



**F3**

**Faculty of Electrical Engineering  
Department of Computer Science**

**Master's Thesis**

## **Visual Localization with HoloLens**

**Pavel Lučivňák**

**Supervisor: doc. Ing. Tomáš Pajdla Ph.D.**

**Field of study: Artificial Intelligence**

**Subfield: Open Informatics**

**May 2020**



## Acknowledgments

TODO. Děkuji ČVUT, že mi je tak dobrou *alma mater*.

## Declaration

Prohlašuji, že jsem předloženou práci vypracoval samostatně, a že jsem uvedl veškerou použitou literaturu.

V Praze, 20. May 2020

## Abstract

TODO. Let us suppose we are given a modulus  $d$ . In [?], the main result was the extension of Newton random variables. We show that  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{r},b}(Z_{\beta,f}) \sim \bar{E}$ . The work in [?] did not consider the infinite, hyperreversible, local case. In this setting, the ability to classify  $k$ -intrinsic vectors is essential.

Let us suppose  $\mathfrak{a} > \mathfrak{c}''$ . Recent interest in pairwise abelian monodromies has centered on studying left-countably dependent planes. We show that  $\Delta \geq 0$ . It was Brouwer who first asked whether classes can be described. B. Artin [?] improved upon the results of M. Bernoulli by deriving nonnegative classes.

**Keywords:** HoloLens, localization

**Supervisor:** doc. Ing. Tomáš Pajdla  
Ph.D.  
CIIRC ČVUT,  
Jugoslávských partyzánů 1580/3,  
Praha 6 - Dejvice,  
160 00

## Abstrakt

TODO. Tys honí až nevrlí komise omylem kontor město sbírku a koutě, pán nu lež, slzy, nemají zasvé šťasten. Tetě veselá. Vem lépe ty jí cíp vrhá. Novinám prachy kabát. Býti čaj via pakujte přeli, dýt do chuf kroutí kolínský bába odkrouhnul. Flámech trofej, z co samotou úst líp pud mysel vocad víc doživotního, andulo a pakáž kadaníkovi. Čímž protiva v žába vězí duní.

Jé ní ticho vzoru. Lepší zburcují učil nepořádku zboží ní mučedník obdivem! Bas nemožné postele bys cítíte af února. Den kroku bažil dar ty plums mezník smích uživí 19 on vyšlo starostlivě. Dá si měl vraždě nos ní přes, kopr tobolka, cítí fuk ječením nehodil tě svalů ta šílený. Uf ted jaké 19 divným.

**Klíčová slova:** HoloLens, lokalizace

**Překlad názvu:** Vizuální lokalizace pro HoloLens

## Contents

<b>1 TODO</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Outline</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4 Dataset</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Reference poses.....	10
<b>5 Demo</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6 Evaluation</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>A Bibliography</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>B Project Specification</b>	<b>27</b>

## Figures

4.1 The camera and an object tracked by Vicon. The tracked coordinate system is called Omega and is visualized in subfigure 4.1a by the xyz arrows. TODO: make the images of same resolution. . . . .	11
4.2 Visualization of the HoloLens and Vicon time series. The synchronization constant must be found. Note that the sampling frequencies are vastly different. However, given a query image from HoloLens taken at some point in time, we find the corresponding Omega pose that has the nearest timestamp (after taking the synchronization constant into account). TODO: make it a vector graphics. . . . .	12
<b>4.3 Visual quality comparision of the same cutout under different FoV.</b> Top: horizontal FoV: 106.26°. Bottom: horizontal FoV: 60.00°. The image with a lower FoV contains a lot of artifacts and is of lower visual quality. . . . .	16

<b>6.1 Qualitative comparison of query localization.</b> From left to right: Query name and localization error (meters, degrees), query image, the best matching database image, synthesized view at the estimated pose, error map between the query image and the synthesized view. Green dots are the inlier matches obtained by P3P-LO-RANSAC. The query images in the 1st, 2nd, 3th and 4th row are well localized within 1.5 meters and 10.0 degrees whereas localization results in the last two rows are incorrect. All of the shown queries are OffMap, to test challenging estimation scenarios. . .	21
<b>6.2 Comparison between InLoc and InLocCIIRC</b> on their respective datasets. The x-axis describes the maximum allowed translation error. The angular threshold is set to 10°. .	22
<b>6.3 View on the floor plan of room B-315.</b> Red dots: sweeps. Blue dots: queries. Yellow dots: estimated query poses. . . . .	23
<b>6.4 View on the floor plan of room B-670.</b> Red dots: sweeps. Blue dots: queries. Yellow dots: estimated query poses. Queries 23 and 40 from room B-315 were incorrectly localized. They are positioned to the left side of this floor plan, but they are not drawn, in order to simplify this figure. . . . .	24

