

Generating Annotated Training Data for 6D Object Pose Estimation in Operational Environments with Minimal User Interaction

*Note: This is a preprint currently under peer review at IROS 2021

Paul Koch
Radboud University
6525 HR Nijmegen, NL
Email: paul.koch@student.ru.nl

Marian Schlüter
Fraunhofer IPK
Institute for Production
Systems and Design Technology
Pascalstr. 8-9, 10587 Berlin, DE
Email: marian.schlueter@ipk.fraunhofer.de

Serge Thill
Donders Institute for Brain,
Cognition, and Behaviour
Radboud University
6525 HR Nijmegen, NL
Email: s.thill@donders.ru.nl

Abstract—Recently developed deep neural networks achieved state-of-the-art results in the subject of 6D object pose estimation for robot manipulation. However, those supervised deep learning methods require expensive annotated training data. Current methods for reducing those costs frequently use synthetic data from simulations, but rely on expert knowledge and suffer from the *domain gap* when shifting to the real world. Here, we present a proof of concept for a novel approach of autonomously generating annotated training data for 6D object pose estimation. This approach is designed for learning new objects in operational environments while requiring little interaction and no expertise on the part of the user. We evaluate our autonomous data generation approach in two grasping experiments, where we archive a similar grasping success rate as related work on a non autonomously generated data set.

I. INTRODUCTION

The manufacturing industry currently sees – within several domains – a shift to a flexible, customisable, and intelligent production line as part of the 4th industrial revolution [1], [2], [3], [4]. Consequently, to accommodate this flexibility, there is a move away from highly controlled, fully defined environments that industrial robots often require. For robots to work in the resulting unpredictable world, in which various objects – whose identity could still be unknown at the time of design of the system – might arrive on a conveyor belt in a number of possible orientations, a robust perception system is a key requirement.

In recent years, machine-learning approaches to 6-dimensional (6D) object pose estimation methods that can tackle this kind of challenge have been introduced for model-based robotic perception [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]. However, training supervised deep learning methods typically requires an enormous amount of annotated training data, which currently incurs a high investment cost [10]. To reduce this cost, a popular approach is to conduct supervised training in simulations first [7], [8], [11], [12], [13], [14]. For example, Deng et al. [12] recently proposed a *self-supervised* 6D model for robot

manipulation that avoids high annotation costs by learning how to estimate the 6D pose of an object in simulation.

However, learning from synthetic data often results in a high *domain gap* – a term referring to performance loss that occurs when applying a model trained in a source domain to a target domain [15]. Recent work in robot perception trained in simulation utilize methods like domain adaptation and domain randomisation to cope with the sim-to-real *domain gap* [16], [17], [18], [19]. Nonetheless their success in bridging their task specific *domain gap*, those methods are not guaranteed to succeed [20]. The need to gather real-world data to fine-tune the model on the target domain therefore remains [12], [18].

Development of simulations further requires expert knowledge (for example to identify key features and physics which need to be simulated) and can be time consuming (for example, if detailed CAD models and 3D scans of the objects need to be acquired). They can thus be a significant cost factor, potentially difficult to deploy in operational environments, and do not necessarily remove the need for training in the real world.

In this paper, we present a complete novel approach for generating and autonomously annotate training data for 6D pose estimation of novel objects. This approach learns new objects quickly and with minimal user interaction. It requires no particular expertise from the end user going through the training procedure. The approach thus avoids the *domain gap* by training entirely in the real world, the costs associated with generating large data sets of annotated data, and the need for expert knowledge to teach new tasks.

We achieve this through a novel approach to data generation. We use an industrial robot arm to autonomously capture RGB-D images from multiple perspectives of the scene as well as relevant objects. We use background subtraction to produce a binary mask distinguishing foreground (objects) from background (scene). This, in turn, is used to create a point cloud describing the object’s shape by stitching together partial point clouds of the object taken from multiple view points.

Afterwards, we derive the target pose from the stitched point cloud. Together, segmentation label, point cloud, and target pose form the generated, annotated data set for 6D object pose estimation.

We demonstrate that this set can be used to train the unmodified *DenseFusion* [6] 6D object pose estimation model. The use of this existing model demonstrates that the performance observed is due to the approach for generating the training data, rather than improvements in pose estimation itself.

