THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Planning for terrestrial laser scanning in construction: A review

Citation for published version:

Aryan, A, Bosché, F & Tang, P 2021, 'Planning for terrestrial laser scanning in construction: A review', *Automation in Construction*, vol. 125, 103551. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2021.103551>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.autcon.2021.103551](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2021.103551)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Automation in Construction

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Planning for Terrestrial Laser Scanning in Construction: A Review

Afrooz Aryan

Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK

Frédéric Bosché

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Pingbo Tang

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

Abstract

Terrestrial Laser Scanning (TLS) is an efficient and reliable method for collecting point clouds which have a range of applications in the Architecture, Engineering and Construction (AEC) domain. To ensure that the acquired point clouds are suitable to any given application, data collection must guarantee that all scanning targets are acquired with the specified data quality, and within time limits. Efficiency of data collection is important to reduce jobsite activity disruptions. Effective and efficient laser scanning data collection can be achieved through a prior planning optimisation process, which can be called Planning for Scanning (P4S). In the construction domain, the P4S problem has attracted increasing interest from the research community and a number of approaches have been proposed.

This manuscript presents a systematic review of prior P4S works in the AEC domain and presents a categorisation of point cloud data quality criteria. The review starts with the identification and grouping in three categories of the point cloud data quality criteria that are commonly considered as constraints to the P4S problem. The three categories of data quality criteria include 1) completeness, 2) accuracy and spatial resolution, and 3) ‘registrability’. The prior P4S works are then reviewed in a structured way by contrasting them in the way they formulate the P4S optimisation problem: the type of inputs they assume (model and possible scanning locations), the constraints they consider, and the algorithm they utilise to solve the optimi-

sation problem. This work makes two contributions: (1) it identifies gaps in knowledge that require further research such as the need to establish a fully automated scan plan which provides the optimum coverage in construction domain specifically for indoor construction; and (2) it provides a framework — principally a set of criteria — for others to compare new P4S methods against the existing state of the art in the field. This will not only be valuable for young researchers who want to start research in solving the P4S problem, but also for the ones already working in the domain to rethink the problem from different perspectives.

Keywords: Laser Scanning, Network design, Planning for Scanning, Data Quality, Level of Accuracy (LOA), Level of Detail (LOD), Level of Completeness (LOC), Computer-Aided Design (CAD), Building Information Modelling (BIM), Point Cloud, Optimisation

1. Introduction

1.1. Reality Capture in Construction

Different reality capture technologies have been proposed for application in the construction domain, especially with the upsurge in the application of Building Information Modelling (BIM) in recent years. These applications vary from monitoring and managing construction projects to preparing as-built/as-is documentations, and more. Akinici et al. [1] are among the pioneers who suggested application of sensor systems in construction projects for active quality control and defect detection. They linked inefficiency of quality controls on construction sites to late detection of construction defects, and discussed the importance of efficient inspection of construction sites. They also proposed three-dimensional (3D) laser scanning as an essential data collection technology to perform active project control through frequent, complete, and accurate dimensional and visual assessment of as-built conditions at construction sites [1].

3D laser scanner is one of the technologies used to create detailed and accurate indoor and outdoor building models. Terrestrial Laser Scanning (TLS) is a ground-based 3D reality capture technology that produces dense 3D point clouds of its surrounding by utilising time-of-flight or phase-based distance measurement principles. Point clouds come with additional data like colour or intensity information per point or support images, which helps the user to better visualise the raw point cloud. TLS' single-point accuracy is at

the *mm* level and below, and the technology can measure millions of points in a matter of minutes. This makes TLS suitable for a wide range of applications in the Architectural Engineering Construction and Facilities Management (AEC/FM) sector, such as creating as-built/as-is documentation, monitoring construction activities, dimensional quality control, asset monitoring, reverse engineering, cultural heritage recording, and urban planning [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. Although mobile laser scanning (MLS) is also now relatively common for outdoor point cloud acquisition for construction purposes, there are still some challenges (e.g. GPS limitations) that make it less practical for indoor applications [5]. Application of Simultaneous Location and Mapping (SLAM) is investigated as a substitute to GNSS (Global Navigation Satellite System) for indoor MLS, but the result remains inadequate for obtaining high scanning accuracy [10]. While these technologies and their performances are improving rapidly, this review only focuses on ground-based TLS.

