UFO: Unidentified Foreground Object Detection in 3D Point Cloud

Hyunjun Choi¹,^{2*} Hawook Jeong²

Jin Young Choi¹ ² RideFlux Inc.

¹ ASRI, ECE., Seoul National University

numb7315@snu.ac.kr hawook@rideflux.com

m jychoi@snu.ac.kr

Abstract

In this paper, we raise a new issue on Unidentified Foreground Object (UFO) detection in 3D point clouds, which is a crucial technology in autonomous driving in the wild. UFO detection is challenging in that existing 3D object detectors encounter extremely hard challenges in both 3D localization and Out-of-Distribution (OOD) detection. To tackle these challenges, we suggest a new UFO detection framework including three tasks: evaluation protocol, methodology, and benchmark. The evaluation includes a new approach to measure the performance on our goal, i.e. both localization and OOD detection of UFOs. The methodology includes practical techniques to enhance the performance of our goal. The benchmark is composed of the KITTI Misc benchmark and our additional synthetic benchmark for modeling a more diverse range of UFOs. The proposed framework consistently enhances performance by a large margin across all four baseline detectors: SECOND, PointPillars, PV-RCNN, and PartA2, giving insight for future work on UFO detection in the wild.

1. Introduction

In autonomous driving scenarios, 3D object detection using point clouds is a crucial perception technology. While the recognition performance of 3D object detectors has advanced, confidence in their stability for real-world applications remains insufficient. Specifically, a notable issue is the tendency of 3D object detectors to assign high confidence scores to unidentified foreground or unknown objects. Recently, methods addressing Out-of-Distribution (OOD) detection [4, 5] or open-set object detection [3, 8, 13] in 2D object detection on images have tackled similar challenges. Similarly, in the realm of 3D object detection [12, 26] on point clouds, efforts are underway to address these issues.

However, we have found that 3D object detectors [14, 21, 22, 27] not only face challenges in OOD detection for unidentified foreground objects but also encounter significant difficulties in localization. Unlike 2D images, Lidar





Figure 1. Base 3D object detector and our method comparison. (a): 3D object detection result of baseline SECOND [27] on KITTI [6] 'Misc' class object; (b): Comparison of the base detector and our method in two aspects: OOD localization performance (Recall) and OOD detection performance (AUROC).

point clouds are sparse, making it challenging to obtain accurate context and precisely localize unidentified foreground objects with various sizes. As depicted in Figure 1a, SECOND [27], which is trained on the classes of Car, Pedestrian, and Cyclist, fails to localize the 'Misc' class object within the green box even at a close distance. Instead, SECOND recognizes the unknown object as a smaller pedestrian, posing a potential threat to safety. Furthermore, these localization challenges have a critical impact on OOD detection measurements. For instance, if the detector fails to localize an unknown object, obtaining corresponding detection results becomes impossible, leading to difficulties in acquiring confidence scores for OOD data. In this paper, the term 'Unidentified Foreground Object (UFO)' is employed as a synonym for an unknown object or an OOD object.

In our paper, we address the UFO detection problem through three main directions: (i) introducing a novel protocol for evaluation, (ii) presenting methodologies for enhancement, and (iii) introducing a new synthetic benchmark. We propose a comprehensive protocol that evaluates UFO detection considering OOD detection and holistic assessment, including localization performance. Our ideal 3D object detector excels in precisely localizing UFOs while assigning low scores to them. We establish a standardized approach to measure localization and OOD detection on Lidar-based detectors trained on KITTI scenes. We designate the 'Misc' class as the OOD object, creating the KITTI Misc benchmark, and propose baselines for four existing detectors: SECOND [27], PointPillars [14], PV-RCNN [22], and PartA2 [21]. Localization performance is measured by the recall of UFOs, and OOD detection is evaluated using our proposed Hungarian-based matching strategy and established metrics: AUROC, FPR95, and AUPR.

Secondly, in line with our UFO detection protocol, we propose practical techniques to simultaneously enhance localization and OOD detection performance. We introduce an anomaly sample augmentation approach inspired by the outlier exposure method [10], acquiring anomaly samples from indoor scene SUN-RGBD [23] data and incorporating them as a new additional class for training. As a result, our method undergoes training to localize UFOs of various sizes. Next, we address the conflicting aspects between OOD detection and localization. While aiming to obtain low confidence scores for unknown objects, which simultaneously acquires low objectness scores for localization. Therefore, we add a separate objectness node alongside the classification nodes for the 3D object detector. In addition to the proposed augmentation, we introduce a technique to enhance OOD detection performance by leveraging energy-based regularization and outlier-aware supervised contrastive learning using the anomaly samples introduced in the proposed augmentation. As evident from Figure 1b, the application of our techniques yields improvements in both localization and OOD detection compared to the four baseline detectors.

