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Abstract

Conventional sensor-based localization relies on high-precision maps. These maps are generally built using specialized mapping techniques, which involve high labor and computational costs. While in the architectural, engineering and construction industry, building information models (BIMs) are available and can provide informative descriptions of environments. This paper explores an effective way to localize a mobile 3D LiDAR sensor in BIM considering both geometric and semantic properties. Specifically, we first convert original BIM to semantic maps using categories and locations of BIM elements. After that, a coarse-to-fine semantic localization is performed to align laser points to the map via iterative closest point registration. The experimental results show that the semantic localization can track the pose with only scan matching and present centimeter-level errors over 340 meters traveling, thus demonstrating the feasibility of the proposed mapping-free localization framework. The results also show that using semantic information can help reduce localization errors in BIM.
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1. Introduction

Localization is a fundamental module for navigation that estimates the position and orientation of a robot with sequential sensor data. Almost all construction robots, whether tele-operated or autonomous require the estimated poses from the localization module to achieve safe human operation or self navigation \cite{1,2,3}.

With the development of sensor technologies, indoor localization can be achieved by deploying AprilTag \cite{4}, ultra-wideband \cite{5} or other signal emitters in buildings. Such methods rely on the distribution of sensors and inherently lack flexibility within large built-up environments. Instead of deploying sensors in such environments, a more popular approach is to utilize the perception capabilities of on-board sensors, such as laser scanners and cameras, which can improve the generalizability of the localization module in large scenes.

In robotics, a general localization approach is simultaneous localization and mapping (SLAM) system \cite{6,7}, which achieves mapping and localization simultaneously using on-board sensors. However, for some long-term applications that operate under stable conditions, i.e., a quadruped robot working daily on building inspection, the mapping process of SLAM is redundant because the generated map is almost invariant in each run of SLAM. Besides that, applicable SLAM require multiple additional modules to guarantee accuracy and robustness, such as loop closing \cite{8} and map management \cite{9}, leading to inefficiencies for long-term operations.

To address this problem, researchers proposed to achieve mapping first and then metric localization within the known map \cite{10,11}. In this context, map building is required only once and after that localization in the map is able to handle the pose tracking for long-term operation, thereby reducing the complexity of repetitive SLAM processes. In the Architectural, Engineering and Construction (AEC) industry, some models or representations are directly available, such as Computer-aided design (CAD) or building information models (BIM). These map-like representations contain informative measurements that are human readable. In this context, we propose the idea that high-cost pre-mapping may not always be necessary in known built environments, and mapping-free localization could be an alternative choice.

On the other hand, architectural CAD and BIM are designed for construction and building management, which are not localization-oriented maps essentially. To bridge the gap between architectural models and pose estimation, a number of research works proposed to align laser points or visual images to the as-designed models \cite{12,13,14,15}. However, almost all alignment approaches were performed using only geometric properties of observed points and models. In recent years, with the popularity of BIM, semantically rich models provide high-level semantic information for building construction and management. This semantic information is helpful for scene understanding and is easy to obtain compared to traditional CAD models. Thus, we hypothesize that semantic property of BIM can help improve the performance of localization.

To build a semantic localization method, deep learning techniques have been widely used to extract objects or features for data association \cite{16,17,18}. Large amounts of labeled data is required to train neural networks and these existing works can not guarantee the generalization ability in the unseen environments. In addition, learning-based localization methods are
generally computationally expensive with high time costs in the inference stage, especially for dense images in real-time, leading to inefficient applications when using resource-constrained devices.

Based on the above analyses, we conclude that a desirable localization in BIM requires both effectiveness and efficiency for real-time application. In this paper, we propose a novel learning-free framework to achieve localization in BIM with only a 3D mobile LiDAR sensor, as shown in Figure 1. Specifically, the entire framework consists of two parts: offline BIM-to-Map conversion and online semantic localization. The offline workflow can convert the as-designed BIM to semantic point cloud maps. Then we propose to use a semantic localization approach to label the LiDAR readings and achieve pose tracking using Iterative Closest Point (ICP). The entire framework requires no deep learning for feature extraction or pose regression, making it totally interpretable. To test the hypothesis of using semantic information, we conduct extensive experiments using our self-collected multi-session dataset in an university building with multiple storeys.

