



modality such as a low-power optical camera (Ongoing work)

Day 2: STP shown placed inside the lion enclosure Platform was mauled . . .

Classification Accuracy Results

518

734





Exponential Weighted Energy and Recursive Correlation					
Intruder vs Clutter					
Minimum Accuracy	Average Accuracy				
96.8 %	96.5 %				
92.6 %	96.3 %				
	I Weighted En rsive Correlat Intruder vs Clutter Minimum Accuracy 96.8 % 92.6 %				

Human vs Animal						
	Minimum Accuracy	Average Accura				
Human Detection	92.1 %	96.9 %				
Animal Detection	100.0 %	98.3 %				
Overall	93.9 %	97.2 %				







Internet

Demoed the sensor platform and MGH deployment at LCN, Dubai

Monitoring Station





Design, development, study and deployment of a passivE InfraRed based Intrusion System for an outdoor environment



Tarun Choubisa

ECE Department

Thesis Advisor: Prof. P. Vijay Kumar

WSN for the Minimization of Human-Animal Conflicts

Long-Range Goal

Exploring the use of WSN for the minimization of humananimal conflicts

Different Sensing Modalities Pyroelectric Infra-Red (PIR) Pulse Doppler Radar Fiber Optics

Our Focus

PIR





PIR Sensors: Detects Change in Incident Radiation



Challenges Faced in Outdoor Deployments

False Alarms from Wind-Blown Vegetation



Literature Relating to the Use of PIR Sensors in an Outdoor Setting



EIRIS: a passivE InfraRed based Intrusion System



Α

 $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\max}$

Evolution of Sensor Platform



Chirplet-Based Model For Intruder Detection



Explaining the chirp

Observed Intruder and clutter signals

How Does Chirplet Decomposition Help?



Not synchronized and different duration

Final 2-Stage Classifier: Classification Accuracy



Simplified Correlation and Energy Calculations



Reduces the computation complexity from O(W2) to O(W)

$$\widehat{E}_A(m) = \alpha \widehat{E}_A(m-1) + s^2_A(m)$$

Energy Calculation: Reduced Memory Requirements

	Clutter	Intruder	Human	Animal
Chirplet and Energy	98.5 %	99.4 %	98.0 %	98.7 %
Simplified Correlation and Energy	96.3 %	96.5 %	96.9 %	98.3 %

Impact of Background Temperature on PIR Signals

Dramatic drop in signal strength as ambient temperature approaches human-body temperature





12

Impact of Background Temperature on PIR Signals and Solution

Impact of sunny and shadow patches: spatial variation



Time (s)

We are the first to recognize and study the impact of temperature on PIR signal [1]



Solution: Employ a complimentary sensing modality such as a lowpower optical camera (Ongoing work)

[1] Choubisa et. al. "Challenges in Developing and Deploying a PIR Sensor-Based Intrusion Classification System for an Outdoor Environment", Eleventh IEEE International Workshop on Practical Issues in Building Sensor Network Applications (SenseApp 2016), November 2016, Dubai,

A Learning Experience in Bannerghatta Park, Bangalore







Day 1: Platform deployed outside fenced area

24 detections registered - no false alarms or misclassifications

Day 2: STP shown placed inside the lion enclosure Platform mounting was mauled ...

Deployment: Bannerghatta Park, Bangalore, India



Deployment at Main Guest House, IISc



Deployment Site

Example Intrusions: Classified by the Platform



During April and May (4 days)

Intrusions	Correctly Detected	Misses Misclassified		False Alarms	
734	693	18	29	5	

Demoed the sensor platform and MGH deployment at LCN Conference, Dubai

Ongoing Work



Thank You! Questions?





PIR Sensing: Pyroelectricity

- PIR sensors work on the principle of pyroelectricity
 - Temperature (T) dependent spontaneous polarization Ps
 - Detects changes in incident radiation (w)





Preventing Overlap of VPA



Effect of vertically offsetting sensor wrt lens to prevent overlapping beams

- The VPA generated by two sensor-lens units can overlap
 - Offset sensor wrt lens to prevent overlap

VPA when a Multi-lens is Used



Point Spread Function



- Object Plane has one and only one corresponding image plane
 - Intruder plane is not restricted to
- Blurred patch is called the Point Spread Function (PSF) of the lens
 - Viewed as impulse response of the lens
 - It is a scaled version of the lens aperture
- The spread (dimensions of the patch) is $h = A(\frac{d}{v} 1)$

