions. However this is inherently problematic because these landmarks themselves may have been recorded with errors and they may also change under different illumination conditions. In this note we describe a unique beacon light coding system which is robust to desynchronized clock bit drift. The described beacons and codes are designed to be used in industrial or consumer environments for full standalone 6dof tracking or as known error free landmarks in a SLAM pipeline.

1. Background

Numerous situations exist in the modern world where accurate knowledge of the position and orientation of an object or person are required in real time with cm to sub-mm level accuracy. This problem is known as positional or spatial localization (includes orientation) and is necessary for many applications including but not limited to user and controller tracking in Virtual Reality/Augmented Reality, robotic navigation for personal vacuum cleaners and warehouse robots, autonomous vehicle navigation and others.

Typical solutions to this problem include using position sensors such as GPS, time of flight/arrival radio positioning, magnetic field sensing, optical tracking systems and camera localization systems involving marker tracker and SLAM (simultaneous localization and mapping). Each one of these has their advantages and disadvantages for different use case scenarios. GPS is generally only accurate to a few meters and not effective indoors. Magnetic field sensing can be very accurate but is susceptible to interference, has a very short practical range of a few meters and involves strong magnetic fields which are not suitable for certain use case scenarios. External optical tracking systems require multiple synchronized cameras which are tethered to a host computer. The number of 6D tracked objects needs to be defined in advance and more coverage requires more cameras which are often expensive. Furthermore the tethered nature of the system means that all computing has to be collated on a single computing station. System calibration needs to be performed before almost every use as small deviations in orientation of the tracking cameras caused by temperature, vibration, accidental bumps etc can often cause significant errors in localization. Time of flight (TOF), Time of arrival (TOA) radio systems use Ultra Wide Bandwidth transmissions at low power to obtain 10cm positional accuracy at 500 – 900MHz. Improving to centimeter level accuracy requires an order of magnitude increase in operational frequency requiring highly specialized hardware and specialized radio spectrum licensing.

In this work we describe a system specifically designed to overcome many of the limitations of current spatial localization systems by using active beacons. It is designed to act in a stand alone capacity or as a way to augment SLAM systems to provide drift free tracking using robustly detectable known landmarks.

2. Full 6D localization with coded light beacons

2.1. Overview

Our approach involves determining the location (3 degrees of freedom) and orientation (3 dof) of a mobile tracking and processing unit that includes a processing sys-
tem and image capture device (from now called a Tracker) inside an environment with flashing beacons (from now called Flashers). We position multiple (more than 3) electronically controlled Flashers (light sources connected to a power source and electronic control circuits) around an environment that we wish to track inside. The Flashers flash unique cyclic binary code identifiers (IDs) at high speed using visible or near visible illumination sources. These codes uniquely identify each Flasher. The specific encoding and decoding process of these IDs is novel and enables Flasher identification without a shared clock signal. This in itself is a significant contribution and may be useful in scenarios other than those described here.

2.2. Calibration and mapping

Once the Flashers have been positioned in the environment we perform a Calibration and Mapping stage. This is performed only when we need to setup the Flashers in a new location or after moving them around. Mapping is required to determine the absolute positions of the Flashers in a global coordinate frame. One method to do so is to directly measure the Flasher locations using a measuring device such as a measuring tape, laser rangefinder or other similar devices. These positions are then stored in a digital format and transferred to the Tracker processing systems. Another method is to position the Flashers on a geometric structure with known geometry such as a room in a building which has available architectural information or has been previously measured. Alternatively an automatic process can be applied directly with the Tracker processing and capture system to determine the absolute positions of the Flashers in a world coordinate frame. This can be done by first detecting the locations of natural image features and Flashers in a sequence of frames observed by the Tracker capture device while actively moving or being moved around the environment in a looped trajectory (i.e. starts and stops at the same point). These 2D image locations can then be used in standard 2D to 3D processing pipelines in which a global bundle adjustment process minimizes the re-projection errors such as in calibrated SLAM system. This process then provides the known locations of detected points in the image frame and converts them into a common world coordinate frame. However this will yield a scale ambiguity. To overcome this a specially designed Flasher pair is used where the distance between the Flashers is known and then the computed world coordinates of every observed Flasher can be determined.

