

## Aberystwyth University

### *Multi-Viewpoint Visibility Coverage Estimation for 3D Environment Perception*

Ososinski, Marek; Labrosse, Frédéric

*Published in:*

Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer Vision Theory and Applications

*DOI:*

[10.5220/0004693504620469](https://doi.org/10.5220/0004693504620469)

*Publication date:*

2014

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Ososinski, M., & Labrosse, F. (2014). Multi-Viewpoint Visibility Coverage Estimation for 3D Environment Perception: Volumetric Representation as a Gateway to High Resolution Data. In S. Battiato (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer Vision Theory and Applications* (Vol. 2, pp. 462-469). (VISAPP 2014 - Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer Vision Theory and Applications; Vol. 2). Science and Technology Publications. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0004693504620469>

#### **Document License**

CC BY-NC-ND

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400  
email: [is@aber.ac.uk](mailto:is@aber.ac.uk)

# Multi-viewpoint Visibility Coverage Estimation for 3D Environment Perception

## *Volumetric Representation as a Gateway to High Resolution Data*

Marek Ososinski and Frédéric Labrosse

*Department of Computer Science, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3DB, U.K.*

**Keywords:** Visibility Coverage Estimation, Multi Viewpoint, 3D Environment Perception, Volumetric Representation, Art Gallery Problem.

**Abstract:** Estimation of visibility is a crucial element of coverage estimation of large, complex environments. This non-probabilistic problem is often tackled in a 2D context. We present an algorithm that can estimate the visibility of a high resolution scene from a low resolution 3D representation. An octree based voxel representation provides a dataset that is easy to process. Voxel occupancy properties ensure a good approximation of visibility at high resolution. Our system is capable of producing a reasonable solution to the viewpoint placement issue of the Art gallery problem.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Environments are often represented as maps or plans. These 2D metric projections are adequate in capturing the main dimensions of the environment in question, however, they fail to capture the 3D geometry of the objects within the space. To capture the full geometry of the environment a 3D representation is required. Such representation can be created using terrestrial laser scanning. However, a single laser scan is often not enough to represent the whole environment. In such case multiple scans are acquired and registered together to form a complete laser scan. High resolution laser scanning is a lengthy process, the required time is directly related to the number of scans (viewpoints). We propose a method that is able to estimate the position of the required viewpoints. Our method is based on a completeness of a high resolution scan based on a low resolution 3D representation of the environment.

Multi-viewpoint visibility estimation is part of a larger area of environment perception, which is often divided into low level perception, high level spatial awareness and scene understanding. A multitude of techniques exist that aid environment perception. 3D environments can be reconstructed using monocular and stereo cameras as well as range sensors. The monocular multi view systems such as (Furukawa and Ponce, 2010; Furukawa et al., 2010) rely on identifying small rectangular patches within images and us-

ing the relative positions within multiple images to estimate 3D spatial relationships. The resulting patch model is converted to a mesh. The recreation of the environment is limited to perception, modeling the environment does not provide any understanding of it. Other multi-view stereo system (Hernandez et al., 2007) use a deeper understanding of the scene by foreground-background segmentation and graph-cut techniques to extract 3D models. This is however limited to singular objects. Some methods use volumetric representation to detect occlusions (Zhang et al., 2011) that allow Simultaneous localisation and mapping systems such as (Roussillon et al., 2011), which uses landmark detection and odometry information to generate terrain model, and (Endres et al., 2012), which uses SIFT based attitude estimation to register together range images. The localisation methods often limit the understanding of the scene to detecting position of the camera/robot. They provide awareness of a single position within a given space, rather than information about that space.

All the aforementioned techniques are modeling the world by attempting to understand it. Some with more success than others, they provide an insight into the world increasing the detail of our perception. The Art gallery problem on the other hand is attempting to provide an insight into the environment itself. The Art gallery problem is addressing the issue of placing the least amount of viewpoints within any given space to achieve the complete visibility coverage of that space.

This non probabilistic problem requires a certain degree of spatial awareness derived from understanding occlusions within the given space.