Literature Relating to the Use of PIR Sensors in an Outdoor Setting

Author Year	Type of PIR Sensor	Indoor or Outdoor	Target Range and Motion	Classification Approach	Test Environment(s)	Number of classes	Objects Classified	Accuracy	Comment
Lin [21] 2005	Single analog sensor	Outdoor	5m (approximately)	Frequency-domain filtering followed by adaptive thresholding	200 nodes, three sensing modalities	4	Humans, humans with ferrous objects, vehicles, absence of target	NS	Accuracy at individual sensor level not discussed
Arora et al [22] 2005	Single sensor with integrated cone optics	Outdoor	12m (Humans) and 25m (SUV)	Frequency-domain filtering followed by thresholding	0.3 Sq Km opening in a forest	3	Humans, vehicles and absence of target	NS	False alarms arising from moving vegetation not discussed
Wang [23] 2011	Dual-element sensor with 2-layer Fresnel lens	NS	NS	WPE plus LS-SVM	Summer and autumn; 6 humans and 2 dogs; 60 watt bulbs	2	Human versus non-human	91.20%	False alarms arising from moving vegetation not considered
Hong et al [24] 2012	Single, digital PIR with golf-ball type multilens	Outdoor	2m-15m	Neyman-Pearson detector under Bayesian model for (a) window energy and (b) alarm duration	Sensor placed in front of bushes, under 3 conditions: (a) hot and windless day, (b) clear and breezy day and (c) cool day with light wind	2	Human or false alarm	P _{FA} = 9.6%, P _D = 90%	False alarms from moving animals not considered
Gong et al [25] 2012	Single analog sensor	Both	NS	Coefficients of auto- regressive-process model + SVM	NS	2	Human versus non- human (dog, goose)	94.6% (outdoor)	False alarms arising from moving vegetation not considered
Jin et al [26] 2012	Single analog sensor with multilens	Outdoor	5m	CWT + SDF + SVM	3 sites along outdoor trail that included a dry creek bed and some choke points	4	Humans walking and running, animals, absence of target	91.70%	Smaller range of operation, false alarms not explicitly addressed
Chari et al [27] 2014	128-pixel linear array	Outdoor	10m-20m (transverse motion)	Height-width ratio and energy in Gabor-filter frequency bands fed as inputs to decision-tree- based classifier	 (a) Arid terrain with thorn bushes and (b) Petting zoo having grass, trees, rolling hills 	2	Human versus animal; animals included: small cows, ponies, horses, small donkeys	94%	More expensive lens, higher power consumption of sensor
Zhao et al [28] 2016	Single sensor with 3-layer multilens	Both	NS	EMD + SDF + SVM + Weighted-Voting	NS	2	Humans versus animals (dogs and geese)	99% (outdoor)	False alarms arising from moving vegetation not considered
Upadrashta et al (pesent paper) 2017	Array of 8 analog sensors & 4 multilenses	Outdoor	5m-10m	(Chirp, Correlation, Energy) + SVM on laptop (Energy, Correlation) + SVM on mote	Human and animal motion in a variety of vegetative clutter environments	3	Human versus short animals (dogs, leopard, tiger, wolf), absence of target	97%	Variety of vegetative clutter contained in data set

CWT: Continuous Wavelet Transform EMD: Emperical Mode Decomposition LS: Least Squares SUV: Sport Utility Vehicle NS: Not Specified SDF: Symbol Dynamic Filtering SVM: Support Vector Machine WPE: Wavelet Packet Entropy

The Sensor Platform (SP)



Lenses on the outside



Sensors inside

Simple, Height-Based Classification



Good Correlation in Case of an Intruder









Intruder = Human / Animal

Intruder Signals Exhibit Chirp





Intruder signal its corresponding Short-Time Fourier Transform

Intruder Detection via Chirplet Decomposition



- Chirplet–based feature vector C_{60} : Append ML estimates $(\hat{a}_i, \hat{m}_i, \hat{\omega}_i, \hat{c}_i, \hat{d}_i)$ corresponding to 3 chirplets
- C₆₀ has dimension 60: (5 Parameters per Chirplet * 3 Chirplets per Signal * 4 Signals)

Reference : J. C. O'Neill, P. Flandrin and W. C. Karl, "Sparse representations with chirplets via maximum likelihood Estimation"

•

Simplified Correlation and Energy Calculations



96.3 %

Simplified Correlation and Energy

96.5 %

96.9 %

98.3 %

31

Simplified Correlation and Energy Calculations

Т

$$C(-2,0) = x_2 y_0$$

$$C(-1,0) = x_1 y_0 + x_2 y_1$$

$$C(0,0) = x_0 y_0 + x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2$$

$$C(1,0) = x_0 y_1 + x_1 y_2$$

$$C(2,0) = x_0 y_2$$

$$C(-2,1) = x_3 y_1$$

$$C(-1,1) = x_2 y_1 + x_3 y_2$$

$$C(0,1) = x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3$$

$$C(1,1) = x_1 y_2 + x_2 y_3$$

$$C(2,1) = x_1 y_3$$

Reduces the computation complexity from O(W2) to O(W)

$$\hat{E}_A(m) = \alpha \hat{E}_A(m-1) + s^2_A(m)$$



Reduced Memory Requirements

Temperature Variation in Bangalore during March



Impact of Background Temperature on PIR Signals

Dramatic drop in signal strength as ambient temperature approaches human-body temperature





Impact of temperature on different surfaces: background and ground





Experimental Setup: Drafter Board



Experimental setup showing STP mounted on a drafter board