We summarize the contributions as follows:

- We build an effective pipeline to convert original BIM to semantic point cloud maps, which can bridge the gap between digital representations and metric maps.
- Based on the localization-oriented maps, we design a three-step coarse-to-fine localization pipeline to achieve data labeling and pose tracking in real time.
- We validate the proposed method in a real-world building over 340m traveling. The results show that the BIM-based localization can track the pose successfully.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: we present the related work in Section 2. The proposed semantic localization framework is introduced in Section 3. Section 4 reports the experimental set-up and results on our self-collected datasets. Conclusions and future works are presented in Section 5.

2. Related Work

2.1. BIM-based pose estimation

Many research publications have reviewed pose estimation topics from different perspectives, including deep learning-based [19], sensor-based [20, 21, 22], etc. These research works mainly focus on robot localization on visual or lidar maps, which require SLAM or data collection for pre-mapping. In this paper, we propose to achieve mapping-free localization and we present some related topics and works on CAD or BIM-based localization in this section.

Intuitively, floor plans or 2D points can be generated from CAD models for lightweight 2D localization. In [23], point clouds were extracted from CAD models to achieve radar localization via multi-modal registration. Researchers in [24] proposed to localize a 2D laser scanner on floor plans and hand-drawn maps using stochastic gradient descent. As for localization in 3D space, ICP-based alignment is considered an effective method to track the robot pose [14]. Other than the point-based ICP method, meshes were also used for robot global localization without the need of an initial guess in [25]. Recently, researchers in [26] proposed a novel interface to connect building construction and map representation, which could also detect deviations between as-designed and as-built models via localization results.

Compared to traditional CAD models, BIM is more interoperable in the construction industry and contains more semantic information that may be suitable for robot navigation. For single-frame-based localization, photogrammetric point clouds can be aligned to BIM [13] for camera pose estimation from scratch. As for pose tracking, BIM was combined with a LiDAR-based SLAM system to localize the robot in [27] and experiments were conducted in simulated environments. Visual-based pose tracking was also demonstrated to be effective [13], in which camera poses were estimated by aligning images to BIM models. In [17], learning-based visual localization was proposed for facility operations and management. The learning-based method was also used in [28] for indoor localization. These deep learning-based methods rely on a pre-trained neural network for feature extraction and pose regression, in which the pose estimation module lacked interpretability, bringing difficulties for debugging and deployment in the real world. Researchers in [29] extracted semantic features without learning and also performed robot localization in BIM using 2D laser scans. The results showed that the robot can track its pose in BIM but the localization performance was not evaluated quantitatively.

Inspired by the related works above, we conclude that it is feasible to use BIM for pose estimation or robot localization. However, some existing localization experiments were conducted in simulated environments without considering the gap between reality and simulation. Furthermore, some existing research works use neural networks to extract semantic features, bringing potential difficulties in real-world applications. To address these problems, we proposed an efficient and effective semantic localization in BIM and validated the method in real world contexts.

2.2. Semantic mapping and localization

Semantic mapping and localization is a popular topic in the robotics community. Compared to geometric-only localization, semantic localization is able to closely mimic human understanding of the real world.

Semantic information is easy to extract from visual images. A typical semantic-based visual localization is retrieving query images from database, namely visual place recognition or global localization [20, 30]. Furthermore, semantic information is also helpful for metric pose estimation [31, 32]. Almost all semantic-based visual localization require deep neural networks for feature extraction at the front-end.

As for point cloud-based localization, researchers also proposed to use semantics to enhance the data matching. A semantic ICP-based registration was proposed and validated in RGBD dataset [33]. Similarly, semantic ICP was also used in [16] to localize a vehicle on the road. In [34], semantic-based LiDAR
3. Methodology

3.1. Overview

Given a mobile LiDAR scanner and a BIM file, we denote the input LiDAR data as $P_k$ at timestamp $k$ and the global point cloud map as $M$. The timestamp index is omitted for simplified representation of a single time instance in this paper. The main problem of metric localization is how to align $P$ to the reference $M$ by estimating a transformation $T = [R, t] \in \text{SE}(3), \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$, where $R$ and $t$ are estimated rotation and translation respectively. The alignment must be precise and efficient to guarantee the estimation of $T_{k=1,2,\ldots}$ with sequential inputs $P_{k=1,2,\ldots}$, or namely pose tracking. In the context of this paper, pose tracking and localization are deemed to have the same meaning.

