Bootstrapping the Dynamic Generation of Indoor Maps with Crowdsourced Smartphone Sensor Data

Georgios Pipelidis, Christian Prehofer and Ilias Gerostathopoulos

Fakultät für Informatik, Technische Universtität München, Munich, Germany
{georgios.pipelidis, christian.prehofer, ilias.gerostathopoulos}@in.tum.de

Abstract. Although there is a considerable progress in mapping the indoor places, most of the existing techniques are either expensive or difficult to apply. In this paper, we articulate our view on the future of indoor mapping, which is based on customized, crowdsourced and scalable approaches. On the basis of this approach, we discuss the research challenges that we envision to face in this world of customized bootstrapping and diverse techniques and services. We focus our interest in the combination of multiple of indoor mapping generation techniques and discuss challenges and various indoor mapping techniques. We introduce our adaptive method for bootstrapping the procedure of indoor mapping in multiple ways through intermediate services. Those emerged services enable the obtaining of useful data for this procedure, while they increase the quality of those data. We discuss the necessary components for such approach and we give an example of a bootstrapping procedure.

Keywords: Indoor Mapping; Crowdsourcing; Bootstrapping Process

1 Introduction

Indoor mapping is an enabler for many applications such as indoor navigation systems, augmented reality or even robotics. This is a useful service even if indoor localization is not available, since it enables people to have a view of the indoor place. Together with indoor localization techniques, which have been an active area of research [1], indoor mapping can help materialize the vision for ubiquitous indoor positioning system on a worldwide scale[2].

There is considerable progress in the mapping of indoor places, and many diverse techniques have been proposed, ranging from vision-based [3] and robot-based [4], up to crowdsourced mapping [2]. However, most of the existing techniques are either expensive or difficult to apply, since sensors and methods are usually prone to error due to a variety of the building structures. It remains a challenge to provide cost-effective, easy-to-apply mapping techniques which can cover the large volume and variety of indoor places with their often unique characteristics and semantics. Furthermore, there is a large volume of indoor places to be considered. For instance, the building footprints in Open Street Maps (OSM) recently surpassed the amount of the street data—not even considering the indoor maps [5].

In this paper, we articulate our view on the future of indoor mapping, which is based on the fact that (i) mapping techniques differ in terms of complexity, required resources and output and (ii) compared to outdoor maps, indoor mapping is more challenging for several reasons:

– *Indoor places are very diverse* in nature and many of them also change frequently; consider e.g. remodeling of floors or new shops in a shopping mall. This also refers to the semantic description of the objects in the buildings.
– *Indoor mapping techniques are very diverse* and range from manual with ad hoc tuning to crowdsourcing techniques. While manual techniques are often more reliable, the abundance of new personal devices with advanced sensors (e.g., motion sensors, cameras, gyroscopes, pedometers) also enable sophisticated crowdsourcing of indoor maps [6].
– *Services related to indoor mapping are also very diverse* in terms of end-user needs and technical assumptions. For instance, architects have different needs than pedestrians or fire fighters. Also, some services require localization, some only mapping, and some only user traces or landmark identification.

To emphasize the diversity of end-user needs and assumptions in the services related to indoor mapping, consider a hospital: the main service is finding doctors, patients, or equipment, assuming a well administered building with well defined tags for tracing and localization. Here, manually created maps can be used—a costly, yet worthy, investment for the hospital administration. On the other hand, in a shopping mall with diverse shop owners, diverse infrastructure and no central management of tags, users also aim to discover places, find other people and explore the map. Here, users may have time to contribute to crowdsourced map creation in exchange for some useful apps. Finally, in an automated factory, highly accurate indoor maps can be important in guiding robots, augmented reality and help avoiding accidents.

Following the above, in this paper we argue that there will be no single way for mapping indoor places, but rather *a diverse set of techniques and services will be used to build up maps and services for indoor locations in a customized way.* Some services may actually not even require proper maps, as in the case of a "take me to the exit" service for which only user traces can be sufficient. We also posit that we will move towards custom solutions for combining indoor mapping techniques in order to improve accuracy and enable a number of diverse services. On the basis of this approach, we discuss the research challenges that we envision to face in this world of customized bootstrapping and diverse techniques and services.