Finally, to assess safety for a more diverse range of UFOs, we propose a benchmark by introducing various new objects from indoor scenes into the outdoor scene of KITTI. The proposed synthetic benchmark is composed using SUN-RGBD data, classes that are not utilized in the augmentation process. Furthermore, for the construction of a challenging benchmark, we employ the Nearest Neighbor

grid Sampling method to reduce the domain gap between indoor and outdoor scenes, ensuring that in-door scene objects are incorporated into the outdoor scene. As a result, we can create a more challenging benchmark for OOD detection from the perspective of existing baseline detectors.

In summary, our contribution can be outlined as follows: (i) Introducing a novel protocol for evaluating UFO detection on KITTI scenes, providing baseline assessments for four 3D object detectors: SECOND, PointPillars, PV-RCNN, and PartA2. (ii) Applying practical techniques enhances UFO detection performance in both localization and OOD detection from existing 3D object detector baselines. (iii) Constructing a new synthetic benchmark scenario for modeling a more diverse range of UFOs can demonstrate the validity on the evaluation protocol and give insight for future works on UFO detection in the wild.

2. Related Works

Open set object detection

Open Set Object Detection (OSOD) extends from object detection to Open Set Recognition (OSR) [20]. OSOD is formally introduced in [3], evaluating detectors like Faster-RCNN [19], Retinaet [15], and YOLO [18]. Their key protocol, wilderness, measures the precision ratio between scenes with mixed unknown and purely known instances. Recently, OpenDet [8] proposes to expand low-density latent regions to improve OSOD. However, these approaches require scenes with mixed unknown and purely known. Our protocol is more practical, as it can be applied to individual scenes with mixed unknown instances. It evaluates two aspects for the unknown elements present in individual scenes: localization and OOD detection.

OOD detection on object detection

OOD detection [9] is similar to rejecting unknown classes in OSR [20] but doesn't require maintaining the accuracy of known classes. In recent 2D object detection, the STUD [4] and VOS [5] papers introduced a protocol for OOD detection. They measure the OOD detection performance by distinguishing scenes with only known objects and scenes without them, considering all scores obtained from the detector. However, this may not be suitable for many practical environments where known and unknown objects coexist. Recently, in Lidar 3D point clouds, an evaluation protocol has been proposed in [12] that aimed to evaluate OOD detection when known and unknown instances coexist. However, they use heuristic IOU thresholds for unknown instances to obtain OOD scores. Our approach differs in seeking consistent OOD detection performance across multiple detectors based on heuristic-free one-to-one matching.

Lidar-based 3D Object Detection

3D object detection based on Lidar point clouds has seen significant improvement by aggregating features through



Figure 2. **ID** and **OOD** localization performance comparison. This plot illustrates the recall for both ID and OOD objects based on the proposal number. This depicts the recall for OOD objects at IoU thresholds of 0.1, 0.25, and 0.4.

voxel-based learning [28]. SECOND [27] enhances speed over VoxelNet [28] by replacing its conventional 3D convolution with sparse convolution. PointPillars [14] divides the point cloud into pillar units and applies PointNet to each unit. In contrast to SECOND and VoxelNet, which use 3D convolution to integrate voxel units, PointPillars uses 2D convolution to integrate pillar units which boosts efficiency in time. PartA2 [21] newly designs a RoI-aware point cloud pooling module to encode effective features of 3D proposals. PV-RCNN [22] extends SECOND, preserving more 3D structure information by adding a keypoint branch. Existing methods have primarily focused on improving detection precision for in-distribution data. However, there has not been a clear investigation into their ability to distinguish and localize OOD or unidentified foreground objects.

3. Unidentified Foreground Object detection

3.1. Problem Formulation and Evaluation

We can formalize a Lidar based 3D object detector as $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^{D \times M} \to \mathbb{R}^{L \times N}$, which maps an input 3D Lidar consisting of M points to object detection results. A point is a vector with dimension D, including location x,y, and z. Object detection results consist of N detection results which are $O_i = \{conf_i, \mathbf{cls}_i, x_i, y_i, z_i, l_i, w_i, h_i, \theta_i\}$ con f_i can also be defined as the final objectness score, representing the degree to which an object is present. For a classification score with a total of K classes, it is defined as $\mathbf{cls}_i = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_K\}$. The set $\{x_i, y_i, z_i, l_i, w_i, h_i, \theta_i\}$ corresponds to the 3D detection box, defined as a cuboid with an orientation angle.

