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State-of-the-Art digital camera hardware and processing stimulate development of multi-head camera systems:

- Midas Track‘Air
- IGI PentaCam
- Hexacon/Leica RCD30 oblique
- Microsoft Osprey

Also known through

- Pictometry/Bing Maps
- BlomOblique
- ....

Colored mesh of a 3D point cloud, derived from dense image matching
INTRODUCTION
MULTIPLE VIEW AIRBORNE OBLIQUE IMAGERY

- Main advantage: observability of lateral structures
- Main disadvantage: occlusions ➔ multi view and high overlap
- Primary usage
  - automatic model texturing
  - manual interpretation
  - surface modeling (dense matching)
- Automatic scene interpretation:
  Interesting, but not so much work yet done

Colored mesh of a 3D point cloud, derived from dense image matching
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MULTIPLE VIEW AIRBORNE OBLIQUE IMAGERY

- Main advantage: observability of lateral structures
- Main disadvantage: occlusions → multi view and high overlap
- Primary usage
  - automatic model texturing
  - manual interpretation
  - surface modeling (dense matching)
- Automatic scene interpretation:
  Interesting, but not so much work yet done

Colored mesh of a 3D point cloud, derived from dense image matching

Classical single image interpretation: 3D neighborhood and object properties not easily exploitable.
3D SCENE CLASSIFICATION

BASIC IDEA

Urban scene, observed from different angles
3D SCENE CLASSIFICATION
BASIC IDEA

Compute point cloud from images and derive 3D features: normals (z component, residual), height above ground
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BASIC IDEA

From images also compute features and assign to points (need for visibility check) ....
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Color features, like Excess of Green Index
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Straight lines
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BASIC IDEA

Standard deviation in a sliding window
3D SCENE CLASSIFICATION

BASIC IDEA

Spatial enumeration (voxelisation)
Segment the point cloud: planarity and connected components → entity to be classified
3D SCENE CLASSIFICATION

BASIC IDEA

Compute features per segment
3D SCENE CLASSIFICATION
BASIC IDEA

So we

- combine 3D and image features
- exploit 3D point cloud for scene segmentation, entities defined in 3D object space
- and finally will use standard methods for classification
  - Random Trees (supervised)
  - MRF-approach, using graph-cuts for energy minimization (unsupervised)
3D SCENE CLASSIFICATION
SUPERVISED APPROACH

- Reference labeling in images, project labels into 3D space and assign to segments
- Sample from the reference segments some 20% for the training (Random Forest, opencv implementation)
- Evaluation of result using the remaining reference labels
- Repeat to check for overfitting
- the final label information per segment is transferred to voxels.

Classes defined: roof, tree, facade, vegetated ground, sealed ground and roof destroyed/rubble (for damage mapping application case)
3D SCENE CLASSIFICATION
UNSUPERVISED APPROACH

- Using graph cuts in the 3D lattice (voxels)
- Total energy to be minimized
  \[ E = \sum_{p \in P} D_p(f_p) + \sum_{(p, q) \in N} V_{pq}(f_p, f_q) \]
  with \( D_p(f_p) \): Data energy at voxel \( p \) for label \( f \),
  and \( V_{pq} \): pairwise interaction potential (Potts here: label smoothness),
  and \( N \): local neighborhood, here 3x3x3
- \( D_p(f_p) \) is composed out of factors, derived from the features. Example:
  factor from local normal, z component (for the others see paper)

\[
S_Z = \begin{cases} 
    m_Z, & \text{if } f_p=\text{facade} \\
    1 - m_Z, & \text{if } f_p=\text{sealed\_grnd} \\
    \min(1 - m_Z, |0.5 - m_Z|), & \text{if } f_p=\text{roof} \\
    \min(m_Z, 1 - m_Z, |0.5 - m_Z|) + C, & \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]
EXPERIMENTS

- Here only dataset Enschede. For Haiti damage mapping refer to paper
- Flight by Slagboom en Peeters BV
  - Altitude 400m, overlap > 60% in all directions
  - 5 Canon MarkII cameras (36mm x 24mm), mounted in a custom head
  - Oblique views: 45deg tilt, GSD 5-8 cm
EXPERIMENTS

- Dense point cloud matching using PMVS2 (Furukawa and Ponce, 2011)

Test area: mixed settlement and industry, small green areas
EXPERIMENTS

Example extraction

Example: reference labels, extraction Random Trees, extraction Graph Cut
EXPERIMENTS

Confusion matrices: Random Trees, overall accuracy 84.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF→</th>
<th>Facade</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Seal_Grd</th>
<th>Veg_Grd</th>
<th>Tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facade</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal_Grd</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg_Grd</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion matrices: Graph Cut, overall accuracy 78.3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF→</th>
<th>Facade</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Seal_Grd</th>
<th>Veg_Grd</th>
<th>Tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facade</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal_Grd</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg_Grd</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXPERIMENTS

Example Façade/roof confusion

Main problem: structures on the façade (balconies, sun blinds, small roofs above entry) not modeled (façade in reference, but roof in extraction)
**EXPERIMENTS**

Confusion matrices: Random Trees, overall accuracy 84.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>Facade</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Seal_Grd</th>
<th>Veg_Grd</th>
<th>Tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facade</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal_Grd</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg_Grd</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion matrices: Graph Cut, overall accuracy 78.3%

<table>
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<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>Facade</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Seal_Grd</th>
<th>Veg_Grd</th>
<th>Tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facade</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal_Grd</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg_Grd</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPERIMENTS

Example Tree/ground vegetation, especially in unsupervised method

Main problem: low vegetation (bush, shrub): is it ground vegetation or tree?
EXPERIMENTS

Confusion matrices: Random Trees, overall accuracy 84.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF→</th>
<th>Facade</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Seal_Grd</th>
<th>Veg_Grd</th>
<th>Tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facade</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
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<td>Seal_Grd</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg_Grd</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion matrices: Graph Cut, overall accuracy 78.3%
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facade</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal_Grd</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veg_Grd</td>
<td>0.000</td>
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<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPERIMENTS

Example sealed/vegetated ground confusion, especially in unsupervised experiments.

Main problem: color information in shadow areas misleading.
DISCUSSION

- Both approaches perform similar, specific problems
  - Not modeled objects
  - Confusion vegetation (ground vs tree)
  - Shadow areas (sealed vs. vegetation)
- The two latter ones more serious in unsupervised approach
- Noise and gaps in point cloud another problem (especially at facades)
OUTLOOK

- New midformat systems come with NIR, \(\Rightarrow\) better for vegetation detection
- Still noise in stereo-views, thus need to filter
- Need to model structures at facades
OUTLOOK

- New midformat systems come with NIR, ➔ better for vegetation detection
- Still noise in stereo-views, thus need to filter
- Need to model structures at facades
- First tests with SURE (SGM) done, typical result: denser, but more noise especially in stereo views ➔ more sophisticated denoising necessary
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