SLAM was tested in challenging forest environments, where tree trunks can be segmented by networks for precise localization. Inspired by these existing works, we propose a semantic localization method to achieve pose estimation in this paper, as illustrated in the following sections.

As shown in Figure 1, the proposed semantic localization framework consists of two modules: offline BIM-to-Map conversion and online semantic localization. The offline module converts original BIM file to a localization-oriented point cloud map, and also labels the map points with categories from BIM. Based on the generated semantic maps, the semantic localization module is designed to track the mobile LiDAR scanner in the real world.

Figure 1: The whole mapping-free localization framework consists of two modules: offline BIM-to-Map conversion and online semantic localization. The offline module converts original BIM file to a localization-oriented point cloud map, and also labels the map points with categories from BIM. Based on the generated semantic maps, the semantic localization module is designed to track the mobile LiDAR scanner in the real world.

3.2. From BIM to semantic maps

Within the AEC industry, BIMs can be created by many software tools and has been used to support various construction processes, such as building inspection [35] and quality management [36]. To achieve robot or sensor localization in Euclidean space, precise metric maps are required instead of modeled information. In this context, the first challenge is how to generate localization-oriented point cloud maps from BIM files.

In this paper, we propose to convert BIM to a localization-oriented map in three steps. This conversion pipeline is shown in the upper part of Figure 1. Given a whole BIM of one building, we first split the whole BIM into several separate BIM according to different storeys. After that, we use the IfcOpenShell
utilization of information from BIM for metric localization in robot navigation. Thus we also propose to integrate the semantically and dynamically, which may bring potential advantages for a geometric model and these semantic properties can be updated manually and dynamically, which may bring potential advantages for robot navigation. Thus, we also propose to integrate the semantics into the offline BIM-to-Map process, thus maximizing the utilization of information from BIM for metric localization in this paper.

To achieve this, an automated approach for map labeling is used, which is simple but effective compared to the manually labeling process. Let \( m \) be a map point of \( M \). To label the map point \( m \), we first use Dynamo to extract the category labels \( C \) of all elements in BIM. We denote the minimum and maximum local points of one bounding box \( d \) as \( d_{\text{min}} = [x_{\text{min}}, y_{\text{min}}, z_{\text{min}}]^\top \) and \( d_{\text{max}} = [x_{\text{max}}, y_{\text{max}}, z_{\text{max}}]^\top \), which can represent the coverage of \( d \) in 3D space. With the extracted bounding boxes and labels, we then retrieve all the boxes and classify whether \( m \) is in a specific box. The classification criteria is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{m} \text{ is in } d_j = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
1, & x_{\text{min}} \leq x_i \leq x_{\text{max}}, \\
y_{\text{min}} \leq y_i \leq y_{\text{max}}, \\
z_{\text{min}} \leq z_i \leq z_{\text{max}}, \\
0, & \text{else}.
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]

Specifically, to accelerate the semantic labeling process, a K-Dimensional (k-d) tree is built based on the center points of \( D \). In summary, the proposed semantic labeling process is presented in detail in Algorithm. Note that the labels of \( C \) are not unique, which means some map points are in different boxes but with the same category label \( c() \), e.g., columns are with the same category label “Column”. In Figure 2, we present an example to better understand the semantic mapping process, in which different colors are used to represent different categories.

One might argue that the bounding box extraction in Dynamo is not so accurate and some map points could exist in multiple boxes, i.e., points may lie on the boundary of columns and floors, leading to the ambiguity of semantic map building. These are termed as mixed label points. In reality, there are relatively few of such ambiguously labeled points in the whole global map. These mixed label points have little impact on the localization performance, and this will be validated in the experimental section.
3.3. Semantic localization in BIM-based map

