

University Building Recognition Dataset for mission-oriented IoT sensor systems in Thailand

Takara Taniguchi

The University of Tokyo

hiroshi-tani@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Yudai Ueda

The University of Tokyo

ueda-yudai0913@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Atsuya Muramatsu

The University of Tokyo

muramatsu-atsuya870@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Kohki Hashimoto

The University of Tokyo

k-84mo10@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Ryo Yagi

The University of Tokyo

yagi-ryo143@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Hideya Ochiai

The University of Tokyo

ochiai@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Chaodit Aswakul

Chulalongkorn University

Chaodit.a@chula.ac.th

Abstract—Many industrial sectors have been using of machine learning at inference mode on edge devices. Future directions show that training on edge devices is promising due to improvements in semiconductor performance. Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL) has been proposed as a promising approach for collaborative learning with device-to-device communication among edges. In particular, WAFL with Vision Transformer (WAFL-ViT) has been tested on image recognition tasks with the UTokyo Building Recognition Dataset (UTBR). Since WAFL-ViT is a mission-oriented sensor system, it is essential to construct specific datasets by each mission. In our work, we have developed the Chulalongkorn University Building Recognition Dataset (CUBR), which is specialized for Chulalongkorn University as a case study in Thailand. Additionally, our results also demonstrate that training on WAFL scenarios achieves better accuracy than self-training scenarios. Dataset is available in <https://github.com/jo2lxq/wafl/>.

Index Terms—Ad Hoc Networks, Deep Learning, Device-to-Device Communication, Image Recognition

I. INTRODUCTION

Machine learning on edge devices has become increasingly important because of the growing demand for distributed sensor systems. In this context, federated learning is one of the approaches for machine learning on edge devices. Centralized federated learning [1], [2] was originally proposed for machine learning on edges, which has been applied to many real-world problems, such as mobile keyboard prediction [3], COVID-19 warning systems [4], and financial risk management [5]. Meanwhile, decentralized federated learning [6], [7] has also been proposed to tackle problems such as privacy issues and the single point of failure that are attributed to traditional federated learning.

In particular, Wireless Ad hoc Federated Learning (WAFL) [6] has been proposed as a framework for decentralized federated learning. WAFL has been applied to a generative adversarial network [8] and the robustness of model poisoning attacks [9], respectively. WAFL-ViT [7] is proposed as a collaborative training method for Vision Transformer [10] for the mission-oriented image recognition task with the UTokyo Building Recognition Dataset (UTBR). While sensor systems such as WAFL are expected to be constructed for a

specific mission, such as an image recognition task of UTBR, few datasets have been investigated for WAFL-ViT.

In this study, we consider the image recognition task for the smart-campus application in Chulalongkorn University. Therefore, we create the Chulalongkorn University Building Recognition Dataset (CUBR) under the assumption of an IoT sensor system. CUBR compounds of 32 buildings, where the number of images of each building is about 100. To consider an IoT environment of Chulalongkorn University, we assume that 10 devices are distributed in the campus of Chulalongkorn University. Moreover, we evaluated the dataset by using collaborative learning. In our evaluation, we compare Vision Transformer (ViT) [10] with VGG [11], Resnet [12], and Mobilenet [13] with WAFL and self-training cases, respectively. As a result of the experiment, we show that WAFL enhances the accuracy compared to self-training cases.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We tackle evaluating the decentralized federated learning model WAFL.
- We develop the new dataset CUBR, which is composed of 32 labeled buildings for the image recognition task.
- We demonstrate that WAFL works for the created CUBR compared to the self-training cases.

II. WIRELESS AD HOC FEDERATED LEARNING

In this section, we explain related works about WAFL and its dataset. Federated learning has been proposed as a method to enhance model generalization by performing machine learning across multiple edge devices [14]. In recent years, applications of federated learning in the real world have been proposed. Hard *et al.* [3] suggested the application of federated learning in predictive models for mobile keyboards, while Ouyang *et al.* [4] applied federated learning to the COVID-19 early warning system. In addition, Pingulkar *et al.* [5] investigated the architecture of asset management using federated learning.

However, traditional federated learning models [1], [2] are centralized federated learning, which contain a single point of failure. To tackle the problem of a single point of failure,




Fig. 1. Examples of CUBR, where images are taken from aside, afar, and various angles. Even within the same building, there are different features according to the conditions in which images are taken.

