**IAES Journal of Electrical and Electronics Engineering**
Vol. 3, No. 2, December 2016, pp. 29~32
ISSN: 2338-7432, DOI: 10.11591/jeee.v3i2.pp29-32


# Localization and navigation techniques for autonomous mobile robots in indoor and outdoor environments

**Watra Arsadianto[1], Mohd Hatta Jopri[2]**
[1]Embedded Systems and Power Electronics Research Group, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[2]Faculty of Electrical Technology and Engineering, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Melaka, Malaysia

**Article Info**

***Article history:***

Received Jan 9, 2016
Revised Sep 15, 2016
Accepted Oct 15, 2016

***Keywords:***

Autonomous mobile robot
Localization
Navigation
SLAM
GPS
LiDAR
Visual odometry

**ABSTRACT**

Reliable localization and navigation are fundamental requirements for autonomous mobile robots operating in indoor and outdoor environments. Indoor robots commonly face the absence of reliable global positioning system (GPS) signals, repetitive structures, and dynamic obstacles, whereas outdoor robots must cope with GPS errors, changing terrain, and environmental disturbances. Various techniques have been developed to address these challenges, including odometry, laser-based localization, visual navigation, GPS-based positioning, sensor fusion, and simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM). This review examines the principles, advantages, and limitations of these techniques and discusses their suitability for different operating environments. The reviewed literature indicates that no single localization method can provide reliable performance under all conditions, making sensor integration and environment-specific navigation strategies essential. The review concludes that robust autonomous navigation requires the coordinated use of localization, mapping, path planning, and obstacle avoidance.

*This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Autonomous mobile robots are designed to move through their environments and perform tasks without continuous human control. Their applications include warehouse transportation, industrial inspection, agricultural monitoring, search and rescue, and domestic services. The effectiveness of these systems depends heavily on their ability to determine their position and navigate safely toward a specified destination. Localization and navigation are therefore closely related functions that determine whether a robot can operate reliably in practical environments.

Despite advances in robotics, accurate localization remains a significant challenge. Indoor environments often prevent global positioning system (GPS) signals from being received reliably, while corridors, walls, and repetitive structures can make position estimation ambiguous. Outdoor environments provide greater access to satellite positioning, but GPS measurements may be degraded by multipath effects, signal obstruction, and limited positioning accuracy. These differences mean that localization methods developed for one environment cannot always be transferred directly to another.

The central problem addressed in this review is how localization and navigation techniques can be selected and integrated to support autonomous mobile robots in indoor and outdoor environments. The discussion focuses on sensor-based positioning, mapping, sensor fusion, path planning, and obstacle avoidance. Research on probabilistic localization, visual and simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM), and outdoor GPS-based positioning provides the foundation for this comparison [1]-[6]. The objective is to identify the strengths and limitations of established techniques and explain how they can be combined to improve navigation reliability.

## 2. LOCALIZATION TECHNIQUES FOR INDOOR ENVIRONMENTS

Indoor localization generally relies on sensors that estimate robot movement or detect surrounding environmental features. Wheel odometry is a common technique because it estimates displacement from wheel rotation measurements. Its main advantages are low cost, simple implementation, and continuous availability of motion information. However, wheel slippage, uneven floors, and mechanical inaccuracies cause accumulated errors that make odometry unsuitable as the only long-term localization method.

Laser-based localization uses range measurements to identify walls, objects, and other geometric features in the environment. A robot can compare its current laser scan with a previously constructed map to estimate its position and orientation. This method is particularly useful in buildings with relatively stable geometric structures and can provide accurate positioning when the environment contains distinctive features. Its limitations include sensor cost, sensitivity to certain environmental conditions, and difficulties when large portions of the surroundings change.

Probabilistic localization provides a framework for handling uncertainty in robot position estimates. Dellaert, Fox, Burgard, and Thrun introduced Monte Carlo Localization, which represents the robot's possible positions using a set of weighted samples [1]. This method can represent multiple possible locations and is useful when the robot does not know its initial position accurately. Nevertheless, its computational requirements depend on the number of samples, the complexity of the environment, and the quality of sensor observations.

Visual localization uses camera images to estimate robot movement and recognize environmental features. It can provide rich information about the surroundings without requiring expensive laser scanners, making it attractive for compact mobile platforms. Mur-Artal, Montiel, and Tardós introduced ORB-SLAM, a monocular visual SLAM system that supports tracking, mapping, relocalization, and loop closing in indoor and outdoor environments [2]. However, visual methods can be affected by lighting changes, motion blur, texture-poor surfaces, and dynamic objects.

## 3. LOCALIZATION TECHNIQUES FOR OUTDOOR ENVIRONMENTS

Outdoor localization commonly uses GPS because satellite signals provide global positioning information over large geographical areas. GPS is useful for applications such as agricultural robots, outdoor inspection platforms, and autonomous ground vehicles. However, standard GPS accuracy may be insufficient for applications requiring precise navigation near obstacles or along narrow paths. Buildings, trees, multipath reflections, and satellite visibility can also produce intermittent or biased measurements.