The basic Art gallery problem was solved (Chvatal, 1975) and proven (Fisk, 1978). Since then countless variations have been explored. Most of the approaches attempt to solve the problem using 2D polygons, often extending the problem to include reflex vertices (Iwerks and Mitchell, 2012). Others allow inconsistencies within the polygons such as holes (Hoffmann et al., 1991) or edge variations (Cano et al., 2013), however rarely expanding into the 3D (Trucco et al., 1997). Use of the maximum cardinality of the dataset as a starting point and incremental optimisation of their position leading to the elimination of the obsolete viewpoints has been explored (Bottino and Laurentini, 2011). This approach is viable for 2D datasets but maximum cardinality of real-world 3D datasets would provide an impractically large set of potential viewpoints. A piecewise solution reducing a concave polygon into a set of convex polygons has been used (Cano et al., 2013). A method relying on heuristic placement of potential viewpoints was presented in (Amit et al., 2010). A union of a set of viewpoints positioned close to the vertices and a set of viewpoints positioned in centers of mass of deconstructed convex polygons was used. This initial placement allows an efficient reduction of obsolete viewpoints. An incremental multi-agent system capable of repositioning the agents positioned near vertices can be used to improve the performance (Obermeyer et al., 2011).

Our method provides a way of estimating 3D visibility coverage using a data driven approach. Unlike the mathematical geometry driven methods it is designed to work with real world data which complexity, even after reduction makes many other methods impractical.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 describes our method for visibility coverage estimation, Section 3 describes the algorithm for viewpoint position detection and Sections 4 and 5 provide further evaluation and discussion of our method.

## 2 ENVIRONMENT MODELING

The common way of representing 3D objects is the use of vertices. These points in space can be stored as pointclouds or joined together using edges to create meshes. The data stored in such a way does not retain the information about spatial distribution of the data. This causes difficulties in reasoning about the environment. An alternative way of representing the

data is volumetric representation. This relies on representing the data on a regular grid in 3D space. We use an octree based occupancy grid OctoMap (Hornung et al., 2013). Figure 1 shows multiple scales of an octree based voxel representation.




Figure 1: Octree based voxel representation. Each voxel represents 8 voxels on a lower level of an octree.

Such representation retains the spatial information, however it compromises the colour/intensity information. Our method relies on the distribution of occupancy within the 3D space. Information such as colour and intensity is ignored.

### 2.1 Voxel Interpretation

Voxels are volumes of space delimited by a regular grid. Each voxel has a resolution defined as the length of the edge of a cube delimiting the space. The main significant property of a voxel is occupancy: a voxel can either be empty or occupied. The empty voxel guarantees that all the voxels contained within the bounds of that voxel are empty. This means that the space delimited by the bounds of an empty voxel is free of any obstructions. It is an important property as it allows the assumption that the space delimited by an empty voxel will remain empty at a higher resolution of an octree.




Figure 2: Possible data distribution within a voxel.

As shown in Figure 2 an occupied voxel can be partially empty. When working with real world data voxels are rarely completely full. Voxel occupancy has an interesting property, if the voxel is occupied, at least one voxel contained within the volume of the current voxel is occupied. Using octree based representation means that if at least one out of eight voxels contained within the current voxel is occupied, the current voxel is occupied.

These properties require further consideration while trying to estimate the visibility of a voxel from a given viewpoint. If a voxel was a rigid cube at most 3 out of its 6 faces would be visible from any viewpoint, see Figure 3.




Figure 3: Visible faces of a voxel in green. One, two and three visible faces.

We know that an occupied voxel can be partially empty, which leads to potential visibility of the inner faces of the voxel, see Figure 4.




Figure 4: Visible inner faces of a voxel in green. One, two and three visible faces.

Each voxel has the potential to be both full and empty at the same time. The properties of occupancy in a multi scale environment support the hypothesis that any given voxel is partially empty. To account for the empty space while estimating the visibility each face is treated as a separate entity, as if the voxel they are a part of was transparent.

## 2.2 Visibility Estimation

The visibility of a voxel is estimated in two stages. The perception stage checks whether a voxel is visible from the given viewpoint. The awareness stage is an estimation of how well the voxel can be seen.