This paper focuses on the combination of indoor mapping techniques and the services they enable. It presents a research direction that focuses on flexible, customized mapping of buildings. This can integrate existing data, manual techniques as well as crowdsourcing from user data. It specifically targets the problem of obtaining the critical mass of user data for self-starting crowdsourcing mapping techniques. A main point here is that some services can be offered earlier in order to collect data for crowdsourcing. This, we also call intermediate service, as these do not require fully detailed and accurate maps. To illustrate and exemplify the approach, we show a way to describe such flexible bootstrapping of indoor maps that combines techniques as well as services.

In particular, we contribute by highlighting the need for a bootstrapping process that can be customized to the available techniques and building characteristics and by providing an example of such a process.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 1.2 overviews the most promising indoor mapping techniques. Section 2 provides an overview of our approach, while Section 2.3 exemplifies it on a specific bootstrapping process. Section 3 provides a short assessment of the current state of the art, while Section 4 puts forward a research roadmap and concludes by summarizing the key points. This paper is extension of the work already presented by [7]. More specific, in this paper the approach, the methods and the related work have been extended.

1.1 Indoor Mapping and Challenges

An indoor map implies the existence of a model that describes the geometry, the topology and the semantics of an indoor space [8]. The geometry of an indoor space indicates the morphology of important places or objects in the space. For example the shape and the location of a room or a desk. Topological relationships signify the explicit description of adjacent and connected places in that space. The semantics indicate the way that places in the space are used. For example the existence of stairs, elevator, toilet etc. Semantics may also indicate unique characteristics of locations in that space. For example the Received Signal Strength Indicator in a place with multiple WiFi Access Points.

Indoor maps are typically created via a manual process that starts off with obtaining the architecture blueprints of a building, enhancing them with Places of Interest (POIs), and submitting the result to a floorplan database. The problems of this traditional approach are that (i) it is labor-intensive and slow; (ii) it is not always economically viable, as many times the cost of creating the maps can surpass the revenue they create; (iii) it relies on having the building blueprints in the first place, which is not always true, as e.g., in the case of developing countries; and (iv) there is a huge effort in keeping the maps up-to-date, since the manual process has to be repeated to capture changes in the environment.

Additionally, there is not a well agreed upon model for these procedure. Beyond the technical challenge of generating the maps, mapping indoor places is a resource demanding procedure with an expansive cost. Additionally, environment characteristics are never static (i.e. objects displaced etc.). Hence, indoor maps can often become outdated, while their maintenance effort increase the overall cost. Legal challenges are often present, since in most cases indoor places are privately owned. Furthermore, indoor localization cannot use the maps without semantically enhanced and uniquely identified nodes which can be used by an entity for successfully localized.

As a result, there is clearly potential in automating the map creation and update process. In particular, we see a great potential in automated techniques that rely on user data, i.e. crowdsourcing, for creating maps that are cost-effective, semantically-rich and dynamically updated. In this vision, crowdsourced maps are created based on fusion of data sensed by modern ubiquitous devices such as smart phones.

1.2 Mapping Techniques

In this chapter we describe the available technologies for a potential use in a bootstrapping process for indoor maps. We posit that those technologies can be used to provide services, which by their turn can be used as the means for incentivizing users to participate in the envisioned crowdsource-based system. These initial users can provide the critical data mass allowing the creation of more sophisticated services leading to full-blown indoors maps. In this chapter, on top of articulating our generic bootstrapping model, we exemplify how the presented different techniques and technologies for indoor mapping fit within the model.

Light Detection And Ranging (LiDAR). LIDAR uses lasers to measure the distance between objects inside a building (i.e., walls, floors, ceilings etc.) like [4]. A LiDAR unit, often mounted on a robot or vehicle, scans the environment. The position of the unit is estimated by vSLAM [9]. A point cloud is generated and by identifying contours (i.e. points of similar distance), a map can be extracted. Semantic annotations are usually manually made by expert surveyors.

Usage of existing architectural blueprints. If blueprints are encoded in formats such as Industry Foundation Classes (IFC) [10] or Building Information Modeling (BIM) [11], they contain the geometric information that can be readily used in indoor maps. However, such formats do not include topological nor semantic information. The last is usually added manually by expert surveyors, resulting into mapping data encoded into formats such as IndoorGML [12]. Approaches for automatic derivation of topological relations (e.g., adjacency and connectivity of rooms) from IFC models have also been suggested [13].

