Virtual Planning and Testing of AUV Paths for Underwater Photogrammetry
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Abstract: We introduce a system for automatically generating paths for autonomous underwater vehicles which optimize views of a site of interest. These paths can then be used to survey and map underwater sites of interest using photogrammetry. Paths are generated in a virtual world by a single-query probabilistic roadmap algorithm that quickly covers the configuration space and generates small maps with good coverage. The objective function used to compute the paths measures an approximate view coverage by casting rays from the virtual view to test for intersections with the region of interest, with added weight for views with high information gain. The motion planning algorithm was implemented in a virtual world that includes the ability to test paths and acquire views of the virtual scene for evaluation prior to real world deployment. To measure the effectiveness of our paths versus the commonly used pre-packaged lawnmower paths, photogrammetry reconstructions were compared using CloudCompare. The 3D reconstructions created from the views along the paths generated by our algorithm were more detailed and showed better coverage, creating point clouds with a mean distance between points ranging from 1.5 to 2.3 times better than that of the lawnmower pattern.

1 INTRODUCTION

Searching for archaeological sites underwater involves time consuming field work and expensive equipment. A common approach is to select a large area to explore then conduct a survey, for example using a towfish for sonar mapping from a boat. Sonar data is then analyzed by experts (or intelligent systems (Rutledge et al., 2018)) which rank potential sites of interest. The sites are revisited, for example, by an accomplished human dive team or remotely operated vehicles (ROVs).

A potentially safer and less expensive solution is the use of Autonomous Underwater Vehicles (AUVs) for both survey and site mapping. The work presented here focuses on the problem of developing good paths for the AUV to map a site for photogrammetry reconstructions using an on-board goPro camera. The goal is to acquire good camera views of the site of interest for reconstructions. Building from an initial sonar scan which is used to determine the extents of the site of interest, our algorithm creates paths for the AUV to map the site. A set of the video image frames is then used for photogrammetry to create a 3D reconstruction which can be used for educational and site monitoring purposes.

In general, determining the path for an autonomous vehicle has applications to many fields. Our specific path planning algorithm prioritizes collecting images of all sides of a region of interest with good coverage by using a probabilistic roadmap algorithm. The path planning algorithm takes into account the geometry of the site of interest and general physical constraints of the AUV's movement. The objective function weights potential positions based on the view of the on-board camera of the region of interest.

We present our path planning algorithm and a virtual world testbed, where various paths can be tested and compared. A virtual camera collects images along the automatically generated paths and those images are then used to create 3D models and point clouds using photogrammetry. Most AUVs include easy to use motion planning for surveys in the form of ‘lawnmower’ patterns. To measure the effectiveness of our paths versus the commonly used pre-packaged lawnmower paths, the 3D models and point clouds
created from the different paths were compared. The paths generated by our algorithm captured images resulting in 3D reconstruction which were more detailed and showed better coverage of the site of interest than those from the lawnmower pattern. Our work is primarily focused on underwater shipwrecks, thus, our testbed includes a simple boat model. A comparison of the side profiles of an original virtual boat model, the 3D model created from images captured along the lawnmower pattern, and the 3D model generated from images along the path computed by our algorithm is shown in Figure 6.

1.1 Field Work and Motivation

This path planning work arose from extensive field work in the coastal waters of Malta (Wu et al., 2019; Rutledge et al., 2018; von Fock et al., 2017a). Initial work using a 2D bounding box, seen in Figure 1 on real sonar data, showed promising results for reconstructions. See Figure 2 for a reconstruction of a World War 2 shipwreck created from the initial 2D bounding box paths. Due to time, weather and cost limitations to deployments, this virtual testbed was developed to test and evaluate further motion planning.

Figure 1: An example of the 2D bounding box of a region of interest produced from field deployments (see (Wu et al., 2019; Rutledge et al., 2018; von Fock et al., 2017a) for more information).

2 RELATED WORKS

Motion planning for robots is well studied (Dudek and Jenkin, 2010; Demofox, 2015; Alcazar et al., 2011) with this work building on many of the prior algorithms. Garau, Alvarez, and Oliver introduce a heuristic cost function that estimates the time the AUV would need to travel from one grid point to the next (Garau et al., 2006). Rao and Williams present a rapidly-exploring random tree (RRT) algorithm to plan collision-free paths for an underwater glider in 3D space (Rao and Williams, 2009). Tan, Sutton, and Chudley also propose a RRT algorithm to plan collision-free paths in three-dimensions while also accounting for vehicle dynamics (Tan et al., 2017).