### 2.2.1 Voxel Perception

Thanks to the regular grid and unified voxel size there is a limited number of interactions between voxels viewed from a fixed viewpoint. The occlusions caused by the voxels closer to the viewpoint can cause some faces not to be visible or to be partially visible. This leads to three classes of visibility: full visibility, partial visibility and no visibility, see Figure 5.

A corner is considered visible if the ray cast from the viewpoint towards the corner terminates on one of the four voxels adjacent to that corner. The approximation is caused by an undefined termination location of ray cast algorithm (Amanatides and Woo, 1987) in this situation.

A face of a voxel can be classified as fully visible only when all its four corners are visible. A face is




Figure 5: Example face visibility from the yellow viewpoint. Green – fully visible, Blue – partially visible, Red – not visible

classified as partially visible if at least one corner is visible, but not all corners are visible from the given viewpoint, see Figure 6. A face is not visible if no corners are visible from the given viewpoint. In a rare occasion that part of the face would be visible from the viewpoint, but no corners are visible that face would be considered not visible.




Figure 6: Partially visible faces. Three, two and two visible corners.

### 2.2.2 Visibility Value

Visibility value is a value ranging from 0 to 1, where 0 means not visible and 1 means perfect conditions for visibility, partially relies on the voxel perception classification. The partially visible face will get a value of  $V = 0.3$ . Only the fully visible faces have their visibility value computed as in Equation 3 where  $V$  is visibility,  $D$  is the normalised distance between a viewpoint  $v_p$  and a face  $f$ ,  $d$  is the distance between the viewpoint  $v_p$  and the center of the face  $f$  of a voxel,  $R_{min}$  is the minimum range of the data acquisition device,  $R_{max}$  is the maximum range of the data acquisition device,  $A$  is the normalised angle of incidence,  $\theta$  is the angle of incidence of the ray cast from the viewpoint  $v_p$  onto face  $f$  of the voxel expressed in radians.

$$D(v_p, f) = \frac{d(v_p, f) - R_{min}}{R_{max}} \quad (1)$$

$$A(v_p, f) = \left( \frac{\theta(v_p, f) - \frac{\pi}{2}}{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right) \quad (2)$$

$$V(v_p, f) = 0.5 + 0.3 \times D(v_p, f) + 0.2 \times A(v_p, f) \quad (3)$$

The visibility is composed of a perception class constant (0.3 for partially visible faces and 0.5 for

fully visible faces) and, in case of fully visible faces, weighted normalised distance between the viewpoint  $v_p$  and face  $f$  and a weighted normalised angle of incidence, see Figure 7.




Figure 7: Visibility is affected by both distance and angle of incidence.

The constants were empirically chosen to represent the significance of a given component of the visibility computation. 0.3 was chosen for partially visible faces to allow a small input to the visibility value. 0.5 was chosen for full visibility as the ability to see a face plays a major role in visibility computation and is more important than distance and angle of incidence. The combined influence of distance and angle of incidence carry the same weight as the full visibility. The distance is more important out of the pair as it influences the potential resolution, however the angle of incidence follows shortly. This led to the assignment of weights 0.3 for distance component and 0.2 for angle of incidence.

Global visibility is defined as a normalised sum of the maximum visibilities of the faces:

$$\bigwedge_{v_p \in S} G_v(S, F) = \sum_{f \in F} \frac{\max(V(v_p, f))}{|F|} \quad (4)$$

Equation 4 describes the global visibility  $G_v(S, F)$  as a sum of the maximum visibility  $V$  of a face  $f$  from any viewpoint  $v_p$  belonging to a set of all selected viewpoints  $S$  normalised by the number of faces  $|F|$ .

### 3 MULTI-VIEWPOINT SYSTEM

To detect the position of the viewpoints a low resolution representation of the environment is required. Such representation can be acquired using one of the methods described in Section 1 or other mapping tools. We use a decimated laser scan as a base for generation of the volumetric representation, see Figure 8, to guarantee the high resolution ground truth.