In practical terms, to address the UFO problem, we utilize a detector with K = 3 in the KITTI dataset: car, pedestrian, and cyclist. For UFOs, we define the 'Misc' class provided in the actual KITTI dataset. We refer to this as the KITTI Misc benchmark and propose a protocol for its evaluation. In the evaluation, we simultaneously assess two aspects of UFOs: localization and OOD detection. For localization, we utilize $con f_i$. For OOD detection, we obtain scalar scores (e.g., MSP, Energy) from cls_i for evaluation. Unless stated otherwise, we use Energy score [16] for evaluation in this paper.

3.1.1 Evaluation of Localization on UFO

Generally, recall is a crucial metric for ensuring the safety of an object detector. In actual KITTI settings, detectors often follow a base setting, obtaining a maximum of 500 results. We demonstrate recall results for the actual SECOND detector on KITTI as described in Fig 2. Specifically, recall is measured based on the proposal number and IOU threshold criteria. The predictions are uniformly restricted to the topk based on the score $conf_i$ and similarly found based on the IOU threshold, calculating True Positives (TP) for objects predicted among actual objects, and then computing $Recall = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$. As evident from the graph, the baseline detector, SECOND, significantly lags behind in OOD localization compared to ID at the same threshold of 0.40. Furthermore, our recall in the graph shows minimal differences beyond a proposal number of 300. Therefore, we fix the proposal number k = 500 and evaluate localization performance using three IOU thresholds: 0.10, 0.25, and 0.40.

3.1.2 Evaluation of OOD Detection on UFO

We perform OOD detection based on scalar scores obtained for ID classification and OOD classification from the final detection results [9]. The evaluation metrics include AU-ROC, FPR95, and AUPR. In previous work [12], for an OOD object IOU threshold of 0.3 or higher is selected for OOD detection. However, the challenge arises when applying this approach uniformly across multiple detectors. To address this, we propose an algorithm that performs one-toone matching of detection results to ground truth to measure OOD detection consistently across detectors. Our algorithm is based on the Hungarian algorithm, similar to the bipartite matching optimization in DETR [1].

However, the existing DETR [1] like matching does not handle exceptional cases where ground truth and detection results have no overlap. In actual detectors, such cases often occur for OOD data, and conventional methods randomly match them. Therefore, for precise OOD detection evaluation, we propose a separate handling for such ground truth samples. We address cases where IOU is not available by matching the closest detection result based on Euclidean distance. As outlined in the algorithm 1, we first distinguish samples with no IOU and then handle them separately. For these cases, we perform matching based on distance to find

Algorithm 1: Hungarian Based Matching
Input: G_i : Ground truth M, O_j : Detection results N
Output: M_i : Matching index result
Step0: Classify into results with overlap or no
Get IOU matrix $IOU_{i,j} \leftarrow$ IOU between pairs (G_i, O_j)
for $i = 1$ to M do
if $IOU_{i,j}$ is all zero then
Gather as A_i
else
\Box Gather as B_i
Step1: IOU based hungarian matching
Get IOU matrix $IOU_{i,j} \leftarrow$ IOU between pairs (B_i, G_j)
Hungarian Matching IM_i which maximize $IOU_{i,j}$
Remove matched result $C_i \leftarrow G_i$
Step2: Distance based hungarian matching
Get distance matrix $DIST_{i,j} \leftarrow$ IOU between pairs (A_i, C_j)
Hungarian Matching DM_i which minimize $DIST_{i,j}$
Aggregate and get final matching result $M_i \leftarrow IM_i, DM_i$

the closest sample, proposing a more precise one-to-one matching compared to conventional methods.

3.2. Practical Techniques for UFO detection in 3D

Baseline 3D object detectors struggle with localizing and detecting UFOs. To address this, we employ two key strategies. Firstly, inspired by outlier exposure [10], we introduce auxiliary UFO data by copying and pasting from SUN-RGBD [23] indoor scenes, treating it as a new 'Anomaly' class for training UFO localization across various sizes. Figure 3a illustrates this sample from SUN-RGBD. Secondly, for improved OOD detection, we utilize the Anomaly data to implement energy-based regularization and outlier-aware contrastive learning. Our approach consists of four main techniques: (i) Anomaly Sample Augmentation, (ii) Learning on Objectness, (iii) Learning on Localizing UFO, and (iv) Learning on Distinguishing UFO.