2.3. Detection and tracking

Once mapping is complete the system enters a Detection-Tracking loop. This is initialized by first receiving the mapping and calibration information to the Tracker processing unit and then processing each received Tracker frame to detect the 2D image locations of each of the visible Flashers. Detection is performed by searching each Tracker frame for the brightest image points, associating these points to similar points in a previous frame and then determining the Flasher ID represented by the detected sequence. Correct tuning of the exposure and sensitivity of the camera can performed to improve detection rates. Each Flasher ID and its 2D pixel location is stored on-board the Tracker processing unit and is broadcast using wireless technologies such as WiFi or Bluetooth to nearby devices for further processing. Alternatively the Tracker unit can be directly coupled to an additional processing unit which performs further processing using the locations provided by the Detection-Tracking loop. If more than 4 or more Flashers are correctly identified in one Tracker frame then these are used to determine the Tracker’s full 6 degrees of freedom if the Flashers are not co-planar. If 3 or fewer Flashers are detected or those detected are co-planar then the Tracker may still be able to determine either full or partial degrees of freedom depending on a-priori scene information (e.g. the Tracker only moves on a 2D surface or the processing unit makes temporal consistency assumptions). An alternative approach for the Tracking stage is to augment a standard SLAM system by using detected Flasher locations as known fixed reference points. Combining the predictions made by the Tracker based on Flasher locations can also be improved using sensor fusion such as using an Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) attached to the Tracker unit. This may be performed using a Kalman Filter or an Extended Kalman Filter or any other reasonable approach to combining measurement predictions. The whole pipeline can be seen in Figure 1.

2.4. Synchronization modes

Clock drift is a common problem with systems that use separate clocks and do not have a synchronization line to physically transfer clock signals. The result of clock drift is that two systems which are initialized at the same instant in time will quickly drift apart in their measurement of the passing of time. The effect of this is to cause bit-drift in data transmission between such systems. Creating synchronization protocols which can overcome this drift is therefore a critical part of the system design. In this work, the Flashers and Trackers are designed to work without a common clock signal by using a novel binary code which is described in Section 3. This code enables simplex transmission and decoding of unique, repeated, cyclic Flasher ID signals while being robust to single insertion/deletion and bit flip (IDF) errors per code. Despite the robustness of the suggested codes, an additional HeartBeat signal (either by radio, IR or wire signal transmission) can be used to further reduce IDF errors as well as providing a system wide mechanism for determining whether to continue operation or to enter a
sleep state. There are thus two modes of operation for our system: synched and unsynched.

**Synched.** When synched we use a HeartBeat unit that broadcasts a simple binary pulse. A flow diagram of this component can be seen in Figure 2.4. This is then simultaneously detected by a HeartBeat receiver (radio, IR or wired) on every Flasher and Tracker and is used to synchronize their clocks as shown in Figure 2.4. This pulse can occur at any point and is not used specifically as a clock signal but instead as a clock alignment signal (although it can also be used as a clock signal if necessary). As such, it does not need to happen frequently. To compute the minimum HeartBeat pulse period we define an upper bound on acceptable clock drift as \( \delta_{\text{max}} \) seconds. Clocks typically have their drift rates \( \rho \) measured in parts per million (ppm). Thus if we know the maximum drift possible \( \rho_{\text{max}} \) for all system clocks then we can determine the maximum synchronization pulse interval \( \tau_{\text{sync}} \) as

\[
\tau_{\text{sync}} \leq \frac{\delta_{\text{max}}}{2\rho_{\text{max}}}.
\]

As mentioned, the HeartBeat pulse serves a further purpose of informing the Flashers that they should continue operating. In the case of fully wireless, battery powered Flashers this yields an effective energy saving scheme because they go into low power states when there is no HeartBeat pulse. This enables the Flashers to be completely standalone devices which are not physically tethered to each other or a central unit when used in a synched mode.

**Unsynched.** This second mode of operation does not use a HeartBeat unit to produce synch pulses. This system is technically simpler to construct because the Flashers and Trackers do not need extra circuity to detect HeartBeat pulses. However, this leaves the units no way to compensate for clock-drift which may potentially lead to a higher IDF rate. However the codes of Section 3 are specifically designed to overcome this and so in practice the issue is not significant. What is more significant is that the Flasher units now need to be physically wired to an external long lasting power source or manually recharged if they use on-board batteries. Once again though, in practice this is not a serious issue as most uses cases occur in close proximity to easily available electrical outlets that can easily supply the required current drawn by the Flashers.