## Tables

4.1 Statistics of the <b>InLocCIIRC</b> dataset. . . . .	15
6.1 Pose estimation errors on query images. . . . .	20
6.2 Evaluation of performance of localization methods. The method in the first column was run on InLoc dataset. The second column method was run on InLocCIIRC dataset. Percentage rate of correctly localized queries within given threshold is shown. Angular threshold is equal to $10^\circ$ in every row. The last two columns belong to InLocCIIRC method. InMap queries are queries for which we have a similar cutout in the dataset. . . . .	21



# Chapter 1

## TODO

- Check the assignment whether it corresponds to the plan below.
- Make an outline.
- Suggest a method for localization from a image sequences.
- Evaluate and demonstrate it.
- Get queries for B-670, inspect the data, localize, evaluate.
- Localization of sequences will be based on predicting the next view from the pose obtained by localizing an initial segment of the sequence and attaching the next view(s) using the relative pose between the views provided by HoloLens pose tracking.
- Level-1: localize initial segment of length 1, evaluate, wait or this to work, ...
- Evaluate w.r.t. to the Level-0 (baseline) obtained by localizing just one image without any verification by predicting the next views. Introduce another label = not-localized.
- Level-2: localize initial segments of length  $> 1$ . How to do it? Use the maximal 1st/2nd NN ratio to select the best image in the indexing phase. Next use the sequence as a generalized camera and replace p3p with GP6P.
- Level-3: Combine images before image indexing. How to do it? We don't know as of now.
- Zadani ma byt umístěny jinde, viz email z 14.7.2020. Fyzická verze má obsahovat také podpisy.



## Chapter 2

### Outline

- Introduction.
- Relevant work with regards to HoloLens or indoor localization.
- Literature overview: NetVLAD, InLoc, Single view depth estimation, Deep depth completion.
- Newly acquired datasets - how they were build, description, statistics, examples. I need a dataset with query images and reference poses (done). I also need a dataset with query sequences and reference poses - this will be simulated by Habitat.
- Describe, demonstrate the method for query localization on the newly acquired dataset.
- Describe, demonstrate and evaluate the improved method for HoloLens localization.
- Analyze the sources of errors and inaccuracies. Analyze the influence of incorrectly constructed 3D models and its maintenance in time, this can be only done on the datasets that are not completely synthetic, i.e. queries are from real world.
- Conclusion and possible future extensions.



## **Chapter 3**

### **Introduction**

InLocCIIRC is a modification of the InLoc [1], that runs on a dataset taken at CIIRC. TODO: repeat some info about InLoc



## Chapter 4

### Dataset

The original InLoc demo is using the InLoc dataset [1], which is based on data taken at the Washington University in St. Louis (WUSTL dataset). The InLocCIIRC dataset aims to keep the same structure as the InLoc dataset.

The dataset is a result of scanning two rooms at CIIRC: the B-670 lecture hall and a room B-315. For scanning the environments, a Matterport 3D scanner is used. Let's call the environments *spaces*. This scanner is much faster to operate and cheaper than the Faro 3D scanner used in InLoc (WUSTL dataset). The disadvantage is that the resulting point cloud model tends to be of lower quality. Matterport creates a point cloud and a mesh model of each space. This is made possible by scanning the area at various locations. Let's call each such scan a *sweep*, to match the Matterport API terminology. To construct the models, RGBD panoramas are taken around the rooms. In B-670, I have taken 31 such panoramas. In B-315, I have taken 27 panoramas. Overall, there are 58 RGBD panoramas taken by Matterport 3D scanner. The scanner was mounted on a tripod at height of approximately 1.52cm and I tried to avoid walls and objects in 60cm radius.

When creating an RGBD panorama, the Matterport scanner has to revolve around yaw axis in order to capture the scene in  $360^\circ$ . For each RGBD panorama, we are given the pose of the Matterport scanner at the moment right before the rotation started. These poses are provided by Matterport, so we don't have to bother to estimate them ourselves as in [2].

