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# Lab 4: Localization

## Objective

To use the ultrasonic sensor and light sensor to accurately navigate the robot to a known(initial) position and orientation on the field.

## Data

Table 1 -



## Observations and Conclusions

1. Which of the two localization routines performed the best? Which performed the worst? What factors do you think contributed to the performance (or lack thereof) of each method?

The Falling edge performed the best with a mean of 3.34 degrees and a standard deviation of 1.74. The rising edge performed the worst with a mean of -5.85 degrees and a standard deviation of 1.89. Overall the falling edge was more consistent as shown by the smaller standard deviation and it was on average closer to the 0 mark as shown through the mean.

The odometer reading was a big deciding factor in the precision of the results along with the rotation speed of the robot. When taking the results with both methods, the robot was placed facing the origin at 45 degrees. This caused for the robot to stop relatively quickly with falling edge because it would stop when it would notice a wall however, the rising edge would begin to look for a wall and then continue until it no longer saw the wall and then do the same in going in the other direction. Therefore, the robot would be in rotation for a longer time. This would make for a higher accumulated error due to slipping and caused faulty odometer readings. The rotation speed was relatively high in contrast to other robots which caused more slipping. The falling edge however had error only due to slipping for a shorter distance when compared to the rising edge. Overall, the error was acceptable.

1. Why does the light sensor provide a more accurate means of orienting the robot than the ultrasonic sensor?

The light sensor is more accurate than the ultrasonic sensor for many reasons. The ultrasonic sensor is more sensitive to noise from external objects and can give faulty readings if the filtering is not done thoroughly. When more than one robot would be running on the cause, sometimes the robot would read something that was not there. Furthermore, the ultrasonic sensor uses a predetermines distance (33 cm in this case) to detect a wall however, the robot might only receive the data once the distance is smaller than 33 cm due to polling timing and due to the robot’s rotation.

The light sensor stops once it detects a gridline. The light sensor is less susceptible to noise in this case since the board that the robot is running on has only two colors and therefore it is easier to program it to detect a black line.

1. Propose a means of determining (approximately) the initial position of the robot using the ultrasonic sensor (Hint: Consider the minima of the ultrasonic sensor’s readings as the robot rotates). Why is detecting minima with the ultrasonic sensor problematic?

It is problematic because when the sensor reads a value that is too low, it can read it as actually being at a maximum distance away from the sensor.

## Error Calculations

Rising:

Mean:

(-7.60 - 3.20 - 8.10 - 4.30 - 7.50 - 6.50 - 7.40 - 4.50 - 3.20 - 6.20)/10 = (-5.85)

Standard Deviation

Falling:

Mean:

(-1.40+3.40+4.80+4.50+4.10+3.60+3.20+4.10+3.60+3.50)/10 = 3.34

Standard Deviation:

## Future Improvements

1. Propose a way to avoid small errors more accurately than a clipping filter.
2. Propose a sensor design that would result in a more accurate and reliable reading than an ultrasonic sensor.
3. Propose another form of localization than rising-edge or falling-edge.