**Figure 2.** Flow diagram for sending the Flasher ID bits.

**Figure 3.** Flow diagram for optionally transmitting a HeartBeat signal.

### 2.5. Camera types

The system described is applicable to digital camera systems that use either CMOS rolling shutter sensors or CCD global shutter sensors. An example sampling scenario for both CCD and CMOS sensors is illustrated in Figure 5 and Figure 6 with a \( 10 \times 10 \) sensor array and three different types of Flasher motion.

**CMOS rolling shutter** Complementary metal-oxide semiconductor (CMOS) rolling shutter sensors are the most prevalent type of sensor available because of their low-cost. To maximize frame rates they expose each sensor row sequentially in time and the sensor data for every pixel bin is read and sent through that row’s analog to digital (A/D) converter and passed into a frame buffer. This process allows a high frame rate because buffer read-outs can overlap
new row sensing. The sample period for each row is fixed and fully determined by the total row readout time and the chosen exposure duration. The primary disadvantage with the rolling shutter is that each row represents a sample of the scene at a slightly different point in time. As a result, world points projected onto different sensor rows between frame captures will be seen with a period that will shorten or expand as the Flasher projection moves down or up the rows respectively. The net result of this kind of motion is once again a bit-drift.

CCD global shutter In contrast to CMOS based cameras, charge coupled device (CCD) sensors expose all the sensor rows simultaneously and then read out the rows after exposure is complete. This results in a fully synchronized exposure of all pixels which in turn results in significantly reduced motion artifacts. The sensor sampling period for every observed world point is identical and bit-drift errors do not occur as a result of scene or camera motion. They can still occur as a result of clock drift.

2.6. Visibility

In our system, the Tracker image sensor uses a wide angle lens to obtain a field of view of 90 degrees or more in order to detect as many Flashers as possible per sensor frame. There is however an engineering trade-off between having a large field of view and retaining detection reliability and repeatability at further distances from the Tracker sensor. A narrow field of view can accommodate a higher detection accuracy but any motion of the camera will cause the Flashers to leave the visible frame quickly resulting in frequent tracking loss. On the other hand a wide field of view reduces the size and brightness of the Flasher point on the image sensor thereby making detection and localization more challenging. This can be improved by increasing the framerate but this incurs an additional computational cost. There are thus two ways in which we improve the visibility of the Flashers in the Tracker frames.

High intensity, lens concentrated LEDs as Flasher emitters. In the case where we can reduce the sensor exposure to low levels (for example less than \( \frac{1}{2000} \) s at 120 fps frame-rate) then detecting very bright, small, concentrated Flasher LED points becomes relatively straightforward when combined with local non-maximum suppression (provided the LEDs output sufficient power). We take advantage of the built in lenses for surface mount LEDs which efficiently concentrate the LED light. Although there may be false positives (non-Flasher points) detected in the image, we simply track them by ensuring they are part of our robust Flasher code-book. This scenario does not typically enable SLAM tracking in the primary Tracker sensor and a secondary camera is needed if natural feature based SLAM is to also be performed because the very low primary Tracker camera exposure essentially removes everything but the brightest points on the sensor.

Highly diffuse LED packages as Flasher emitters. The use-case in which the exposure needs to be made close to the frame-rate of the camera (typically for natural feature based SLAM) means that there will be numerous bright areas in the resulting image. This is typically the case for a SLAM tracking scenario. For this we cannot rely on only detecting bright spots. We therefore need the Flashers to project onto a number of neighboring pixels so that we can reliably detect the locations, hues and intensities of the Flashers. To enable maximum visibility the illuminated surface of a Flasher is covered with a light diffusing material and made large enough so that it subtends a sufficient angle in the Tracker sensor to cover enough pixels for a Flash detection. Large tracking environments require either greater Tracker sensor resolution or large Flasher illumination surfaces.

3. Coded light codes

We briefly describe the physical transmitter properties that we leverage to generate the coded sequences. We then describe our key contribution: coded light sequences that can be used as robust entity identifiers.

3.1. Coded light

We use Flashers that produce either red-blue visible light cyclic codes 7 or low-high brightness cyclic codes using near-infrared illumination 8. The use of visible or near-infrared Flashers depends on the specific use and environment.