Inertial measurement units (IMUs) and wheel odometry can complement GPS by providing information about short-term motion. An IMU measures angular velocity and acceleration, while odometry estimates displacement from wheel movement. These sensors can maintain a continuous estimate when GPS measurements become temporarily unreliable. Nevertheless, inertial errors and odometric drift accumulate over time, so their estimates generally require correction using external positioning information.

Sensor fusion combines measurements from multiple sources to obtain a more reliable estimate of robot position and orientation. Kalman filtering and its extended form are commonly used to integrate GPS, odometry, and inertial measurements. Eck, Hess, Borrmann, and Schilling evaluated outdoor localization using GPS and odometry fusion with a Kalman filter and a high-precision positioning reference [3]. Their work demonstrates the importance of validating localization estimates against an independent ground-truth system rather than relying only on the consistency of the filter output.

Visual SLAM can also support outdoor localization when satellite positioning is unavailable or unreliable. ORB-SLAM demonstrated real-time monocular localization and mapping across both indoor and outdoor datasets [2]. Visual methods can recognize environmental features and use loop closure to reduce accumulated trajectory errors. However, outdoor performance may be affected by changing illumination, vegetation movement, repetitive road features, and rapid changes in the camera viewpoint.

## 4. SIMULTANEOUS LOCALIZATION AND MAPPING

Simultaneous Localization and Mapping enables a mobile robot to estimate its position while constructing a representation of an initially unknown environment. This capability is important when a reliable map is unavailable or when the environment changes over time. Durrant-Whyte and Bailey reviewed the fundamental SLAM problem and discussed its major estimation and mapping challenges [4]. Their work established an important conceptual foundation for understanding how localization uncertainty and map uncertainty are interdependent.

Different sensor technologies can be used to implement SLAM, including laser range finders, ultrasonic sensors, stereo cameras, and RGB-D cameras. Each sensor provides different information and has

different limitations in terms of range, resolution, cost, and environmental sensitivity. Chong and colleagues compared several sensor modalities for SLAM and discussed the advantages and disadvantages of laser, acoustic, stereo-vision, and RGB-D sensing [5]. Their review indicates that sensor selection should be based on the environment and the information required by the navigation system.

The distinction between indoor and outdoor SLAM is primarily related to sensor visibility and environmental characteristics. Indoor SLAM often benefits from stable walls, corners, and other geometric structures, while outdoor SLAM must handle larger spaces, changing illumination, and moving environmental elements. Visual SLAM can be useful in both settings, but its performance depends on the availability of reliable image features. Laser-based SLAM provides geometric measurements that are less dependent on illumination, although it may face difficulties in open areas with few detectable structures.

## 5. PATH PLANNING AND OBSTACLE AVOIDANCE

Localization provides the robot's estimated position, while path planning determines how it should reach a target location. Global path planning typically uses a map to identify a route between the starting point and the destination. Local planning adjusts the robot's movement in response to nearby obstacles and changing environmental conditions. A practical navigation system therefore requires coordination between global route selection and local motion control.

The Dynamic Window Approach is a local obstacle-avoidance technique that evaluates feasible robot velocities while considering the robot's motion constraints. Fox, Burgard, and Thrun demonstrated that the method can select safe motion commands by considering the robot's ability to stop before reaching an obstacle [6]. This approach is particularly relevant to environments containing moving obstacles because it evaluates candidate trajectories over a short time horizon. However, its performance depends on accurate obstacle measurements, suitable evaluation parameters, and sufficient computational resources.

The requirements of path planning differ between indoor and outdoor environments. Indoor robots often navigate through narrow corridors, doorways, furniture arrangements, and areas occupied by people. Outdoor robots may need to handle uneven terrain, slopes, vegetation, and larger travel distances. Consequently, navigation systems should consider not only geometric distance but also robot dynamics, terrain traversability, safety margins, and environmental uncertainty [7].

The principal characteristics of indoor and outdoor localization and navigation techniques are summarized in Table 1. The comparison considers typical sensors, commonly used methods, major advantages, and operational limitations. It does not assign universal accuracy rankings because the reviewed studies use different robots, sensors, environments, and evaluation procedures. Table 1 should therefore be interpreted as a qualitative guide for selecting technologies rather than as a direct numerical comparison.

