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Figure 1: From left: Overlapping proposals from Task 1, predicted BPSH, building masks after NMS, additionally recovered building proposals, and final building masks. The overlapping proposals are the purple and teal buildings in the top left, where the teal proposal actually covers two buildings, and the purple proposal overlaps the part of the teal that covers the smaller building.

In this supplementary material, we present additional details about the network, optimization, and building overlap refinement strategies of our method. We also present additional qualitative results and ablative analysis.

1. Shared feature representation between T2, T3, T4

Our proposed multi-task learning framework for Tasks 2, 3, and 4 utilizes a common feature representation, as discussed in Sections 3.1.2, 3.3, and 3.4 of the main paper. From the feature layer $P2$ of the Feature Pyramid Network (FPN), we perform two $(3 \times 3)$ convolutions, followed by a $(1 \times 1)$ convolution and a skip connection to obtain this shared feature representation. We obtain the outputs of Task 2, 3, and 4 by using this shared representation, and by performing lightweight task-specific convolutions. This construct is illustrated in Fig. 2 of the main paper.

2. Optimization for multi-task learning

We initialize parts of our network from pre-trained weights. The FPN and the region proposal network are initialized using Mask R-CNN trained on the SpaceNet dataset [3]. Since many overhead datasets have multi-spectral images (for example, 8-channel images instead of typical 3-channel RGB) we initialize the parameters of the first layer using He initialization [6]. All of the newly added layers are also initialized with this method. All batch normalization layers are frozen during the training. Random flipping, cropping, and rotation are used as data augmentation techniques. We optimize the loss using stochastic gradient descent with an initial learning rate of $2 \times 10^{-3}$, momentum of 0.9, weight decay of $10^{-4}$, and batch size of 6 images of $(512 \times 512)$ px. Loss gradients are clipped to $[-0.5, 0.5]$, and gradient norms are clipped at 1.

3. Overlap refinement – recovering buildings after NMS

In this section, we provide additional detail on how we recover valid building proposals that were removed during overlapping proposal detection, which is described in Section 3.1.3 of the main paper. Recall that Task 1 of the multitasking framework provides us with building proposals, where the proposals may overlap with each other. Task 2 learns the boundary proximity signed heatmap (BPSH) of the image, which is used to refine the overlapping proposals of Task 1. For this refinement, each building proposal is scored using (1) the proposal confidence from Task 1 and (2) the proposal’s agreement with the building boundaries indicated by the zero-level set of the BPSH. We apply a non-maximum suppression (NMS) based on these new scores to
remove proposals whose predicted building masks overlap. However, this NMS may in turn suppress valid buildings. For example, consider the two buildings shown in the top left corner of the left subfigure in Fig. 1, above. For two buildings $B_1$ and $B_2$ that are very close to each other, Task 1 may generate two building proposals: (1) one proposal that covers $B_1$ but not $B_2$ (the purple-colored proposal in the figure), and (2) a proposal that combines $B_1$ and $B_2$ together into a single building (the teal-colored proposal; parts of the teal-colored mask are covered by the purple-colored proposal’s mask). The scoring mechanism described in Eq. (2) of the main paper will give a higher score to the first proposal, as it will have a stronger agreement to the BPSH zero-level set. The NMS will suppress the second proposal as a result. To recover building $B_2$, we regenerate proposals as explained next.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the set of building proposals output by Task 1, with each building $B \in \mathcal{B}$ having a binary pixel-wise mask $M_B$ and confidence $c_B$. Let $M$ be the aggregated pixel-wise mask of all building proposals after NMS (Fig. 1, middle). We create a “recovered” mask $M^+$ (Fig. 1, second from right) for suppressed buildings containing pixels that: (1) have no overlap with $M$, (2) are inside a building according to the BPSH, and (3) are part of at least one highly confident proposal in $\mathcal{B}$. We specify these criteria at each pixel $p$:

$$M^+(p) = \left( \overline{M(p)} \land (BPSH(p) > \alpha_1) \land \exists_{B \in \mathcal{B}} (M_B(p) \land c_B > \alpha_2) \right)$$  
(1)

For the second condition enforcing that the pixel is inside a building as indicated by the predicted BPSH, we use $\alpha_1 = 0.5$. The last condition enforces that at least one building mask proposal covers pixel $p$ with some minimum confidence $\alpha_2$. We experimentally found that $\alpha_2 = 0.7$ offers good building retention without introducing many false-positive detections. The connected components in $M^+$ with covering fewer than 256 pixels are suppressed. Finally, the remaining connected components of $M^+$ are added to the predicted building set to obtain the final set of building outlines.

4. Evaluation datasets

In this section, we give a brief overview of the different datasets used in our experiments.

**GRSS_DFC_2019 dataset** The GRSS_DFC_2019 dataset [1, 4] contains multi-spectral satellite images, nDSMs, and semantic segmentations for parts of Jacksonville, FL and Omaha, NE with over 100,000 building instances. We split the dataset containing buildings into a training set containing 88 regions and a test set containing 11 other regions. The ground truth contains semantic segmentations over building, ground, vegetation, water, bridge deck, and unclassified regions. To extract the ground-truth building footprints from the slightly noisy semantic segmentation, we apply a morphological closing operation on the building mask, followed by removing objects with areas smaller than $23m^2$ (256 pixels).