Structure from motion. In this technique, a 3D structure of a building can be extracted from a camera [3] by capturing many images of an indoor place and translating them into a single 3D view. To do this, the camera's internal and external parameters, e.g. lens-generated distortion, translation and rotation matrix have to be known or be retrievable from common features of the captured images.

Depth sensors. In this technique, a typical setting is to have an infrared projector that projects a unique pattern. An infrared sensor, whose relative distance to the projector and rotation are known, recognizes this pattern. A depth map is constructed by analyzing the unique pattern of infrared light markers by triangulating the distance between the sensor, projector and the object. Finally, a 3D point cloud is extracted from stereoscopic view algorithms, from which a map can be generated [14].

Smart phone 3D modeling tools. In this technique, specialized smart phone apps enable users construct components of a building [15]. After initial versions of the maps have been created, other users can enhance the maps or vote on their accuracy and completeness.

Activity-based map generation. An indoor map can be transparently and autonomously generated based on activity recognition of users as it has been suggested by [2]. This technique works as follows: After extracting steps of users by their `x` and `y` coordinates or by a series of trajectories, a point cloud can be extracted. A map of the indoor place can be created by fusing data from different users and identifying places with common patterns. For example, places where users performing the same activity (i.e., stairs) can be identified.

From the above, the use of **Structure from motion** or **Depth sensors**, the use of **Smart phone 3D modeling tools** as well as **Activity-based map generation** lend themselves to crowdsourcing, whereas **Lidar** and **Usage of existing architectural blueprints** do not.

2 Adaptive Bootstrapping

In this section, we outline our envisioned approach towards indoor mapping, based on the following observations on the present and future research and development in indoor mapping:

- *Techniques need to be combined.* There are many indoor mapping techniques which differ in terms of complexity, required resources, and output. For instance, if one wants to use LiDAR, a localization technique has to be in place, and also sophisticated laser equipment has to be available. Activity-based map generation, on the other side, does not make any major assumptions in terms of equipment; however, it assumes a plethora of data. We argue that a combination of different techniques will be used to create or maintain indoor maps that are both cost-effective and accurate.
- *Bootstrapping is needed for crowdsourcing.* As discussed, we posit there will be no “single-shot” solution towards indoor mapping; combined solutions, as shown below, will also involve crowdsourcing. Therefore an incremental, stepwise bootstrapping will be needed to obtain user data. This is substantiated by crowdsourcing techniques which not only need user data, but also other inputs like building floorplans or points of interest.
- *No single bootstrapping process.* We believe that the diversity of buildings, mapping techniques, as well as services will lead to individual and custom processes for such bootstrapping. The processes will be adapted to end-user needs, available infrastructure, available budget, and other factors.

2.1 Services Related to Indoor Mapping

A number of services with different characteristics, users, and assumptions on crowdsourcing effort can be supported by our approach, e.g.:

Wellness monitoring. This is a family of emerging services that provide feedback to users based on their activities during the day. For example, services that can track the number of steps that a user did during a day can be used for identifying the distance traveled by the user.

Card swiping. This service may substitute the Magnetic stripe cards with smart phone build-in NFC chips. In combination with other sensor data, it can be used to generate a general model for identifying outdoor-indoor transitions and vice versa.

"Take me to the exit". This service can work as a digital Ariadne's thread, where users will be able to find their way back to the entrance of indoor places by following their own captured route in reverse. User traces collected from this service can be used for generating a point cloud.

Instruction-based navigation. This service can provide basic instructions on how to visit an office or a classroom in the form of instructions such as "Enter from the north entrance, walk straight for 10 secs, then turn right, walk up the stairs and enter the door on the right".

Location-aware ticketing. This service can free users of public transportation from the need to purchase tickets in advance, as users can be billed based on the actual distance traveled. In addition, companies that run the transportation services will be able to acquire an accurate view of the usage patterns and optimize their services.

Elderly monitoring. This service can be used to identify accidents involving elderly or people with special needs in real time by detecting problems in mobility or patterns that correspond to sudden falls. Data from such service can be used for semantically enhancing indoor maps, via adding the use of a room.