There is likewise a rich body of work addressing the field of photogrammetry (Yamafune et al., 2016), and AUV path planning (Rantanen, 2014; Li and Shie, 2002; Dale and Amato, 2001; Poppinga et al., 2011; Candeloro et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2019). Viswanathan et al. implemented a motion planner with an RRT with a goal similar to ours (Viswanathan et al., 2017). Our work was also influenced by a probabilistic roadmap planning algorithm to generate virtual camera paths for fly-throughs of a digital scene (Davis, 2017). And related later work (Clark et al., 2017), which aimed to create good cinematographic and geometric views. However, in this prior work, rotation is only free around one axis instead of two as in our algorithm.

Yamafune et al. share the same goal in their work as our own - to survey shipwrecks for the purpose of reconstruction (Yamafune et al., 2016), however, they use a team of professional human divers to capture their video data. It is worth noting that they recommend that divers capture many circular views for optimal reconstructions and the proposed paths look very much like a lawnmower pattern.

Dunn et al. present a path planner for autonomous vehicles with a goal of creating detailed 3D reconstructions (Dunn et al., 2009). Computer vision is used to obtain the geometric structure of the scene being reconstructed and a path with ‘the next best view’ is determined by their novel cost function that “quantifies the expected contribution of future viewing configurations”. In addition, related work includes recent work for drone trajectory optimization (Hepp et al., 2018) for an aerial path to capture data for photogrammetry.

Within the context of related work, our algorithm
is novel in its algorithmic computation of view coverage to weight roadmap nodes, tuned for the task of capturing images of all sides of a site of interest for an underwater vehicle, thereby improving coverage.

3 ALGORITHM

To generate AUV paths, this system uses a robotics motion planning algorithm - single-query probabilistic roadmaps (PRM). This algorithm quickly covers the configuration space and generates small maps with good coverage. In order to create a viable 3D reconstruction of a site of interest, it is important for the camera to capture good views of all regions. Our path planning algorithm seeks to ensure that for the discrete nodes along the path that the AUV visits, the camera is viewing significant portions of the site of interest as well as ensuring all regions of the site have been viewed. Geometric principles, primarily an approximation of how much of the main site of interest is in view of the camera, are used to set node weights and select nodes to include in the path for the AUV. Specifically, the objective function used in our algorithm measures an approximate view coverage by casting rays from the camera and intersecting them with the region of interest.

For our path planning, the algorithm solves for the motion within a virtual representation of a general volume of space (in our case, sea) surrounding the region of interest. This region of interest is identified from low resolution side scan sonar data obtained from a high altitude scan by the AUV (Rutledge et al., 2018). A bounding box is computed based on an automatically detected region of interest (Wu et al., 2019), defining both the site to be mapped as well as a no ‘fly’ zone (to prevent collisions). Assuming a mapping between real-world GPS and sonar coordinates and the virtual world, ultimately, the configuration space is the $x,y,z$ position and pitch-yaw of the camera (relative to the AUV) within the extents of the virtual world. Constraints are used to model the possible AUV turning radius between nodes and the fact that the camera is fixed to the AUV while traveling along a path. From the bounding box, a starting position for the AUV is chosen and a roadmap is built, expanding nodes branching from the prior node until a path which visits all visible sides of the bounding box has been found.

Our algorithm uses a discrete representation of the camera’s frustum and computes an intersection quantity for possible views (derived from potential vehicle positions). Using this metric, a path can be planned that maximizes camera coverage of all of the sides of the site of interest. Figure 3 illustrates an intersection between the camera’s view frustum and the site of interest’s bounding box. After a path has been found, discrete images from the perspective of the virtual camera travelling the planned path can be used to create a reconstruction of the site. The reconstruction can then be compared to the original 3D model or other reconstructions to measure the overall path viability.