Another outcome of the sweeps are RGB panoramas. Matterport does not support automatic gathering of these panoramas, so they have to be

downloaded manually for every sweep. Another problem is that these downloaded RGB panoramas are not pointing the same direction as is the initial orientation of the Matterport camera. Therefore, I have created a tool to semi-automatically find the proper orientations. This is done by

1. projecting the point cloud model so that the camera’s pose matches the sweep’s position and orientation,
2. sampling the RGB panoramas around the yaw axis and picking such a sample that best matches the projection. The matching is done by picking such a sample for which the amount of edges in a difference edge image is minimal.

This approach works well, however it may still fail in an exceptional case. Then, a user is encouraged to try 2nd lowest amount of edges, 3rd least amount and so on. Alternatively, one may try to increase the point size of projected the model. As a last resort, one can manually find the RGB panorama sample by manually rotating it via a provided script.

Once we have the RGB panoramas which are pointing the same direction as the RGBD panoramas, we can move into the next stage. Here we construct cutouts, which are projections of the RGB panoramas at a specific orientation. As in InLoc, I am sampling around the yaw axis per  $30^\circ$  under the pitch direction of  $\{-30, 0, 30\}$  degrees. The cutouts also contain information about the depth (not provided by Matterport).

The dataset contains sets of query images (queries). The first set, called s10e, was taken by a smartphone camera — via Samsung Galaxy S10e’s wide angle rear facing lens. I have taken 40 query images in a restricted area of room B-315. This room was chosen to be in the dataset, because it contains a pose estimation system called Vicon. The other two sets of queries were obtained using 1st generation HoloLens. The sets are named HoloLens1 and HoloLens2 — the suffix number indicates the sequence number. The major difference between s10e and HoloLens query datasets is that the queries from HoloLens form a sequence of images, as the user walked around the room. The sequential nature of those query datasets shall be leveraged, and data from multiple cameras may be used for a higher precision pose estimation of a current frame.

All of the query images were taken in this area, so that their reference pose is known. No queries were taken in room B-670, as it would be time

consuming to estimate the reference poses manually (or creating a program that does this). Hence, its only purpose is to serve as a confuser.

The queries in the s10e set have a pixel resolution  $4032 \times 3024$ . InLoc demo requires the knowledge of focal length of the camera that was used when taking the query images. I found conflicting information about the S10e's field of view (FoV) online, and the focal length didn't add up. TODO: talk about a similar problem with HL. I ended up computing the focal length manually with the help of a tripod and a ruler. The focal length turned out to be 3172 pixels. The IDs of query images are sorted in a non-decreasing difficulty, e.g. queries with IDs 1 to 10 were taken such that the camera's direction vector is roughly parallel with the floor. Queries with higher IDs have the camera rotated on a tripod under any direction.

The HoloLens queries have a pixel resolution of  $1344 \times 756$  pixels and according to the official documentation, the horizontal FoV is  $67^\circ$ . However, looking at the data generated while capturing the sequences, HoloLens provides a cameraProjectionTransform matrix. According to an article, the effective hFoV can be computed as

$$\text{hFoV} = 2 * \arctan\left(\frac{1}{\text{cameraProjectionTransform.m11}}\right), \quad (4.1)$$

which gives the value of 65.83 degrees.

The sweeps, used to construct the point cloud model, were taken on Thursday/Friday midnight. The s10e query images were taken on a Monday morning 3 days later. Note that there was a weekend within these days, meaning the scene didn't change a lot during that time. The reason the query images were taken later was to test what happens when items such as chair, lighting and people move around or change.

The two HoloLens sequences were captured about three weeks later. This means the environment was more challenging to worth it, because it has changed from the state in which it was scanned by Matterport.

Alignments define the pose of individual sweeps within the space they are in. Because the poses are given to us from Matterport, we do not need to perform the generalized iterative closest point (GICP) step, as in InLoc. Because Matterport gives us an entire model (point cloud and mesh) of each scanned space, we do need to consider alignments at all. They were useful

in InLoc, where there were individual point clouds for sweeps and thus the 3D coordinates of the points projecting onto cutouts were wrt the sweep coordinate system.

In InLoc, there are point cloud models for every sweep. On the contrary, in InLocCIIRC we have a model for each space.


