Automatic semantic and thematic classification of 3D models to create CityGML

Merwin Rook

P5 Presentation Master of Science in Geomatics for the Built Environment

November 4 2016



Presentation overview

- Introduction
- Problem statement and research scope
- Methodology
 - Indexing
 - Region growing
 - Thematic classification
 - Semantic classification
 - LoD detection
- Results
- Conclusions
- Future work



Advancing developments in remote sensing





Source: serc.carleton.edu

*f***U**Delft

Source: AHN3

3

3D GIS: the creation of 3D city models





Applications 3D GIS





Applications of 3D GIS



Flood modelling

Solar irradiation analysis





Semantic and thematic information

Thematic information



Semantic information



Semantic and thematic information

- Use of semantic and thematic information:
 - Query: select surfaces or objects of interest
 - Spatial analysis & real world simulations
 - Interoperability



Problem statement



ŤUDelft

Data source: Waldbrucke model

Semantic and thematic classification

Mostly a manual process: time and cost expensive

- Limitations of current research:
 - Thematic aspect is ignored

- Not all semantic classes that are required to create CityGML are covered



Research question

How to automatically enrich a 3D city model with thematic and semantic information as defined in CityGML, by only utilising the models geometry?



Research goal





Automate the process of thematic and semantic classification, in accordance with the CityGML standard



CityGML

- OGC standard
- 3D city model with attached its thematic and semantic information.

 Most important: defines the thematic and semantic structure used in this research



Research challenges

5 Challenges are identified



Research challenges (1)

 Complexity of the semantic classes and the lack of definition: CityGML only defines the surface normal.





Research challenges (2)

 Limited applicability of utilisation the surface normal



Source: blog.wolfire.com





Research challenges (3)

Topology and spatial index

 Reconstruction of the topology is hindered by slivers and double stored vertices.





Research challenges (4): Level of Detail (LoD)



Source: Biljecki et al., 2016

 Only the classification of LoD 1 and 2 models is researched







Research challenges (5)

Lack of definition for the thematic features



Data source: Rotterdam 3D



Methodology





Methodology: Indexing





Indexing

 Index: stores the adjacency relations between triangles

Relationship is adjacent if triangles share a vertex





Indexing (2): KD-tree, used to reconstruct the topologic relationships

Errors are repaired by setting a threshold and the distance to the k nearest neighbours



Region Growing





Region Growing(1)

 Clusters adjacent spatial features together if they have similar geometrical properties.



Region Growing (2); Selecting Wall and non-Wall triangles

Sets are individually processed in the region growing algorithm.



2 Sets, based on the semantic class: WallSurfaces

- Threshold to detect WallSurfaces is used in both approaches: implemented before the region growing
 - Threshold is based on the pitch angle of the triangle: defines verticality



Creation of thematic features





Creation of thematic features: building reconstruction

Adjacent regions are clustered to recompose the single building entities.



Creation of thematic features: building reconstruction (3)

 Single building consists out of a set of connected Wall and non-Wall regions.



Data source: Rotterdam 3D



Data source: New York 3D



Creation of thematic features: the terrain

- Recognition of regions which contain terrain polygons.
 - 25% of all triangles
 - Connected to more than 4 WallSurfaces









 Both approaches take the reconstructed buildings from the previous step as input



Recognition of the WallSurfaces is used in the region growing





- Two approaches are implemented:
 - Two class approach: Limited
 - to Roof- and GroundSurface





– Comprehensive approach:

Additionally the classes OuterFloorand OuterRoofSurface









Semantic classification: Two class approach

• Compute a threshold which is situated slightly above the GroundSurface.



 GroundSurface is situated below the threshold, RoofSurfaces above the threshold.







Semantic classification: Comprehensive approach

 Additional classes can not be classified based on height or surface normal



 An extension of the definitions for the semantic classes is needed

ŤUDelft

Semantic classification: Comprehensive approach (1)

- Extensions of the definitions for the semantic classes in CityGML:
 - **RoofSurface:** Encloses a building from above.
 - GroundSurface: The GroundSurface encloses the building from below





Semantic classification: Comprehensive approach (2)

- These definitions allow for a rule based classification, based on arguments:
 - 1. RoofSurfaces cannot overlap
 - 2. GroundSurfaces cannot overlap
 - 3. OuterCeilingSurface and OuterFloorSurface cannot enclose a building from below or above
 - 4. An OuterFloorSurface cannot be present without an OuterCeilingSurface



Semantic classification: Comprehensive approach (5)





Methodology: LoD detection





LoD detection

- Two properties are used:
 - 1. The slope of the RoofSurfaces



Source: Häfele, K. (2011)

2. The presence of the semantic classes OuterCeilingSurface and OuterFloorSurface





Results

- 1. LoD detection
- 2. Thematic classification
- 3. Semantic classification:
 - 1. Two class approach: 5 test datasets
 - 2. Comprehensive approach: 3 test datasets



Results: LoD detection and thematic classification

- For all models, the correct LoD is detected
- Thematic labelling:

City model	Buildings in original dataset	LoD	Reconstructed buildings
Rotterdam	1544	2	507
Montreal	384	2	191
Switzerland	3151	2	2218
Waldbruke	606	2	273
New York	Unknown	1	276
CityEngine 1	6	2	6
CityEngine 2	7	2	7

Semantic labelling, two class approach

99% accurate



Rotterdam dataset

Semantic labelling, comprehensive approach

• CityEngine model 1: 100% accurate





Semantic labelling, comprehensive approach

• CityEngine model 2: 97,1% accurate





Semantic labelling, comprehensive approach

• Rotterdam model: 97,1% accurate





Limitations of both approaches

Presence of other objects



Source: Ettenheim dataset

Building reconstruction

elft



56

Limitations of both approaches (1)

One region can represent multiple classes



- Recognition of the terrain
 - Data dependent



Limitations of the comprehensive approach

- Float precision errors
- Methodology works on models till LoD 2.3



Conclusions

How to automatically enrich a 3D city model with thematic and semantic information as defined in CityGML, by only utilising the models geometry?

- 1. LoD detection
- 2. Semantic classes
- 3. Geometric properties
- 4. Remote sensing techniques
- 5. Thematic features
- 6. Accuracy





ŤUDelft

Limitation and future work(1)

Complete and partly overlapping surfaces







Future work(2)

- Extend definitions of CityGML
- Improve the region growing algorithm



Source: Switzerland dataset



Seperating the terrain from the GroundSurface







References

- Biljecki, F., Ledoux, H., and Stoter, J. (2016). An improved lod specification for 3d building models. Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 59:25– 37.
- Getsi (2016) What is geodesy. [online] <u>http://serc.carleton.edu/getsi/geodesy/index.html</u> (visited: November 1 2016)
- Häfele, K. (2011). CityGML Model of the BIEN-ZENKER Jasmin-Sun.
- SIG3D (2015). Modeling guide for 3d objects part 2: Modeling of buildings (lod1, lod2, lod3).



Methodology should work on all cases



