Danil Kuzin¹, Olga Isupova², Brooke Simmons¹, Steven Reece³ **Disaster Mapping from Satellites:** Damage Detection with Crowdsourced Point Labels ¹Lancaster University, ²University of Bath, ³University of Oxford

Abstract

High-resolution satellite imagery available immediately after disaster events is crucial Why object detection, not segmentation 1. A lot of pre-processing work to obtain and for response planning as it facilitates broad situational awareness of critical infrastructure status such as building damage, flooding, and obstructions to access co-align multitemporal satellite images pixelroutes. Damage mapping at this scale would require hundreds of expert personby-pixel, and for object detection we generally hours. However, a combination of crowdsourcing and recent advances in deep need less precision when defining footprints. learning reduces the effort needed to just a few hours in real time. Asking volunteers Architecture to place point marks, as opposed to shapes of actual damaged areas, significantly Ensemble of UNet meta-architectures predecreases the required analysis time for response during the disaster. However, trained on XView2, similar to one of the different volunteers may be inconsistent in their marking. This work presents winning solutions for this challenge. methods for aggregating potentially inconsistent damage marks to train a neural network damage detector.

Planetary Response Network

Introduction: Point Marks

RescueGlobal

Motivation for using point marks

- Existing large satellite image datasets for building damage detection: SpaceNet, XView.
- But still need to fine-tune models on new data for the current disaster response operation.
- This new data needs to be annotated and pre-processed in a short period of time during the disaster.

Volunteer marks are useful, but require additional processing, as they often contradict to each

Contributions: the processing pipeline

The processing pipeline to create a training dataset from point crowdsourced marks to train an object detection algorithm for damage mapping.

Satellite images

- MAXAR Open Data program: satellite images before and after the disaster.
- Caribbean islands Antigua and Barbuda.

Volunteer marks

Zooniverse platform: volunteers marked the points on images with structural damage of different severity.



Crowd-labelled Dataset

This data needs to be converted to the input suitable for computer vision algorithms.

Problems

- 1. Point marks instead of object shapes;
- 2. Lack of consensus for nearby marks.

Solution

- 1. Detecting the building footprints;
- 2. Aggregating marks inside the buildings.
- Minor damage
- Significant damage
- Catastrophic damage



Building Footprint Detection Network



XView2 dataset



github.com/DIUx-xView/xView2 first place

Mark Aggregation Algorithms

Aggregate marks inside each building footprint: find a consensus label for this building.

Majority voting

- For each object the most common label is selected
- When the data quality is low, a significant number of volunteers can miss damaged objects and leave them unmarked

Bayesian classifier combination

• Learn the accuracy of each label class for each volunteer





Majority voting

Bayesian classifier combination

Acknowledgements

- UKRI via the Medical Research Council [FLF grant number MR/T044136/1]
- Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council [grant number BB/T018941/1]
- Lancaster University IAA funding support
- Science and Technology Facilities Council [grant number ST/S00307X/1]
- Lloyd's Register Foundation through the Alan Turing Institute's Data Centric Engineering programme
- EPSRC funding as a Researcher in Residence with the Satellite Applications Catapult



2. We don't actually require the precise pixelby-pixel outputs, we rather need the amount of damaged buildings and the level of their damage in the particular area for disaster relief purposes.

 Convert the segmentation masks into bounding boxes.

Timestamp	AP50	F1	Precision	Recall
Pre-event	38	57	52	63
Post-event	23	47	44	49

- Weighted labels, with a lower value for the undamaged label
- Optimal weight varies in different cases

• Weight their labels accordingly

F1 score accuracy results

Label	MV	BCC
average	90	92
undamaged	70	92
minor	40	40
significant	60	58
catastrophic	59	65

Post-event images only

Accuracy	results
AP	18.5
AP50	31.2
AP75	21.9
APs	16.2
APm	27.2
API	0.0

- create damage datasets.
- labelling process.
- with the sound accuracy.





AI + HADR 2021



Damage Detection Example

• Faster-RCNN pre-trained on ImageNet.













Ground truth

Predictions

Conclusions

A crowdsourced point-based labelling strategy that reduces the time to

We rely on only point marks placed anywhere on damaged buildings. This allows us to employ non-expert volunteers and to speed up the

Datasets can be used to train a neural network for damage detection

This network can then be used during the same response deployment.