



Design and Implementation of Wireless Sensor Network-Based Environmental Monitoring Systems

Preben Ben-Mizrahi

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Tonle Sap Institute of Engineering and Commerce, Cambodia

preben.ben.mizrahi@tsiec-kh.org

Peer Review Information

Submission: 09 Jan 2018

Revision: 05 Feb 2018

Acceptance: 04 March 2018

Keywords

Wireless Sensor Network, Environmental Monitoring, Zigbee, Low-Power Sensing, Remote Monitoring

Abstract

Wireless sensor networks (WSNs) provide a practical platform for continuous environmental observation because distributed sensor nodes can measure local physical variables and forward data without extensive cabling. This paper presents a methodology for the design and implementation of a WSN-based environmental monitoring system intended for temperature, relative humidity, light intensity, soil-moisture, and air-quality observation. The proposed architecture combines low-power sensing nodes, an IEEE 802.15.4/ZigBee-class wireless link, multi-hop forwarding, a gateway, and a centralized database/dashboard. The methodology proceeds from requirement definition and sensor selection to node hardware integration, communication design, power management, data validation, gateway processing, and performance verification. Energy use is reduced through periodic sampling, radio duty cycling, local threshold filtering, and short packet transmission. A design-level evaluation is reported rather than fabricated field measurements: under a five-minute sampling interval and representative component-current assumptions, the average node current is approximately 0.26 mA and the expected usable lifetime of a 2400 mAh battery is about 266 days after applying a 70% utilization factor. Link-budget analysis also indicates that a 30 m outdoor hop can retain roughly 15 dB margin under a conservative path-loss model. These estimates show that the design is suitable for low-maintenance monitoring where moderate data rates and long operating life are more important than high-bandwidth communication. The methodology can be adapted to farms, greenhouses, forests, water bodies, campuses, and industrial environmental observation.

Introduction

Environmental monitoring requires observations that are spatially distributed, frequent, and sufficiently reliable to reveal local changes that may be missed by occasional manual sampling. Conventional wired stations can provide high-quality measurements, but installation cost, cable routing, limited mobility, and maintenance requirements can restrict dense deployment. WSNs address this limitation by combining

sensing, embedded processing, and short-range wireless communication within small autonomous nodes. Foundational surveys identified environmental monitoring as a major WSN application and emphasized that network design must jointly consider energy, communication, sensing, deployment, fault tolerance, and application constraints (Akyildiz et al., 2002; Yick et al., 2008).

Early habitat-monitoring work demonstrated the value of tiered architectures in which many inexpensive sensing nodes send data toward more capable gateways and servers (Cerpa et al., 2001). Mainwaring et al. (2002) subsequently showed a real habitat deployment in which power management, remote retasking, communications, and data management had to be treated as one system rather than independent modules. Environmental sensor networks later evolved from passive loggers to intelligent networks able to transmit observations automatically and integrate them with centralized data services (Hart & Martinez, 2006). These developments established the practical basis for remote sensing in sites where routine human access is costly or undesirable. The principal engineering difficulty is that WSN nodes normally operate with constrained energy, memory, processing capability, and radio range. Römer and Mattern (2004) argued that WSN requirements vary strongly with application context, so the design cannot be reduced to a single universal architecture. Energy is especially critical because communication and idle operation can dominate node power consumption; therefore, duty cycling, local processing, energy-aware communication, and appropriate sampling intervals are fundamental to long-term operation (Anastasi et al., 2009). IEEE 802.15.4-class radios are attractive for this purpose because they support low-rate and low-power wireless networking, while ZigBee-style networking can add addressing, routing, and application services (Buratti et al., 2009). The objective of this paper is to provide a reproducible, step-by-step methodology for designing and implementing a low-cost environmental monitoring WSN. The proposed system is intended to sense several environmental variables, transmit data to a gateway, store the measurements, display trends, and issue threshold alerts. The focus is not on claiming a completed field experiment; instead, the results section reports transparent design calculations and verification targets that can be reproduced during prototype testing. This approach is suitable for a methodology paper because it defines what should be built, how it should be tested, and which quantitative indicators should be reported.

