Artificial Intelligence and Vision: Visual-Inertial Odometry and Localization for Next Generation Augmented Reality

> Juho Kannala Aalto University

Joint work with A. Solin, S. Cortés, E. Rahtu, X. Li, J. Ylioinas, J. Verbeek

May 13th, 2019

Presentation outline



Motivation: Background

► What:

- **Track** the motion of the device precisely in real-time
- Localize the device with respect to a pre-built map/model

► Why:

- Needed to enable augmented reality
- Why is it challenging?





Motivation: iPhone data



Sensor fusion on smartphones

- Fusion refers to combining information from several sources
- Smartphone sensors include:
 - Accelerometer
 - Gyroscope
 - Camera
 - Magnetometer (compass)
 - GNSS (such as GPS)
 - Wi-Fi/BLE
 - Microphone



Inertial Navigation: How it could work

- Velocity is the integral of acceleration
- Position is the integral of velocity
- We can observe acceleration and angular velocity in the mobile phone





Inertial navigation: Why it does not work

- All inertial navigation systems suffer from integration drift
- Small errors in measurement of acceleration and angular velocity ...
- Progressively larger errors in velocity...
- Even greater errors in position.

Inertial navigation: Why it does not work

- All inertial navigation systems suffer from integration drift
- Small errors in measurement of acceleration and angular velocity ...
- Progressively larger errors in velocity...
- Even greater errors in position.
- The dominant component in acceleration is gravity.
- Even slight error in orientation makes the gravity 'leak'.
- The sequential nature of the problem makes the errors accumulate.

Additional problems on smartphones

- IMUs are cheap and small
- Noisy and low-quality signals (biases, transients effects, alignment issues, etc.)
- Additive and multiplicative biases (not observing the absolute accelerations or rotations)
- Low sampling frequency (100 Hz vs. 2000 Hz)
- Missing data / variable sampling rate



But these are all only hardware limitations...

lnput data is the accelerometer data \mathbf{a}_k and gyroscope data ω_k .

[1] Solin A, Santiágo C, Rahtu E, Kannala J (FUSION 2018). Inertial odometry in handheld smartphones.

lnput data is the accelerometer data \mathbf{a}_k and gyroscope data ω_k .

Dynamical model:

$$egin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p}_k \ \mathbf{v}_k \ \mathbf{q}_k \end{pmatrix} = egin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{k-1} + \mathbf{v}_{k-1} \Delta t_k \ \mathbf{v}_{k-1} + [\mathbf{q}_k (ilde{\mathbf{a}}_k + arepsilon_k^{\mathbf{a}}) \mathbf{q}_k^{\star} - \mathbf{g}] \Delta t_k \ \Omega[(ilde{\omega}_k + arepsilon_k^{\omega}) \Delta t_k] \mathbf{q}_{k-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for the position \mathbf{p}_k , velocity \mathbf{v}_k , and orientations \mathbf{q}_k over time steps t_k .

[1] Solin A, Santiágo C, Rahtu E, Kannala J (FUSION 2018). Inertial odometry in handheld smartphones.

lnput data is the accelerometer data \mathbf{a}_k and gyroscope data ω_k .

Dynamical model:

$$egin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p}_k \ \mathbf{v}_k \ \mathbf{q}_k \end{pmatrix} = egin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{k-1} + \mathbf{v}_{k-1} \Delta t_k \ \mathbf{v}_{k-1} + [\mathbf{q}_k (ilde{\mathbf{a}}_k + arepsilon_k^{\mathbf{a}}) \mathbf{q}_k^{\star} - \mathbf{g}] \Delta t_k \ \Omega[(ilde{\omega}_k + arepsilon_k^{\omega}) \Delta t_k] \mathbf{q}_{k-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for the position \mathbf{p}_k , velocity \mathbf{v}_k , and orientations \mathbf{q}_k over time steps t_k .

A (non-linear) Kalman filter combines the model with the data in a probabilistic way.

[1] Solin A, Santiágo C, Rahtu E, Kannala J (FUSION 2018). Inertial odometry in handheld smartphones.

Additional constraints are required.

- This framework can use:
 - Zero-velocity updates
 - Position fixes
 - Loop-closures
 - Barometric air pressure for relative height
 - Indirect orientation info
 - ...

A pseudo-constraint keeping the velocity component from exploding

Example studies

Equipment used:

- Off-the-shelf iPhone
- Sensors:
 - Gyroscope, accelerometer
 - Sampling rate: 100 Hz
- Computations:
 - Off-line

...but can (of course) be done on the device

Example: With position fixes



Note: The camera is *not* used at all.