#### 3.1 Environment Representation

The 3D representation is converted to an octree based volumetric representation of resolution 0.1 m. Such voxel representation approximates most geometric




Figure 8: The laser scan of the environment used for testing.

complexities, while keeping the number of voxels manageable, see Figure 9(c). At this resolution, the cross beams on the roof, arcades and the windows are still recognisable. Smaller resolutions would give more accurate results, but acquisition of higher resolution data starts to become impractical. The lower the resolution the larger the obstacles become. This inflation of occupied space means that intricate detail will not be directly evaluated. The detail is accounted for in the visibility estimation by the use of voxel transparency.

#### 3.2 Viewpoint Position Estimation

The next step is estimation of a plane on which an acquisition device operates. Because terrestrial laser scanners are operated from a tripod a 2D plane delimiting the potential position of the scanner can be approximated. A uniform grid (1 m resolution) is then created and overlayed on the plane.

At this stage each of the potential positions on the grid is assigned a total count of compatible voxels. A voxel is considered compatible if a ray cast from the viewpoints in direction of its centre terminates on that voxel. This is a less accurate way of estimating potential visibility of a given viewpoint. Figure 10 presents the sum of compatibility of the voxels for a given viewpoint. The dark red areas represent low compatibility, whereas blue into white areas represent high compatibility. After the position with maximum number of compatible voxels has been selected, those voxels are removed from the set of all voxels. The process is then repeated until either the set of all voxels reaches 0 or the number of detected viewpoints reaches the limit of allowed viewpoints, see Figure 11(a)–11(k). In the provided example a limit of 11 viewpoints has been reached. To increase the visibility each of the potential viewpoints can be converted to a set of viewpoints positioned in close proximity of the potential viewpoint allowing for more






Figure 9: Data at different scales.

variation within the dataset. The presented heuristic is greedy and tries to maximise the amount of compatible voxels. This heuristic is fairly expensive as it relies on the creation of a grid of potential viewpoints and evaluation of each of the viewpoints. We are planning to explore different heuristics as well as random placement of the viewpoints in the future.




Figure 10: Voxel compatibility on the potential viewpoint position plane.

### 3.3 Viewpoint Reduction

The last step is the reduction of the number of viewpoints based on global visibility estimation, see Section 2.2. The reduction potential is defined as the global visibility coverage of the viewpoints in the set of potential viewpoints  $P$  excluding the set of viewpoints considered for reduction  $T$ . Global visibility estimate is computed using Equation 4, where  $S = P - T$ . Elimination of multiple viewpoints might be more beneficial than elimination of a single viewpoint during a single iteration. During a single itera-

tion sets of two viewpoints are considered for elimination alongside the potential viewpoints.

Figure 12 shows the reduction potential of permutations of viewpoints within the set of potential viewpoints  $P$ . Both x and y axes signify a viewpoint number, the diagonal starting at position 1,1 shows the reduction potential of a single viewpoint, whereas other values signify multi-viewpoint reduction. Viewpoint 11 has the highest reduction potential, closely followed by viewpoint 2 and viewpoint 1. In the example none of the viewpoints is obsolete, therefore none of them will be removed. This method is designed to provide a pareto-optimal solution with lowest data loss during viewpoint elimination. The system can be configured to perform viewpoint elimination until a maximum allowed number of viewpoints is reached.

## 4 EVALUATION

Visibility coverage estimation has been performed at both working resolution (0.1 m) and testing resolution (0.01 m). Figure 13 shows the visibility coverage for viewpoints from the example in Section 3. In all cases the visibility at higher resolution is higher. This tendency is caused by the reduction of object inflation causing occlusions to appear larger than in reality.

The stable increase in visibility means that the method slightly underestimates the visibility on a higher resolution. This behaviour is not undesirable when detecting viewpoints for use with terrestrial laser scanning as it leads to a higher overlap between scans. The visual comparison shows little to no signs of reduction in visibility coverage between the low




Figure 11: Consecutive viewpoint detection points.




Figure 12: The reduction potential of a given set of viewpoints.

and high resolution representations. Figure 14 shows the visualisation of the global visibility coverage of a given viewpoint seen from a fixed position within the dataset. This coupled with an increase in global visibility makes the algorithm robust in a multitude of environments.