Ochiai *et al.* [6] proposed Wireless Ad hoc Federated Learning (WAFL), which is a fully decentralized and mission-oriented federated learning model under the idea of the work by Frodigh *et al.* [15]. WAFL applications have been investigated for several missions since WAFL is a mission-oriented sensor system. While Tezuka *et al.* [9] investigated the robustness of WAFL for the model poisoning attacks, Tomiyama *et al.* [8] addressed distributed generative adversarial networks using WAFL.

In this context, Ochiai *et al.* [7] proposed WAFL-ViT [7], which is a collaborative training method for Vision Transformer [10]. In the following, we briefly explain the foundation of WAFL-ViT. We denote n as devices participating in the training. Let $\text{adj}(n)$ and W^n be the set of neighbor nodes of device n and parameters of MLP heads of device n , where λ means a hyperparameter between 0 to 1, respectively. Then, the algorithm of parameter exchange is given as follows:

$$W^n \leftarrow W^n + \lambda \frac{\sum_{k \in \text{adj}(n)} (W^k - W^n)}{|\text{adj}(n)| + 1} \quad (1)$$

Using this algorithm, the parameters of their MLP heads are updated. In training, parameters of MLP heads are fine-tuned with their *local* images once per round. To avoid overfitting to the *local* images, all parameters of each ViT in each device are not fine-tuned.

To evaluate WAFL-ViT, Ochiai *et al.* [7] also created the UTokyo Building Recognition Dataset (UTBR) composed of 10 labeled buildings, which is assumed to be utilized for a smart-campus service. While creating a dataset of the mission-

oriented task for WAFL is essential, there are few datasets for the image recognition task, except for UTBR. Hence, we tackle creating a large dataset of Chulalongkorn University for the image recognition task.




Fig. 2. Target area where the photos were taken and correspondence between the label number and each building.

III. CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY BUILDING RECOGNITION DATASET

In this section, we explain the contents of the created dataset in detail. For WAFL, which is a mission-oriented sensor system, we created a Chulalongkorn University Building Recognition Dataset (CUBR). The correspondence between

each building and the label number in the map is given in Fig. 2, and the number of photos of labeled buildings is shown in Table I, respectively. As shown in Table I, 32 distinct buildings within Chulalongkorn University were selected as targets for this dataset. Photographs were captured using 4 different devices. This multi-device approach was adopted to introduce variability in image quality, resolution, and sensor characteristics, which is crucial for developing robust recognition models.

The selection criteria prioritized buildings with varying architectural designs, sizes, and functional purposes to ensure a diverse set of visual features. Similar to the UTBR dataset [7], these photos were captured from a wide variety of environments and conditions. For example, images were taken from different distances, various viewing angles, and under diverse illumination conditions. Fig. 1 illustrates some examples of these varied perspectives and conditions. Furthermore, we intentionally included images with partial occlusions and cluttered backgrounds to reflect real-world complexities. The data collection was primarily conducted over a period of a month.

TABLE I
THE NUMBER OF PHOTOS FOR TRAINING AND VALIDATION.

Label	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Train	98	125	93	88	83	93	103	101	104	88	120	86	104	84	107	110
Val	25	32	26	21	20	24	26	26	26	22	31	22	26	22	22	28

Label	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
Train	103	84	120	126	99	84	107	104	120	92	88	103	102	83	86	106
Val	26	22	30	32	25	22	27	25	30	23	28	26	26	21	22	27

TABLE II
ACCURACY OVERVIEW – HIGHER BETTER.
WAFL-ViT ACHIEVED THE BEST IN THE IID CASE.

Model	Accuracy	Standard Deviation
WAFL-ViT	0.861	0.007
WAFL-Resnet	0.833	0.022
WAFL-VGG	0.732	0.008
WAFL-Mobilenet	0.791	0.015
SELF-ViT	0.619	0.017
SELF-Resnet	0.596	0.025
SELF-VGG	0.498	0.023
SELF-Mobilenet	0.561	0.018

IV. EXPERIMENT

A. Implementation detail

We evaluated the performance with the CUBR dataset. In our experiment, we compare Vision Transformer-B/16 with ResNet-152, VGG-19-BN, and MobileNet-V2 with WAFL and self-training cases, as well as previous research by Ochiai *et al.* [7]. The description of "WAFL-*" and "SELF-*" follows from Ochiai *et al.* [7] as well. For "WAFL-*", we have carried out training up to 500 epochs for self-training and up to 1500 epochs for collaborative training. For "SELF-*", we have carried out training up to 2000 epochs for self-training.

We apply random waypoint mobility (RWP) [16] to the simulation for the movement of each device. We assume that all images are uniformly distributed to each device, which is denoted as IID in [7].