Call forwarding. This service can use the information of a person's position inside a building (e.g. a specific office) and the position of land lines within the building in order to automatically forward calls to the nearest land line.

Dynamic meeting scheduler. This service can use the (indoor) user position (or an approximation, e.g. a room) and possibly user calendar data, in order to propose meeting locations that fit the participants' locations. Data from this service can be used for labeling indoor spaces.

It is clear that the services related to indoor mapping are rather diverse, and make different assumptions regarding the maturity and completeness of the supporting indoor mapping systems. For instance, wellness monitoring does not assume any complete mapping or localization system (even though the data captured from such services can actually allow for activity-based mapping tech-



Fig. 1. Customized bootstrapping process for a university campus building. Circular nodes are artifacts, arrows are tasks with inputs and outputs, rectangles are intermediate services (services in bold are described in the text) [7].

niques). Also, “take me to the exit” does not assume the existence of a complete navigable map, but only of a single well-defined route from a *single* user.

Even though one might argue that a single indoor mapping techniques will prevail and allow for the creation of different services, including the ones outlined above, we do not believe this will be the case. Instead, we believe that the current fragmented picture of the techniques and services will continue to be the norm. The question then becomes, how can we combine different techniques in a specific indoor setting towards creating innovative applications? The naïve answer is to just use all the available techniques in parallel and pick the best results out of their execution. In reality, though, different techniques have different starting and ending points. Hence, a more realistic view of the composition is as a chain of tasks with inputs and outputs, dependencies between them, even loops, representing that a task receives inputs from other tasks and provides output to them. (As an aside, the simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) technique features this exact loop between the localization and mapping module.)

An important observation is that services with rudimentary assumptions in terms of indoor mapping can act as catalysts for gaining the critical mass of user data that can enable services with more advanced mapping needs. For instance, in a hospital building, the target service might be full-blown indoor navigation, whereas intermediate services might be call forwarding for medical personnel, room-based localization of equipment, elderly monitoring, and others. Potential users are the medical personnel, patients, and visitors. In contrast, consider a university campus building: the target service can be the same as in the hospital case, but now intermediate services could be room finders, “take me to the exit”, wellness monitoring, etc., whereas potential users are now students and academic employees. Finally, in the case of a subway station, a promising intermediate service is, e.g., location-aware ticketing.

In the following, we are providing a way to model such bootstrapping processes. Our modeling technique is based on the fact that each indoor mapping technique can be broken down to a number of tasks with inputs and outputs. The input of the initial task indicates the technique's assumptions. As a result, a bootstrapping process can be represented as a graph of tasks. We present an example of this in the next section.

2.2 Bootstrapping Components

In this section we discus the number of components needed for initiating the bootstrapping procedure.

Distance. An important component of the bootstrapping process, is the one responsible for estimating the traveled distance from the user. The user's travel distance can be estimated from pedometer data. Pedometer applications have become ubiquitous in the today smart-phones, while their accuracy has been dramatically increased [16]. This information is essential for indoor localization, while services can be emerged indicating to the user's distance in a particular time interval.

Indoor Transition. A mechanism for detecting the indoor transition is also important, since this will provide an accurate initial location for localization. By fusing GPS and sensor data (i.e. light sensor, wifi RSS etc.), the location of the transition from outdoors to indoors, and vice versa, can be detected [17]. The accurate detection from outdoor to indoor environment will provide with an accurate initial position, which can enhance the localization.

Heading Direction. A mechanism for estimating the user direction is equally important for a localization algorithm, since together with the estimated distance traveled can contribute on a pedestrian dead reckoning algorithm. From Inertial Motion Unit IMU data (i.e. accelerometer, gyroscope, compass etc.), the walking or even standing direction of the user can be estimated in various ways [18]. This information can be used for estimating the position of the user.

User Activity. A component for recognizing the user's performing activity is needed for more robust localization, for identifying unique landmarks as well as for enhancing the procedure of the semantically annotation of places, by indicating the use of this place. Identifying the activity a user is performing from a given set of activities, using IMU data can be performed accurate enough [19]. Having this information the localization procedure will be improved and the final map can be enhanced with semantic information.