We solve for a vehicle path considering nodes in the configuration space. Physical considerations such as the camera being oriented 90 degrees orthogonal to the vehicle, allow the camera frame to be derived from the vehicle velocity. Velocity is what determines the magnitude and the direction in which the robot moves towards the next node in the path. Other values stored in each node for the algorithm include weights determined by the objective function and parent information. For each node, we also keep track of a lightweight representation of the sides of the region of interest which have, so far, been seen in an unsigned integer using 5 bits.

The basic algorithm is as follows:

```java
while bboxSideCoverage < desiredCoverage do
    // select node n to expand from
    if declustering then
        n ← node from voxel with least nodes;
    end
    else
        if even iteration of loop then
            n ← random node in highWeightNodes;
        end
        else
            do
                n ← random node in roadmap;
                while n < weightThreshold;
            end
        end
    end
    randomly generate n’ from n;
    calculate edge e from n to n’;
    Roadmap.add(n’, e);
    bboxSideCoverage ← n’.bboxCoverage;
    n’.weight ← calculateWeight(n’);
    if n’.weight > highWeightThreshold then
        highWeightNodes.add(n’);
    end
end
```
Figure 3: Visualization of the camera view frustum, in this case intersecting with the bounding boxes representing the region of interest.

**Node Selection.** The algorithm starts with the selection of a root node, which is added to the roadmap and the algorithm proceeds with the node selection step. For node selection, we must choose a node \( n \) from the roadmap to expand from.

All nodes in the roadmap are stored in a 3D uniform spatial grid. The 3D grid is represented as \( C = c_{ijk} | i = 1,...,m; j = 1,...,n; k = 1,...,o \). The three dimensions of \( C \) refer to discretized values of the x, y, and z coordinates of the virtual world. Each newly created node is inserted into the spatial data structure by its x, y, z location. The \( i, j, k \) space is twice the magnitude of the original bounding box acquired from a high altitude sonar scan, but this scaling is configurable.

For all nodes, \( n \), a weight measuring the node’s viewpoint is computed. To compute \( n.\text{weight} \), three main criteria are used:

- **Viewpoint quality:** the view frustum for this node, (where \( n \) includes x, y, z and pitch and yaw) is discretized as a matrix of 200 rays. These rays are intersected with the bounding box of the region of interest. Any ray that intersects with a side of the bounding box contributes towards the total weight for the current node,

\[
n.\text{weight} = \sum \left( \text{RayHits} / \text{totalRays} \right)
\]  

- **Information gain via new side coverage:** If a node offers a view of a side of the bounding box of the region of interest that has not previously been seen, the weight of the node is significantly increased, +\( c \). The algorithm is able to distinguish that a side is newly seen by keeping a record of viewed sides for each node, \( n \). To reduce the memory footprint of nodes in the complete roadmap, each node holds an unsigned int with five bits used to encode which sides of the region of interest have been seen (via ray intersections with sides of the bounding box denoted with a unique bit). This encoding can be compared to the prior node to distinguish the viewing of a new side.

- **Viewpoint gain:** If the current node has a higher weight than its parent, an additional contribution, +\( \delta \), is added to promote expansion towards promising directions.

Node weights are used in the selection step of the algorithm to balance both exploration and targeted selection.

Node selection alternates to optimize various motion planning goals.

- For declustering, to promote expansion in all directions, the voxel \( i, j, k \) that contains the least number of nodes is selected for expansion every other step.

- For pruning, on every other step we alternate between selecting:
  1. a node from the list of “high weight” nodes. Weights for an initial 440 nodes are placed in a discrete grid around the region of interest. The high weight threshold is then initialized to the average weight plus the standard deviation of these initial nodes:

\[
\text{highWeightThresh} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i.\text{weight} / m + \sigma
\]

These nodes have better than average viewpoints.

2. a random node with a weight above a significantly lower minimum threshold value. This minimum threshold decreases with each iteration to promote node selection even if the roadmap only contains low quality nodes.

The declustering step prevents the roadmap from producing too many nodes in a single area that offers high weight views of the region of interest, encouraging exploration and coverage of the configuration space. By selecting higher weight nodes, the algorithm effectively prunes low quality directions and decreases the potential size of the roadmap.

