# Mobile Information Systems

# Lecture 04: UbiComp & IoT

© 2015-24 Dr. Florian Echtler
Bauhaus-Universität Weimar
Aalborg University

# Ubiquitous Computing

Source (FU): Mark Weiser, "The Computer for the 21st Century", 1991

- Mark Weiser, 1991: "The most profound technologies are those that disappear. They weave themselves into the fabric of everyday life until they are indistinguishable from it."

- Proposes 3 device classes:

  - Tabs: wearable centimetre sized devices
  - Pads: hand-held decimetre-sized devices
  - Boards: metre sized interactive display devices.

→ Original vision has already (mostly) arrived.

# Ubiquitous Computing (2)

- … or has it?
  - Ubiquitous computing not just about devices …
  - … but also about interaction (or lack thereof)
- Also {calm | ambient | pervasive} computing
  → implies less/no manual setup effort
- Ever tried to use more than one Bluetooth speaker at once?

  → Not *quite* there yet after all.

# "Internet of Things" (IoT)

- Mostly a (widely/over-used) marketing term

- Core idea: put connectivity *everywhere*

- Basic concept similar to UbiComp:

  - Less focus on personal/interactive devices

  - More focus on "smart things" & sensor networks

  - E.g. light bulb, fridge, trash can, water meter…

  - Also: "Industry 4.0", "Factory of the Future"

# "Internet of Things" (IoT) (2)

- Stated goals:
  - Automate mundane, everyday tasks
  - Increase energy/resource efficiency
  - "Smarter" logistics, e.g. in factories
- Other goals:
  - Sell more wireless sensor modules?
  - Gather more data about consumers?
  - E.g. wireless power meter → possible to infer movie being currently watched! (How?)

# Big issues for UbiComp/IoT?

- Power/energy supply?
  - Imagine changing batteries across 1000s of sensors/ "smart things"... → energy harvesting?

- Interaction concepts?
  - People already struggle with synchronizing *two* devices → how to manage huge networks?

- Privacy & security?
  - Even more massive amounts of private data that requires adequate protection

- Standards (or lack thereof)

# UbiComp/IoT Technologies

- Wearables & interaction concepts

- Sensor & mesh networks

- Personal area networks (BTLE, NFC)

# Wearables & interaction concepts

- "Wearable" = any body-worn, hands-free device
  - Smartwatches, fitness trackers
  - Smart glasses, e.g. Google Glass
  - Headsets/headphones?
- Require new interaction concepts
  - E.g. small screen or no screen at all
    → use swipe/shake gestures
    → use voice commands

# Smartwatches (1)

- Not a new concept, exists since late 1990s

- Recent popularity due to …

  - Companion device for smartphone
    → less complex hardware & power supply

  - Better/more sensors, e.g. motion, heart rate, …

  - Improved screens (e.g. round LCDs)

- Problems:

  - Battery lifetime

  - Size

# Smartwatches (2)

- Hardware
  - Surprisingly powerful (1 GHz quad-core, 4 GB ROM)
  - Bluetooth LE + (sometimes) WiFi
- Software
  - Android Wear (Android derivative)
  - Various proprietary OS (iOS, Tizen, …)
  - Native notification & app support:
    - iOS device + Apple Watch
    - Android device + Android Wear

# Smartwatches (3)

- New interaction concepts:
  - Rough swipes, motion gestures (no pinch-zoom :-)
  - Interaction with smartphone: e.g. trace in-air gestures after touch lifted
- Usage scenarios:
  - Notifications & quick responses
  - Data logging (body state/movement/sleep)
  - … other ideas … ?

# Sensor & mesh networks (1)

Image source (CC): http://tango.freedesktop.org/

- "Regular" networks: star/tree topology
  - Central hubs for each segment (wired or wireless)
- Problems for sensors & IoT devices
  - Low transmission power → short range
  - Would require (many) additional hubs/gateways?