We conclude by demonstrating that a robot arm trained using this approach achieves a 6D pose estimation accuracy sufficient to match or exceed grasping performance of related work using a similar (but not identical) setup [6], [12].

II. RELATED WORK

A. 6D object pose estimation

Xiang et al. [5] proposed a pose estimation convolutional neural network (*PoseCNN*) to estimate a given object's pose from a moving view point in a non-discrete fashion. *PoseCNN* is a combination of a *CNN* encoding a *RGB-D* image, a post-processing algorithm computing vertices on the object, and a non-iterative perspective-n-point algorithm [21] to estimate the object's pose.

Wang et al. [6] later proposed an end-to-end deep learning 6D pose estimation model (*DenseFusion*) which outperformed *PoseCNN* in terms of performance and computational speed by a fair margin. The model achieved state-of-the-art results in the two common pose estimation benchmarks data sets *YCB-Video* [5] and *LineMOD* [22]. Similarly to *PoseCNN*, *DenseFusion* uses a single *RGB-D* image to estimate an object's pose in a non-discrete fashion. However, *DenseFusion* runs approximately $175\times$ faster than *PoseCNN*, resulting in a processing time of $0.06s$, which is acceptable for continuous, real time applications (with the caveat that the hardware used to achieve this result was not specified).

B. Training set requirements for 6D pose estimation algorithms

Training data for 6D object pose estimation should feature images of objects seen from multiple perspectives, segmentation labels that distinguish the object from the background, and the ground truth regarding the target's 6D object pose [5], [22]. Additionally, the (often irregular) shape of an object needs to be described using a point cloud to compute the loss [5], [6], [12] and to evaluate the performance [5], [23].

C. Simulation-based and self-supervised approaches to robot object manipulation

Synthetic data generation allows users to generate annotated training data within simulated realities. For example, Bousmalis et al. [13] demonstrated state-of-the-art results using simulations to train grasping for a robotic arm. Bewley et al. [14] developed a car driving simulation, which could be used to teach a neural network how to drive. Other methods like the *DenseFusion* algorithm [6] or work by Tremblay et al. [24] use synthetic data to augment and increase their data set.

As previously mentioned, Deng et al. [12] presented a self-supervised training method for 6D object pose estimation based on both synthetic and real world data, outperforming *DenseFusion* in terms of grasping success rate. Specifically, although the grasping success rate using synthetic data was 46.7%, fine-tuning on real-world data increased this to 86.7% (compared to a 73% grasping success rate for *DenseFusion*).

D. Background Subtraction

Background subtraction has been an active topic of research for decades and there are correspondingly many approaches available. However, there is no one-size-fits-all solution and one has to find a working solution suitable for our problem at hand [25].

As in many other domains, recent approaches to background subtraction increasingly make use of modern machine learning algorithms. For example, Braham & Van Droogenbroeck [26] presented a *CNN*-based background subtraction for detecting objects in the scenery. Babaee et al. [27] proposed a segmentation *CNN*, which extracts features, updates a background model, and performs a segmentation. Wang et al. [28] proposed a *CNN* featuring depth information for background subtraction demonstrating the utility of a 4th feature channel with information that cannot be obtained from colour information alone. Implementations of background subtraction algorithms are readily available; for example, the public *OpenCV* library offers several.

However, these methods are typically designed to run on-line in very dynamic scenes, updating their background and learning over time. Since we only use background subtraction to create an initial training set for our segmentation label model, we can assume relatively static scenes. Using the aforementioned approaches in such a setting leads to issues with over-fitting to the background as a result of minor disturbances (such as positional offsets of the camera, light changes, etc). There is also no need, in our context, for a continuously running algorithm. We therefore develop our own, simpler, background subtraction algorithm (see section III-B).

E. Point Cloud Stitching

The training set for 6D pose estimation should contain a point cloud describing the object as a whole (section II-B). Here, we create this by joining partial point clouds obtained from different views of the object. This process is called point cloud stitching.

Recently developed methods address the problem of such a multi view point cloud registration [29], [30], [31], but ready-made implementations of these are not available.