3.2.1 Anomaly Sample Augmentation

In the existing SECOND, the augmentation method during training involves sampling ground truths from the database, specifically copying object points and labels from the ground truth to training point clouds while checking for collisions to prevent unrealistic outcomes. We adopt a similar strategy for Anomaly Sample augmentation, constructing a database from SUN-RGBD data. From this database, we obtain anomaly samples using a copy-paste approach, treating them as an additional class ('Anomaly') for detector training. Anomaly Sample Augmentation trains the detector to localize UFOs of various sizes or contexts. Specifically, we directly utilize the database formed in previous research [17] for indoor 3D object detection, which consists of 3D cuboids and their corresponding RGB-D point clouds.



Figure 3. Visualization result on SUN-RGBD [23] pointcloud of original and resized object. (a): Point cloud of the original object for Anomaly Sample Augmentation; (b): Point cloud of the resized object for Multi-size Mix Augmentation.

3.2.2 Learning on Objectness

Existing 3D object detectors often have a high correlation between classification scores and confidence scores. For instance, in a single-stage detector like SECOND, the confidence score $con f_i$ operates as $max\{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_k\}$. However, we aim to enhance localization and OOD detection separately. Therefore, we propose the addition of a separate objectness node that is trained for decoupling these aspects.

$$FL(p_t) = -\alpha (1 - p_t)^{\gamma} \log(p_t), \tag{1}$$

We use the conventional Focal loss employed in RetinaNet [15] with the established SECOND settings, setting $\alpha = 0.25$ and $\gamma = 2$. We label the foreground, including the ID class and the 'Anomaly' class, as 1, and everything else as 0. The objectness loss constructed with Focal loss is denoted as L_{obj} . The introduced objectness node aims to model a universal objectness, akin to Faster-RCNN [7]'s Region Proposal Network. In a single-stage detector, it serves as the confidence score, while in a two-stage detector, it acts as a bridge, forming proposals for subsequent stages. The final confidence score for the two-stage detector is derived through the second-stage classifier.

3.2.3 Learning on Localizing UFO

We train the model to localize objects of various sizes by adding the 'Anomaly' class with Anomaly Sample augmentation. However, as shown in Figure 3a, the sizes of indoor scene data are generally smaller or less diverse compared to outdoor scenes. To address this, we propose Multi-size Mix augmentation to create a more diverse set of anomaly objects. As illustrated in Figure 3b, we construct a database by resizing the original anomalies to various sizes and mixing them together. Specifically, Multi-size mix augmentation combines equal parts of the original anomaly at its original size and the resized anomaly. Additionally, the sizes for resizing the boxes are randomly extracted from various samples of box sizes in the KITTI Misc class.

3.2.4 Learning on Distinguishing UFO

The straightforward application of the previous simple OE loss is not effective when using Anomaly data for a onevs-rest classifier. This is because the basic classifier already trains an additional Anomaly class as it should go to all zero for the existing ID classes. Therefore, we address this issue by introducing energy regularization loss [16], Furthermore, we enhance performance by incorporating outlieraware contrastive learning [2], which improves the separability between ID and OOD data in the representation. Energy regularization loss is defined by

$$L_{en} = L_{in,hinge} + L_{out,hinge}$$

= $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}_{in},y)\sim D_{in}^{train}} [(\max(0, E(\mathbf{x}) - m_{in}))^2]$ (2)
+ $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim D^{train}} [(\max(0, E(\mathbf{x}) - m_{out}))^2].$

Here, D_{out}^{train} is defined as an 'Anomaly' class object. The loss for contrastive learning is defined by

$$L_c = \sum_{i \in B_{in}} L_i,\tag{3}$$

$$L_{i} = -\frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{|B_{y_{i}}^{in}|>1\}}}{|B_{y_{i}}^{in}|-1} \sum_{p \in B_{y_{i}}^{in} \setminus \{i\}} \log \frac{exp(\widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{p}/\tau_{c})}{\sum_{k \in B^{all} \setminus \{i\}} exp(\widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i} \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{k}/\tau_{c})},$$
(4)

where we set $\frac{I_{\{|B_{y_i}^{in}|>1\}}}{|B_{y_i}^{in}|-1} = 0$ when $|B_{y_i}^{in}| = 1$; $I_{\{|B_{y_i}^{in}|>1\}} = 1$ when $|B_{y_i}^{in}| > 1$.