With the generated semantic map $M$, the online semantic localization module aims to estimate transformations $T_{k=1,2,...}$ with inputs $\mathcal{P}_{k=1,2,...}$. At timestamp $k$, the kernel of the localization problem is to align a LiDAR scan $\mathcal{P}$ to $M$, which can be achieved by minimizing the error function $e(\cdot)$ between two point clouds, stated as follows:

$$T = \arg\min_{T \in SE(3)} (e(M, TP))$$

Then, data association is required to build the error function. We denote the data association as $A = \{(p,m): p \in \mathcal{P}, m \in M\}$, where $(p,m)$ is a match between the transformed input LiDAR scan and the reference map. The error function is formulated as follows:

$$T = \arg\min_{T \in SE(3)} \left( \sum_{(p,m) \in A} e(p,m) \right)$$

Furthermore, to build a robust data association, some relations can be used to build weights $W = \{w(p,m) \in [0,1]: (p,m) \in A\}$. $W = 1$ means all point matches are used without weights in error minimization. Consequently, the error function is as follows:

$$T = \arg\min_{T \in SE(3)} \left( \sum_{(p,m) \in A} w(p,m) \cdot e(p,m) \right)$$

Various point cloud registration methods have been proposed to minimize the error function in Equation (4). Generally, among these methods, ICP is one of the most widely used method in the robotics community [42, 43]. Equation (4) is solved via ICP iteratively and the matches $A$ and weights $W$ are updated at each iteration.

ICP has many variants in different robotic or computer vision applications. For the error term $e(\cdot)$, we estimate the normal vectors $n$ of each map point $m$ and use point-to-plane ICP for pose estimation. Thus the error metric term in Equation (4) can be expressed as:

$$e(p,m) = \| (R \cdot p + t - m) \cdot n \|_2$$

where $R$ and $t$ are rotation and translation of $T$ respectively.

As for the weight term $w(\cdot)$ in Equation (4), we propose to use semantic associations to weight the data association in this paper. Generally, the semantic associations are built from semantically labeled maps and sensor readings, as presented in previous works [33, 19]. However, different from the BIM-based map $M$, the raw input scan $\mathcal{P}$ are not labeled, causing the difficulty of building semantic weights.

Inspired by the selective ICP in [14], we propose an efficient semantic localization algorithm that consists of three steps: original ICP, semantic labeling and filtering, semantic ICP. The three-step localization can be regarded as a coarse-to-fine process, as shown in Figure 3 and Algorithm 2. Firstly, we perform an original ICP to minimize Equation (3). The data association of the last iteration can be recorded, denoted as $A'$, as follows:

$$A' = \{(p_1,m_{1,1}),(p_2,m_{2,1}),\cdots,(p_s,m_{s,1}),\cdots,(p_1,m_{1,K}),(p_2,m_{2,K}),\cdots,(p_s,m_{s,K})\}$$

where $S$ is the number of points in $\mathcal{P}$ and $K$ is the number of nearest neighbor search of each point in $\mathcal{P}$. Each column of $A'$ represents the matched results of one point $p_i$ to its nearest neighbors after ICP alignment. In the second step, each column of $A'$ and label $p_i$ is checked if the matched map points satisfy the consistency criteria: all the matched map points must be of the same category, formulated as follows:

$$c(p_i) = \begin{cases} c(m_{i,1}), & \text{if } c(m_{i,1}) = \cdots = c(m_{i,K}) \\ \text{Not labeled}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Thereafter, some points in $\mathcal{P}$ are “labeled” and some are not. Only labeled points are considered in the following process. However, not all the labeled points are informative, e.g., points

![Diagram](Figure 3: The proposed semantic localization pipeline. We present a toy case at timestamp $k$.)
matched as “windows” may not return any meaningful measurements using LiDAR sensors. Thus, we only select those labeled points of certain specific types for robust alignment, so the second step can be formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}' \leftarrow f_{\text{select}}(f_{\text{label}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{M}'))$$ (8)

where $f_{\text{label}}()$ and $f_{\text{select}}()$ represent the labeling and selection process, respectively; $\mathcal{P}'$ is the filtered point cloud that will be used in the following estimation.