Here, we thus use our own purpose-built point-cloud stitching algorithm based on the *Iterative Closest Point (ICP)* registration algorithm [32]; a commonly used optimization method for point cloud registration and refinement [5], [7]. *Open3D* [33] – an open source *Python* library for 3D data processing – contains an ICP implementation as well as a set of useful optimised point cloud manipulation tools that are needed for processing point clouds in reasonable time.

any re-training or adaptation, to generate binary masks that segment novel objects from a scene given the background. Note though that our focus was not on designing a state-of-the-art background subtraction algorithm. As such, although its performance is sufficient for our purposes, improvements are certainly necessary. For example, our background subtraction approach might still overfit to our setup and require re-training in a different setup. However, with sufficient data, a similar background subtraction model that generalises to any object or scene could be trained.

C. Point Cloud Stitching

We sample $v \in V$ view points from the V available view points. For each of the r rotations (including the zero rotation) added to a given object during the data acquisition, a set of surface point clouds is generated (Fig. 3a). We sample p evenly distributed pixels from the segmentation label and map them into the robot space via their depth information, the camera intrinsics, and a hand-eye-calibration.

This creates $v \times r$ surface point clouds per object, from which statistical and spacial outliers are then cleaned. Each set of v surface point clouds is joined into a point cloud shell via ICP registration (Fig. 3b). The point cloud shells are rotated by their added rotation and fused into a complete point cloud (Fig. 3c).

From the complete point cloud, T_R^O can now be extracted. To cope with offsets that arise from the human manipulation of the objects, the complete point cloud is fitted into the r point cloud shells. This thus approximates the actual offsets that need to be added to T_R^O for each rotation.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Implementation

To demonstrate our approach, we use the a *UR5* industrial robot arm together with an *Intel RealSense d435i* RGB-D camera, mounted at the robot flange using a 3D printed adapter. The parallel *Robotiq 2F-85* Gripper is used to conduct the grasping experiment. We use two *Nvidia GTX 1080* GPUs to train our models and a *Intel i7-7700HQ* CPU for the remaining tasks.

B. Collected Data

We collected data on 12 objects using the approach described above (Fig. 4). The objects were selected for being common objects in an industrial work environment while varying in size, color, weight, form, and difficulty in terms of grasping them with a parallel (2-fingered) gripper.

For each object, the robot iterates over 156 fixed view points (Fig 1a) and collects data samples covering the front site of the object. To capture the backside of the object, the object is then rotated 180° around its vertical axis. This results in a total of 3744 evenly distributed data samples on which pose estimation is trained for the 12 objects.

TABLE I
PERFORMANCE OF THE BACKGROUND SUBTRACTION AND SEGMENTATION MODEL.

Task	IoU	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
Back. Sub.	.726	.996	.917	.794	.851
Seg. Model	.707	.995	.958	.740	.835

C. Overall quality & performance assessment

To assess the quality of our data generation approach, we train a *DenseFusion* 6D object pose estimation model on our generated data and conduct grasping experiments with it. As the *DenseFusion* pose estimation model requires the object mask during inference, we train a semantic segmentation model as a pre-processor. We use a casual *U-Net* with a *ResNet 34* [38] backbone. The architecture for semantic segmentation is thus similar to that used for background subtraction; however, given the different nature of the task, the backbone used in this step is pre-trained on the *ImageNet* [39] data set.

The performance of the segmentation model is reported in section IV-D. Moreover, we report the average distance of model points (*ADD*) [23] in section IV-E to evaluate the 6D pose estimation. However, this metric by itself can not readily be compared meaningfully with other work for two reasons: first, our reference standard is autonomously generated by our approach for generating training data, and therefore an approximation resulting from heuristic functions. Second, different papers tend to use different objects, which influences performance.

We evaluate the grasping success rate based on the estimated object pose in section IV-F, to estimate the applicability of our data generation approach to a real world task. We present our grasping results together with those from the original *DenseFusion* paper [6], and the work of Deng et al. [12]. Both papers conducted a grasping experiment for which they reported their grasping success rate and we re-use their setup to the degree possible.

D. Background subtraction and semantic segmentation

We manually annotated the segmentation mask for 20% of our generated data to evaluate and compare the semantic segmentation of both the background subtraction and segmentation model. We report the performance in respect to IoU, Accuracy, Precision, Recall, and F1 (Table I). Since we need to train a segmentation model as pre-processor for the *DenseFusion* pose estimation, one could update the initial segmentation labels generated by the background subtraction model using the initial trained segmentation model; effectively resulting in a second pass that may generate segmentation labels that are closer to the actual situations encountered by the pose estimation model during live inference.

