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The Vision: Virtual Experiences

- Simulate Experiences
- More than just being in a place
- More than just appearance
- One aspect: Other people
Virtual Experience Applications

- Training
  - Emergency Rescue, Crowd Control
- Design
  - Evaluating populated spaces
- Entertainment / Commerce
  - Games, Shopping Malls, Chat

All need people!
The Demands of Virtual Experiences

- Fast
- Responsive
- Streams of Motion
- Realistic
- Attractive
- Detailed
- Directable
- Autonomous
The problems

- What do characters do?
  - How do they choose their actions?

- How do they do it?
  - How do we generate their movements?

- What do they look like?
  - How do we draw them?
Two Sub-Projects

Snap-Together Motion

High-Quality Motion Within Interactive Apps

Efficient Skins

High-Quality Appearance Within Interactive Apps
How do we synthesize character motion?

- Need streams not clips
- Generated in response to action
  - Rules out capture, hand-animation, ...

- Procedural Methods?
- Physics?
  - Can’t get richness and quality
Synthesis by Example

- Graph-based approaches
  - Kovar et al., Lee at al., Arikan and Forsyth

- Good:
  - High quality results
  - Flexible

- Bad:
  - Offline (need to search)
  - Limited Precomputation

- Trade some quality for performance

We’ll fix this
A Review:
Synthesis by Example

- Piece together clips of good motion
- Find “easy” transitions to make
What is Similar?

- Factor out invariances and measure

1) Initial frames

2) Extract windows

3) Convert to point clouds

4) Align point clouds and sum squared distances
An Aside: Other Invariances
(Kovar&Gleicher ’03)

Different Timing

Different Curvature

Different Constraints
An easy point to miss: Motions are Made Similar

- “Undo” the differences from invariances when assembling
- Rigidly transform motions to connect
Building a Motion Graph

- Find Matching States in Motions
Automatic Graph Construction

- Find many matches (opportunistic)

- Good: Automatic
- Good: Lots of choices
Motion Graph Problems

- Graphs built opportunistically
  - Leads to unstructured graphs
  - Don’t know what’s there
  - No control over connectivity
  - No way to know what is close
  - Don’t know what character can or can’t do

- Lots of transitions
  - Can’t check them all, be conservative
Why is this OK?

- Search the graphs for motions
- Look ahead to make sure we don’t get stuck
- Cleanup motions as generated
- Plan “around” missing transitions
- Optimization gets close as possible

Not OK for Interactive Apps!
Snap-Together Motion

Three basic ideas

- Find “Hub Nodes”
- Pre-process motions so they “snap” together
- Build small, contrived graphs
Snapable Motions

- What if motions matched exactly?
  - Match both state and derivatives
  - Match reasonably at a larger scale
Make motions match exactly

- Add in displacement maps
- Bumps we add to motions
- Modify motions to common pose
- Compute changes at author time

Average or Common Pose
C(1) Displacement Maps

- Add displacements to make motions match in both value and derivative.
- Displacement maps themselves are smoother.

![Diagram showing motion matching and displacement maps](image)
Some features of Cuts

- Don’t need original motions
  - Just use displacements
  - No database growth

- Multi-way transitions
  - Find common point for several motions
Hub Nodes

- Multi-way cuts yield Hub Nodes
- Hub nodes allow nice graphs
Contrived Graph Structure?

Search: Look ahead to get where you need to go

React: Always lots of choices. Something close to what you need.
Gamers use these
Semi-Automatic Graph Construction

- Pick set of *match frames*
  - User selects
  - System picks “best” one
- Modify motions to build hub node
- Check graph and transitions
Common poses for Multi-way Hubs

- All motions displace to one pose
- Pose must be consistent with all motions
- Average "common" pose
  - Average of poses
  - Constraints solved on frame
- Must solve constraints on all motions
  - Inconsistencies are possible
Building the Motion Graphs
Why should we care?

- Precompute everything but rigid transforms = FAST!
- Nodes with high connectivity = RESPONSIVE / CONTROLLABLE
- Add in user interaction
  - Build convenient graph structures
  - Verify transitions (less conservative)
Some results

- Corpus of Karate Motions
  - Pick two best poses
  - Map motions to game controller
  - 12 minutes – including picking buttons

- Walk

- Walk + Karate
  - 20 minutes – including picking buttons
Nothing for Free

- Less Variety
- Less “Exactness”
- Lower Quality Transitions
  - “Big” Transitions
  - Big changes to get multi-way
- Need user intervention
  - Pick Match Frames
  - Verify Transitions

In Practice, heuristics work REALLY well – but no guarantees
Are we done yet?

- May not have exact motions you need
  - Make them using blending techniques
- Discrete nature (choices)
  - Parametric “fat” arcs
- Better matching of dissimilar motions
  - New and better invariances
  - Motion specific invariances

- How do characters decide what to do?
Snap Together Motion in Action
Crowd Simulation
Snap-Together Motion

- Animation by Example for Interactive applications!
- User-controlled graph structures
- Multi-way cut transitions
- Pre-computed transitions
Now that we have Movements...

