# Recognition in Terra Incognita

Sara Beery, Grant Van Horn, and Pietro Perona

Presenters: Amit Parikh & Taixi Lu

## Motivation

#### State of the art recognition models perform great in **common** contexts...



(A) Cow: 0.99, Pasture:
0.99, Grass: 0.99, No Person:
0.98, Mammal: 0.98



(B) No Person: 0.99, Water:
0.98, Beach: 0.97, Outdoors:
0.97, Seashore: 0.97



(C) No Person: 0.97,Mammal: 0.96, Water: 0.94,Beach: 0.94, Two: 0.94

#### ...but, in **uncommon** contexts they fail to detect (B) or perform poorly (C)



(A) Cow: 0.99, Pasture:
0.99, Grass: 0.99, No Person:
0.98, Mammal: 0.98



(B) No Person: 0.99, Water:
0.98, Beach: 0.97, Outdoors:
0.97, Seashore: 0.97

(C) No Person: 0.97,Mammal: 0.96, Water: 0.94,Beach: 0.94, Two: 0.94

### What makes generalization difficult?



### Scenarios with varying backgrounds







Surveillance

Automated Exploration

Home Automation

#### **Camera Traps**



#### Deployed in wide variety of backgrounds

#### Controlled for lighting

#### Eliminates photographer bias

## The Dataset

### **Existing Datasets**





### **CCT-20: CalTech Camera Traps-20**







- 57,868 Images
- 20 Camera Locations
- 16 Species Classes
- Bounding Boxes

- 243,187 Images
- 140 Camera Locations

### Challenges



(4) Occlusion

86, 85, 2887 84 :22 :22

(5) Camouflage

(6) Perspective



## **Evaluation Protocol**

### **Most Confident**



### Oracle



## Experiments

## Classification

L

	Cis-Locations		Trans-Locations		Error Increase	
Sequence Information	Images	Bboxes	Images	Bboxes	Images	Bboxes
None	19.06	8.14	41.04	19.56	115%	140%
Most Confident	17.7	7.06	34.53	15.77	95%	123%
Oracle	14.92	5.52	28.69	12.06	92%	118%

### Detection

	Cis-Locations		Trans-Locations		Error Increase	
Sequence Information	ResNet	Inception	ResNet	Inception	ResNet	Inception
None	77.10	77.57	70.17	71.37	30%	27.6%
Most Confident	84.78	86.22	84.09	85.44	4.5%	5.6%
Oracle	94.95	95.04	92.13	93.09	55.8%	39.3%

Detection mAP at IoU=0.5 across experiments.

## **Number of Training Examples**