Literature Review

The literature shows a progression from generic sensor-network concepts to application-specific environmental systems. Cerpa et al. (2001) proposed habitat monitoring as an application driver and described a tiered architecture in which local processing reduces the amount of

raw data forwarded through the network. Mainwaring et al. (2002) translated similar ideas into an outdoor habitat deployment, illustrating that sensing schedules, radio connectivity, node health, and remote data access must be considered during deployment. Akyildiz et al. (2002) provided a broad architecture and protocol survey, identifying power consumption, scalability, fault tolerance, production cost, topology, hardware constraints, and transmission media as major design factors.

Römer and Mattern (2004) expanded the design perspective by showing that WSNs occupy a broad application design space involving node mobility, heterogeneity, deployment method, communication pattern, infrastructure availability, and quality-of-service needs. Hart and Martinez (2006) focused specifically on environmental sensor networks and highlighted the shift toward intelligent nodes capable of automated communication and integration with sensor-network servers. Yick et al. (2008) later reviewed WSN applications and design issues, again emphasizing that environmental conditions, hardware capability, application objectives, network topology, and power budgets shape the final system architecture.

Energy management became a central theme as deployments matured. Heinzelman et al. (2000) introduced the LEACH clustering concept, using rotating cluster heads and data aggregation to distribute communication energy. Anastasi et al. (2009) reviewed duty cycling, data-driven approaches, mobility, and other conservation techniques, showing that node lifetime depends on both networking and sensing behavior. Buratti et al. (2009) reviewed WSN technologies and standards, with particular attention to IEEE 802.15.4 and environmental implementations, supporting the use of low-rate wireless links for sensor data that do not require broadband capacity.

Application studies further demonstrate the range of environmental variables that can be monitored. Ruiz-Garcia et al. (2009) reviewed WSN and RFID applications in agriculture and food systems, including environmental and precision-agriculture sensing. Lloret et al. (2009) presented a wireless multisensor deployment for rural and forest fire detection, demonstrating the importance of coverage, scalability, and verification mechanisms. Ojha et al. (2015) reviewed practical agricultural WSN deployments and identified hardware choice, communication technology, energy use, and field conditions as persistent implementation challenges. For urban air monitoring, Yi et al. (2015) showed why distributed WSN systems can provide finer spatio-temporal information

than a small number of conventional stations. Adu-Manu et al. (2017) reviewed WSN-based water-quality monitoring and emphasized data accuracy, sampling, communication, and energy-aware operation. Taken together, these studies support a modular methodology that treats sensing accuracy, network reliability, energy consumption, and data management as coupled design objectives.

Methodology

Step 1 - System Requirements and Monitoring Variables

The first step is to define the monitoring objective, study area, expected node density, sampling interval, environmental exposure, required measurement range, and acceptable maintenance interval. A baseline configuration uses 20 fixed sensor nodes distributed over an approximately 100 m × 100 m area. Each node measures ambient temperature, relative humidity, light intensity, soil moisture, and one air-quality indicator. A nominal sampling interval

of five minutes is selected because most environmental variables change slowly compared with communication time. Alarm thresholds are evaluated locally and at the gateway so that abnormal values can be reported immediately rather than waiting for the next scheduled upload.

Step 2 - Sensor Node Hardware Design

Each node consists of a sensing subsystem, a low-power microcontroller, a wireless transceiver, local power regulation, and a battery supply. The microcontroller periodically wakes from sleep, powers or reads the sensors, converts analog channels through its ADC where required, performs range and plausibility checks, creates a compact data packet, and activates the radio. Sensor selection should be based on measurement range, accuracy, response time, power requirement, calibration stability, environmental protection, and interface compatibility. The node should also report battery voltage and a device-health flag so that maintenance can be planned before failure.