**Node Generation.** In order to cover the entire scene, the roadmap must expand to a new node, \( n' \). Once a node to expand from has been selected as described above, a new node is generated based off the prior node. The velocity of the prior node is taken and a new velocity with a randomly perturbed pitch and yaw is added to it. A delta value, within a range of 0 and \( \pi \) of the prior node’s pitch is randomly chosen. The new delta value is then added to phi. The same process happens for yaw with a delta added to theta.
The new, perturbed pitch and yaw are then used to calculate the new velocity. The new velocity is added to the previous position, creating the position of the new node, \( n' \). If that is, in fact, a valid position and not colliding with the region of interest, then the orientation for the robot at that position is calculated.

**Path Completion.** Our algorithm terminates when all sides of the region of interest have been seen. Each time a node is added to the roadmap, the algorithm evaluates if all sides of the bounding box around the region of interest have been seen. After the final side has been seen, the algorithm runs for a finite amount of time. The time limit is an experimental choice and other methods to ensure further coverage of the final side of the region of interest could be explored. The final path is generated from the roadmap by following parent nodes from the final node to the root node. The nodes along this path can then be used to replay a virtual path to gather images for reconstruction in our virtual testbed. Future work includes mapping these points from the virtual space back to real world GPS coordinates which can then be used as way points for an AUV trajectory around the real site of interest.

**Using Paths in the Testbed.** As underwater vehicle deployments can be challenging (in terms of cost, weather, etc.), we sought to design a virtual platform to plan and test AUV paths and camera views. The virtual world used in our testbed is an OpenGL application which, in its current implementation, includes simple geometric models. The ground plane represents the seafloor and is textured with an image of a sandy seafloor like that of the Mediterranean. To generate motion between the nodes, the positions is interpolated using a cubic Hermite interpolation function creating a spline (Demofox, 2015). An image is captured every third frame by the virtual camera as it follows the generated spline. Building off the work of (von Fock et al., 2017b), we use the frames from the paths to construct a model of the target of interest.

**4 RESULTS**

We present a probabilistic roadmap algorithm for the generation of paths for an AUV to travel in order to capture multiple views of a region of interest with good coverage. In addition, we present an application to test these paths in a virtual environment which uses simple geometry but allows for virtual frames to be written out and then used with a photogrammetry application for path evaluation.

To measure the effectiveness of our paths, the 3D models and point clouds created from our algorithm were compared to those generated from running a standard pre-packaged lawnmower pattern. The paths generated by our algorithm captured images that could be used in a 3D reconstruction, that were more detailed and that showed better coverage of the region of interest than those from the lawnmower pattern. Point clouds of each reconstruction are also compared to determine the level of detail of each.

**4.1 Measures**

To test the quality of images generated by the various paths, we used Agisoft Photoscan® for photogrammetry. We selected a set of twelve paths created by our algorithm to consider for comparisons. In addition, image frames from three lawnmower pattern paths were also captured for comparison. While one set of lawnmower path images led to a good reconstruction, the other two, including an attempt to run
the pattern created by Yamafune et al. (Yamafune et al., 2016), failed to produce usable models at all. For the one lawnmower path that was able to produce a reconstruction, the 3D model and point clouds are compared to the original 3D model of the shipwreck (i.e., the site of interest).

One of the key steps in photogrammetry is image alignment (see Figure 5) and the number of aligned images directly corresponds to the amount of data usable in the reconstruction. The percentage of aligned images for the comparison paths are shown in Table 1. On average, at least 57% of the images from our paths are aligned. Reconstructions were created for three of our paths, PRM 1 and PRM 6 and PRM 11. While PRM 1 has very good image alignment, the later two paths are more average and are included to show that even average paths created by our algorithm can produce better results than a reconstruction following the lawnmower pattern.

Table 1: Summary of Paths with Good Potential. Includes the images aligned, the percent of those actually aligned, and the average weight of each path.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Images Aligned</th>
<th>Percent Aligned</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>599/608</td>
<td>98.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>121/666</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>468/551</td>
<td>84.94</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>198/614</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>296/641</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>790/1322</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>476/988</td>
<td>48.18</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>429/743</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>544/646</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>832/688</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>295/573</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>478/592</td>
<td>80.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 shows the side profiles of the reconstructions for PRM 6 and the lawnmower pattern alongside the original 3D model. It is clear that the reconstruction generated from images from our paths include much more complete model information, while the model reconstructed from a lawnmower pattern is missing the sides of the model. One limitation of the current work is that given the small scale of our current virtual testbed, both our paths and lawnmower produced good reconstructions of the top of the shipwreck as shown in Figure 8 and Figure 7.