Within the total batch B^{all} , an instance \mathbf{x}_i holds the following representation $\mathbf{\tilde{f}}_i$. B^{all} has partition B^{in} and B^{out} , each of which is an ID object and an Anomaly class object, respectively. As a result, total loss L_{total} for our loss is defined by

$$L_{total} = L_{cls} + L_{reg} + L_{obj} + \lambda_{en}L_{en} + \lambda_c L_c.$$
(5)

3.3. Proposed Synthetic Benchmark

We propose a benchmark for evaluating UFOs using the 'Misc' class on KITTI. However, this primarily consists of objects seen in outdoor scenes. To create a more diverse UFO scenario, we have synthesized data from previously used indoor scenes and incorporated them into the benchmark. Using the cut-paste technique, we insert instances Algorithm 2: Nearest Neighbor grid Sampling

Input: T_i : Target point cloud, I_j : Input point cloud TB: Target 3D box (L, W, H), IB: Input 3D box (l, w, h), N : number of slice **Output:** S_i : Sampled point cloud Step0: Size conversion from input to target Resize box from input 3D box to target 3D box Resized point cloud $RI_i \leftarrow I_i$ Step1: Height grid wise partition Height of Box is H and slice into $P = [0: H + \frac{H}{N}: \frac{H}{N}]$ for k = 1 to N do Gather as $TP_k \leftarrow T_i$ of height between [P[k-1], P[k]]Gather as $IP_k \leftarrow RI_i$ of height between [P[k-1], P[k]]Step2: Nearest Neighbor Sampling for k = 1 to N do if $numel(TP_k) > numel(IP_k)$ then Sample all point cloud $\hat{S}_i \leftarrow IP_k$ else for l = 1 to $numel(TP_k)$ do Find Nearest Neighbor of $TP_k(l)$ in IP_k Gather as $S_i \leftarrow NN(IP_k)$ Remove matched point from TP_k, IP_k



Figure 4. **Visualization on our proposed synthetic benchmark.** The blue box represents the original ID object, while the green box represents our cut-pasted synthesized OOD object.

from the indoor SUN-RGBD data whose classes do not overlap with the training sample. As depicted in Figure 4, our benchmark involves adding UFOs to existing scenes. Blue represents the original in-distribution data, while green depicts the synthesized UFOs. We aim to evaluate OOD detection and UFO localization for existing baseline 3D detectors in scenes where these coexist.

Our goal is to create a challenging synthetic benchmark. The key issue here is to reduce the domain gap between indoor and outdoor scenes to convincingly synthesize UFOs in outdoor scenes. Indoor data generally has denser point clouds compared to outdoor data. To mitigate this domain gap, we first perform standardization for intensity features, aligning their mean and standard deviation with the outdoor data. Next, to adapt dense indoor data to sparse outdoor patterns, we propose a sampling method. As described in Algorithm 2, we introduce the Nearest Neighbor grid sampling method. We set a number of slices N = 5 for the default setting. As detailed in Section 4.3.2, our approach demonstrates a more challenging aspect compared to the conventional naive random sampling or no sampling methods, showcasing lower OOD detection performance for the baseline SECOND detector.

4. Experimental Result

4.1. Experiment Settings

We conduct experiments on the KITTI [6] training and validation sets with a 5:5 split. For the baseline configuration, the baseline detector is trained based on the code of Open-PCDet [24]. The key difference is that, in the training set, classes other than Car, Pedestrian, and Cyclist (e.g., Truck, Van, etc.) were removed from the point cloud to avoid training them as background. Also, we consistently aim to obtain a maximum of 500 detection results. For this purpose, SECOND and PointPillar maintain their original configuration settings from OpenPCDet. For PV-RCNN and PartA2, we changed the settings for inference in the first stage, increasing the NMS configuration of pre-max size to 8196 and post-max size to 2048 to ensure a lot of detection results. We utilized the $\{R, G, B, x, y, z\}$ information from the SUN-RGBD dataset and followed the processing protocol outlined in [23] and [17]. The RGB values were averaged to convert them into intensity $\{I, x, y, z\}$, forming a 4D vector as same as KITTI.

For the Misc benchmark, we used the existing validation set but selected only scenes with Misc objects within the 0-50m distance range. We collected samples coexisting with in-distribution samples in these scenes to form the ID and OOD distribution. The recall was also measured by aggregating these scenes to evaluate OOD recall. This is the same setting for a synthetic benchmark. Detailed hyperparameter settings and training environments are described in the supplementary material.

4.2. Evaluation on KITTI Misc benchmark

4.2.1 Quantitative Result

We first quantitatively validate our method on the KITTI Misc benchmark, particularly showcasing superior localization performance for the Misc class, compared to the prominent baseline, SECOND. As depicted in Figure 5, regardless of proposal number and IOU thresholds (0.1, 0.25, 0.40), our method consistently exhibits excellent recall. Our method goes beyond SECOND, evaluating recall and OOD performance for four detectors. As summarized in Table 1, the two-stage detectors, PV-RCNN and Part-A2, outperform single-stage detectors (PointPillars and SEC-OND) in both OOD performance and recall. Our method significantly improves recall and OOD detection across all detectors, as shown in Figure 1 of Introduction.



