Efficient Panorama Database Indexing for Indoor Localization

Jean-Baptiste Boin

Stanford University jbboin@stanford.edu

Dmytro Bobkov

Technical University of Munich dmytro.bobkov@tum.de

Eckehard Steinbach

Technical University of Munich eckehard.steinback@tum.de

Bernd Girod

Stanford University bgirod@stanford.edu

Indoor Localization

- Task: panorama retrieval using a single query image
- Goal is fast coarse localization; can be used as a first pass for a more complex fine localization system
- Query/database asymmetry



System design



3

Retrieval with descriptor aggregation



4

Contributions

- Systematic evaluation of view sampling and aggregation
 - Fine sampling of panoramas + descriptor aggregation is preferred to coarse sampling
 - Pooling descriptors with Generalized Max Pooling (GMP) is superior to mean pooling
- Speed up search with hierarchical index based on the location and orientation of the views

5

Background – Image representation

- Traditional pipeline: hand-crafted features
 - > Local patch representation: SIFT [Lowe, '04]
 - Global descriptor:
 - Bag of Words (BoW) [Sivic et al., '03]
 - Fisher Vectors [Perronnin et al., '07]
- CNN-based features
 - > Representations extracted from networks trained on other tasks
 - > Can be fine-tuned for improved results



Background – Descriptor aggregation

- Generalized max-pooling (GMP) [Murray et al., '14]
 - Increased similarity to ALL descriptors



7

Background – Indexing and search

- Task: Nearest Neighbor (NN) search
 - > Database: $X = \{x_1, ..., x_N\}$, with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $||x_i||^2 = 1$
 - > Query: $\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|\boldsymbol{q}\|^2 = 1$
 - > Find *i* that maximizes $q^{T}x_{i}$
 - > Exhaustive search: O(Nd)
- High dimensional exact NN search is hard
 - > When $d \ge 10$, no gains compared to exhaustive search [Weber et al., '98]
- Approximate Nearest Neighbor (ANN) techniques:
 - > Space-partitioning techniques: FLANN [Muja et al., '14]

Technical University of Munich

8

System design



9

View sampling

- Rationale: higher similarity when matching with limited FoV queries
- Vertical sampling
 - Sampled at elevations -30°, 0°, 30°
- Horizontal sampling
 - Sampling rate of 48 (step = 7.5°)
 - Considerable overlap between views
- 144 views per panorama



System design



11 Technical University of Munich

Descriptor extraction



Evaluation

- Similarity between query and database descriptors computed from L2 distance (order is equivalent to cosine similarity)
- Convert list of views to list of panoramas by keeping the first occurrence of each panorama
- Evaluate average precision for the query

Datasets

- WUSTL Indoor RGBD dataset [Wijmans et al., '17]
 - 129 geo-localized panoramas captured in a university building



- Matterport3D dataset [Chang et al., '17]
 - Used as distractors



Datasets

- InLoc dataset [Taira et al., '18]
 - > 329 queries
 - Same building as the WUSTL dataset
 - Captured at a different time and on a different camera (iPhone)
 - 6DoF manually verified reference poses
- Total of 693 panoramas per query









Stanford University

5 Technical University of Munich

Results (baseline)



16 Technical University of Munich

System design



17 Technical University of Munich

 Rationale: reduce effective size of database (number of descriptors compared per query) while keeping the performance high



Sub-sampling

Aggregation

elevation



Aggregation (1,1)

19 Technical University of Munich

elevation



Aggregation (4,1)

20 Technical University of Munich

elevation



Aggregation (8,1)

21 Technical University of Munich

elevation



Aggregation (4,3)

22 Technical University of Munich

elevation



Sub-sampling (8,1)

23 Technical University of Munich

elevation



Sub-sampling (4,3)

24 Technical University of Munich

Results (pre-processing)



- Aggregation offers better trade-offs than sub-sampling
- GMP is preferable to MP when aggregating many dissimilar descriptors

25 Technical University of Munich

System design



26 Technical University of Munich

Indexing

- Hierarchical aggregation: best of both worlds
 - > Upper levels: coarse search = large complexity gains
 - > Lower levels: fine search = higher retrieval performance
- Node: set of database descriptors; leaf: single database descriptors
- Index search:
 - > Compute distance of a query with all children of the root
 - > Pick node with lowest distance; put other nodes in priority queue
 - > Continue until reaching leaf node
 - > Pull node with lowest distance in priority queue and recurse
- Early stopping: allows exploration of cost/accuracy trade-off

Indexing

- Data-based hierarchy (DBH)
 - > Based on k-means tree algorithm in FLANN [Muja et al., '14]
 - Choose branching factor B
 - Recursive k-means until each cluster contains < B descriptors
 - Internal node descriptors:
 - Pooled with GMP
 - Normalized
- Geometry-based hierarchy (GBH)
 - > Based on view orientation
 - + room-level aggregation



Results (DBH)



- Modifications to FLANN are critical for an acceptable performance
- 29 Technical University of Munich

Results (GBH)



- Importance of pre-processing (last stage of the hierarchy)
- 30 Technical University of Munich

Results (Summary) 374 descriptors/query ~50k descriptors/query 42 40 mAP (%) , 80 133x complexity reduction 44x Зx 34 Sub-sampling (exh. search) Aggregation (exh. search) 32 DBH GBH 30 + 10² 10³ 104 10⁵ #descriptor comparisons

31 Technical University of Munich

Conclusions

Reducing database size through pre-processing by aggregating neighboring views (3x speed increase)

GMP provides a better representation for a set of descriptors

Faster search by nesting multiple aggregation levels (44x speed increase)

Code available on GitHub: https://github.com/jbboin/panorama-indexing-localization

Stanford University

Technical University of Munich

Questions?