Point clouds of all of the reconstructed 3D models were compared using CloudCompare. In general, the denser the point cloud, the more detailed the reconstruction. One measure of the density is the mean distance between points, with smaller distances between points indicating greater density. Figure 8 and Figure 9 show point clouds in blue created from our paths, over the gray point cloud created from the original model. As shown in the images and reinforced in the data displayed in Table 2, the point clouds created by our paths are significantly more dense than the point clouds created by the lawnmower pattern. The mean distance of the point clouds produced by our paths range from being 1.5 to 2.3 times better than that of the lawnmower pattern.

Table 2: Point Cloud data for PRM and lawnmower paths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Mean Distance</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 6</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawnmower</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing the paths, it is worth noting that the total distance of each path does not correlate to the quality of the reconstruction. Table 3 shows the distance each path covered in the virtual world. The lawnmower pattern covers a distance of almost twice as far as path PRM 11, but PRM 11 is a better reconstruction overall.
Figure 7: Additional views of the 3D Models created by images captured along paths using our algorithm (PRM 11 and PRM 6).

Table 3: Total distance by the selected paths in virtual world units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Total Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3</td>
<td>1678.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 6</td>
<td>2270.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 11</td>
<td>664.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawnmower</td>
<td>1128.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance. All work was executed for testing on a 2019 MSI GS63 Stealth with an Intel 8th Generation Core i7-8750H processor. The computer also has a dedicated graphics card - NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1060. The code was written in C++14 along with the Open Graphics Library (OpenGL) version 4.6. The OpenGL Mathematics library, GLM, version 0.9.8.5 and GLFW3 version 3.2 were also used.

The objective function has a significant effect on performance. Initially, the algorithm was allowed to expand by choosing a node completely randomly from the roadmap. On multiple occasions, the algorithm was left to run overnight without generating a complete path because it either never saw all sides of the region of interest or the computer ran out of memory. When the high weight threshold was added to the node selection process, path generation went from taking hours to minutes.

An important optimization to performance for this project was the use of a hash map to represent the spatial data structure, allowing the algorithm to look up the voxel with the least amount of nodes rapidly. As shown in Table 4, all of the generated paths took between 10 and 27 seconds of computation. Table 4 shows a summary of the generated paths including
the length of each path, the number of nodes in each respective roadmap, and the time it took to generate them. The larger the roadmap, the more time the algorithm took to create a path, however, even the largest roadmap with 538 nodes took only 27 seconds to generate a path.

Table 4: Summary of generated paths. Includes the number of nodes of each path, the number of nodes in each roadmap, and the time to generate each path in seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roadmap Size</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a virtual path planning and testing system to help plan paths for underwater vehicles to map underwater sites of interest. The 3D models created by the paths computed using our algorithm are more detailed and show better coverage of all sides than those created by the lawnmower pattern. The images gathered along our paths also created significantly denser point clouds than the lawnmower paths, with a mean distance between points that ranges from 1.5 to 2.3 times better than that of the lawnmower pattern.

This project represents the culmination of a large amount of experience in field work focused on mapping underwater sites of interest (Wu et al., 2019; Rutledge et al., 2018; von Fock et al., 2017a), however, there are many areas for future work including: testing the paths in a real world setting and expanding the algorithm to account for multiple bounding boxes.

For real world AUV paths, while underwater the AUV’s location accumulates error as time goes on (an acoustic underwater positioning system would give measurements with bounded error, but these systems are not always in place). Therefore, in order to convert the automatically generated paths to ones that could be accurately used with the AUV, additional way-points (nodes) will be added. Pairs of nodes with similar velocities would be selected and corresponding surface way-points would be appropriately spaced to reach the correct depth for each node before and after the node pairs are added to the final path. This process would be repeated until all nodes are paired and associated with surface way-points. The AUV would then travel to each way-point until the path is complete. We hope to complete field testing of our system in the upcoming year. Additional future work includes deeper exploration and comparisons to other motion planning algorithms.
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