Photogrammetry is an alternative approach to the production of 3D point clouds for some similar applications [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. It has advantages over TLS in terms of portability and price; but it also presents a number of limitations in terms of accuracy, data completeness, scaling, robustness to various material textures, etc.

The network of data acquisition for any reality capture device (TLS, photogrammetry, etc.) can be optimally arranged to best capture the scanning targets given constraints (requirements) in quality, time, cost, etc. This is generally called network design and in the case of scanning, we refer to it as Planning for Scanning (P4S). In Geodesy, geodetic network design combines general concepts of mathematical optimisation to the design concept. The design of geodetic networks is dated back to 1974 [16]. The network design problem in photogrammetry is also relatively well-addressed in the literature [17, 18]. This review paper focuses on 3D point clouds acquired by terrestrial laser scanners only, and investigates the works that have been published on P4S to date. Although the main focus has been given to TLS alone, the findings and the framework will benefit other types of point cloud generating devices, as the problem statement is broad and can be adjusted to different hardware associated limits. The comparison approach presented for TLS would also be useful in any other novel application of scanners (e.g. aerial scan or scanner on robots, mobile laser scanning (MLS)), however the corresponding criteria for evaluation and the device limitations need to be identified for any device first.

1.2. Planning for Scanning (P4S)

Some domain experts formalised the P4S problem as the problem of finding the minimum number of predefined view points that give a full coverage of the scanning targets while satisfying the data quality requirements. This problem is similar to Art Gallery problem for monitoring with minimum cameras [19, 20], and the Next Best View (NBV) problem for robotic navigation in unknown environments [21, 22].

The algorithms to solve Art Gallery and robotic navigation problems focus on the line-of-sight factor that influences the coverage of the collected 3D point clouds, with limited consideration for other factors [22]. In contrast, in the context of P4S, other parameters that affect data quality must be taken into account in addition to visibility, such as single point incident angle and range [23, 24]. Interestingly, only González-Baños and Latombe [25] applied these constraints as well as visibility in their randomized Art-Gallery approach to find the best locations for (robot-mounted) sensor placement.

Current practice of laser scanning data acquisition relies on human intuition for planning the scanning locations and acquisition parameter settings at each selected location. Yet, construction sites are complex and constantly changing environments, which makes it impossible, even for experienced surveyors, to guarantee that the acquired point clouds fully cover all scanning targets with the specified levels of quality [5, 26, 27, 28]. The complexity is further increased by the fact that scanners present varying technical performances, and all scanning targets (e.g. objects) across a site may have differing data quality requirements.

Naturally, the risk of incomplete and insufficiently accurate data can be reduced by increasing the amount of scanning done on site (i.e. increasing the number of scanning locations, and/or changing the scanner settings); But increasing the number of scans and/or scanner settings can introduce redundancies in the data and result in inefficiencies. Point cloud data are notoriously large and redundancies make data storage and management a challenge. Moreover, collecting more data always needs more time and labour, and thus can be costly [27, 28] and result in further site disruptions. There is, therefore, a need to optimise scanning operations to achieve the required data completeness and quality while minimising site interferences and data quantity. Figure 1 graphically represents the P4S optimisation elements.

P4S is commonly done manually, before site visit using 2D sketches of the environment or 2D CAD models when available. On-site visual investigation can be used to complement this process. However, it has been shown

Figure 1: P4S Optimisation Elements.

that such manual approaches based on intuition and experience often lead to sub-optimal plans. For example, Zhang et al. [27] asked two experienced surveyors to generate plans to scan target points on the facades of a building with specified point accuracy and detail. The results showed that (1) the plans were only able to capture 60% to 75% of all target points with the specified quality, and (2) the additional scans subsequently required to capture all remaining target points with the specified quality increased the overall scanning time by 60 to 80%. Such findings motivate the development of (semi-)automated P4S approaches, and recent years have indeed seen a growing number of research publications in this area. These can be categorised as:

- *model-based* approaches where existing information about the environment to be scanned is provided, e.g. 2D (CAD) floor plans [29, 30, 31, 32]. These approaches are typically employed for offline P4S; or
- *non-model-based* approaches, generally used for online planning. These approaches are commonly considered within the robotics field of Simultaneous Localisation And Mapping (SLAM). In that context, the terms *view planning* or *next best view (NBV)* are commonly employed [22, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39].