The InLoc demo requires the knowledge of scores between every pair of a query image and a cutout image. An individual score describes similarity between the two images. When the demo is run, InLoc chooses, for each query, top N cutouts with the highest scores. The other cutouts will not be considered. It is thus quite important that these scores are relevant. NetVLAD [3] descriptors are computed for both cutouts and query images. The features are the output of the L2 normalization layer. A score between a query image and a cutout is computed using a dot product between the two feature vectors. Note that the similarity scores of cutouts for a query do not represent a probability distribution, and thus don't need to sum up to one. The code for doing so was not provided in InLoc, so I came up with an implementation that reuses existing InLoc MATLAB components. The resulting scores seem to be meaningful, but a reference implementation would have been better.

## 4.1 Reference poses

For every query we need to know its reference pose, in order to evaluate how accurate the pose estimation algorithms are. The pose of the cameras used to take the query pictures in query sets was also being tracked by a pose estimation system – Vicon. Figure 4.1a shows the s10e camera (thus also its coordinate system) and a coordinate system that is being tracked by Vicon. Let the latter coordinate system be called Omega.

Let's now focus on a more difficult scenario, which is the reference pose determination of the HoloLens queries. There are three reasons why the reference poses cannot be simply taken from the Vicon tracking:

1. camera pose and Omega are widely different,
2. the Vicon coordinate system differs from the World coordinate system,



**(a)** : s10e camera and an object being tracked by Vicon. TODO: replace drawings with straight arrows.

**(b)** : HoloLens camera and an object being tracked by Vicon.


**Figure 4.1:** The camera and an object tracked by Vicon. The tracked coordinate system is called Omega and is visualized in subfigure 4.1a by the xyz arrows. TODO: make the images of same resolution.

3. Vicon started tracking before HoloLens was run, as visualized in figure 4.2.

Luckily, the second issue turned out to be easily mitigated. I have been told where the origin of the Vicon coordinate system is. And by experimentation, the rotation matrix that converts Vicon bases to World bases was found. Because the Vicon bases and World bases are aligned to the room (i.e. a basic vector is parallel with the floor or the walls), the rotation matrix can be represented by a simple rotation.

The transformation from Omega to camera is considered to be a constant (for all queries in a query set), because the tracking device is securely attached to the camera. One could manually estimate that transformation and visually evaluate how close the model projection is to the original query image. However, this approach is prone to errors. Instead, a quantitative approach was employed, which I describe next.

For a particular query set, we need to manually set up the reference pose for a small number of queries. I used 6 of them in HoloLens1. Let these queries be called *interesting* queries. For such a query, we manually find 9 2D-3D correspondences. The 2D correspondences are carefully chosen, such that they actually represent the same 3D point – because the 3D points were



**Figure 4.2:** Visualization of the HoloLens and Vicon time series. The synchronization constant must be found. Note that the sampling frequencies are vastly different. However, given a query image from HoloLens taken at some point in time, we find the corresponding Omega pose that has the nearest timestamp (after taking the synchronization constant into account). TODO: make it a vector graphics.

captured up to three weeks earlier than the query images and the environment has changed. For each query with the correspondences, we compute its initial reference pose using P3P. The pose returned by P3P may not be completely accurate, however.

Given reference poses for 6 queries and corresponding poses from Vicon, we can almost compute individual Omega to camera transformations. The last piece missing is a synchronization constant, to match the correct Vicon pose taken at Vicon tie with a particular query taken at HoloLens time. I created a script, `findOptimalParamsForInterestingQueries.m`, which computes the Omega to camera transformations and evaluates the reference poses quality both quantitatively (reprojection error) and visually (manually investigated by the user). Currently, user must guess a synchronization constant. Finding a reasonable synchronization constant does not take long. Alternatively, one could implement a brute-force search, where various synchronization constants are guessed and the one with lowest quantitative error is chosen. In my case this was not necessary. At the end of the script, a generic transformation is suggested, which is an average of the individual transformations. The quality of the generic transformation is again evaluated on all the 6 queries. This generic transformation and the synchronization constant are used as a baseline and are further optimized, described next.