How to draw characters?

- Skinning:
  - Mapping controls to geometry
  - n parameters, p points

\[ f_{\text{skin}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times p} \]
How to do this?

- Arbitrary code
- Need to embody art in code
- Easier: deform given geometry

\[ f_{\text{skin}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3) \]
Where do “high-end” characters come from?

- Artists make model
- Technical director “rigs” model
  - Defines deformations
  - Arbitrary code
    - Non-linear deformations
    - Expressions
    - Code Pieces (physical simulations)
- Animation system executes rig
Where do low-end (interactive) characters come from?

- Run-times (now hardware) embody a specific mathematical model
- Riggers forced to use these abstractions
  - Skinning is setting vertex weights
  - I will explain this, and why it's bad
- Couples authoring and runtime
Skinning 101

Each “bone” is a coordinate system

A coordinate system is a 4x4 matrix in graphics

Rigid Skin (Catmull ’72) put each point in one coordinate system
Skinning 101 (2)
Method with many names

Linear blend skinning, skeletal subspace deformation, enveloping, smooth skin

- Each point influenced by multiple bones
- Weighted linear blend
Using Linear Blend Skins

- Each point has weight vector
- Artist (rigger) sets weights
  - Possibly by direct manipulation (Mohr, Tokheim, Gleicher ’03)
  - Often by “weight painting”
- Range of effects from different weightings
Why is this bad?

- Artists work with weights
- Good for hardware, not good for artists

- Hard to get complex effects
- Hard to know what can be gotten

- Can lead to bad artifacts
- Hard to know if artifacts can be fixed
Linear-blend skin artifacts

- Pinching
- Candy-Wrapping
Linear-blend skin artifacts

- Pinching

- Candy-Wrapping
What do others do?

- Give up on linear blend skinning
  - But can’t fit in existing run-times
- Interpolate between example shapes
  - Can’t scale and stay interactive

- Multi-weight enveloping (MWE)
  - Add more parameters to LBS model
  - Need artist input (approximate solution)
  - Automatically determine parameters
  - Mathematical tricks for stability
Our Solution:
Decouple Authoring and Display

- Author skins using whatever high-end method they like

- Compute linear-blend skin that best approximates authored rig

- Optionally extend LBS model
  - Add joints since they are used automatically
Mathematically

- Skin defines deformation field
  \[ f_{\text{skin}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3) \]
- Sample this function
  - Easy! Just run some animation
- Construct a good approximation
  - Form of approximation should map to existing infrastructure
  - Piecewise linear approximation with non-linear basis functions
The Details

Linear Blend Skin Model

\[ p = \sum_{i} w_i M_i D_i^{-1} p_d \]

- point position
- weight vector
- bone matrices
- dress-pose matrices
- dress pose
- joints
- point position
- dress pose point position
Example skins

For each example and each point:

- We know $M_i$ (bone configuration)
- We know $p_e$ (where point should be)
- We know $D_i^{-1}$ (inverse dress pose matrix)
- We sortof know $p_d$ (dress pose position)
- We want to find $w_d$ (weight vector)
Optimal Linear Blend Skins

- Minimize error across examples
  \[ g(w_i, p_d) = \sum_{e} \left\| p_e - \sum_{i} w_i M_i^e D_i^{-1} p_d \right\|^2 \]

- Bilinear least squares problem
- Solve by alternation
  - We have a good estimate for \( p_d \)
Extending Linear Blend Skinning

- Matrices are functions of parameters

\[ M_i = f_i (q) \]

- Consider as our basis functions
- To get a better approximation, pick better basis functions
Extending the basis set

- Still within linear blend skin model
- Little computational overhead
  - Basis set is still small, many points
- User doesn’t do any more work

What functions to add?
- Today: Ad-Hoc – pick known good functions
- Future: determine what bones to add
“Bones” to add

- **Half-Angle**
- **Scale**

Remember:
\[ R(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \neq R(\theta_1) + R(\theta_2) \]
Results

original

basic LBS

our method
More results
Bulging Muscles

original

basic LBS

our method
More results
An addition:

Deformation Sensitive Decimation

- Simplify geometry for speed
- Simplifying the rest shape doesn’t work
- Extend QSLIM to look at set of examples
Decimation Results

- original
- QSLIM 1 pose
- our method
Use with Cloth Simulation

Simulation (6170 faces)  Simplified (2170 faces)
What did we just do?

- Used the existing skin model
  - Works with existing runtimes
  - (Almost) No performance penalty
- Better results with less work
  - Avoids worst linear blend artifacts
  - Avoids artists having to think about fast runtime models
Some things to think about

- Better than linear blend skinning?
  - Now that we have programmable hardware...
- Better basis sets
- Less ad-hoc basis sets

- How to author the rigs to begin with
The bigger picture:
Creating Virtual Experiences

- How do we *author* virtual experiences?
- How do we provide high-quality characters in virtual experiences?
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