Hue. To determine the bit value of each flash from a Flasher when using red-blue flashes we use the hue (from
For near-visible illumination we found that a $2^{nd}$ order polynomial is good at approximating the intensity changes over a number of consecutive frames. Deciding a bit value based on whether it is above or below the polynomial line is then a reasonable conversion process. However there are many cases where the polynomial will intersect with the intensity graph and this simple conversion fails. Instead we use the intensity of the previously associated sequence of flashes to calibrate the high and low values to correspond to 0 and 1 bits. To justify this we note that every code has at least one high pulse and one low pulse. This means there is guaranteed to be a transition. What we do not know is the size of the intensity change that represents a true bit transition. So we first find the largest point to point transition in the last n bits. We then classify each of the points as being a high or low pulse based on which is before and after the transition and whether the transition is positive or negative. Using these values as seeds we move from point to point outward along the sequence and if the change between consecutive points passes 40% the value of the largest transition then we count this as a transition. This is demonstrated in Figure 8. In order to correctly and consistently identify brightness levels at different distances and in different lighting environments we ensure that the Tracker capture device has a fixed contrast and exposure set for all images captured in a Tracking session.

3.2. Robust cyclic binary codes for unique identity detection

We wish to continuously pulse a binary code that can be used to uniquely identify a Flasher. The use of coded light pulses for identifying light emitting beacons has a long history in the field of navigation manifesting itself in lighthouses and way-point buoys among others. See for example [4]. Because navigational codes are designed to be observed and decoded by human operators they span timescales of seconds or minutes. This enables every code bit to be continuously observed and timed by a person or alternatively sampled numerous times by electronic sensors. In direct contrast to this scenario we describe a coding system for which it is assumed that only a single sample of every bit
will occur and the sampling clock (Tracker) is not synchronized with the beacon (Flasher) emission clock. Our contribution here is therefore to specify code-words that are designed to have three properties which make them useful to an automated detection and decoding pipeline:

- fast lock-on and decoding time that is close to a single full code cycle
- robustness to single bit-shift and bit-flip errors
- code-book size at least linear in code-word length

It is important to note that realizing only one or two of these properties without the other is considerably simpler than realizing all three together.

### 3.2.1 Initial approach - no error robustness

To design a code-book with code-words that can be detected within one full code cycle without the need to use a synchronization comma we initially choose the set $C$ of complete cyclic equivalence classes $[3]$ using n-bit binary codes. Every element $c \in C_n$ is defined as the set of the $n$ cyclic shifts of the $n$-bit sequence $(b_1, b_2, ..., b_n)$. In other words $c$ has the property that if $(b_1, b_2, ..., b_n) \in c$ then $(b_i, b_{i+1}, ..., b_n, b_1, b_2, ..., b_{i-1}) \in c \forall i \in \{1..n\}$. We will denote $c_i$ as the code-word in $c$ with a cyclic shift of $i$ bits. These codes are particularly useful in our case because the Flasher code-word (which can be selected as any one of the elements of $c$) is always continuously repeated by a specific Flasher. This means that as long as a Tracker receives at least $n$ bits from a Flasher then we can be sure we have seen and can decode the whole code-word irrespective of what position we started looking at it in the bit stream as long as there are no errors. The trivial cyclic codes are $(00..0)$ and $(11..1)$ and in our case serve no useful purpose so we ignore them. An example of a single element in $C_4$ is the set $c = \{(0001), (0010), (0100), (1000)\}$. We always define $c_0$ to be the smallest number in $c$ and use this to represent $c$ because the other elements can be obtained by performing cyclic bit-shifting of $c_0$. We can therefore consider the decimal value of $c_0$ to be a representative identifier. The total number of codes available in $C_n$ is given by Integer Sequence A000031. This sequence is exponential in code-word length

**Creating the code-book.** In order to create the code-book we need to find all the complete cyclic equivalence classes. We do this by storing a list of the $c_0$ code-words for every such class. We also maintain a lookup table that stores every possible n-bit sequence together with the corresponding $c_0$ code-word from which it can be generated. The algorithm to generate these data structures can be seen in Algorithm 1. In practice we remove the trivial code-words with all 1s or 0s.

**Encoding** We choose an identifier from 0 to $|C_n| - 1$ to represent a Flasher. To encode this identifier we use the identifier as an index into the code-book and take the $c_0$ stored at that location. This is shown in Algorithm 2. The process of transmission is now trivial. We transfer the code to a Flasher and repeatedly transmit the bits with a Flasher at a known bit rate using either the intensity or hue based methods described at the start of this Section.

