## Some techniques for agile **visual** tracking and SLAM

Georg Klein Active Vision Lab, Oxford





ISMAR 2008 Cambridge, UK

#### Research $\neq$ Real world

#### Lab environment

- Small
- Static
- Controlled lighting
- Textured surfaces
- Controlled clutter
- Expert user

#### Real world

- Large
- Ever-changing
- Variable lighting
- Blank walls
- Dynamic clutter
- Untrained user

#### Researcher vs. untrained user

- SLAM systems and trackers often need constrained camera motions
- The researchers who wrote the software understand this
- Other users often break the system

We would like a system which any untrained user can pick up and use naturally

#### Two approaches:

1. Improve frame-to-frame robustness

- Correctly track unconstrained motions
- Reduce frequency of tracker failure
- 2.Fast recovery from tracking failure
  - All trackers fail eventually
  - Make this as painless as possible

#### Frame-to-frame visual tracking

Current approaches:

1. Bottom-up detection each frame

(e.g. ARToolkit, EPFL)

2. Direct minimisation

(Usually planar target)

3. Particle Filtering

**4.Active Search** 

#### Active Search

- Based on image features such as points or lines
- Start with a prior pose from previous frame + motion model
- Unknown acceleration produces a search region in the image
- E.g.: Andrew Davison's EKF-SLAM



#### Active search regions in EKF-SLAM

#### Active Search Advantages

- Fast:
  - Only look at interesting parts of image
  - Naturally culls outliers
- Probabilistically sound
  - Can include both acceleration and map uncertainty

# Active Search Example: 10-pixel search region



# Active Search Example: 40-pixel search region



#### Search range compromise

- Rapid accelerations require large search regions
  - Introduce outliers
  - Outliers produce jitter and tracking failure
  - Slow to process





Large region: Three matches

#### **Robust Estimation Techniques**

- Random Sample Consensus (RANSAC / MLESAC)
- Joint Compatibility Branch & Bound (JCBB)
- M-Estimators

### **M-Estimators**

- Modify cost function from L2 norm
- Reduce influence of outliers
- Fit neatly into standard least-squares minimisation methods



#### M-Estimators: 5 measurements, no outliers



#### M-Estimators: 5 measurements, 1 outlier



#### M-Estimators: 5 measurements, 1 outlier



#### Large search range, M-Estimator



#### Large search range, M-Estimator

- M-Estimators work best with many measurements
- .. but large search range is expensive!
- Also motion blur destroys small patches

#### Large image patches

- Larger patches more resilient to repetition, blur
- ... but are slow to compute!
- Solution: Use an image pyramid



Four levels from 640x480 to 80x60







## Library of Congress: 2007907005 8x8 pixel patches at different levels

Los Alamitos, CA 90720-1514

Published by the IEEE Con 10062 Los Vaquetos Orde

P O 80x 1014

1000

IEEE Catalog Number CEPOTIMAR.PRT ISBN: 976-1-4244-1749-0 Lebrary J.C.

### Coarse-to-fine tracking

- Find largest features with a large search radius
- Compute rough pose estimate from these
- Then search for small features with much tighter radius

#### **Coarse-to-fine tracking**



#### Coarse-to-fine tracking

- Fast to process and *reasonably* robust
- Implemented in a SLAM system for ISMAR 2007
- Source code available:

http://www.robots.ox.ac.uk/~gk/PTAM

Image degradation: no motion

Image degradation: moderate motion

#### Image degradation: rapid motion

### Tracking with Motion Blur

- Need features which are trackable despite blur
- Large image patches somewhat OK..
- Also use **Edges**

## Edge Tracking

- Well-studied problem
- Very fast: real-time since 1989! (Harris' RAPID)
- Active search is **1-dimensional** along edge normal
- Downside: poor data association



## Edge Tracking with Blur

• Typically some edges will still be un-blurred!



## Edge Tracking with Blur

- Typically some edges will still be un-blurred!
- We can even track the blurred ones:
  - Predict amount of blur
  - Use matched filter to detect blurred edge



## Edges in SLAM

- Use short, locally straight segments: "**Edgelets**" (Introduced by Eade & Drummond 2006)
- Add these to Klein & Murray 2007
  - Used along-side point features
  - Triangulate from key-frames with Canny detector
  - Adapt for motion blur

### Edges in SLAM: Limitations

- High velocities are now OK...
- ... but sudden accelerations are still a problem!
  - These cause **unpredicted** blur
  - Edge detection fails!
- Mostly caused by fast saccades (snappy camera rotations)

- Solution: rapidly guess rotation between every frame
- Assume only rotation
- Direct 3-DOF image-to-image minimisation

• Sub-sample two frames to 40x30 pixels



• Sub-sample two frames to 40x30 pixels



• Apply Gaussian blur with 0.75 pixel sigma



• Apply Gaussian blur with 0.75 pixel sigma

















• Transform this 2D warp to a 3D rotation



- Solution: rapidly guess rotation between every frame
- Assume only rotation
- Direct 3-DOF image-to-image minimisation
- Very fast: 0.5ms for subsample, blur, and 10 iterations of ESM tracking

## Recovery from Tracking Failure

- Even the most robust visual tracker can fail (Just cover the lens with your hand!)
- A rapid failure recovery method is essential
- Some trackers do this the whole time:
  - ARToolkit
  - EPFL's tracking-by-detection
- Frame-to-frame trackers need separate procedure

- One approach is to relocalise from map features
- E.g. Williams et al ICCV'07

- One approach is to relocalise from map features
- E.g. Williams et al ICCV'07



1. Classify corner points in new view

- One approach is to relocalise from map features
- E.g. Williams et al ICCV'07



1. Classify corner points in new view

- One approach is to relocalise from map features
- E.g. Williams et al ICCV'07



2. Use RANSAC and 3-point-pose to calculate camera pose

- Fairly wide-spread approach
- Many classifiers/matchers used:
  - Williams et al ICCV'07: Randomised Trees
  - Eade & Drummond BMVC'08: Light-weight SIFT + BOW
  - Checklov et al BMVC'08: Haar wavelets
  - Calonder et al ECCV'08: Pre-learned Randomised Trees

- Fairly wide-spread approach
- Many classifiers/matchers used:
  - Williams et al ICCV'07: Randomised Trees
  - Eade & Drummond BMVC'08: Light-weight SIFT + BOW
  - Checklov et al BMVC'08: Haar wavelets
  - Calonder et al ECCV'08: Pre-learned Randomised Trees
- All fairly complex

### **Trivial** Relocalisation for SLAM

- Exploit the presence of keyframes
  - Know pose of each keyframe
  - Have image of each keyframe
- Compare current frame to all keyframe
- Set pose to the best match
- Optimise rotation



### Raw Keyframe

## 40x30 sub-sampled keyframe

### Blurred subsampled keyframe = Descriptor



### 100 keyframes



## Query view



#### Query view: best match



#### Align best match and re-start tracker

### Trivial Relocalisation for SLAM

- Fast: **1.5ms** with 250 keyframes
- Predictable: works when camera near old pose
- Sensitive to scene changes
- Cannot relocalise upside-down

- Can get reasonable performance from a single camera, using active search + initialisation
- Could go further with extra sensors..
  .. or even just fiducials
- Have not addressed other challenges:
  - Ligthing, clutter, occlusions, dynamic objects..

## Some techniques for agile visual tracking and SLAM

Georg Klein Active Vision Lab, Oxford