A brute-force search is employed to find an improved version of the baseline transformation and synchronization constant in nearby space. First, an improved synchronization constant is estimated, by simply evaluating the interesting queries on the same transformation but for different synchronization constants, that are close to the baseline constant. Then, different transformations are being tried. An Omega to camera transformation is described by a 3D translation vector and a 3x3 rotation matrix. Note that

this rotation matrix can be represented by three parameters (yaw, roll and pitch). Thus, the code iterates over predefined values of the 6 parameters, such that every combination is tried. For each combination, the reprojection error is computed and stored for later. The parameters are continuous, but I try a sequence of values nearby the baseline value, where the offset is a constant. When it comes to the translation parameters, I have had good experience with trying 17 values, where the middle value is the baseline. The offset was 0.023 Matterport meters. Each orientation parameter was evaluated on 11 values with even offsets, where the middle value was the baseline. The offset was  $0.5^\circ$ . Overall, the brute-force search is very time consuming, taking about 20 hours on a machine capable of processing 45 threads at once. Optionally, one can iterate over 5 synchronization constant values, for even more optimal parameters to be found. Of course, by doing that, the search will take asymptotically 5 times as much time and memory resources. TODO: some example data of how much the brute force search improves the reprojection error.

The resulting reference poses are not perfectly matching ground truth poses, which can be seen when projecting the reference poses and comparing the results with the query images. I have created the following procedure in order to estimate the mean translation and orientation error (reference vs ground truth poses). Although we do not know the true ground truth poses, one can use the poses from HoloLens. According to TODO:citation, the poses estimated by HoloLens have the following mean accuracy with respect to the ground truth poses:

- $1.6 \pm 0.2$  cm translation error,
- $2.2 \pm 0.3^\circ$  orientation error.

Notice that namely the the translation error is very low. To estimate the quality of my reference poses wrt ground truth poses, I consider the HoloLens poses as the ground truth poses. However, because the poses from HoloLens are wrt some unknown HoloLens coordinate system, I first need to convert those poses to be wrt World. To achieve this, I use procrustes TODO:citation, which find a linear transformation from one coordinate system to another (translation, rotation, scale), given corresponding 3D points. In my case, the 3D points are simply the camera centers. Procrustes minimizes the sum of squared errors of points in the same coordinate system. After the conversion, we have ground truth estimates. Using these, we can compute the mean reference vs ground truth pose errors, which is:

- 15 cm translation error,

- $2.09^\circ$  orientation error.

These errors may be either an upper bound on the real mean errors, but they can also be approximately the true mean errors. As you can see, the translation error is significant. This causes trouble, because it is not clear whether my method is better or worse than the poses provided by HoloLens themselves. **TODO: evaluate estimated poses by procruses with poses from HoloLens** (if the queries are from HoloLens). Note that in case of s10e queries, the reference poses seem to have a lower error wrt ground truth. However, because we do not know the ground truth and no HoloLens poses are available here, I cannot quantitatively evaluate it.

The query images can be split into two categories — InMap and OffMap. An InMap query is such a query, for which we have a cutout that has a similar pose. I have defined the pose similarity as:

- the translation difference is less than 1.3 meters,
- the angular difference between reference and retrieved rotation matrices is at most 10 degrees. **TODO: elaborate.**

The set of s10e queries consists of 5 InMap queries and 35 OffMap queries. The set of HoloLens1 queries consists of 111 InMap queries and 239 OffMap queries. The HoloLens2 does not have up to date reference poses. According to an outdated result, it contains 48 InMap and 570 OffMap queries.

The entire dataset, including the output of the InLocCIIRC demo, takes up to TODO GB of disk space.


The dataset statistics are depicted in table 4.1. Notice that the horizontal field of view of database cutout images is widely different from the query FoVs. When I tried to generate the dataset, such that the cutouts have horizontal FoV of 60 degrees, the resulting pose estimation accuracy became 0%. **TODO:** that might been caused by that densePE bug, re-run it. I have spent a significant time investigating why this is happening, and came to the conclusion that the problem is in the data. When one creates a cutout of a lower FoV, smaller portion of the  $360^\circ$  panorama gets rendered. This also means that the visual quality of the image decreases. I believe that the quality of such cutouts is not good enough for the convolutional neural network to generate reasonable feature descriptors. Figure 4.3 illustrates this

Type	Number	Image size [px]	Horizontal FoV [°]
Query - s10e	40	4,032×3,024	64.86
Query - HoloLens1	350	1344×756	65.83
Query - HoloLens2	618	1344×756	65.83
Cutout	2,088	1,600×1,200	106.26

**Table 4.1:** Statistics of the **InLocCIIRC** dataset.

problem. It seems that there is nothing we can do about it, since the pixel density of each 360° panorama is determined by Matterport. It is, however, true that one could experiment with other FoV values. Such experiments were not conducted here, as regenerating the dataset and then uploading it to an evaluation server takes a lot of time (one day is not an exception).