Localization. Knowing the orientation, distance traveled and activity a basic pedestrian dead reckoning mechanism can be put in action, since the orientation together with the distance traveled and an initial location (i.e. entrance) can be used for estimating the current user location, while the activity can be used for improving this procedure. For example, the standing activity can be used for re-calibrating the sensors (i.e. gravity direction identification or gather more measurements for restarting the location etc.) or walking can be used for resetting the pedometer error. On this step, applications such as "guide me back to the entrance", or "share my indoor path" can be emerged. Delivery services will have the precise location of the delivery address and will not only be limited on the building location. It can enhance outdoor navigation by suggesting the entrance which is nearest to the destination, or services such as subway transportation suggestions, since the distance from outdoor to the indoor station can be more accurate estimated or even be personalized.

Landmarks. After segmenting sensor data based on discrete characteristics, uniquely identified locations will be emerged. For example the activity performed by the user on a specific area, the RSS of the WiFi or the magnetic field intensity, can be used to characterize the area. After mapping these places on a basic map, the localization procedure can be enhanced, thus better localization implies better landmark locations. Similar to a Simultaneous Localization And Mapping (SLAM) algorithm. Services such as "Find an available meeting room" will be emerged. This service can work as follows: It will identify users who are in a meeting room, based on calendar data and similarities in sensor data (i.e. WiFi RSS). Then it will broadcast the name of this room to users who have been delayed and are going to join the meeting, according to their calendar and the room name is either unknown or has been changed.

2.3 Bootstrapping Example

This section introduces an example of a bootstrapping process for a university campus building. To illustrate the bootstrapping process, we use a data-flow-like diagram depicted in Figure 1.

In this diagram, circular nodes correspond to artifacts. Each artifact enables the creation of one or more services. For example, `Distance Traveled` (`e`) can enable a service such as wellness monitoring, since the walked distance is directly related with exercising. Inputs and outputs of artifacts are visually presented as solid enumerated arrows which indicate data flow. For example, the input of `Indoor Transition` (`f`) is GPS signal (`3`) and IMU (`4`) data (i.e. ambient light, magnetic field, proximity and sound). By reasoning on these input data, similar to [20], the output is the locations of entrances (`5`). In case of more than one input, a solid line connecting them implies conjunction (e.g. lines `5`, `9` and `7`); a dashed line implies disjunction (e.g. `11`, `12`, `13`, `14`). Finally, dotted connections imply additional inputs which can improve the data quality (e.g. `15`).

An artifact can be connected to a number of intermediate services. A service is represented by a rectangle and implies a set of software functionalities which can be a user-facing application. Finally, the target artifact is represented as a filled circular node (e.g. `n`).

Figure 1 presents a set of possible bootstrapping options. One would start at one or more of the nodes on the left, e.g. assuming devices with GPS (`b`) or compass/gyroscope and accelerometer (`d`). Informally speaking, we can then proceed to some of the connected nodes (e.g. `f` or `g`), based on user data generated from operating services possible at this point. Based on the new data, we can proceed with further steps in this graph.

As depicted in Figure 1, the entire bootstrapping process could emerge via existing services, such as wellness monitoring or card swiping. Of course, alternative paths are also available. For example the `Coarse-Grained Map` step could be skipped; similarly, `User activities` might not be needed if semantically-rich calendar data are available.

In our example, the target service is to enable indoor navigation based on dynamically created maps that capture the geometry, topology and semantics of the building. The above information needs to be integrated in a data model, e.g. by using and extending the IndoorGML standard [12]. IndoorGML provides the constructs to denote subdivisions of indoor places (i.e. rooms), spaces that connect two indoor places (e.g., inner doors), spaces that connect indoor places to outdoor ones (e.g., entrance doors), spaces acting as passages between indoor places (e.g., corridors, stairs), and other important properties.

There are a number of intermediate services among the ones described in the beginning of this Section. We describe here the indoor mapping techniques and associated artifacts they rely upon:

Instruction-based navigation. To provide this service, a `Coarse-Grained Map` is needed. This is a model that includes the elements essential for routing, such as corridors, stairs, doors, and entrances. This is the outcome of merging three other artifacts: `Indoor Transition`, `Heading Direction` and `User Activities` (tasks `5, 7, 9`). The first one is derived by using GPS data (task `3`) and fusing them with other mobile sensor data such as light, magnetic, and proximity data (task `4`). The intuition is that the sensors' behavior changes during the outdoor-indoor transition, where the GPS uncertainty and the WiFi received signal strength are both increasing.