Other networks, Internet

# Sensor & mesh networks (2)

Image source (CC): http://tango.freedesktop.org/

- Alternative: mesh networks
    - Each device also acts as hub/relay
    - Data is forwarded across several "hops"
    - Topology can change dynamically

Other networks,
Internet

# Sensor & mesh networks (3)

- Main forwarding strategies:
  - Flooding, re-broadcasting (problems?)
  - Routing – on-demand: e.g. Ad hoc On-Demand Distance Vector (AODV)
  - Routing – pro-active, e.g. Optimized Link State Routing (OLSR), B.A.T.M.A.N. (cf. Freifunk network)
- Current implementations:
  - ZigBee (IEEE 802.15.4)
  - Bluetooth LE (since 5.1)
  - WiFi-based (Freifunk)

# Sensor & mesh networks (4)

- Alternative: LPWAN (Low Power WAN)
  - Relatively long range (1-10 km)
  - Very low bandwidth (< 50 kBit/s)
  - Also uses ISM bands
- Current standards: LoRaWAN, Weightless, WiFi HaLow, …
- Not (yet) widely used
- Intended for smart meters, street lamps, etc.

# Personal Area Network (WPAN)

- Originally IrDA, later Bluetooth (see lecture 3)
- Goal: communication with personal peripherals
- Disadvantages:
  - High power draw (on par with WiFi/cellular)
  - Complex setup procedures (pairing, PIN codes etc.)
- Alternative: Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE/BTLE)
  - Also available for medium-area mesh networks

# Bluetooth Low Energy ❖(1)

- Little in common with "classic" Bluetooth
  - Same frequency band (2.4 GHz ISM)
  - Similar modulation → no hardware change
  - Much smaller/less complex protocol stack
  - Part of Bluetooth specification v4.0
- Optimized for simple battery-powered sensors
  - Goal: months or years of battery lifetime
  - Maximum data rate 1 Mbit/sec

# Bluetooth Low Energy ⚫(2)

- 2 major roles: central or peripheral
  - Peripherals can …
    - Broadcast to all central devices
    - Unicast to one specific central device
  - Centrals can …
    - Open connections to peripherals
    - Be notified about value changes
- OS support (mobile):
  - Central role supported since Android 4.3, iOS 5
  - Peripheral since Android 5.0 (not all devices), iOS 6

# Bluetooth Low Energy 🅱(3)

- "Complexity" classes for peripherals:
  - Beacons (pure static broadcasts)
    - E.g. iBeacon: simply broadcasts own UUID
    - Additional data possible on request
  - Sensors (broad-/unicast with sensor data)
    - Multiple profiles: heart rate, activity, temperature, …
    - Notification support to avoid constant polling
  - Bidirectional communication
    - Not primarily designed for synchronous comm.
    - Mostly for setting sensor parameters etc.

# Bluetooth Low Energy (4)

- Power consumption
  - Highly dependent on advertising interval
  - nRF51822 SoC, CR2032 button cell, 1 s interval
    → estimate ~ 1 year of lifetime
  - Power management becomes very important
  - Modern SoCs have multiple peripherals
    that can be powered down individually

# BTLE Profiles/Protocols (1)

- GAP = Generic Advertising Profile
  - Up to 31 bytes advertisement broadcast
  - Up to 31 extra bytes on request by central
- GATT = Generic Attribute Profiles
  - Only available to one central at a time
  - 1+ *services*, containing 1+ *characteristics* each
  - Each s/c identified by global 16-bit UUID
  - Publish/subscribe model
    - Value change notifications, no constant data stream
    - Less "on" time for radio module → power savings

# BTLE Profiles/Protocols (2)

Image source (FU): Townsend et al., Getting Started with Bluetooth Low Energy, O'Reilly Media

- GAP: Generic Access Profile
  - Advertising, discovery, connection establishment