**Decoding** Once a Tracker has detected and recorded at least $n$ bits from a Flasher, then decoding the received code-word to obtain the Flasher identity is performed on the last $n$ received bits using a look-up table to map the bit sequence to the Flasher identity. As an example, a look-up table for $C_4$ can be seen in 1. If we receive 1101110111 then this would be processed as each new bit comes in as $(\cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot 1), (\cdot \cdot \cdot 11), (\cdot 111), (0111), (1011)$ and so on where $\cdot$ represents...
unknown data. The resulting decoding stream would be 44444444... which is as we expect. If for some reason we retrieve a 0 as the identifier then it means the detected bit sequence is unknown. It is instructive to notice that only 4 bits were required until the decoder could lock-on and determine the identifier. Furthermore, the decoding process is just a table look-up which implies fast decoding provided that the Tracker memory is quickly accessible or the table is implemented in hardware.

Procedure 3 Decode n-bit code

**Input:** $D_n, c_i$ \(\triangleright\) look-up table, binary sequence

**Output:** $c_0$

1. $idx \leftarrow \text{BIN2DEC}(c_i)$
2. $c_0 \leftarrow D_n(idx) − 1$

### 3.2.2 Robust approach - including noise

The approach to creating and decoding codes described above is straightforward. However it lacks any ability to detect and correct errors. Typical error correcting approaches encode bit sequences with parity bits, Hamming codes, CRC codes and others. These methods measure the distance between two code words using the Hamming metric and ensure a minimal Hamming distance between all code-words. The Hamming metric simply counts the number of bits which are different between two code-words. Unfortunately this is only useful for bit transmission errors where a bit or sequences of bits are incorrectly received. In our case where both bit-flips and bit-shift errors may occur the Hamming distance is insufficient. A considerably more appropriate metric is the Levenshtein distance [2], otherwise known as the Edit Distance. This measures how many changes are required to turn one sequence into another. A single insertion or deletion resulting from bit-drift would result in a Levenshtein distance of 1. A bit flip is considered as a chained insertion and then deletion (or vice-versa) and has a Levenshtein distance of 2. However, we do not expect more than a single insertion or deletion to occur per code but we do expect occasionally that there will be bit-flips. So even though the Levenshtein distance is more appropriate we will not use it directly. Instead, to build a code-book based on insertion, deletion and bit-flip errors we enumerate all code-words that can be reached by these permissible errors for every complete cyclic primitive class. We say that two primitive classes overlap if an error in both map to the same code. To find the maximal set of non-overlapping primitive classes we initially used the Bron-Kerbosch [1] algorithm. However, solving the maximal independent set problem is NP-complete and finding a solution became unfeasible for $n$ larger than 14. Instead, we found that a simple greedy algorithm was sufficient to produce a code-book with size exponential in the number of bits. This greedy algorithm is almost exactly the same as Algorithm 1. The only difference is that instead of only storing the cyclic variations of $c_0$ in the look-up table, we also store all the noise variants of all the cyclic variations in the look-up table. In other words for every $c_i$ we generate the set of all possible single bit insertion, deletion and bit-flip errors and store them in the look-up table with the same identifier as $c_0$. This can be seen in Algorithm 4. The code-books generated by this procedure can be seen in the supplementary material and the number of codes produced for both this method and the non-robust initial method can be seen in Figure 9.

**Encoding** The encoding process is identical to that of Algorithm 2.

**Decoding** The decoding process can be run the same way as Algorithm 3 on any sequence of $n$ bits. However we can in fact take advantage of the redundancy available in the look-up table and .... See Table 2 for an example
Figure 9. Comparison of code-book sizes for different code-word lengths for the initial and robust code-book generation methods.