E. 6D Object Pose Estimation

To address the question whether the segmentation model could be used to usefully update the segmentation labels,




Fig. 3. The Point Cloud Stitching processing Steps. a) Create the surface point clouds from the different perspectives, (b) join the surface point clouds into shells for each added rotation, (c) Fuse to a combined point cloud.




Fig. 4. An overview of the objects and their corresponding tags used in this paper (except for training the background subtraction algorithm).

TABLE II

THE RESULTS PER OBJECT OF THE POSE ESTIMATION MODEL TRAINED WITH SEGMENTATION LABELS PROVIDED BY THE SEGMENTATION MODEL OR BY BACKGROUND SUBTRACTION. WE REPORT THE *ADD* IN *mm* AND THE PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLES WHICH HAVE AN *ADD* BELOW 20 *mm*.

Object	Seg. Model <i>ADD</i>	< 20	Back- Subtraction <i>ADD</i>	< 20
Angle	6.24	100 %	7.44	96.88 %
Assembly Wall	8.01	96.88 %	8.79	98.44 %
Camera Stand	5.46	100 %	5.46	100 %
Cylinder	9.78	98.44 %	11.95	96.88 %
Disk	7.92	96.88 %	95.8	95.31 %
Edge	10.04	98.44 %	10.07	100 %
Joint	5.68	100 %	6.3	100 %
Motor	6.26	98.44 %	6.78	100 %
Plug	7.57	98.44 %	9.6	96.88 %
Pole	48.26	48.44 %	48.86	48.44 %
Screw	5.15	100 %	5.46	100 %
Tube	6.53	100 %	7.46	100 %
All	10.57	94.66 %	11.48	94.4 %

we generate a second training set following the procedure previously described but with this updating in place. We then evaluate the performance of *DenseFusion* 6D object pose estimation models trained on each of these training sets (Table II). Note that the segmentation model has a higher precision score than the background subtraction model in Table I; however, it has lower IoU, Accuracy, Recall and F1 scores.

Interestingly, it can be observed that, in spite of the better precision score of the semantic segmentation model, performance when trained on this training indeed slightly outperforms the original training set. Thus, a higher precision score appears to outweigh the IoU, Accuracy, Recall, and F1 score for 6D object pose estimation. However, further

TABLE III

GRASP PERFORMANCE FOR TWO EXPERIMENTS, WHICH ARE MARKED WITH I & II. IN EXP. I, 5 OBJECTS ARE GRASPED AFTER BEING SEEN FROM A SINGLE PERCEPTIVE. IN EXP II, 9 OBJECTS GRASPED AFTER BEING SEEN FROM MULTIPLE VIEW POINTS.

Object	Success I	Success II	Fails I	Fails II	Success Rate I	Success Rate II
Angle	11	10	1	2	91.67 %	83.34 %
Assembly Wall	12	11	0	1	100 %	91.67 %
Camera Stand	12	11	0	1	100 %	91.67 %
Cylinder		6		6		50 %
Edge	9	9	3	3	75 %	75 %
Joint		12		0		100 %
Plug	12	12	0	0	100 %	100 %
Pole		12		0		100 %
Screw		11		1		91.67 %
Total	56	94	4	14	93.34 %	87.04 %

investigations are necessary.

F. Grasping Experiments

To evaluate the overall approach, we consider its actual purpose: once trained, a robot should be able to estimate the pose of an object whose orientation and location may be random with sufficient accuracy to be able to grasp the object. We therefore carry out two grasping experiments following an established procedure [6], [40]. For each object, 12 grasps are attempted (three random object orientations at four random locations). Note that autonomously deciding the best grasping point is outside the scope of the present work; we therefore teach a grasp for each object to the robot through demonstration. In the experiments, the robot therefore needs to identify both the object itself (to retrieve the correct grasp) and the object pose (to grasp the object at the correct point).

For the first experiment, the grasp is attempted after the pose is estimated from a single view point. This is similar to the approach used for the evaluation of *DenseFusion* [6]. We use five randomly selected object out of our total set of twelve for this experiment; this to maintain a similar number of objects and grasping attempts for comparison with the *DenseFusion* evaluation. The results of this experiment are shown in table III, demonstrating overall good performance.