**USSOCOM Urban 3D dataset** The USSOCOM Urban 3D dataset [5] contains RGB satellite images and nDSMs for parts of Jacksonville and Tampa, Florida, with over 180 $km^2$ of land coverage containing over 74000 buildings. We split the dataset into a training set containing 130 regions and a test set containing 44 other regions.

**SpaceNet Buildings Dataset v2** SpaceNet [3] contains multi-spectral satellite images with ground-truth building masks for over 300,000 building instances, which we use to evaluate 2D building outline detections, without training for height or semantic segmentation. For our experiments, we split the dataset with 7128 training and 1254 testing images.

**Potsdam and Vaihingen datasets** These datasets are released by the ISPRS 2D Semantic Labeling contest [2] and contain high-resolution but lower-spatial-coverage aerial images. The Potsdam dataset contains 4-channel (R,G,B,NIR) aerial images, while the Vaihingen dataset provides 3-channel (IR,R,G) aerial images. Semantic segmentations of buildings, low vegetation, trees, impervious surfaces, cars, and background are available for both datasets, and both datasets include normalized DSMs.

Following [7], for the Potsdam dataset we select 10 images for training, and the remaining 7 images (image IDs: 02_11, 02_12, 04_10, 05_11, 06_07, 07_08, and 07_10) are used to test all models. Similarly, for the Vaihingen dataset we follow [7] and select 11 images for training, and the remaining 5 images (image IDs: 11, 15, 28, 30, and 34) are used for testing our model.

5. Additional ablation

We study the effectiveness of our proposed overlap refinement technique compared to an naïve NMS technique. In the naïve NMS setting, building outline proposals generated by Task 1 are suppressed if they overlap another proposal with higher confidence. Table 1 shows that, in comparison of F1 scores, the proposed refinement technique is more robust in retaining true building instances compared to the naïve NMS. The table also contrasts between performing the overlap refinement using the BPSH learned by the multi-task network, and using the improved BPSH using instance-level reasoning (see Section 3.5 in the main paper). Instance-level reasoning improves the BPSH across all datasets, which is evidenced by the fact that this step consistently improves refinement.
Table 1: Comparison of building detection F1 scores (higher is better) for different overlap refinement techniques, and with our BPSH refinement network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Naive NMS</th>
<th>With Overlap Refinement</th>
<th>Overlap &amp; BPSH Refinement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SpaceNet</td>
<td>67.12</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>68.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSS_DFC</td>
<td>63.70</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>68.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 3D</td>
<td>80.87</td>
<td>82.67</td>
<td>82.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potsdam</td>
<td>67.47</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>71.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaihingen</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>72.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Additional qualitative results

Fig. 2 provides example building mask, nDSM, and BPSH outputs of our network for images from the GRSS_DFC_2019 dataset, along with 3D reconstruction visualizations for each image. We provide additional qualitative results for our method versus the methods of Wang and Frahm [9] and Srivastava et al. [8] on the Potsdam, Vaihingen, and Urban3D datasets. We compare the building outline detection performance of our method versus Wang and Frahm [9] in Figs. 3 and 8. Our proposed method is contrasted against Srivastava et al. [8] in Figs. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Results on the Urban3D dataset with zoom-in crops are shown for both methods, as well as our own, in Fig. 13. For nDSM visualizations, the black-to-white visualization range is clamped between 0 and 25.5 meters. Additional 3D scene reconstructions for our method are shown in Figs. 14 and 15 for the Potsdam and Vaihingen datasets, respectively.
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Figure 3: Qualitative result on our method versus Wang and Frahm’s [9] method. First two rows: Potsdam dataset. Bottom two rows: Vaihingen dataset.
Figure 4: Results on the Potsdam dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM. Fourth row: semantic segmentation.
Figure 5: Additional results on the Potsdam dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM. Fourth row: semantic segmentation.
Figure 6: Results on the Vaihingen dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM. Fourth row: semantic segmentation.
Figure 7: Additional results on the Vaihingen dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM. Fourth row: semantic segmentation.
Figure 8: Qualitative results on our method versus Wang and Frahm’s [9] method on four images from the Urban3D dataset.
Figure 9: Results on the Urban3D dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM.
Figure 10: Additional results on the Urban3D dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM.
Figure 11: Additional results on the Urban3D dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM.
Figure 12: Additional results on the Urban3D dataset for our method versus [8]. First row: aerial image. Second row: predicted building instances overlaid on the overhead image. Third row: nDSM. Our prediction apparently does not capture two ground-truth building instances in the top-right corner. However, the ground truth may be incorrect for both of these instances, as we can observe roads passing through them. When visualized in Google Earth, as well, these instances do not appear to be buildings.
Figure 13: Comparison of building mask predictions, plus zoom-in crops, for our method versus [9] and [8] on two images from the Urban3D dataset.
Figure 14: 3D building models generated for the Potsdam dataset.
Figure 15: 3D building models generated for the Vaihingen dataset.