Figure 5. **OOD object recall comparison on KITTI Misc benchmark**. OOD(B) represents the result of the baseline detector SEC-OND, and OOD(P) represents the result of our method on SEC-OND.

Table 1. Quantitative result of our method on KITTI Misc benchmark. 500 proposals are used for all cases.

METHOD		Recall @IOU			OOD detection		
METHOD		0.10	0.25	0.40	AUC↑	AP↑	FPR↓
SECOND	Base	69.69	35.67	9.28	85.53	81.17	78.14
SECOND	Ours	81.65	48.87	24.12	88.48	82.94	55.05
D	Base	76.70	44.74	18.14	75.38	68.79	89.48
PointPillars	Ours	82.89	54.85	26.60	83.79	76.76	61.65
DUDCNN	Base	85.98	54.43	16.49	86.28	80.79	72.37
PV-KCININ	Ours	89.48	62.47	31.13	90.43	85.89	40.21
Dowt A 2	Base	80.21	44.54	10.31	85.63	79.73	66.39
PartA2	Ours	88.87	57.32	23.09	88.45	84.20	46.39

4.2.2 Qualitative Result

We qualitatively validate our method through visualization, specifically against the baseline SECOND detector. As shown in Figure 6, the top images depict the results of the conventional SECOND, while the bottom images showcase our method. Blue boxes represent ground truth boxes for indistribution, and green boxes represent ground truth boxes for Misc. The red boxes indicate the Top-25 results from the final detection. In contrast to the baseline, which estimates Misc localization with significantly different-sized boxes, our method consistently provides more accurate estimates with boxes of similar sizes. The superiority of our approach is visually evident, confirming its effectiveness.

4.3. Evaluation on Synthetic benchmark

4.3.1 Comparison with baseline

We also validate our method on the proposed synthetic benchmark. As summarized in Table 2, conventional base detectors struggle with localizing objects in synthetically generated indoor scenes. Consistent with the results from the Misc benchmark, high-performance two-stage detectors outperform single-stage detectors in OOD detection. Furthermore, applying our method to all four detectors leads



Figure 6. Qualitative result of our method on KITTI Misc benchmark. (a): Base detector result; (b): Our result.

Table 2. Quantitative result of our method on the proposed synthetic benchmark.

METHOD		Recall @IOU			OOD detection		
METHOD		0.10	0.25	0.40	AUC↑	AP↑	FPR \downarrow
SECOND	Base	69.40	25.28	2.44	84.63	85.99	85.81
SECOND	Ours	92.36	66.97	34.16	96.94	96.96	9.44
DointDillono	Base	67.69	22.49	3.93	76.23	74.49	93.65
PointPillars	Ours	85.56	47.63	23.49	90.28	87.46	32.97
DUDCNN	Base	80.27	24.22	2.02	90.58	88.62	50.67
PV-RCNN	Ours	97.33	79.33	43.56	96.25	96.55	5.12
PartA2	Base	73.97	21.91	1.95	87.37	84.40	57.92
	Ours	96.05	70.18	37.06	96.33	97.55	5.70

to a substantial improvement in localization and enhanced OOD detection performance. This trend holds true across all detectors. Notably, our approach exhibits significant improvements in OOD detection, particularly when compared to the Misc benchmark. This pronounced enhancement can be attributed to the use of indoor scene data in the Anomaly Sample augmentation, which, despite having different classes, shares the same domain as the OOD data. This makes OOD detection more straightforward compared to the outdoor scene with a Misc class object.

4.3.2 Comparison on Sampling method

Firstly, we aim to qualitatively validate the effectiveness of our method. We compare the target point cloud with five sampling methods: No sampling, Random sampling, Random-grid sampling, Nearest Neighbor sampling, and our sampling method. Random grid sampling obtains samples randomly in terms of the height grids of the target. As illustrated in Fiure 7, our method synthesizes samples that closely match the characteristics of the original target, enabling effective indoor-to-outdoor synthetic sample generation.

Table 3. Comparison result of Sampling method. The under-bar indicates the worst one.