TODO: how are reflective surfaces handled? TODO: describe the steps taken in dataset construction tool, maybe also some technical details.



**Figure 4.3:** Visual quality comparision of the same cutout under different FoV. Top: horizontal FoV:  $106.26^\circ$ . Bottom: horizontal FoV:  $60.00^\circ$ . The image with a lower FoV contains a lot of artifacts and is of lower visual quality.

## Chapter 5

### Demo

InLoc [1] authors provide a demonstration in MATLAB that operates on the InLoc dataset. I have taken this demonstration and adjusted it, so that it works on the InLocCIIRC dataset instead. I have added an evaluation script, that was missing from the original code. Although the evaluation of InLoc is handled by [visuallocalization.net](#), this tool of course doesn't handle the newly created InLocCIIRC dataset yet.

The entire InLocCIIRC demo has to run on a machine with a GPU. This is because we are using inference of NetVLAD neural network, which would take much longer on a CPU. This restriction is present in InLoc demo as well.

One difference from the original InLoc is that I am using a mesh model projection instead of a point cloud projection in the point verification step. This is because the code for point cloud projection did not support variable point size. Because the model is dense (compared to Faro 3D scanner), the projection can sometimes see through pillars or objects that are close to the camera. This is not desirable, as seeing what is behind the object can result in a different NetVLAD descriptor that is not similar to the query image.



## Chapter 6

### Evaluation


In order to measure how the InLocCIIRC algorithm is performing, I have measured the percentage of correctly localized poses within a threshold from a reference pose. Position difference threshold is one of the following values, with decreasing difficulty: 0.25m, 0.50m, 1.00m. Angular threshold is set to 10°. Table 6.1 shows the errors in pose estimation for individual queries. Rows with a NaN entry mean that densePE returned a NaN P matrix. Translation error 666.00 signals that the estimated pose was in a different space than the reference query pose. Table 6.2 shows the performance under the various thresholds. The InMap/OffMap performance is also shown. Figure 6.2 shows how the localization accuracy changes given increasing translation error threshold.

Figure 6.1 shows example queries, how they are being processed and what is the localization result.

Figures 6.3 and 6.4 depict the dataset including the localization results.

Query ID	InMap	Translation [m]	Orientation [°]
1	Yes	0.09	1.58
2	Yes	0.30	2.30
3	No	1.36	7.83
4	Yes	0.06	0.92
5	Yes	0.10	1.54
6	No	0.34	3.82
7	Yes	0.15	1.35
8	No	0.12	1.10
9	No	0.22	1.41
10	No	0.16	0.90
11	No	0.07	0.84
12	No	0.47	1.88
13	No	0.27	4.40
14	No	0.13	1.54
15	No	0.12	0.75
16	No	19.74	177.21
17	No	0.20	3.29
18	No	0.10	0.88
19	No	1.06	6.97
20	No	0.24	1.50
21	No	0.21	1.76
22	No	0.18	2.28
23	No	666.00	NaN
24	No	4.15	175.03
25	No	0.09	0.41
26	No	6.09	179.05
27	No	NaN	NaN
28	No	0.20	1.80
29	No	0.08	1.09
30	No	0.87	4.45
31	No	0.65	2.50
32	No	666.00	22.42
33	No	666.00	89.10
34	No	1.88	16.56
35	No	1.50	151.26
36	No	666.00	89.84
37	No	NaN	NaN
38	No	0.13	1.27
39	No	666.00	91.82
40	No	666.00	NaN


**Table 6.1:** Pose estimation errors on query images.




**Figure 6.1:** Qualitative comparison of query localization. From left to right: Query name and localization error (meters, degrees), query image, the best matching database image, synthesized view at the estimated pose, error map between the query image and the synthesized view. Green dots are the inlier matches obtained by P3P-LO-RANSAC. The query images in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th row are well localized within 1.5 meters and 10.0 degrees whereas localization results in the last two rows are incorrect. All of the shown queries are OffMap, to test challenging estimation scenarios.