In the third step, semantic ICP is designed to minimize Equation (4) based on the coarse result from the first step. A semantic-aided weight function $w_r(\cdot)$ is formulated that incorporates the labels of LiDAR readings $\mathcal{P}'$ and the map $\mathcal{M}$:

$$w_c = \begin{cases} 1, & c(p_r) = c(m_s) \\ 0, & c(p_r) \neq c(m_s) \end{cases}$$ (9)

Besides the semantic filter above, a Huber function [44, 45] is also utilized to weight the data association $\mathcal{A}$, as follows:

$$w_p = \begin{cases} 1, & e(\cdot) < \delta \\ \frac{e(\cdot)}{\delta}, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$ (10)

where $\delta$ is a point-to-plane distance threshold. Finally, the overall weight function of for each matched $(p, m)$ is computed as the combination of the semantic information and the geometric relation:

$$w = w_c w_p$$ (11)

The proposed three-step semantic localization is shown in Figure 3 and Algorithm 2. Specifically, we randomly sample the raw LiDAR scan and sub-sample input points in high-density regions, guaranteeing the efficiency for real-time application.

Besides that, the initial guess of the transformation is also critical to build an efficient and robust scan matching. At each timestamp $k$, the previous estimated $T_{k-1}$ is used as the initial guess to estimate $T_k$, as shown in Figure 4. To achieve a more robust and accurate localization, high-frequency sensor information can be integrated into systems [7][8], e.g., inertial measurement unit (IMU), which can provide velocity estimation to improve pose estimation. Note that neither the IMU nor other odometry is used to build a motion model. This means we only test the robustness and accuracy of the localization method via scan-by-scan matching.

4. Experiments

In order to validate the effectiveness of the proposed framework, several experiments are conducted in the real world, including the offline BIM-to-Map conversion and online semantic localization.

4.1. Set-up

Ten sequences are collected using a Velodyne VLP-16 sensor. The data collection devices are shown in Figure 4. All the data sessions are collected in the building of School of Design and Environment 4 (SDE4) at NUS, which is a six-storey university building. To make for extensive testing, we test the localization performance from the second to the fifth storey, covering different environments including corridors and lounges, as shown in Table 1. Approximated traveled distances of sequences are also presented. The total traveled distance is over 340 meters.

The semantic maps are generated using Dynamo, CloudCompare and MATLAB. The density of map points is set as 30 points/m². The semantic localization is implemented using a C++ package libpointmatcher [46] on Robot Operating System (ROS). All the online localization experiments are performed using a low power laptop with Intel I5-8265U and 16G RAM.

4.2. Semantic maps

First of all, the proposed BIM-to-Map conversion module generates multiple semantic maps from a single BIM file. We present the original BIM model and its generated maps in Figure 5(a). Sub-maps of individual storeys are also presented in Figure 5(b) and several categories are visualized with different colors. In SDE4 building, there are 13 categories extracted from Dynamo software: “Ceilings (CE)”, “Columns (CO)”, “Curtain Panels (CP)”, “Curtain Wall Mullions (CWM)”, “Floors (FL)”, “Furniture (FU)”, “Generic Models (GM)”, “Planting (PL)”, “Roofs (RO)”, “Structural Columns (SC)”, “Structural Framing (SF)”, “Walls (WA)” and “Windows (WI)”. Furthermore, we make a statistic on the number of each category and the distributions are shown in Figure 5(c),5(d),5(e) and 5(f).

As shown in Figure 5(b), the mapping module can generate semantic maps. With regards to the distribution of points, it was found that most points are associated to Walls ($\approx 40\%$), Floors ($\approx 20\%$) and Curtain Panels ($\approx 20\%$). Considering that the laser reflectivity of Curtain Panels is not strong, we
use Columns (≈ 5%) to replace Curtain Panels for point selection since there are plenty of concrete columns in these storeys. So only points matched with Walls, Floors and Columns are selected for the final semantic ICP. Note that the category selection is flexible in our proposed semantic localization framework, which is related to the environment, e.g. in a room filled with various furniture, the Furniture category can be used for point selection. Hence, in the following localization test, only the LiDAR points labeled with Walls, Floors and Columns are considered.

4.3. Localization evaluation

With the generated localization-oriented semantic maps, the proposed semantic localization is performed and evaluated quantitatively. Ground truth poses are required to evaluate the continuous localization. But compared to outdoor autonomous
Figure 5: We present a visualization of BIM file and semantic map of SDE4 building in (a). The different colors indicate category of different elements in (b) and the ratios of semantic points are also presented.
vehicles equipped with GPS/INS, it is challenging to collect ground truth poses in indoor scenes, since motion capture systems, such as Vicon, are difficult to be deployed across all halls and corridors in a large building.