Mobile Information Systems - © 2015-24 Dr. Florian Echtler, BUW/AAU

# BTLE Profiles/Protocols (3)

Image source (FU): https://learn.adafruit.com/introduction-to-bluetooth-low-energy/gatt

- GATT: Generic Attribute Profile

  - Main transport for "live" data

  - Extension of GAP

  - Profiles, services + characteristics (each with unique UUID)

  - Publish-subscribe model

# Near Field Communication (NFC)

Image sources (FU): http://nfc-forum.org/ (Logo), (CC) own image

- Very simple devices, price down to ~ 0.10 €

  - Various form factors: sticker, token, card, glass capsule (implantable/injectable), …

  - Contain small IC + antenna coil

- Subclass of RFID (radio freq. ID)

- Power for tag provided by reader device through magnetic field

- Communication through EM field modulation (bi-directional!)



IC

Coil

# Near Field Communication (NFC)

- Characteristics:

    - 13.56 MHz band, ~ 400 kBit/sec

    - Range ~ 2 cm with standard antenna

    - Storage: 137 byte – 80 kByte

- Variants:

    - Simple storage devices (cf. NDEF standard)

    - Smart cards with crypto functions (e.g. Mifare)

    - Java cards (user-programmable in Java)

    - Card emulation (device mimics card/token)

# Near Field Communication (NFC)

- Usage scenarios
  - URLs/contact data, e.g. in poster/business card
  - Security & access control (e.g. AAU student cards)
  - Mobile payment (some credit cards, Apple Pay)
  - Passports (lots of sensitive information)
  - Device-to-device (Android Beam)
- Directed antenna can increase range to ~1 m
  → personal data stolen without direct contact

# NFC Security

- Public tags:

  - should be write-protected (but often are not)

  - E.g. overwrite with malicious URL?

- Security measures

  - Simple/low-level:

    - Read and/or write keys for each data block

    - Can often be brute-forced or sniffed

  - Complex/high-level:

    - Dedicated crypto "apps" in NFC chip

    - Similar security concept to SIM card

# UbiComp/IoT issue: energy supply

- Possible solution: energy harvesting?

- Many possible sources
  - Sunlight/environment light
  - Vibration & sound
  - Temperature differences
  - EM radiation (e.g. power lines, TV stations)

- Drawbacks:
  - Low efficiency (few 10-100 mW)
  - Energy storage (e.g. during night?)

# UbiComp/IoT issue: privacy

- Bluetooth LE devices: often broadcast-based

  - Implies public availability → enables tracking

  - Often leaks additional private data, e.g. pulse

  - MAC address *could* be random, but often isn't

- Classic tradeoff: security/ ↔ ease of setup

- Danger of stalking (Apple AirTags, Google FindMy)

# UbiComp/IoT issue: security

- Mobile phones: bad situation regarding patches, security updates etc.

- IoT devices: even *worse*

- Customer often won't even notice, so why bother?

- Problem: insecure devices on Internet can be used as part *botnet*, execute attacks

# UbiComp/IoT issue: standards

Image sources (CC): https://xkcd.com/927/

- Current state: ~ 1 standard per manufacturer
  → e.g. light bulb A won't talk to control app B

  - Common ground: *sometimes* IP, more recently Matter Protocol

  - Mostly: wild mixture (HTTP, MQTT, Zigbee, …)

- "Universal" approach: URIBeacon/Physical Web

  - Every "smart thing" broadcasts an URL

  - Access/control via common web tools

  - Problem: mapping?



HOW STANDARDS PROLIFERATE:
(SEE: A/C CHARGERS, CHARACTER ENCODINGS, INSTANT MESSAGING, ETC)

SITUATION: THERE ARE 14 COMPETING STANDARDS.

14?! RIDICULOUS! WE NEED TO DEVELOP ONE UNIVERSAL STANDARD THAT COVERS EVERYONE'S USE CASES. YEAH!

SOON: SITUATION: THERE ARE 15 COMPETING STANDARDS.

# The End