Table 1. Proposed system components and design functions

Subsystem	Typical element	Primary function	Design consideration
Sensors	Temperature/RH, light, soil, gas	Acquire environmental variables	Range, calibration, drift, weather protection
Controller	Low-power MCU with ADC	Sampling, filtering, packet formation	Sleep mode, memory, ADC resolution
Wireless link	IEEE 802.15.4/ZigBee-class radio	Node-to-node and node-to-gateway transfer	Range, retries, channel interference
Power unit	Battery; optional solar charger	Supply autonomous node operation	Capacity, regulator loss, service interval
Gateway	Coordinator + embedded computer	Receive, time-stamp and forward data	Local buffering and network backhaul
Server/UI	Database and dashboard	Storage, plots, alarms and export	Data integrity, access control, backup

Step 3 - Network Topology and Communication

A mesh or cluster-tree topology is preferred when direct communication to the gateway is not possible from every location. Nodes are assigned unique addresses, and packets contain node ID, time reference, sensor values, battery voltage, status flags, and a checksum. Short packets reduce channel occupancy and radio-on time. Routing should prefer stable links and limit unnecessary forwarding. The design follows the energy-aware principle established by clustering and aggregation research (Heinzelman et al., 2000), while avoiding excessive protocol complexity for a small environmental network. Channel selection must be checked against nearby Wi-Fi or other 2.4 GHz sources before deployment.

Step 4 - Power-Management Strategy

The node spends most of its time in sleep mode. During each five-minute cycle it wakes, samples the sensors, validates the readings, transmits one packet, waits briefly for acknowledgement, and returns to sleep. Local threshold processing prevents repeated transmission of unchanged information if an event-driven mode is selected. For a design estimate, assume 25 mA for two seconds during sensing and processing, 20 mA for one second of radio activity, and 0.03 mA for the remaining 297 seconds. The average current is $I_{avg} = (25 \times 2 + 20 \times 1 + 0.03 \times 297) / 300 \approx 0.263$ mA. With a 2400 mAh battery and a conservative usable-capacity factor of 0.70, estimated lifetime is $(2400 \times 0.70) / 0.263 \approx 6388$ h, or about 266 days. This calculation is a design estimate; actual lifetime must be measured because regulator

loss, retransmissions, sensor warm-up, self-discharge, temperature, and battery aging alter the result.

Step 5 - Gateway, Database and User Interface

The gateway acts as network coordinator and provides a bridge between the low-power WSN and the storage platform. It receives packets, verifies checksum and node identity, time-stamps measurements, stores a local copy, and

forwards validated records to a database. The server organizes data by node, variable, and time. The user interface displays current values, time-series plots, node status, battery level, and alarm history. Missing packets are explicitly stored as missing values rather than silently interpolated. This preserves data integrity and allows network reliability to be quantified during testing.



Figure 1. Proposed WSN-based environmental monitoring system architecture

Step 6 - Data Quality and Calibration Procedure

Before deployment, each sensing channel is compared with a reference instrument over at least three operating points within the expected range. Offset and scale correction are recorded in node configuration memory or applied at the gateway. During operation, plausibility rules reject physically impossible values and flag abrupt changes that exceed a defined rate-of-change limit. Duplicate packets are removed using node ID and sequence number. The calibration record, firmware version, node location, and maintenance history should be stored as metadata. These procedures are particularly important in environmental applications because a reliable wireless link does not guarantee a valid measurement if the sensor has drifted or become contaminated.

Step 7 - Verification and Performance Metrics

Verification is performed at three levels. First, bench tests confirm sensor response, calibration error, packet formatting, sleep current, and alarm logic. Second, a network test evaluates received signal strength, packet delivery ratio, retransmission count, end-to-end latency, and behavior when a relay node is removed. Third, a short outdoor pilot checks enclosure protection, temperature effects, interference, and gateway buffering during backhaul loss. The primary reporting metrics are measurement error, packet delivery ratio, link margin, average current, estimated or measured battery life, data completeness, and alarm delay. Environmental-domain reviews show that these combined metrics are more informative than radio range alone (Ojha et al., 2015; Adu-Manu et al., 2017).