`Heading Direction` can be derived via machine learning algorithms (embodied in task `6`) that work on compass, gyroscope and accelerometer data. The intuition is, if a phone's pose is identified, it can be used to extract the user's local direction (i.e. in the phone's coordinate system) via monitoring the acceleration changes due to the gait movement, then relate this direction to a global system using the compass.

Finally, `User Activities` can be derived from the same data using machine learning techniques with high accuracy (task `8`), since moving and stationary activities can be detected from disturbances in the acceleration sensor, while movements on the vertical space can be detected from disturbances in the barometric sensor.

Dynamic Meeting Scheduler. This service is based on the `Landmarks` artifact. Landmarks are distinctive locations in a building. They are either locations where users consistently perform the same activity (e.g., stairs)—contributed by the `User Activities` (task `13`)—or locations with distinct characteristics of a measured quantity (e.g., WiFi RSS, geomagnetism, sound, light)—contributed by the `Light, Magnetic, Proximity, Sound` (task `12`). In both cases, landmarks need to be localized in a building—hence the dependence on `Localization` (task `11`). Landmarks can also be derived from `Calendar Data` (task `14`) via semantics (e.g., meeting room name).

"Take me to the exit". In our example, we assume that there is no localization infrastructure in place. As a result, we would need to resort to pedestrian dead reckoning techniques [21]. Pedestrian dead reckoning is based on approximating the position of a user by measuring the distance traveled when walking towards a direction from a known point. This explains why `Localization` depends on the `Distance Traveled` (task `2`) and the `Coarse-Grained Map` (task `10`). The former is derived directly from pedometer data (task `1`). The latter contains information regarding the heading direction (task `7`) and the indoor transition points (task `5`). These points are the initial *known points* in the dead reckoning algorithm. `Localization` can also depend on `Landmarks` for re-calibrating the algorithm (restarting the error) in distinct locations (task `15`).

Finally, `Localization` provides input for the creation of `Point Cloud` (task `16`) using existing techniques, and subsequently of `Navigable Maps` (task `17`). `Navigable Maps` are also enhanced by the identified `Landmarks` (task `18`). In particular, activity-related landmarks can be a rich source of semantic annotation for maps (e.g., places where people sit together for long time can be labeled as meeting rooms). At the same time, `Navigable Maps` can enhance `Localization` by error recalibration on the basis of non-navigable places (task `19`). This can be achieved either by relating user traces to sets of possible routes or via uniquely identified locations (e.g. stairs), in which case the context of users (e.g. "climbing stairs") can be used for re-positioning them.

It is important to note that the example bootstrapping process illustrates a cost-effective solution without dedicated equipment and expensive manual work. As an alternative, consider hiring an indoor localization company, for performing tasks `1` and `2` in our example—this would have led to a different customization of the same bootstrapping process.

Being aware of the orientation, distance traveled and activity of the user, a basic pedestrian dead reckoning mechanism — for *Localization* — can be put in action, since the orientation together with the distance traveled and an initial location (i.e. entrance) can be used for estimating the current user location, while the activity can be used for improving this procedure. For example, the standing activity can be used for recalibrating the sensors (i.e. gravity direction identification etc.) or walking can be used for resetting the pedometer error. On this step, applications such as "guide me back to the entrance", or "share my indoor path" can be emerged.

Side-services such as "Find an available meeting room" can provide with labels of the locations, while in combination with a localization technique can provide *Landmark* locations. The side-service can work as follows: It will identify users who are in a meeting room, based on calendar data and similarities in sensor data (i.e. WiFi RSS). Then it will broadcast the name of this room to users who have been delayed and are going to join the meeting, according to their calendar and the room name is either unknown or has been changed. After segmenting sensor data based on discrete characteristics,uniquely identified locations will be emerged. For example the activity performed by the user on a specific area (i.e. door handling events **??**), the RSS of the WiFi or the magnetic field intensity, can be used to characterize the area. After mapping these places on a basic map, the localization procedure can be enhanced, thus better localization implies better landmark locations. Similar to a Simultaneous Localization And Mapping (SLAM) algorithm.