For the second experiment, we exploit the fact that our approach easily allows observing an object from multiple view points prior to executing the grasp, which might increase the confidence of the pose estimation. Nine objects are used for

TABLE IV
TIME CONSUMPTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL MODULES TO UPDATE THE COMPLETE PERCEPTUAL SYSTEM FROM THE DATA GENERATION TO A TRAINED *DenseFusion* 6D OBJECT POSE ESTIMATION MODEL.

Module	Twelve Objects	Per Object Average
Data Acquisition	9 <i>hours</i>	~ 45 <i>min</i>
Background Subtraction	650 <i>sec</i>	~ 54 <i>sec</i>
Train Segmentation Model	8 <i>hours</i>	~ 40 <i>min</i>
Update segmentation labels	315.5 <i>sec</i>	~ 26.3 <i>sec</i>
Point Cloud Stitching	95.85 <i>sec</i>	~ 8 <i>sec</i>
Target Pose Generation	1.48 <i>sec</i>	~ 0.12 <i>sec</i>
Train Pose Estimation	20.8 <i>hours</i>	~ 104 <i>min</i>
Total	~ 38.1 <i>hours</i>	~ 3.17 <i>hours</i>

this experiment (the motor, tube, and disk are excluded as they are not graspable with the gripper used due to their size or shape). The new set of objects and use of multiple view points aside, the setup is the same as in the first experiment. The results (Table III) again demonstrate good performance. Although the success rate is lower, this is due to the large number of failures on the cylinder, a notoriously difficult object to grasp with a two-fingered gripper (excluding the cylinder yields a success rate of 91.66 %). The remaining discrepancy can be attributed to one additional failure each for three objects also used in the first experiment (the angle, assembly wall, and camera stand). Since the number of objects and grasps we use are in line with state-of-the art evaluations in the literature, this demonstrates a susceptibility to variations in current methods. We return to this point in the discussion.

G. Time Costs

Lastly, we briefly measure and report the time needed by each step in our approach to acquire the necessary data and train both a *U-Net* segmentation and a *DenseFusion* 6D object pose estimation model (Table IV). The initial image acquisition, the only step that requires two minimal user interactions (placing the object at the start and rotating it once in between) takes around 45 min per object using our hardware (Section IV-A) and set of view points (Section IV-B). It is therefore feasible to use this approach to learn new objects in operational environments in reasonable time (two days for the set of 12 objects here, with occasional human interaction required during half of each working day). Note that we limited the speed of the robot arm to 30% of its full abilities, and the number of viewpoints used is likely excessive; significant speed improvements are feasible for these aspects alone.

V. DISCUSSION

The approach presented here does have limitations in its current form as a proof of concept: it is restricted to a single object per class, uses a fixed (likely excessive) set of view points, and objects can only be rotated along the vertical axis during imaging. Moreover, although multiple objects can be detected if they are visually separated (see accompanying video), the current concept can not account for cluttered scenes

since only isolated objects are present in the data samples. However, we are confident that those issues can be addressed due to the modular structure of the concept.

Especially, the background subtraction and point cloud stitching are not optimized and might be source of failure. Nonetheless, the trained segmentation and 6D pose estimation models proved to be capable of handling these errors included in the generated data as shown in our experiments. Further research is required to investigate how these errors effect the overall system’s performance and to identify potential issues.

One particular point worth discussing concerns the fact that differences in grasping experiments based on 6D object pose estimation used in different papers [6], [12] – from the objects used to the setup itself – creates difficulties in comparing results. In addition, as we observed in table III, the number of objects and grasps used tend to be low, resulting in minor variations having a large effect on the reported success rates. We therefore see a need for a comprehensive robotic grasping benchmark, which specific guidelines for the setup and grasping technique. This was recently addressed with a physically accurate simulator [41]. However, real-world benchmarks for algorithms such as the 6D object pose estimation methods seen here remain lacking. With good performance on the algorithms themselves reported repeatedly in the literature, this is an aspect that should receive more attention in the near future. This is especially true for simulation based approaches, since the real world performance is what counts.

VI. CONCLUSION

The primary contribution of this paper is a demonstration that it is possible to generate the data needed to train a 6D object pose estimation model such as *DenseFusion* autonomously in operational environments with minimal human user interaction and no need to pre-train in simulation. The overall concept is modular, allowing for individual components to be easily exchanged or improved. We hope that this encourages future improvements to this pipeline.