117 Within the construction context, the focus has been primarily on developing
118 offline model-based solutions. This is motivated by the wide use of CAD, or
119 even the ease of rapidly creating 2D floor plan sketches of sites to be scanned.
120 However, the recent decade has seen Building Information Modelling (BIM)
121 becoming increasingly employed in the AEC/FM sector to integrate design,
122 construction and management processes of building projects [40]. Some gov-
123 ernments, such as the UK government, are even mandating BIM on public
124 projects [41]. BIM processes are typically based upon the production of
125 (semantically-rich) 3D models, and has been shown that the integration of
126 TLS and BIM can hugely improve the delivery of as-built documentation,
127 construction quality control, progress control, etc. [42, 1]. These applica-
128 tions can be categorised as ‘Scan-to-BIM’ (generating a 3D BIM model from
129 a reality point cloud) [43, 44, 42, 45] or ‘Scan-vs-BIM’ (comparing a reality
130 point cloud with a 3D BIM model) [6, 46, 47]. For example, Turkan et al.
131 [3] suggested a 4D progress tracking system by combining point cloud -based
132 3D object recognition with schedule information. Note that they also high-
133 lighted the need for an effective P4S, because the results of their case study
134 showed that incomplete scan data has a negative impact on the proposed 4D
135 progress tracking system.

136 The advent of 3D modelling and BIM indicates that the availability of
137 such digital models can help generate 2D (CAD) floor plans that could be
138 used to support P4S. More interestingly, such digital models could replace
139 2D (CAD) plans, so that complete 3D geometric and semantic information
140 contained in those models could be leveraged to achieve more efficient and
141 effective P4S.

142 In fact, a number of works have already been conducted to solve the P4S
143 problem given 3D models of the target scene [27, 48, 49, 50, 51].

144 Given the progress made in the last decade in the area of P4S, this paper
145 aims to conduct a systematic review of prior P4S works in the construction
146 domain with the aim to synthesis the progress made to date and identify
147 areas requiring further research. Section 2 first reviews the criteria that are
148 commonly considered to assess point cloud data quality, and that should
149 thus be taken into account by P4S algorithms. It is proposed to group the
150 criteria in three categories reflecting their general importance in the P4S
151 problem. Section 3 subsequently explores the various parameters impacting
152 those criteria, such as time and space constraints, and various data collection
153 parameters (e.g., incidental angle, range). Section 4 reviews prior P4S works

154 in construction, analysing them in the light of their capacity to account for
 155 the identified data quality performance criteria. Section 5 complements this
 156 analysis with a short discussion of P4S works in the manufacturing sector.
 157 Section 6 summarises the review with a discussion of the main challenges and
 158 gaps to be addressed moving forward.

159 This work makes two contributions: (1) it identifies knowledge gaps that
 160 needs further research, such as the lack of systematic investigation into geode-
 161 tic network setup in the construction domain, and the lack of comprehen-
 162 sive characterisation of scan planning algorithms to reveal trade-offs among
 163 data quality, time, and space constraints; and (2) it provides a criteria-based
 164 comparison framework for others to compare new P4S methods against the
 165 existing state of the art in the field, giving them an overview of what needs
 166 to be sought in order to optimise P4S process.

167 2. Point Cloud Data Quality Criteria

168 Point clouds are increasingly acquired to generate semantically-rich 3D
 169 model of sites (i.e. BIM models) or to compare the as-is state they capture
 170 against some prior “as-design” state represented by a 3D (BIM) model or
 171 even prior point clouds. In all cases, the quality of the obtained data is
 172 important; hence the need to define point cloud data quality criteria. This
 173 paper proposes to group data quality metrics into *primary*, *secondary* and *ter-*
 174 *tiary* categories based on the priority of certain metrics in field applications.
 175 Normally, surveyors first emphasise the need for *coverage* or *completeness* of
 176 scanning targets in the field, and then consider the *accuracy* and *spatial res-*
 177 *olution* of data points covering those targets. Adequate *overlapping* between
 178 adjacent scans must also be achieved to enable reliable alignment of all scans
 179 into a global coordinate system. We refer to this *tertiary* criterion as ‘*regis-*
 180 *trability*’. The following sub-sections will present firstly the *primary* category
 181 related to the completeness of 3D data collected (Section 2.1), then the *sec-*
 182 *ondary* category about the accuracy and spatial resolution of the collected
 183 data (Section 2.2), and finally the *tertiary* category related to registrability
 184 of multiple scans collected (Section 2.3).