Figure 13: Global scene visibility coverage from a given viewpoint.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a robust method of estimating visibility within a 3D environment based on multi-scale properties of voxel occupancy. Due to reliance on a octree based data structure the accuracy of the method is linked to the accuracy of the initial data. If the data is very noisy or contains many ghost artefacts the accuracy of the method could be lowered. This can be improved by noise reduction methods.

The method provides a slight underestimation of the actual visibility from a given viewpoint. This is




Figure 14: Visibility coverage.

mostly due to partial voxel occupancy. Such underestimation leads to more overlap between viewpoints which is a desirable side effect when considering laser scanning or security applications. Proposed method of viewpoint position detection in a multi-agent system is capable of providing reasonable results. The current heuristic of detecting an initial set of potential viewpoints is however computationally expensive and should be improved. In the future we plan to explore different approaches for generating the initial set of potential viewpoints as well as testing out the method in a wider range of real world environments.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales for help in acquiring and understanding of the datasets used within the project.

This research project is funded by Knowledge Economy Skills Scholarships (KESS), which is part-funded by the European Social Fund (ESF) through the European Union's Convergence Programme (West Wales and the Valleys), administered by the Welsh Government.

## REFERENCES

- Amanatides, J. and Woo, A. (1987). A fast voxel traversal algorithm for ray tracing. In *Eurographics 87*, pages 3–10.
- Amit, Y., Mitchell, J. S. B., and Packer, E. (2010). Locating guards for visibility coverage of polygons. *International Journal of Computational Geometry*, 20(5):601–630.
- Bottino, A. and Laurentini, A. (2011). A nearly optimal algorithm for covering the interior of an art gallery. *Pattern Recognition*, 44(5):1048–1056.
- Cano, J., Tth, C. D., and Urrutia, J. (2013). A tight bound for point guards in piecewise convex art galleries. *International Journal of Computational Geometry*, 46(8):945–958.
- Chvatal, V. (1975). A combinatorial theorem in plane geometry. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B*, 18:39–41.
- Endres, F., Hess, J., Engelhard, N., Sturm, J., Cremers, D., and Burgard, W. (2012). An evaluation of the rgb-d slam system. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 1691–1696.
- Fisk, S. (1978). A short proof of chvatal's watchman theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 24(3):374.
- Furukawa, Y., Curless, B., Seitz, S. M., and Szeliski, R. (2010). Towards internet-scale multi-view stereo. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- Furukawa, Y. and Ponce, J. (2010). Accurate, dense, and robust multi-view stereopsis. *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 32(8):1362–1376.
- Hernandez, C., Vogiatzis, G., and Cipolla, R. (2007). Probabilistic visibility for multi-view stereo. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1–8.
- Hoffmann, F., Kaufmann, M., and Kriegel, K. (1991). The art gallery theorem for polygons with holes. In *32nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 39–48.
- Hornung, A., Wurm, K. M., Bennewitz, M., Stachniss, C., and Burgard, W. (2013). OctoMap: An efficient probabilistic 3D mapping framework based on octrees. *Autonomous Robots*.
- Iwerks, J. and Mitchell, J. S. (2012). The art gallery theorem for simple polygons in terms of the number of reflex and convex vertices. *Information Processing Letters*, 112(20):778–782.
- Obermeyer, K. J., Ganguli, A., and Bullo, F. (2011). Multi-agent deployment for visibility coverage in polygonal environments with holes. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 21(12):1467–1492.
- Roussillon, C., Gonzalez, A., Solà, J., Codol, J. M., Mansard, N., Lacroix, S., and Devy, M. (2011). RT-SLAM: a generic and real-time visual SLAM implementation. In *International Conference on Computer Vision Systems (ICVS)*, Sophia Antipolis, France.
- Trucco, E., Umasuthan, M., Wallace, A., and Roberto, V. (1997). Model-based planning of optimal sen-



sensor placements for inspection. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 13(2):182–194.

Zhang, L.-X., Pei, M.-T., and Jia, Y.-D. (2011). Multiview visibility estimation for image-based modeling. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 26(6):1000–1010.