3 Related Work

To our understanding, there is no prior work on systematic bootstrapping of indoor maps. There are several works which integrate different intermediate techniques, which we list below. More mapping techniques can be found here **??**.

Heading direction. [22] detect the discreate signal vibration when the heel strikes the ground during a gait circle. Then they use this data point as a reference and scan the signal to identify the dominant body's movement partition from the entire signal segment. Finally, they translate the walking direction to the global magnetic system. However, their framework is highly dependent on the terrain as well as on user behavior.

Indoor-Outdoor transition. [20] do not only use the drop of GPS accuracy as an indication of the I/O transition, but also use light censors, cell tower signals, and magnetic field sensors. The acceleration and proximity sensor time series are fused for identifying the I/O transition.

Activity Recognition. [23] use a Support Vector Machine classifier to distinguish among moving activities such as walking, running, and ascending and descending stairs and improve existing position systems. Their observation is that the step length varies when a user is walking, running or climbing stairs. Their approach is argued to work in various phone poses. However, their approach uses a large amount of features, which can result in high computational demands.

Localization. [24] have developed a ZUPT algorithm for localization. However, they point out the need to identify vertical transitions due to the limitation the vertical displacements cause. To solve this problem they introduce a moving platform detection module. It works by combining accurate sensors, and not those available on a smart-phone, such as accelerometer, barometer and magnetometer. They estimate altitude using the barometric sensor, while they are also using it to identify instance phases.

4 Discussion and Outlook

Following the diversity of indoor places, techniques and services, we have outlined our position for an adaptive bootstrapping process. This includes mapping techniques but also intermediate services which enable data collection for improving maps and offering enhanced services. We have illustrated examples of customizations of the process in a visual way and argue that the bootstrapping

Our view integrates many existing mapping techniques as well as services and also assumes considerable progress in each of these disciplines. As we focus more on how the different processes for mapping can be integrated, our vision is orthogonal to research roadmaps of specific techniques.

Our new bootstrapping approach also gives rise to the several challenges:

Bootstrapping processes. We need research to understand and model bootstrapping processes, similar to our example, in order to obtain a more complete picture of the techniques and services that are available. Also, most of the services described in Section 2.3 are open challenges mainly due to the inherent complexity of indoor localization: existing sensors (both in phones and specialized devices) fail to effectively propagate a discrete signal patterns in indoor space, making simple triangulation-based techniques infeasible. Additionally, robust heading direction identification independent of the phone's pose remains an open challenge [20].

Intermediate targets/artifacts. We need to understand what can be useful intermediate targets/artifacts, which are both feasible w.r.t mapping techniques and also enable useful services. Moreover, protocols need to be emerged to enable information exchange through APIs between the different services. Importantly, we need to manage the uncertainty inherent to both sensor reading and human users, filter out outliers, and in general work with noisy data. Trust models to manage ambiguous information extracted from multiple users need to be emerged. Existing indoor data models have to be enhanced in order to cope with such incomplete, ambiguous or inaccurate models.

Process customization. We need research to understand when and how to apply different bootstrapping processes to specific buildings. This can also lead to easier or automatic customization of bootstrapping to specific classes of buildings.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we discuss our view on the future of techniques for indoor mapping. We propose customized, crowdsourced and scalable approaches and we discuss the research challenges. We demonstrate methods for the combination of multiple of indoor mapping generation techniques and discuss their challenges. We introduce an adaptive method for bootstrapping the procedure of indoor mapping in multiple ways through a number of intermediate services. Those services enable us to obtain useful data for this procedure, while they increase the quality of those data. Finally, we discuss the necessary components for such approach and we give an example of a bootstrapping procedure.

6 Acknowledgments

This work is part of the TUM Living Lab Connected Mobility project and has been funded by the Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Wirtschaft und Medien, Energie und Technologie.