185 2.1. Primary Criteria - Completeness

186 The most critical, and therefore *primary* point cloud data quality criterion
 187 is arguably that all scanning targets are captured in the final point cloud. In
 188 other words, each scanning target should be scanned, or be ‘*visible*’, in at least

one of the scans making up the final point cloud. These *targets* can be points (e.g. corners of walls and windows), lines (e.g. slab or window boundary), or surfaces (e.g. a wall face, or the entire surface of an object). Most prior model-based P4S works implicitly consider such completeness criterion as a ‘hard’ constraint that all such features be fully captured [51, 52, 53].

However, it can be observed that it is often challenging to acquire entire lines or surfaces that are part of an object. Yet, acquiring a certain minimum portion or percentage of target surfaces may be sufficient for the intended purpose. For example, Son et al. [54] showed that the diameter of a cylindrical pipe can be accurately modelled as long as the points cover at least a third of its cross-section. Covering the whole cross-section is usually not necessary for deriving the radius of a cylinder. Rabbani et al. [55] also demonstrated that complete coverage is not required for modelling through their algorithm. Based on this observation, Biswas et al. [50] introduced a softer *Level of Completeness (LOC)* (or *Level of Coverage*) criterion, defined as: “the amount of surface of a scanned object of interest which is covered in the overall scan” [50]. Rebolj et al. [46], in their work on establishing point cloud quality specifications to successfully perform scan-vs-BIM processes (for object recognition), also mentioned the need for a surface coverage criterion that does not have to be set to 100%. Similarly, Heidari Mozaffar and Varshosaz [51] introduced the surface-based criterion ‘Lack of Coverage’, for which they also used the acronym ‘LoC’. ‘Lack of Coverage’ is defined as the ratio of surface (discretised as points) in the scan that are not visible from the selected scanning locations over the total surfaces needed to be captured. With this description, a lower ‘Lack of Coverage’ figure close to %0 is desirable. Heidari Mozaffar and Varshosaz [51] employed this metric at a scene level only, while Biswas et al. [50] and Rebolj et al. [46] defined and applied LOC for each individual object of interest.

While LOC has been defined with focus on surfaces [50] we note that it is also applicable to lines, although this has never been considered in the literature.

2.2. Secondary Criteria - Accuracy and Spatial Resolution

According to scan data quality specifications developed by the U.S. General Service Administration (GSA), there are currently two major criteria that a point cloud can be evaluated against [41, 56]:

- LOA (Level of Accuracy): tolerance of positioning accuracy of each individual point in 3D point cloud data. LOA is typically defined in

226 millimetre.

- 227 • LOD (Level of Detail or Level of Density): Minimum object size that
228 can be extracted from the point clouds. LOD relates to *surface sam-*
229 *pling*, i.e. how dense the scanned points are. LOD is thus typically
230 defined as a distance (in millimetres) between neighbouring scanned
231 points.

232 LOA and LOD are meaningful, only once targets have been acquired, i.e.
233 if target completeness is achieved. For this reason, LOA and LOD can be
234 categorised as *secondary* performance criteria.

235 Table 1 shows the four specification levels for LOA and LOD that the
236 GSA has developed and that are selected depending on the intended use
237 of the point clouds or the 3-D models derived from them [41]. Typically,
238 for indoor applications (e.g. indoor layouts, HVAC systems), where smaller
239 dimensions are involved, higher LOA/LOD is required. For outdoor appli-
240 cations (e.g. outdoor building components, building facade), that deal with
241 larger dimensions, lower LOA/LOD is desired [28].

GSA Level	LOA (Tolerance) mm/inch	LOD (Data Density) (mm × mm)/(inch × inch)
1	±51/±2	(152 × 152)/(6 × 6)
2	±13/±1/2	(25 × 25)/(1 × 1)
3	±6/±1/4	(13 × 13)/(1/2 × 1/2)
4	±3/±1/8	(13 × 13)/(1/2 × 1/2)

Table 1: Data quality requirements standardised by GSA.

242 While LOD can be assessed using the acquired survey data only, assess-
243 ing LOA demands extra data obtained for a control network using another
244 sensor with accuracy that should be an order of magnitude higher (e.g. to-
245 tal station). This makes LOA a dependent measure that requires additional
246 surveying work. Also, LOA will be calculated for only a limited number of
247 points (the control network), thus it only provides a partial assessment of ac-
248 curacy. These considerations make LOA a quality measure that is difficult to
249 predetermine during P4S. LOA and LOD are applicable in both model-based
250 and non-model-based P4S contexts.