METHOD	Sampling Mathad	Recall @IOU		OOD detection		
METHOD	Sampling Method	0.10	0.25	AUC↑	AP↑	FPR↓
	No sampling	66.29	23.44	88.42	88.92	77.93
	Random	65.08	19.50	87.01	89.80	80.13
SECOND	Random-grid	66.59	21.14	87.37	88.84	77.95
	NN	65.40	23.66	85.10	87.71	<u>89.06</u>
	Ours (NN-grid)	69.40	25.28	84.63	85.99	85.81

Secondly, we quantitatively compare localization and OOD detection for the existing baseline detector, SECOND, across different sampling methods. As summarized in Table 3, our method achieves the best performance in terms of localization but the least favorable in OOD detection. For the SECOND detector trained on KITTI data, our sampling method synthesizes data that closely resembles the existing KITTI training samples, leading to improved localization performance. However, it faces challenges in OOD detection. This quantitatively confirms that our sampling method effectively reduces the domain gap between indoor and outdoor point clouds.



Figure 7. Visualization result depending on Sampling method. (a) refers to the target point cloud. (f) refers to our sampling result.

5. Discussion

5.1. Effect of objectness node

We train the classification score used in object detection and the objectness score used in localization separately. In the inference phase, comparing our objectness score with the traditional confidence score, as summarized in Table 4, which confirms that our method achieves better performance in terms of localization.

Table 4. Effect of using objectness node.

METHOD	Objectness node	Recall @IOU			
METHOD	Objectness node	0.10	0.25	0.40	
Ours (SECOND)	X	78.97	47.01	22.06	
	1	81.65	48.87	24.12	

5.2. Comparison of OOD score metric

We obtain OOD detection performance for all baselines using the Energy score metric. Table 5 summarizes AUROC results obtained for various score metrics on the existing baseline. It can be observed that the choice of OOD score metric has a limited impact on 3D object detectors. The Energy score, while not necessarily the best, consistently demonstrates stable OOD performance across detectors.

Table 5. Comparsion of OOD score metric.

Metric	Method (AUROC↑)						
Wienie	SECOND	PointPillars	PV-RCNN	Part-A2			
Max Logit [11]	85.54	75.37	86.28	85.66			
Sum Logit [25]	85.65	76.07	86.36	83.56			
Max Prob [25]	85.54	75.37	86.28	85.66			
Sum Prob [25]	85.53	75.38	86.28	85.63			
MSP [9]	86.14	70.55	85.52	86.20			
Max Energy [25]	85.54	75.37	86.28	85.66			
Sum Energy [25]	85.53	75.38	86.28	85.63			
Energy [16]	85.53	75.38	86.28	85.63			

5.3. Ablation study on augmentation method

We significantly improve localization performance by employing multi-size mix augmentation in conjunction with the anomaly mix augmentation obtained from indoor scenes. As summarized in Table 6, the combination of both augmentations yields the best localization performance.

Table 6. Augmentation method ablation result.

METHOD	Augmentatio	Recall @IOU			
MILTIOD	Anomaly Sample	Multi-size Mix	0.10	0.25	0.40
	X	X	69.69	35.67	9.28
SECOND	1	×	72.16	40.62	17.11
	✓	1	81.65	48.87	24.12

5.4. Ablation study on loss

To enhance OOD detection performance, we incorporate additional losses, namely energy loss and contrastive loss. As summarized in Table 7, the use of contrastive loss significantly improves the separability between ID and OOD objects in feature embeddings, leading to a substantial enhancement in OOD performance compared to conventional methods.

Table 7. Loss component ablation result.

METHOD	Loss o	component	OOD detection		
METHOD	Energy	Contrastive	AUC↑	AP↑	FPR↓
	X	×	85.53	81.17	78.14
SECOND	1	×	86.38	79.13	58.35
	1	1	88.48	82.94	55.05

6. Conclusion

We proposed a novel protocol for assessing UFO detection on KITTI scenes, establishing baselines for four 3D object detectors: SECOND, PointPillars, PV-RCNN, and Part-A2. Our practical techniques significantly improve UFO detection in both localization and OOD detection compared to existing 3D object detector baselines. We create a new synthetic benchmark to model a diverse range of UFOs, validating our evaluation protocol and offering insights for future work on UFO detection in real-world scenarios.