References

1. Mautz, R.: Indoor positioning technologies. ETH Zurich, Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering (2012)
2. Alzantot, M., Youssef, M.: CrowdInside: Automatic Construction of Indoor Floorplans. In: SIGSPATIAL '12, ACM (2012) 99–108
3. Gao, R., Zhao, M., Ye, T., Ye, F., Wang, Y., Bian, K., Wang, T., Li, X.: Jigsaw: indoor floor plan reconstruction via mobile crowdsensing. In: Proc. of MobiCom '14, ACM (2014) 249–260
4. El-Hakim, S.F., Boulanger, P.: Mobile system for indoor 3-d mapping and creating virtual environments (December 28 1999) US Patent 6,009,359.
5. Goetz, M., Zipf, A.: Towards crowdsoursing geographic information about indoor spaces; mapping the indoor world. GIM International (2012) 30–34
6. Pipelidis, G., Su, X., Prehofer, C.: Generation of indoor navigable maps with crowdsourcing. In: Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia. MUM '16, New York, NY, USA, ACM (2016) 385–387
7. Pipelidis, G., Prehofer, C., Gerostathopoulos, I.: Adaptive bootstrapping for crowdsourced indoor maps. In: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Geographical Information Systems Theory, Applications and Management - Volume 1: GISTAM,, INSTICC, SciTePress (2017) 284–289
8. Chen, J., Clarke, K.C.: Modeling standards and file formats for indoor mapping. In: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Geographical Information Systems Theory, Applications and Management - Volume 1: GISTAM,, INSTICC, SciTePress (2017) 268–275
9. Karlsson, N., Di Bernardo, E., Ostrowski, J., Goncalves, L., Pirjanian, P., Munich, M.E.: The vslam algorithm for robust localization and mapping. In: Robotics and Automation, 2005. ICRA 2005. Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE (2005) 24–29
10. : ISO 16739:2013 - Industry Foundation Classes (IFC) for data sharing in the construction and facility management industries (2013)
11. : ISO/TS 12911:2012 - Framework for building information modelling (BIM) guidance (2012)
12. : OGC IndoorGML version 1.0.2 (August 2016) http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/indoorgml.
13. Liu, H., Shi, R., Zhu, L., Jing, C.: Conversion of model file information from IFC to GML. In: IGARSS'14, IEEE (2014) 3133–3136
14. Henry, P., Krainin, M., Herbst, E., Ren, X., Fox, D.: RGB-D mapping: Using Kinect-style depth cameras for dense 3D modeling of indoor environments. Int. J. Robot. Res. **31**(5) (2012) 647–663
15. Eaglin, T., Subramanian, K., Payton, J.: 3D modeling by the masses: A mobile app for modeling buildings. In: Proc. of PERCOM '13 Workshops, IEEE (March 2013) 315–317

16. Tomlein, M., Bielik, P., Krátky, P., Mitrík, S., Barla, M., Bieliková, M.: Advanced pedometer for smartphone-based activity tracking. In: HEALTHINF. (2012) 401–404
17. Pipelidis, G., Rad, O.R.M., Iwaszczuk, D., Prehofer, C., Hugentobler, U.: A novel approach for dynamic vertical indoor mapping through crowd-sourced smartphone sensor data. In: 2017 International Conference on Indoor Positioning and Indoor Navigation (IPIN). (Sept 2017) 1–8
18. Combettes, C., Renaudin, V.: Comparison of misalignment estimation techniques between handheld device and walking directions. In: IPIN'15. (October 2015) 1–8
19. Kwapisz, J.R., Weiss, G.M., Moore, S.A.: Activity recognition using cell phone accelerometers. SIGKDD Explor. Newsl. **12**(2) (March 2011) 74–82
20. Zhou, P., Zheng, Y., Li, Z., Li, M., Shen, G.: Iodetector: A generic service for indoor outdoor detection. In: SenSys '12. SenSys '12, ACM (2012) 113–126
21. Kourogi, M., Kurata, T.: A method of pedestrian dead reckoning for smartphones using frequency domain analysis on patterns of acceleration and angular velocity. In: Proc. of PLANS '14, IEEE (May 2014) 164–168
22. Roy, N., Wang, H., Roy Choudhury, R.: I am a smartphone and i can tell my user's walking direction, ACM Press (2014) 329–342
23. Nguyen, P., et al.: User-friendly activity recognition using SVM classifier and informative features. In: IPIN'15. (October 2015) 1–8
24. Kaiser, S., Lang, C.: Detecting elevators and escalators in 3d pedestrian indoor navigation. In: 2016 International Conference on Indoor Positioning and Indoor Navigation (IPIN). (Oct 2016) 1–6