Procedure 4 Generating robust n-bit cyclic equivalence classes

**Input:** n \( \triangleright \) n code bits

**Output:** \( D_n, C_n \)  
- look-up table, code-book
  1. \( D_n \leftarrow \text{ZEROS}(1, 2^n) \)
  2. \( C_n \leftarrow \emptyset \)
  3. \( k \leftarrow 0 \)
  4. \( \text{foreach } c_0 \in (0, \ldots, 2^{n-1}) \) \( \triangleright \) \( c_0 \) is decimal
  5. \( \text{inC} \leftarrow \text{false} \)
  6. \( c_0 \leftarrow \text{DEC2BIN}(c_0, n) \) \( \triangleright \) \( c_0 \) is n-bit binary
  7. \( \text{Idx} \leftarrow \emptyset \)
  8. \( \text{foreach } i \in (0, \ldots, n-1) \) do
  9. \( \hat{c}_i \leftarrow \text{CYCLESIGN}(c_0, i) \)
  10. \( \text{Idx} \leftarrow \{ \text{Idx}, \text{BIN2DEC}(\hat{c}_i) \} \)
  11. \( V \leftarrow \text{NOISIFY}(\hat{c}_i) \)
  12. \( \text{foreach } \hat{v} \in V \) do
  13. \( \text{idx} \leftarrow \text{BIN2DEC}(\hat{v}) \)
  14. \( \text{Idx} \leftarrow \{ \text{Idx, idx} \} \)
  15. \( \text{inC} \leftarrow (\text{inC}) \land (D_n(\text{idx}+1) > 0) \)
  16. \( \text{if } \neg\text{inC} \) then \( \triangleright \) if \( c_0 \) not overlaps with \( C_n \)
  17. \( k \leftarrow k + 1 \) \( \triangleright \) increase code counter
  18. \( C_n \leftarrow \{ C_n, c_0 \} \)
  19. \( \text{foreach } \text{idx} \in \text{Idx} \) do \( \triangleright \) for all noised \( c_i \) ...
  20. \( D_n(\text{idx}) \leftarrow k \)

Flasher IDs with code-words of length N that can be generated. Flasher IDs can be reused in different rooms/spaces which are visually separated from each other so that a Flasher with the same ID will not be observed twice by a Tracker. If a Flasher is observed twice in a Tracker image then it is ignored (as can happen accidentally when there are reflections on mirror surfaces). Trackers automatically receive the calibration information of new Flashers in new environments via Bluetooth from room specific transmitters as they move from one area to another for example in a museum environment with multiple rooms or on a farm with multiple fields. Each Tracker unit also retains an internal map of the different tracking environments obtained during mapping. This allows different positional layouts of the same Flashers in different rooms/spaces to be used as an area specific indicator. The simplest way to implement this is to detect a large increase in Tracking error during the Tracker processing. This is a good indication of a Tracker having moved to a separate room/space. All the known mapping and calibration information for a particular environment can be used by the Tracker to determine which room in the environment best matches the layout of the Flashers identified by the Tracker. While setting up the Flashers in the environment it is also possible to choose to take advantage of the fact that two Flashers which are close to each other can be assigned codes with a large Levenshtein distance between them and two Flashers which are far from each-other and are unlikely to be observed at the same time may have similarly assigned codes. This process is used as an extra layer of robustness to improve the identifiability of Flasher IDs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>code</th>
<th>idx</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>idx</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>idx</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>idx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11001</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11010</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11111</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11110</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11111</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. \( C_n \) code-book and \( D_n \) lookup table, built using the robust method. The look-up table has \( 2^{n+1} \) entries because insertion errors (we duplicate bits when creating insertion errors) add an extra bit. The final table is a union over the three error variants. For example 11110 is a bit insertion error of 1110. Similarly 00011 may be a bit flip or deletion error of 1011 or 0111.

3.3. Usage considerations

3.3.1 Flasher distribution

The specific distribution of Flashers in an environment is done so as to effectively utilize the number of available robust code.
3.3.2 Frame rates

The codes used for generating the Flasher IDs are designed to be cyclic so that the Tracker processing system can determine the ID of a Flasher that it has tracked for only N Flasher cycles without having to wait for and identify a "comma" code. The time to first decoding of the Flasher ID is called the "lock-on time". The rate at which the Flasher emits its code bits is designed to match the rate at which the Tracker camera samples the scene. If the Flasher rate is high then we need a high camera frame-rate which puts more strain on the Tracker subsystem as it needs to process more quickly. However a higher frame-rate also means we can obtain a faster lock-on time. If we need many Flashers then we need a large code-book which in turn implies a longer code-word length. This negatively impacts the lock-on time. So the trade-off is clear: we need high frame-rates for both fast lock-on time as well as longer code-words. For a fast moving drone application the Tracker cameras and Flashers can be used without changing the core structure of the technology but immediately improving the Flasher lock-on time and positional accuracy. In other words the technology scales well over time. Furthermore the procedure to generate codes which are robust to drift are general and can be used to generate codes robust to other errors depending on the system requirements.