251 Precision is another metric of data quality that is often considered in the
252 literature, often instead of LOA. This is discussed in more detail in Section
253 3.2.1.

254 Finally, in the case of model-based P4S to support scan-vs-BIM applica-
 255 tions, Rebolj et al. [46] proposed to use another point cloud quality measure,
 256 *Level of Scatter (LOS)*. LOS estimates the percentage of points that are likely
 257 to be mistakenly matched with other objects in close proximity to the object
 258 they are actually acquired from. However, as the authors acknowledge, LOS
 259 is not an independent parameter as it depends on: (1) the matching distance
 260 threshold employed in the Scan-vs-BIM process; and (2) point accuracy (i.e.
 261 LOA). Arguably, the latter relation makes LOS redundant with LOA.

262 2.3. Tertiary Criteria - ‘Registrability’

263 TLS is limited to capture only the points with a clear line of sight, there-
 264 fore capturing all scanning targets requires performing multiple scans from
 265 different view points. The acquired scans are then aligned into a unified
 266 point cloud, through a process called registration. The number of scans and
 267 the quality of the scanned data play a significant role in the registration out-
 268 come. Insufficient data (quantity and quality wise) will not provide enough
 269 overlap and make registration impossible. In contrast, too many scans cost a
 270 significant, yet unnecessary amount of time. So, there is a trade-off between
 271 the number of scans and the computational efforts [23].

272 Point cloud registration can be conducted in one or two stages: coarse
 273 registration, possibly followed by fine registration [57]. In coarse registration,
 274 matching 3D features of the two scans are aligned. The most common method
 275 is using artificial targets inserted in the scene in such ways that they can
 276 be scanned from two or more scanning locations [58]. However, having to
 277 insert such targets increases the scanning time. Robust algorithms have also
 278 been produced that can extract and match discriminatory features (visual
 279 or geometric) that are naturally present in scenes, and therefore present in
 280 scans. This removes the need for manually placing artificial targets in the
 281 scene, which can significantly shorten data acquisition time on site. However,
 282 such feature-based registration also requires ensuring that matching features
 283 do exist among two or more scans (at least three targets need to be matched
 284 between two scans so they can be co-registered) [58].

285 Fine registration follows a coarse registration and results in finding a more
 286 optimal solution by using more data from the scans than the few features
 287 commonly used for coarse registration. Solutions for fine registration are
 288 commonly based on the Iterative Closest Point (ICP) algorithm [59, 60, 61]
 289 that iteratively estimates the rigid transformation that aligns point from

290 one point cloud with the nearest points in the second point cloud. Fine
291 registration is not commonly employed in the construction domain.

292 In the context of P4S, the main challenge in terms of registrability is
293 ensuring that matching, discriminatory features (ideally natural features e.g.
294 wall's or ceiling's corners) are present in pairs of scans. This ensures all scans
295 can be collectively and robustly aligned in the same coordinate system. But,
296 it can also be argued that, given the fact that modern laser scanners can
297 produce individual scans that cover large FOV ($360^\circ \times 290^\circ$) [62, 63], and
298 assuming that successive scanning locations are not excessively far from each
299 other (which is commonly the case), then scan overlap is in fact highly likely
300 to be present between the two respective scans, as illustrated in Figure 5.

301 For construction site progress monitoring, frequently acquired point clouds
302 need to be compared against each other [64]. The point clouds are co-
303 registered with the BIM. Any co-registration error results in wrong deviation
304 detection (i.e. false progress monitoring). A model-based strategy, where the
305 point clouds are co-registered against an existing as-planned model, could re-
306 sult in misalignment because of the potential deviations between as-planned
307 and as-built models. To avoid inaccuracy direct georeferencing is proposed
308 in the literature [65, 64].

309 Another issue which makes registration a critical step in P4S is the fact
310 that registration error contributes to final point cloud accuracy (controlled
311 by the LOA specification). Registration error is commonly of the order of a
312 few millimetres. This is similar even often higher than single point scanning
313 accuracy, which implies that registration error can impact LOA performance
314 just as much as, if not more than, single point accuracy.

315 3. Parameters Impacting Data Quality Criteria

316 We now investigate the parameters that influence the point cloud quality
317 criteria presented above. Section 3.1 below reviews parameters that influ-
318 ence point visibility, or 'scannability', as well as LOC. Section 3.2 introduces
319 parameters influencing point accuracy (LOA), precision, and density (LOD)
320 for objects captured in point clouds. Parameters impacting 'registrability'
321 are discussed in Section 3.3.