VII. GITHUB REPOSITORY

All code for this paper can be found at <https://github.com/KochPJ/AutoPoseEstimation>

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Special thanks go to the Fraunhofer IPK (Berlin, Germany) and the Technische Universität Berlin for the opportunity to conduct our experiments at their facilities. In particular, we would like to thank Carsten Niebuhr for his help with the robot interface.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Lu and C. Weng, “Smart manufacturing technology, market maturity analysis and technology roadmap in the computer and electronic product manufacturing industry,” *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, vol. 133, pp. 85 – 94, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162517311514>
- [2] G. Fragapane, D. Ivanov, M. Peron, F. Sgarbossa, and J. O. Strandhagen, “Increasing flexibility and productivity in industry 4.0 production networks with autonomous mobile robots and smart intralogistics,” *Annals of Operations Research*, 02 2020.

- [3] R. Lai, W. Lin, and Y. Wu, "Review of research on the key technologies, application fields and development trends of intelligent robots," in *ICIRA*, 2018.
- [4] A. Perzylo, M. Rickert, B. Kahl, N. Somani, C. Lehmann, A. Kuss, S. Profanter, A. B. Beck, M. Haage, M. Rath Hansen, M. T. Nibe, M. A. Roa, O. Sornmo, S. Gestegard Robertz, U. Thomas, G. Veiga, E. A. Topp, I. Kessler, and M. Danzer, "Smerobotics: Smart robots for flexible manufacturing," *IEEE Robotics Automation Magazine*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 78–90, 2019.
- [5] Y. Xiang, T. Schmidt, V. Narayanan, and D. Fox, "Posecnn: A convolutional neural network for 6d object pose estimation in cluttered scenes," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1711.00199, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.00199>
- [6] C. Wang, D. Xu, Y. Zhu, R. Martin-Martin, C. Lu, L. Fei-Fei, and S. Savarese, "Densefusion: 6d object pose estimation by iterative dense fusion," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2019.
- [7] K. Kleeberger and M. F. Huber, "Single shot 6d object pose estimation," 2020.
- [8] K. Wada, E. Sucar, S. James, D. Lenton, and A. J. Davison, "Morefusion: Multi-object reasoning for 6d pose estimation from volumetric fusion," 2020.
- [9] N. Pereira and L. A. Alexandre, "Maskedfusion: Mask-based 6d object pose estimation," 2020.
- [10] Y. Roh, G. Heo, and S. E. Whang, "A survey on data collection for machine learning: A big data - ai integration perspective," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, pp. 1–1, 2019.
- [11] N. Patki, R. Wedge, and K. Veeramachaneni, "The synthetic data vault," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*, 2016, pp. 399–410.
- [12] X. Deng, Y. Xiang, A. Mousavian, C. Eppner, T. Bretl, and D. Fox, "Self-supervised 6d object pose estimation for robot manipulation," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2020, pp. 3665–3671.
- [13] K. Bousmalis, A. Irpan, P. Wohlhart, Y. Bai, M. Kelcey, M. Kalakrishnan, L. Downs, J. Ibarz, P. Pastor, K. Konolige, S. Levine, and V. Vanhoucke, "Using simulation and domain adaptation to improve efficiency of deep robotic grasping," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1709.07857, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.07857>
- [14] A. Bewley, J. Ringle, Y. Liu, J. Hawke, R. Shen, V. Lam, and A. Kendall, "Learning to drive from simulation without real world labels," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1812.03823, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.03823>
- [15] N. Jakobi, P. Husbands, and I. Harvey, "Noise and the reality gap: The use of simulation in evolutionary robotics," vol. 929, 01 1995, pp. 704–720.
- [16] J. Tobin, R. Fong, A. Ray, J. Schneider, W. Zaremba, and P. Abbeel, "Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1703.06907, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.06907>
- [17] M. Danielczuk, M. Matl, S. Gupta, A. Li, A. Lee, J. Mahler, and K. Goldberg, "Segmenting unknown 3d objects from real depth images using mask R-CNN trained on synthetic point clouds," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1809.05825, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.05825>
- [18] Y. Chebotar, A. Handa, V. Makoviychuk, M. Macklin, J. Issac, N. D. Ratliff, and D. Fox, "Closing the sim-to-real loop: Adapting simulation randomization with real world experience," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1810.05687, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.05687>
- [19] M. Wang and W. Deng, "Deep visual domain adaptation: A survey," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1802.03601, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.03601>