B. Result

Table I shows the accuracy and the standard deviation of each model. The accuracy is calculated at 10 nodes by test data. Mean and standard deviation are calculated by (the number of labels) \times (the number of nodes) = $32 \times 10 = 320$ accuracies. WAFL-ViT achieved the best accuracy among all models. Also, the result shows that the performance of all models is improved from self-training cases to WAFL cases.




Fig. 3. Confusion Matrix of WAFL-ViT at epoch 2000 (device 6)

The WAFL models generally outperform the SELF models in terms of accuracy, with WAFL-ViT being the most accurate and consistent. SELF-VGG exhibits the least favorable performance, both in accuracy and consistency. This comparative analysis highlights the superiority of WAFL architectures over SELF architectures across different neural network structures. Fig. 3 shows the confusion matrix of node 6. We obtain that distinguishing between the label 10 and label 11 is difficult.

V. CONCLUSION

In this study, we considered the decentralized federated learning model WAFL-ViT for the image recognition task in Chulalongkorn University. Since WAFL-ViT is a mission-oriented model, we created the Chulalongkorn University Building Recognition Dataset (CUBR) for WAFL-ViT, which is composed of 32 buildings. We carried out the simulation with an assumption of 10 distributed devices and obtained the result that WAFL-* models achieved better accuracy than SELF-* models, respectively.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, “Federated Learning: Challenges, Methods, and Future Directions,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 50–60, 2020.
- [2] J. Konečný, H. B. McMahan, F. X. Yu, P. Richtárik, A. T. Suresh, and D. Bacon, “Federated Learning: Strategies for Improving Communication Efficiency,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05492*, 2017.
- [3] A. Hard, K. Rao, R. Mathews, S. Ramaswamy, F. Beaufays, S. Augenstein, H. Eichner, C. Kiddon, and D. Ramage, “Federated Learning for Mobile Keyboard Prediction,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03604*, 2019.
- [4] L. Ouyang, Y. Yuan, Y. Cao, and F.-Y. Wang, “A Novel Framework of Collaborative Early Warning for COVID-19 Based on Blockchain and Smart Contracts,” *Information Sciences*, vol. 570, pp. 124–143, 2021.
- [5] S. Pingulkar and D. Pawade, “Federated Learning Architectures for Credit Risk Assessment: A Comparative Analysis of Vertical, Horizontal, and Transfer Learning Approaches,” in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Distributed Systems Security (ICBDS)*, pp. 1–7, 2024.
- [6] H. Ochiai, Y. Sun, Q. Jin, N. Wongwiwatchai, and H. Esaki, “Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning: A Fully Distributed Cooperative Machine Learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11779*, 2022.
- [7] H. Ochiai, A. Muramatsu, Y. Ueda, R. Yamaguchi, K. Katoh, and H. Esaki, “Tuning Vision Transformer with Device-to-Device Communication for Targeted Image Recognition,” in *Proceedings of IEEE 9th World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT)*, pp. 1–6, 2023.
- [8] E. Tomiyama, H. Esaki, and H. Ochiai, “WAFL-GAN: Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning for Distributed Generative Adversarial Networks,” in *Proceedings of 15th International Conference on Knowledge and Smart Technology (KST)*, pp. 1–6, 2023.
- [9] N. Tezuka, H. Ochiai, Y. Sun, and H. Esaki, “Resilience of Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning against Model Poisoning Attacks,” in *Proceedings of IEEE 4th International Conference on Trust, Privacy and Security in Intelligent Systems, and Applications (TPS-ISA)*, pp. 168–177, 2022.
- [10] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, J. Uszkoreit, and N. Houlsby, “An Image is Worth 16x16 Words: Transformers for Image Recognition at Scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2021.
- [11] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, “Very Deep Convolutional Networks for Large-scale Image Recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [12] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778, 2016.
- [13] A. G. Howard, M. Zhu, B. Chen, D. Kalenichenko, W. Wang, T. Weyand, M. Andreetto, and H. Adam, “Mobilenets: Efficient Convolutional Neural Networks for Mobile Vision Applications,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861*, 2017.
- [14] H. B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. Arcas, “Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data,” in *Proceedings of 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, vol. 54, pp. 1273–1282, 2017.
- [15] P. Johansson, P. Larsson, and M. Frodigh, “Wireless Ad Hoc Networking: The Art of Networking Without a Network,” *Ericsson review*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 248–263, 2000.
- [16] C. Bettstetter, H. Hartenstein, and X. Costa-Pérez, “Stochastic Properties of the Random Waypoint Mobility Model,” *Wireless Networks*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 555–567, 2004.