### Table 3. Table of lock-on times in seconds for code-book size versus sample frame-rate. Lock-on time is calculated as code-word length over frames per second.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code-word length → code-book size</th>
<th>Maximum capture rate (same as Flasher rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7→2</td>
<td>0.23 15.11 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.03 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8→4</td>
<td>0.26 17.10 0.10 0.08 0.06 0.04 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9→3</td>
<td>0.30 20.12 0.10 0.07 0.05 0.03 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10→5</td>
<td>0.33 22.13 0.11 0.08 0.05 0.04 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11→6</td>
<td>0.36 24.14 0.12 0.09 0.06 0.04 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12→8</td>
<td>0.40 26.16 0.13 0.10 0.06 0.04 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13→12</td>
<td>0.43 28.17 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.05 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14→15</td>
<td>0.46 31.18 0.15 0.11 0.07 0.05 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15→25</td>
<td>0.50 33.20 0.16 0.12 0.08 0.06 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16→35</td>
<td>0.53 35.21 0.17 0.13 0.08 0.06 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17→52</td>
<td>0.56 37.22 0.18 0.14 0.09 0.07 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18→85</td>
<td>0.60 40.24 0.20 0.15 0.10 0.07 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19→138</td>
<td>0.63 42.25 0.21 0.15 0.10 0.07 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20→231</td>
<td>0.66 44.26 0.22 0.16 0.11 0.08 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21→376</td>
<td>0.70 46.28 0.23 0.17 0.11 0.08 0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Potential use-cases

A sample of possible application scenarios for the code-book and localization scenario described here:

- Virtual Reality goggle localization on mobile phone devices
- Mobile robot localization
- Drone localization over large land areas for accurate delivery and fly routes
- Wireless tracking for multiplayer systems
- Vehicle localization in warehouses
- Tool tip / controller localization

### 5. System advantages and conclusion

In purely SLAM based systems lighting conditions and fast motion can completely wipe out the ability to detect and match feature points accurately. Because the described Flashers provide bright active light sources and are self identifying (as opposed to natural feature points) they are consistently detectable and trackable yielding a highly robust localization system with little to no drift. Furthermore they can be used to directly augment SLAM based systems by acting as consistent and known anchor points which are modeled without error. However the system is primarily designed to be stand alone without the need for full SLAM pipelines in order to ensure simple and fast processing.

The computational burden on the Tracker processor is minimal because detecting the Flashers per frame is not a computationally heavy process and a simple implementation requires finding the center of mass of Flasher blobs/bright points as imaged by the optical sensor or alternatively using specific sensors which are capable of detecting image blobs. This can be performed by energy efficient line buffer based algorithms which can be implemented in silicon. The proposed approach enables full 6D tracking in almost general environments. Higher speed and resolution Tracker cameras and Flashers can be used without changing the core structure of the technology but immediately improving the Flasher lock-on time and positional accuracy. In other words the technology scales well over time. Furthermore the procedure to generate codes which are robust to drift are general and can be used to generate codes robust to other errors depending on the system requirements.

We do not need a central processing station and each Tracker unit performs its own processing. This removes the cumbersome need for wires and connection to the Flashers. In the synched version the "heartbeat" is nothing more than a drift offset pulse. No communication protocol is setup. Even if the synch signal is lost for a period of time the
system will continue functioning. Additionally, in battery based Flashers, the "heartbeat" pulse is used to determine whether or not the system should remain active. If there is no central heartbeat (either radio, IR or wired) for a predetermined time then the system goes into low power mode. This can significantly save and lengthen battery life. Another advantages of not being wired is that multiple users can move around the same environment simultaneously and the environment size can be as large as required. To enable larger tracking systems either larger area flashing light sources or brighter point sources are required to remain visible to the Trackers.

In conclusion the proposed system has low installation cost, low energy footprint, is easily deployable, can be easily adapted to different environments (warehouses, stadiums, building corridors, factory floors), does not need direct signal communication (the non-synched version), obtains millimeter or sub-millimeter accuracy for small tracking spaces and can be used by multiple users without a centralized processing system. We believe this approach has much potential for robustifying tracking for future industrial and possibly consumer level applications.
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