Table 1. Comparison of localization and navigation techniques in indoor and outdoor environments

| Technique | Typical sensors | Main advantages | Main limitations | Typical environment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wheel odometry | Wheel encoders | Low cost and continuous motion estimation | Accumulated drift and wheel slippage | Indoor and outdoor |
| LiDAR localization | Laser range finder | Accurate geometric measurements and reduced dependence on lighting | Cost and limited feature availability in open spaces | Mainly indoor; also outdoor |
| Visual localization | Monocular or stereo camera | Rich environmental information and relatively compact hardware | Sensitive to lighting, blur, and low-texture scenes | Indoor and outdoor |
| GPS-based localization | GPS receiver | Global positioning over large areas | Multipath, signal obstruction, and limited accuracy | Outdoor |
| Sensor fusion | GPS, IMU, odometry, camera | Combines complementary sensor information | Calibration, synchronization, and computational complexity | Mainly outdoor; also indoor |
| SLAM | LiDAR, camera, RGB-D, or combined sensors | Simultaneous map construction and position estimation | Computational demand and sensitivity to environmental changes | Indoor and outdoor |
| Dynamic Window Approach | Range sensors and odometry | Considers robot motion constraints during local obstacle avoidance | Depends on sensor quality and parameter selection | Indoor and outdoor |

As shown in Table 1, wheel odometry is useful as a basic motion-estimation source but should generally be corrected by other sensors to control accumulated drift. Light detection and ranging (LiDAR) and visual localization provide complementary information, with LiDAR emphasizing geometric measurements and cameras providing visual features. GPS is valuable for outdoor global positioning, while

sensor fusion improves continuity when individual measurements become unreliable. SLAM and local obstacle-avoidance methods provide additional capabilities that support navigation in environments where maps are incomplete or obstacles move.

## 6. RESEARCH CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A major challenge in autonomous navigation is maintaining reliable localization when sensor measurements become inaccurate or unavailable. Indoor robots may encounter repetitive corridors, changing furniture layouts, or feature-poor surfaces, while outdoor robots may experience GPS outages and changing environmental conditions. These problems can cause localization drift and navigation failures if the system depends too heavily on a single sensor. Future systems should therefore emphasize robust sensor fusion, uncertainty estimation, and mechanisms for detecting and recovering from localization failure.

Another challenge is the evaluation of navigation performance under comparable experimental conditions. Localization accuracy alone is insufficient because a robot must also reach its destination safely and consistently. Useful evaluation measures include position error, orientation error, trajectory drift, task completion rate, collision frequency, computational load, and recovery time after localization failure. Testing across different environments and operating conditions would provide a more reliable basis for comparing algorithms and sensor configurations.

Future development should focus on tightly integrated localization, mapping, and planning systems. Multi-sensor fusion can combine the strengths of GPS, IMU, odometry, LiDAR, and cameras to improve robustness across different environments. More efficient SLAM algorithms and improved onboard computing can also support real-time operation on compact mobile platforms. However, increased algorithmic complexity should be justified by measurable improvements in reliability, safety, and practical navigation performance.

## 7. CONCLUSION

This review has examined localization and navigation techniques for autonomous mobile robots operating in indoor and outdoor environments. The analysis shows that odometry, LiDAR, visual localization, GPS, sensor fusion, and SLAM provide complementary capabilities rather than interchangeable solutions. Indoor environments generally require localization methods that do not depend on satellite signals, while outdoor systems can use GPS in combination with inertial and odometric measurements. Path planning and obstacle avoidance must then convert the estimated robot position into safe and feasible motion commands.

The comparison indicates that sensor fusion is an important strategy for improving localization reliability across changing operating conditions. LiDAR and visual methods are valuable for indoor mapping and localization, while GPS-supported fusion is useful for outdoor navigation over larger areas. SLAM provides a foundation for operation in environments where maps are incomplete, and the dynamic window approach offers a practical method for local obstacle avoidance. Ultimately, reliable autonomous navigation requires an integrated design in which sensors, localization algorithms, mapping, path planning, and motion control are selected according to the environment and the robot's intended tasks.

## REFERENCES

[1] F. Dellaert, D. Fox, W. Burgard, and S. Thrun, "Monte Carlo localization for mobile robots," in *Proceedings 1999 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (Cat. No. 99CH36288C)*, IEEE, 1999, pp. 1322–1328. doi: 10.1109/robot.1999.772544.

[2] R. Mur-Artal, J. M. M. Montiel, and J. D. Tardos, "ORB-SLAM: a versatile and accurate monocular SLAM system," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 1147–1163, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.1109/TRO.2015.2463671.

[3] D. Eck, R. Hess, D. Borrmann, and K. Schilling, "A evaluation test bed for outdoor localization algorithms using a high-precision positioning system," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 28, no. 10, pp. 34–40, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.ifacol.2015.08.104.

[4] H. Durrant-Whyte and T. Bailey, "Simultaneous localization and mapping: part I," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Magazine*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 99–108, Jun. 2006, doi: 10.1109/MRA.2006.1638022.

[5] T. J. Chong, X. J. Tang, C. H. Leng, M. Yogeswaran, O. E. Ng, and Y. Z. Chong, "Sensor technologies and simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM)," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 76, pp. 174–179, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.12.336.

[6] D. Fox, W. Burgard, and S. Thrun, "The dynamic window approach to collision avoidance," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Magazine*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 23–33, Mar. 1997, doi: 10.1109/100.580977.

[7] G. Baatar, M. Eichhorn, and C. Ament, "Precise indoor localization of multiple mobile robots with adaptive sensor fusion using odometry and vision data," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes (IFAC-PapersOnline)*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 7182–7189, 2014, doi: 10.3182/20140824-6-za-1003.02345.