Example



Example



Visual-inertial odometry

- Combining visual and inertial data for odometry
- Constraints from visual features seen in consecutive frames
- Strengths over visual-only:
 - Infer the true scale
 - Survive from occlusions



Problems on smartphones

 Small field-of-view (monocular camera)



Google Tango FOV

Problems on smartphones

 Small field-of-view (monocular camera)



iPhone FOV

Problems on smartphones

- Small field-of-view (monocular camera)
- Rolling-shutter camera (not optimised for VIO)
- Limited processing power (maybe not that limited...)
- Handheld movement (different from a drone/robot)
- Full occlusions (the camera might be covered)
- No control of environment (moving objects, feature-poor)





PROBABILISTIC INERTIAL-VISUAL ODOMETRY

- Previous methods tend to be developed visual-first (and in this case visual information is bad)
- Treats visual information as a signal of opportunity
- Information hidden within the noise
- The camera provides bursts of high-quality odometry (recognise those bursts!)
- A calibrated IMU can provide good long-range results (learn the calibration online!)

[2] Solin A, Santiágo C, Rahtu E, Kannala J (WACV 2018). PIVO: Probabilistic Inertial-Visual Odometry for Occlusion-Robust Navigation

PIVO

- State space model (solvable by EKF)
- Dynamics driven by the IMU (alike the inertial odometry)
- Pose augmentation on every new frame
- Visual update performed per feature track
- Suspicious visual updates rejected (if not agreeing with the uncertainties)



City-wide example



City-wide example



Recap - inertial-visual odometry

- Principled approach for fusing inertial and visual information
- Robustness to occlusion and dynamic objects in the scene
- Comparable with state-ofthe-art in ideal scenes
- Improved performance in challenging conditions



Tracking provides relative motion of the device



- Tracking provides relative motion of the device
- Track must be aligned with a map to obtain global coordinates



- Tracking provides relative motion of the device
- Track must be aligned with a map to obtain global coordinates
- This can be solved using deep learning



Image courtesy of Kendall et al.

Kendall, Grimes & Cipolla: PoseNet: A Convolutional Network for Real-Time 6-DOF Camera Relocalization. ICCV 2015

- Given training images, we compute the corresponding camera poses and a point cloud representing the 3D scene structure (= visual map)
 - This is called structure-from-motion (cf. VisualSfM, COLMAP)



Image courtesy of Kendall et al.

- Given training images, we compute the corresponding camera poses and a point cloud representing the 3D scene structure (= visual map)
 - This is called structure-from-motion (cf. VisualSfM, COLMAP)
- At test time, the task is to estimate the camera pose (3D location + 3D orientation) for a query image with respect to the visual map

Scene coordinate regression

We train a fully convolutional neural network (CNN) for regressing the scene coordinates (X,Y,Z) for all pixels



Scene coordinate regression

- We train a fully convolutional neural network (CNN) for regressing the scene coordinates (X,Y,Z) for all pixels
- We compute the camera pose by solving the perspective-n-point problem from the resulting 2D-to-3D matches using RANSAC (i.e. CNN maps the 2D pixel coordinates to 3D scene coordinates)



Angle-based single-view reprojection loss

- We propose angle-based reprojection loss for optimizing the CNN
- The angle between the rays corresponding to true (X') and predicted (X) scene coordinates is minimized for all pixels in all training images
- This formulation does not require a 3D scene model, training images with poses are sufficient!



State-of-the-art results for 7-Scenes dataset















Localization of each frame in a test video (no tracking)



Brachmann & Rother (CVPR 2018)

Ours

Li et al.: Scene coordinate regression with angle-based reprojection loss for camera relocalization. ECCVW 2018

Conclusion

- Contributions for both tracking and localization:
 - Probabilistic inertial-visual odometry for occlusion-robust navigation
 - Scene coordinate regression with angle-based reprojection loss
- Ultimately, tracking and localization should be integrated

Conclusion

- Contributions for both tracking and localization:
 - Probabilistic inertial-visual odometry for occlusion-robust navigation
 - Scene coordinate regression with angle-based reprojection loss
- Ultimately, tracking and localization should be integrated
- Potential for impact in various areas:
 - More robust and precise navigation for autonomous machines (drones, robots, vehicles)
 - Improved inside-out tracking for virtual reality glasses
 - 3D-aware mobile applications (e.g. for measurement purposes)
 - Immersive augmented reality applications for smartphones

Bibliography

[1] Solin A, Cortes S, Rahtu E, Kannala J (2018).
Inertial odometry in handheld smartphones.
In International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)

[2] Solin A, Cortes S, Rahtu E, Kannala J (2018).
PIVO: Probabilistic inertial-visual odometry for occlusion-robust navigation.
In IEEE Winter Conference on Application of Computer Vision (WACV)

[3] Cortes S, Solin A, Rahtu E, Kannala J (2018). ADVIO: An authentic dataset for visual-inertial odometry. In European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)

[4] Li X, Ylioinas J, Kannala J (2018).
Full-frame scene coordinate regression for image-based localization.
In Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)

[5] Li X, Ylioinas J, Verbeek J, Kannala J (2018).
Scene coordinate regression with angle-based reprojection loss for camera relocalization.
In Geometry Meets Deep Learning ECCV Workshop

Thank you!

https://users.aalto.fi/~kannalj1/