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Adversarial Perturbations

We already know modern object detectors’ behavior can change drastically from small changes to an image.

Those behavior changes can be critical to safety.

Detected as: “Bus”  Adversarial Noise  Detected as: “Ostrich”


But what if we are not worried about adversarial inputs?
Related Work - DeepTest

Apply mutations to images and evaluate effect on system learned to produce steering angles

Our approach’s differences:

- Physically realistic mutators
  - Better match what real systems may encounter
  - Ensure ideal output should not change
- Large-scale evaluation
  - Dataset size
  - # Mutators
  - # Algorithms
- Evaluate person detection

Major Take-Aways

Small image changes can have catastrophic effects on safety critical perception.

In fact, common image degradations can often cause such failures for systems running over long periods.

We demonstrate this on many state-of-art fieldable systems within a framework for evaluating robustness in adverse conditions.
Previous Work – Person Detection

Person detection is one sample safety-critical application now dominated by deep-learning-based approaches.

Experiments in this work use NREC Agricultural Person Detection Dataset, largest public dataset for off-road person detection


Chose to partner with the robustness testing group at our University

Robustness Testing is the process of generating many queries of a system and requires knowledge of what wrong behavior is for these inputs.

This technique has found real, dangerous bugs
- Previously tested 17 robotic systems over several years
- An example, shown, is finding a planner ignoring constraints, leading to erratic behavior

Applying to perception...
- Perception systems have such high dimensional inputs to make pure generation of new inputs impractical.
- We propose instead using physically grounded mutations of previously labeled data to create exceptional inputs.

From Philosophy

We propose using **physically grounded mutations** of previously labeled data to create exceptional inputs.

- We built a list of degradations that occur in outdoor imaging
- We implemented parameterized mutators modeling some of these
- We used these mutated datasets to estimate robustness of safety critical machine learning systems
Mutators Used

All are literature backed degradations

See paper for details and model references
Contextual Mutators

We implemented two mutators that depend on the geometric structure of the scene, defocus and haze:

- Estimate scene geometry in each frame from stereo video using scene flow\(^1\) and bilateral filtering\(^2\)
- Mutate images based on estimated depth to each pixel:
  - Defocus – Based on depth-dependent blurring
  - Haze – Based on depth-dependent alpha-blending

---

\(^1\) Vogel et al. “3D Scene Flow Estimation with a Piecewise Rigid Scene Model”. IJCV 2015.
Many state-of-the-art object detectors from some of the most popular deep network frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUT</th>
<th>Base Library</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS-CNN</td>
<td>Caffe</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD w/ MobileNets</td>
<td>TensorFlow</td>
<td>[12]–[14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD w/ Inception</td>
<td>TensorFlow</td>
<td>[12], [13], [15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-FCN w/ ResNet-101</td>
<td>TensorFlow</td>
<td>[12], [16], [17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster R-CNN w/ ResNet-101</td>
<td>TensorFlow</td>
<td>[12], [17], [18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster R-CNN w/ Inception ResNet v2</td>
<td>TensorFlow</td>
<td>[12], [18], [19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deformable R-FCN</td>
<td>MXNet</td>
<td>[16], [20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deformable Faster R-CNN</td>
<td>MXNet</td>
<td>[18], [20]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Striking Results

Small changes to images, even physically realistic changes, can cause a catastrophic change in classifier performance

MSCNN detections on original images and under moderate blur
How We Evaluate Detection Performance

Detections and ground truth are bounding boxes around people.

We consider multiple Intersection-over-Union (IoU) thresholds for whether to consider a detection “correct”.

Then we average area under the ROC curve for each to get a single number for overall detection performance.

Sample Results: Channel Dropout

Channel dropout is devastating to most detectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutator &amp; Parameters</th>
<th>MS-CNN</th>
<th>SSD w/ MobileNets</th>
<th>SSD w/ Inception</th>
<th>Faster R-CNN w/ Resnet 101</th>
<th>Faster R-CNN w/ Inception Resnet</th>
<th>Deformable R-FCN</th>
<th>Deformable Faster R-CNN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Channel Cb (YCbCr)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Channel Cr (YCbCr)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Channel R (RGB)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Channel G (RGB)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Channel B (RGB)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Results: Haze

There is variation in detector robustness to haze

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutator &amp; Parameters</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>MS-CNN</th>
<th>SSD w/ MobileNets</th>
<th>SSD w/ Inception</th>
<th>Faster R-CNN w/ Resnet 101</th>
<th>R-FCN w/ Resnet 101</th>
<th>Faster R-CNN w/ Inception</th>
<th>Deformable R-FCN</th>
<th>Deformable Faster R-CNN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haze (uV 978.0 m (β 0.004))</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haze (uV 326.0 m (β 0.012))</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haze (uV 97.8 m (β 0.04))</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full Results

Evaluated full combination of mutators and detectors

Allows analysis of general robustness characteristics of each detector

Sometimes would change choice of best detector, depending on importance of adverse conditions to you
Predicting Contextual Mutators

For each contextual mutator, we have a simple equivalent that does not require geometric context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Contextual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian Blur</td>
<td>Defocus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Blend</td>
<td>Haze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can performance under contextual mutators be predicted from simple mutators?

Works well for predicting Defocus from Gaussian Blur

Works poorly for predicting Haze from Alpha Blend
Threats to Validity (And Future Work)

• Generalization outside our chosen detection algorithms
  • New systems are developed all the time, and each has a configuration space

• Generalization across performance metrics
  • We chose detection accuracy, but there are many other options

• Generalization outside our dataset
  • Focused on an off-road dataset, there are many domains where autonomous vehicles are applied

• Generalization outside our chosen mutators
  • Future mutators may have radically different effects on detectors
Major Take-Aways

Small image changes can have catastrophic effects on safety critical perception.

In fact, common image degradations can often cause such failures for systems running over long periods.

We demonstrate this on many state-of-art fieldable systems within a framework for evaluating robustness in adverse conditions.