In recent research work [34, 47], state-of-the-art SLAM methods are often used as a proxy for ground truth during evaluation. In [48], Cartographer [49] shows a superior performance over other SLAM systems in indoor scenes, and we adopt this as ground truth. Specifically, in this paper, Cartographer is run with our fine-tuned parameters and also with low-speed rosbag to generate ground truth poses. Cartographer and some other SLAM methods typically require IMU sensors to achieve accurate 3D pose estimation, which is infeasible with only a mobile LiDAR sensor in this paper. Thus we set Cartographer with 2D configurations and evaluate our method in 2D space (x, y and yaw). The open source code of [50] is used to align trajectories and evaluate the localization performance.

We compare our proposed three-step semantic localization method with the conventional ICP localization in map. All the test methods are listed as follows:

- ICP localization in Map [42, 45], which is actually the first alignment step of the proposed method in Algorithm 2.
- Semantic Localization (w_c), which is the proposed method in Algorithm 2 but only using semantic labels to weight matches.
- Semantic Localization (w_c w_ρ), which is the full version of Algorithm 2. The other configurations are kept the same as Semantic Localization (w_c).

To achieve a fair comparison, the methods above share the same data pre-processing and filtering. The maximum number of iteration (MaxIt) is critical for ICP-based localization. For ICP localization in Map, we set the MaxIt as 40. As for Semantic Localization (w_c) and (w_c w_ρ), MaxIt of coarse and fine alignment is set as 20, so there are also 40 iterations for a fair comparison.

The absolute pose error of each sequence can be evaluated...
using Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) as follows,

\[ \text{RMSE}_{\text{Trans.}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\Delta t_n)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)

\[ \text{RMSE}_{\text{Rot.}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\Delta R_n)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (13)

in which \(\Delta t\) and \(\Delta R\) are the translation error \((x\text{ and } y)\) and rotation error \((\text{yaw angle})\) between one estimated pose and ground truth pose respectively.

Overall, as shown in Table 2, semantic localization \((w_c w_{\rho})\) achieves the best performance in most sequences. It can be found that the localization errors are changed in different storeys: the 3rd and 5th storeys can provide more stable environments and the proposed method achieves lower errors \((< [0.05m, 0.5^\circ])\) in these two storeys. Overall, the proposed semantic localization can track the sensor pose with only scan matching, and also present low mean errors in translation and
heading estimation ([0.09m, 0.67°]).

As shown in Figure 6, we also create a visualization using boxplots. We can compare the localization performance by evaluating the median error and the variance of error from the boxplot. It is obvious that the proposed semantic localization (\(w_c\)) performs better than the ICP localization in most sequences, verifying the hypothesis that using semantic properties can improve the localization. Additionally, semantic localization (\(w_{c\rho}\)) performs better than (\(w_c\)) due to the integration of the robust outlier filter \(w_{\rho}\).

The evaluation package [50] also provides the variations on errors with respect to the traveled distance. We present the localization trajectories and errors of Sequence 4-1 and 5-1 in Figure 7, 8 and 9. As observed from the errors, the proposed semantic localization (\(w_{c\rho}\)) achieves a smoother trajectory, thus verifying the effectiveness of the proposed three-step localization method.

### 4.4. Discussion

In addition to the numerical analyses of localization performance presented above, we also conducted several case studies of localized LiDAR scan in BIM, as shown in Figure 10. The four cases show the localization process of Sequence 2-2, 3-3, 4-1 and 5-1 in different storeys of the SDE4 building. Specifically, in Figure 10 white points are input LiDAR scan \(\mathcal{P}\) without data filters applied, cyan-colored trajectories are the estimated poses \(\mathcal{T}_{k=1,2,\ldots}\), semantic map points \(\mathcal{M}\) are with various colors and matched points \(\mathcal{P'}\) are with larger size and colors: red for Column, pink for Wall and green for Floor. We also release a video demonstration online.