Results

Because this paper defines a design methodology rather than reporting a completed field campaign, the results below are design-level estimates and acceptance targets derived from stated assumptions. They should be replaced with measured values when the prototype is physically tested. The first calculation concerns energy. The five-minute duty cycle produces an estimated average node current of 0.263 mA. With 70% of a 2400 mAh battery treated as usable capacity, the expected operating time is approximately 266 days. Increasing the sampling period to ten minutes would reduce the contribution of sensing and radio activity and can substantially extend service life, although event detection becomes less frequent unless asynchronous alarms are enabled.

A second calculation evaluates wireless margin. For a representative 2.4 GHz link with 0 dBm transmit power, approximately 40 dB path loss at 1 m, and a path-loss exponent of 2.7, the estimated path loss at 30 m is $40 + 10(2.7)\log_{10}(30) \approx 79.9$ dB. The received power is therefore approximately -79.9 dBm before small implementation losses. If receiver sensitivity is -95 dBm, the nominal margin is about 15 dB. This is adequate for a planned outdoor hop but should not be treated as guaranteed coverage because vegetation, water, enclosure orientation, terrain, fading, and interference can cause additional attenuation. The deployment procedure should therefore verify RSSI and packet delivery at every proposed relay location.

Table 2. Design-level performance estimates and prototype acceptance criteria

Metric	Design estimate / target	Basis	Prototype verification
Sampling interval	5 min nominal	Slow-changing environmental variables	Compare 1-, 5- and 10-min modes

Average node current	≈ 0.263 mA	Duty-cycle current calculation	Measure with ammeter/power analyzer
Usable battery life	≈ 266 days	$2400 \text{ mAh} \times 70\% / I_{\text{avg}}$	Long-run current profile + field check
30 m link margin	≈ 15 dB nominal	Log-distance path-loss estimate	Record RSSI/PDR at each location
Packet delivery ratio	Target $\geq 95\%$	Environmental data completeness goal	≥ 500 packets per node test
Alarm latency	Target < 5 s for threshold event	Immediate event packet path	Trigger controlled threshold event
Data completeness	Target $\geq 95\%$	Valid records / expected records	Audit gateway/database timestamps

The target packet delivery ratio of at least 95% is an acceptance criterion, not a measured result. If field testing fails this criterion, relay placement, antenna orientation, channel selection, transmit power, retry policy, or sampling synchronization should be adjusted. Likewise, the target alarm delay of less than five seconds applies only to event-driven threshold packets; periodic trend data continue to follow the normal sampling schedule. This separation between periodic monitoring and urgent event reporting is consistent with the broader environmental-monitoring literature, where low data rate and long lifetime are usually prioritized but abnormal conditions may require rapid notification (Lloret et al., 2009; Yi et al., 2015).

Conclusion and Discussion

The proposed methodology integrates sensing, low-power embedded processing, wireless networking, gateway services, data-quality control, and verification into one environmental monitoring workflow. This systems approach reflects the main lesson of earlier WSN research: reliable environmental monitoring depends on more than placing sensors and adding a radio. Hardware limitations, deployment conditions, calibration, communication reliability, data management, and energy consumption interact throughout the lifecycle of the network (Mainwaring et al., 2002; Hart & Martinez, 2006). The design therefore begins with application requirements and ends with measurable acceptance criteria rather than selecting hardware first. The design-level analysis indicates that a five-minute duty cycle can support multi-month battery operation when nodes remain asleep for most of the reporting period. This conclusion is consistent with the energy-conservation principles summarized by Anastasi et al. (2009) and with the use of low-rate IEEE 802.15.4-class communication discussed by Buratti et al. (2009). However, the calculated 266-day lifetime should be interpreted as an engineering estimate, not a guaranteed field value. Sensor warm-up time, retransmissions,