- [20] W. M. Kouw, "An introduction to domain adaptation and transfer learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1812.11806, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.11806>
- [21] V. Lepetit, F. Moreno-Noguer, and P. Fua, "Epnnp: An accurate o(n) solution to the pnp problem," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 81, 02 2009.
- [22] S. Hinterstoisser, S. Holzer, C. Cagniard, S. Ilic, K. Konolige, N. Navab, and V. Lepetit, "Multimodal templates for real-time detection of texture-less objects in heavily cluttered scenes," in *2011 International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2011, pp. 858–865.
- [23] S. Hinterstoisser, V. Lepetit, S. Ilic, S. Holzer, G. Bradski, K. Konolige, and N. Navab, "Model based training, detection and pose estimation of texture-less 3d objects in heavily cluttered scenes," vol. 7724, 10 2012.
- [24] J. Tremblay, A. Prakash, D. Acuna, M. Brophy, V. Jampani, C. Anil, T. To, E. Cameracci, S. Bochooon, and S. Birchfield, "Training deep networks with synthetic data: Bridging the reality gap by domain randomization," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, June 2018.
- [25] M. Piccardi, "Background subtraction techniques: a review," in *2004 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics (IEEE Cat. No.04CH37583)*, vol. 4, 2004, pp. 3099–3104 vol.4.
- [26] M. Braham and M. Van Droogenbroeck, "Deep background subtraction with scene-specific convolutional neural networks," in *2016 International Conference on Systems, Signals and Image Processing (IWSSIP)*, 2016, pp. 1–4.
- [27] M. Babaee, D. T. Dinh, and G. Rigoll, "A deep convolutional neural network for background subtraction," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1702.01731, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.01731>
- [28] X. Wang, L. Liu, G. Li, X. Dong, P. Zhao, and X. Feng, "Background subtraction on depth videos with convolutional neural networks," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1901.05676, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.05676>
- [29] J. Chu and C. Nie, "Multi-view point clouds registration and stitching based on sift feature," in *2011 3rd International Conference on Computer Research and Development*, vol. 1, 2011, pp. 274–278.
- [30] M. Chen, Y. Tang, X. Zou, K. Huang, L. Li, and Y. He, "High-accuracy multi-camera reconstruction enhanced by adaptive point cloud correction algorithm," *Optics and Lasers in Engineering*, vol. 122, pp. 170 – 183, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0143816619305366>
- [31] H. Xu, L. Yu, J. Hou, and S. Fei, "Automatic reconstruction method for large scene based on multi-site point cloud stitching," *Measurement*, vol. 131, pp. 590 – 596, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263224118308509>
- [32] S. Rusinkiewicz and M. Levoy, "Efficient variants of the icp algorithm," in *Proceedings Third International Conference on 3-D Digital Imaging and Modeling*, 2001, pp. 145–152.
- [33] Q. Zhou, J. Park, and V. Koltun, "Open3D: A modern library for 3D data processing," *arXiv:1801.09847*, 2018.
- [34] Y. Du, H. Ai, and S. Lao, "Evaluation of color spaces for person re-identification," in *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR2012)*, 2012, pp. 1371–1374.
- [35] H. Sajid and S. S. Cheung, "Universal multimode background subtraction," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 3249–3260, 2017.
- [36] P. Yakubovskiy, "Segmentation models," https://github.com/qubvel/segmentation_models, 2019.
- [37] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1505.04597, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.04597>
- [38] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1512.03385, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03385>
- [39] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein, A. C. Berg, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge," *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, vol. 115, no. 3, pp. 211–252, 2015.
- [40] J. Tremblay, T. To, B. Sundaralingam, Y. Xiang, D. Fox, and S. Birchfield, "Deep object pose estimation for semantic robotic grasping of household objects," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1809.10790, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.10790>
- [41] H. Yuan, R. C. Veltkamp, G. Albanis, N. Zioulis, D. Zarpalas, and P. Daras, "SHREC 2020 Track: 6D Object Pose Estimation," in *Eurographics Workshop on 3D Object Retrieval*, T. Schreck, T. Theoharis, I. Pratikakis, M. Spagnuolo, and R. C. Veltkamp, Eds. The Eurographics Association, 2020.