References

- Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-toend object detection with transformers. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 213–229. Springer, 2020. 3
- [2] Hyunjun Choi, JaeHo Chung, Hawook Jeong, and Jin Young Choi. Three factors to improve out-of-distribution detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01030, 2023. 5
- [3] Akshay Dhamija, Manuel Gunther, Jonathan Ventura, and Terrance Boult. The overlooked elephant of object detection: Open set. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1021–1030, 2020. 1, 2
- [4] Xuefeng Du, Xin Wang, Gabriel Gozum, and Yixuan Li. Unknown-aware object detection: Learning what you don't know from videos in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13678–13688, 2022. 1, 2
- [5] Xuefeng Du, Zhaoning Wang, Mu Cai, and Yixuan Li. Vos: Learning what you don't know by virtual outlier synthesis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01197, 2022. 1, 2
- [6] Andreas Geiger, Philip Lenz, and Raquel Urtasun. Are we ready for autonomous driving? the kitti vision benchmark suite. In 2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 3354–3361. IEEE, 2012. 1, 6
- [7] Ross Girshick. Fast r-cnn. In Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision, pages 1440–1448, 2015. 4
- [8] Jiaming Han, Yuqiang Ren, Jian Ding, Xingjia Pan, Ke Yan, and Gui-Song Xia. Expanding low-density latent regions for open-set object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9591–9600, 2022. 1, 2
- [9] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. A baseline for detecting misclassified and out-of-distribution examples in neural networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2017. 2, 3, 8
- [10] Dan Hendrycks, Mantas Mazeika, and Thomas Dietterich. Deep anomaly detection with outlier exposure. arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.04606, 2018. 2, 4
- [11] Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Mantas Mazeika, Mohammadreza Mostajabi, Jacob Steinhardt, and Dawn Song. Scaling out-of-distribution detection for real-world settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.11132*, 2019. 8
- [12] Chengjie Huang, Vahdat Abdelzad, Christopher Gus Mannes, Luke Rowe, Benjamin Therien, Rick Salay, Krzysztof Czarnecki, et al. Out-of-distribution detection for lidar-based 3d object detection. In 2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), pages 4265–4271. IEEE, 2022. 1, 2, 3
- [13] KJ Joseph, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. Towards open world object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5830–5840, 2021. 1
- [14] Alex H Lang, Sourabh Vora, Holger Caesar, Lubing Zhou, Jiong Yang, and Oscar Beijbom. Pointpillars: Fast encoders

for object detection from point clouds. In *Proceedings of* the *IEEE/CVF* conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 12697–12705, 2019. 1, 2, 3

- [15] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2980–2988, 2017. 2, 4
- [16] Weitang Liu, Xiaoyun Wang, John Owens, and Yixuan Li. Energy-based out-of-distribution detection. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33:21464–21475, 2020. 3, 5, 8
- [17] Charles R Qi, Or Litany, Kaiming He, and Leonidas J Guibas. Deep hough voting for 3d object detection in point clouds. In proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pages 9277–9286, 2019. 4, 6
- [18] Joseph Redmon, Santosh Divvala, Ross Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 779–788, 2016. 2
- [19] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. Advances in neural information processing systems, 28, 2015. 2
- [20] Walter J Scheirer, Anderson de Rezende Rocha, Archana Sapkota, and Terrance E Boult. Toward open set recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(7):1757–1772, 2012. 2
- [21] Shaoshuai Shi, Zhe Wang, Xiaogang Wang, and Hongsheng Li. Part-a² net: 3d part-aware and aggregation neural network for object detection from point cloud. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03670*, 2(3), 2019. 1, 2, 3
- [22] Shaoshuai Shi, Chaoxu Guo, Li Jiang, Zhe Wang, Jianping Shi, Xiaogang Wang, and Hongsheng Li. Pv-rcnn: Pointvoxel feature set abstraction for 3d object detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 10529–10538, 2020. 1, 2, 3
- [23] Shuran Song, Samuel P Lichtenberg, and Jianxiong Xiao. Sun rgb-d: A rgb-d scene understanding benchmark suite. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 567–576, 2015. 2, 4, 6
- [24] OpenPCDet Development Team. Openpcdet: An opensource toolbox for 3d object detection from point clouds. https://github.com/open-mmlab/OpenPCDet, 2020. 6
- [25] Haoran Wang, Weitang Liu, Alex Bocchieri, and Yixuan Li. Can multi-label classification networks know what they don't know? Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:29074–29087, 2021. 8
- [26] Kelvin Wong, Shenlong Wang, Mengye Ren, Ming Liang, and Raquel Urtasun. Identifying unknown instances for autonomous driving. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 384–393. PMLR, 2020. 1
- [27] Yan Yan, Yuxing Mao, and Bo Li. Second: Sparsely embedded convolutional detection. *Sensors*, 18(10):3337, 2018. 1, 2, 3
- [28] Yin Zhou and Oncel Tuzel. Voxelnet: End-to-end learning for point cloud based 3d object detection. In *Proceedings of*

the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 4490–4499, 2018. 3