battery chemistry, regulator efficiency, seasonal temperature, and enclosure leakage can reduce lifetime. Solar energy harvesting may be added when maintenance access is difficult, but energy storage and charge control must then be included in the verification plan. The architecture is intentionally modular. Agricultural nodes can emphasize soil moisture and microclimate variables, consistent with applications reviewed by Ruiz-Garcia et al. (2009) and Ojha et al. (2015); urban nodes can emphasize gases and particulates as discussed by Yi et al. (2015); water deployments can substitute pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity sensors following the measurement concerns summarized by Adu-Manu et al. (2017). Future implementation work should report real calibration error, packet delivery ratio, node current profiles, outage duration, seasonal link behavior, and maintenance frequency. Such measured evidence would allow the proposed methodology to be converted from a design framework into a validated environmental monitoring platform.

References

- Adu-Manu, K. S., Tapparello, C., Heinzelman, W., Katsriku, F. A., & Abdulai, J.-D. (2017). Water quality monitoring using wireless sensor networks: Current trends and future research directions. *ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks*, 13(1), Article 4, 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3005719>
- Akyildiz, I. F., Su, W., Sankarasubramaniam, Y., & Cayirci, E. (2002). Wireless sensor networks: A survey. *Computer Networks*, 38(4), 393–422. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-1286\(01\)00302-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-1286(01)00302-4)
- Anastasi, G., Conti, M., Di Francesco, M., & Passarella, A. (2009). Energy conservation in wireless sensor networks: A survey. *Ad Hoc Networks*, 7(3), 537–568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adhoc.2008.06.003>

Buratti, C., Conti, A., Dardari, D., & Verdone, R. (2009). An overview on wireless sensor networks technology and evolution. *Sensors*, 9(9), 6869–6896.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/s90906869>

Cerpa, A., Elson, J., Hamilton, M., Zhao, J., Estrin, D., & Girod, L. (2001). Habitat monitoring: Application driver for wireless communications technology. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, 31(2), 20–41. <https://doi.org/10.1145/371626.371720>

Hart, J. K., & Martinez, K. (2006). Environmental sensor networks: A revolution in the earth system science? *Earth-Science Reviews*, 78(3–4), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2006.05.001>

Heinzelman, W. R., Chandrakasan, A., & Balakrishnan, H. (2000). Energy-efficient communication protocol for wireless microsensor networks. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2000.926982>

Lloret, J., Garcia, M., Bri, D., & Sendra, S. (2009). A wireless sensor network deployment for rural and forest fire detection and verification. *Sensors*, 9(11), 8722–8747. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s91108722>

Mainwaring, A., Polastre, J., Szewczyk, R., Culler, D., & Anderson, J. (2002). Wireless sensor networks for habitat monitoring. *Proceedings of the 1st ACM International Workshop on Wireless Sensor Networks and Applications (WSNA '02)*, 88–97. <https://doi.org/10.1145/570738.570751>

Ojha, T., Misra, S., & Raghuwanshi, N. S. (2015). Wireless sensor networks for agriculture: The state-of-the-art in practice and future challenges. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 118, 66–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2015.08.011>

Römer, K., & Mattern, F. (2004). The design space of wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 11(6), 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MWC.2004.1368897>

Ruiz-Garcia, L., Lunadei, L., Barreiro, P., & Robla, J. I. (2009). A review of wireless sensor technologies and applications in agriculture and food industry: State of the art and current trends.

Sensors, 9(6), 4728–4750. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s90604728>

Yi, W. Y., Lo, K. M., Mak, T., Leung, K. S., Leung, Y., & Meng, M. L. (2015). A survey of wireless sensor network based air pollution monitoring systems. *Sensors*, 15(12), 31392–31427. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s151229859>

Yick, J., Mukherjee, B., & Ghosal, D. (2008). Wireless sensor network survey. *Computer Networks*, 52(12), 2292–2330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2008.04.002>