Threshold	InLoc	<b>InLocCIIRC</b>	InMap	OffMap
0.25m	38.9%	<b>47.5%</b>	80.00%	42.86%
0.50m	56.5%	<b>57.5%</b>	100.00%	51.43%
1.00m	<b>69.9%</b>	62.5%	100.00%	57.14%


**Table 6.2:** Evaluation of performance of localization methods. The method in the first column was run on InLoc dataset. The second column method was run on InLocCIIRC dataset. Percentage rate of correctly localized queries within given threshold is shown. Angular threshold is equal to  $10^\circ$  in every row. The last two columns belong to InLocCIIRC method. InMap queries are queries for which we have a similar cutout in the dataset.



**Figure 6.2:** Comparison between InLoc and InLocCIIRC on their respective datasets. The x-axis describes the maximum allowed translation error. The angular threshold is set to  $10^\circ$ .



**Figure 6.3:** View on the floor plan of room B-315. Red dots: sweeps. Blue dots: queries. Yellow dots: estimated query poses.



**Figure 6.4:** View on the floor plan of room B-670. Red dots: sweeps. Blue dots: queries. Yellow dots: estimated query poses. Queries 23 and 40 from room B-315 were incorrectly localized. They are positioned to the left side of this floor plan, but they are not drawn, in order to simplify this figure.

## Appendix A

### Bibliography

- [1] Taira, H.; Okutomi, M.; et al. InLoc: Indoor Visual Localization with Dense Matching and View Synthesis. In *CVPR*, 2018.
- [2] Wijmans, E.; Furukawa, Y. Exploiting 2D Floorplan for Building-scale Panorama RGBD Alignment. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*, 2017. Available from: <http://cvpr17.wijmans.xyz/CVPR2017-0111.pdf>
- [3] Arandjelović, R.; Gronat, P.; et al. NetVLAD: CNN architecture for weakly supervised place recognition. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016.



## I. Personal and study details

Student's name: **Lučivňák Pavel** Personal ID number: **435627**  
Faculty / Institute: **Faculty of Electrical Engineering**  
Department / Institute: **Department of Computer Science**  
Study program: **Open Informatics**  
Specialisation: **Artificial Intelligence**

## II. Master's thesis details

Master's thesis title in English:

**Visual Localization with HoloLens**

Master's thesis title in Czech:

**Vizuální lokalizace pro HoloLens**

Guidelines:

- 1) Review the state of the art in indoor visual localization, see [1,2] and references therein.
- 2) Adjust method [2] to local environment and image acquisition using HoloLens. Create new 3D data set for the local environment and evaluate the accuracy of the localization w.r.t. a ground truth in that environment.
- 3) Apply InLoc localization method on data from HoloLens, evaluate behavior and inaccuracies of the localization on this data. Investigate a possibility of using multiple images for improving the localization.
- 4) Demonstrate and evaluate the improved method for HoloLens localization.

Bibliography / sources:

- [1] Arandjelović, R.; Gronat, P.; et al. NetVLAD: CNN architecture for weakly supervised place recognition. In IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2016.
- [2] Taira, H.; Okutomi, M.; et al. InLoc: Indoor Visual Localization with Dense Matching and View Synthesis. In 2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, June 2018, ISSN 1063-6919, pp. 7199–7209, doi:10.1109/CVPR.2018.00752.
- [3] Garg, R.; Kumar, B. V.; et al. Unsupervised CNN for single view depth estimation: Geometry to the rescue. In European Conference on Computer Vision, Springer, 2016, pp. 740–756.
- [4] Zhang, Y.; Funkhouser, T. Deep Depth Completion of a Single RGB-D Image. The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2018.
- [5] Van Gansbeke, W.; Neven, D.; et al. Sparse and Noisy LiDAR Completion with RGB Guidance and Uncertainty. In 2019 16th International Conference on Machine Vision Applications (MVA), IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.

Name and workplace of master's thesis supervisor:

**doc. Ing. Tomáš Pajdla, Ph.D., Applied Algebra and Geometry, CIIRC**

Name and workplace of second master's thesis supervisor or consultant:

Date of master's thesis assignment: **04.02.2020**      Deadline for master's thesis submission: **14.08.2020**

Assignment valid until: **30.09.2021**

doc. Ing. Tomáš Pajdla, Ph.D.  
Supervisor's signature

Head of department's signature

prof. Mgr. Petr Páta, Ph.D.  
Dean's signature

### III. Assignment receipt

The student acknowledges that the master's thesis is an individual work. The student must produce his thesis without the assistance of others, with the exception of provided consultations. Within the master's thesis, the author must state the names of consultants and include a list of references.

Date of assignment receipt

Student's signature