Interestingly, it was found that there are notable differences between pre-built \(\mathcal{M}\) and observed \(\mathcal{P}\), which are essentially the differences between as-designed models and the as-built. In Figure 10(a) case frame, the two columns in green boxes are observed although there are no columns in the map respectively, making the LiDAR points match to walls (colored with pink). The video is available at this link.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>raw (\mathcal{P})</th>
<th>datafilter((\mathcal{P}))</th>
<th>(\mathcal{P'}) after 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>23375</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>22932</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>21209</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>25428</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
due to the nearest neighbor search strategy of ICP. Another observed column in the blue box is not matched to any element since there is a large distance between the nearest column in the map. In summary, there exists incorrect data associations due to the difference between as-designed and as-built, bringing challenges and errors for localization in BIM. Despite this, the above experiments show the proposed scan matching method can track the LiDAR scanner with low errors, demonstrating the effectiveness of using semantic information of BIM.

We also present the number of points in each step, as shown in Table 3. Based on the random sampling and semantic filter, only hundreds of laser points (≈3% of raw data) are selected for final semantic ICP step. As for efficiency, the mean-time cost of semantic localization (Algorithm 2) is 108ms, 79ms, 112ms and 114ms in these four sequences. The real-time method is able to track the LiDAR scanner operating with 10Hz with only a resource-constrained embedded device. The efficiency can potentially be improved by using more assistance information or optimization method in the future, such as integrating high-frequency IMU to provide more accurate initial guess on roll and pitch for pose tracking.

4.5. Comparison against traditional SLAM-based maps

Compared to the BIM-based map in this paper, conventional LiDAR-based localization methods rely on high-precision maps generated from SLAM. SLAM aims to achieve localization and mapping simultaneously. In this paper, we also try to compare against popular SLAM methods to generate maps for localization. Specifically, we use lidar odometry and mapping (LOAM) [6] and direct lidar odometry (DLO) [51] to generate 3D point cloud maps with only a mobile LiDAR sensor.

The SLAM-based point cloud maps are shown in Figure 11. Note that for a fair comparison, there is no IMU or other information as assistance used in this paper. As shown in Figure 11(c) and 11(d), drift happens on Z-axis using LiDAR-only SLAM. Furthermore, we select two floor points in the maps and measure the distances in Cloudcompare. The measured distances are as follows: $\Delta xy = 23.93m$ and $\Delta z = 1.20m$ in LOAM; $\Delta xy = 24.30m$ and $\Delta z = 1.36m$ in DLO, which means there will be meter-level drifs on Z-axis if these SLAM-based maps are used for localization.

To address the problem, some SLAM systems [52, 53] introduce some more complex modules, e.g., graph optimization with loop closings, but these methods requires fine-tuned parameters to achieve drift reduction. Besides that, to generate a complete map of a multi-storey building, robot traveling trajectory needs to cover all rooms and halls, bringing potential difficulties for applications. While for the BIM-to-Map conversion in this paper, the complete BIM file is easy to obtain and the conversion workflow is simple without parameter tuning. In the BIM file, the floor is almost perfectly flat in one storey, which means all floor points are with the same height, thus providing certain constraints for 3D LiDAR-only localization.

5. Conclusions

This paper proposes a mapping-free semantic-based LiDAR localization framework. A BIM-to-Map conversion is proposed by using spatial locations and category labels of elements in BIM. Based on the semantic maps, this paper also proposes a three-step localization method to track 3D LiDAR sensor, in which both geometric and semantic information are considered.
in data associations. The tests on real-world datasets demonstrate that the proposed framework can achieve effective and efficient localization using only a BIM file and a mobile LiDAR sensor.

Inspired by the related works and the experimental results in this paper, we consider there remain some promising directions in the future, states as follows:

- Multiple sensors can help improve the robustness and accuracy of localization, and we consider to use IMU and other odometry as assistance for pose tracking.
- Despite the pose tracking in this paper, global registration or localization is also important for navigation, which can localize a robot from scratch without initial guess.
- As shown in Section 4.4, the deviation between as-designed and as-built make errors. Based on the matching results, using a low-cost mobile sensor to detect the deviations is worth studying, which is related to the Scan-vs-BIM topic in the AEC industry.
- As shown in Section 4.5, drift happens in LiDAR-only SLAM. One interesting topic is building a BIM-aided SLAM system, which will improve online LiDAR mapping accuracy without integrating other sensors.
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