322 3.1. Parameters Impacting Target Visibility and LOC

323 A point in the scene is considered visible (or 'scannable') if it is within
324 scanning distance and without occlusion from at least one selected scanning

location. There are three parameters that influence point visibility (see also Figure 2):

- Line of Sight: Only points with direct line of sight from the scanning location can be acquired.
- Depth of Field (DOF): Only points within the minimum and maximum scanning distances of the scanner can be acquired. DOF varies for different types of scanners.
- Field of View (FOV): Only points within the vertical and horizontal angle ranges of the scanner can be acquired. These ranges result from each scanner's physical and mechanical characteristics. Typical modern laser scanners (e.g. Leica ScanStation P30/P40 and FARO^{3D} Focus X330) can cover 360° horizontally and around 290° vertically, i.e. close to an entire sphere with only a small invisibility cone right below the scanner [28, 62, 63].

If a point complies with the three constraints above, it is visible from the given scanning location. The LOC criterion generalises the visibility criterion and is thus affected by the same parameters.

Figure 2: Parameters impacting target visibility: line of sight; depth of field (DOF) and field of view (FOV).

3.2. Parameters Impacting Point Data Quality

Scanning accuracy (LOA), precision, and detail (LOD) are affected by parameters such as: instrument technical capability and calibration, environmental conditions, object properties (e.g. surface roughness, surface reflectance, surface colour), edge effect, scanner settings (i.e. angular resolution and number of measurements per point) and scanning geometry (i.e. scanning location) [66, 67, 68, 69].

3.2.1. LOA and Precision

LOA is affected by instrument technical capability and calibration, atmospheric conditions, object properties, scanning geometry and registration quality [70, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74]. Among those, scanning geometry relates to the location of the scanner, which is possibly the parameter most easily controllable by the surveyor after instrument calibration. Scanner location impacts the incidence angle (α) and range (ρ) at which each individual point is scanned, that both have been found to have significant impact on single point scanning accuracy and precision [75].

There are two components for error in laser scanner instrument measurements: systematic error and random error. Single point scanning accuracy, as specified by manufacturers, identifies the systematic error specific to each laser scanner and is typically reported without regard to any changing condition either in scanners hardware [76], geometry, atmospheric condition, or object properties. In addition to systematic error the other error component, measurements random error (i.e. precision), also impacts the final 3D point cloud quality depending on scanning geometry. To model how the scanning geometry affects the scanning measurements, Soudarissanane et al. [24] presented an approach mainly focused on incidence angle (α) and range (ρ), as the main parameters affecting the signal to noise ratio (SNR) of the measurements. Soudarissanane et al. [24] shows that higher incident angles ($\alpha > 70^\circ$) and longer ranges to the surface result in less precise measurements. The result of Soudarissanane et al.'s work has been applied in most subsequent researches and conditions on incident angle and range are commonly considered as principal criteria for achieving specified single point accuracy and precision.

The relationship between precision, incidence angle (α) and range (ρ), as well as the wider set of parameters impacting precision are often investigated individually [77, 78, 23]. Nonetheless, some researchers have attempted to provide some different insight into this matter. There are studies that focus

379 on random error component of TLS to predict the precision of TLS by estab-
 380 lishing the functional relation between the precision of TLS and its intensity
 381 values considering the effect of range, incidence angle, and surface properties
 382 [73, 79, 80, 81, 82]. Wujanz et al. [73] stated that, since most of the effects
 383 on precision imposed by different parameters cannot be explicitly modelled,
 384 those approaches that consider various effects separately are not practical.
 385 Soudarissanane and Lindenbergh [23] related the precision of the laser scan-
 386 ner measurements to the quality of the received signal. Zámečníková et al.
 387 [78] also took the same approach and considered signal strength in laser scan-
 388 ner error modelling. Kavulya et al. [83] investigated the effect of object colour
 389 and texture on point cloud quality. Although Kavulya et al.’s experiment is
 390 limited in scope, their results suggest that for objects with low laser return
 391 intensity surfaces (e.g. red-painted steel) quality rapidly deteriorates with
 392 range. On the other hand, the incidence angle (up to 70°) does not seem to
 393 significantly influence point cloud precision. This latter conclusion is similar
 394 to that in [66] (see Figure 3). Finally, Shen et al. [75] studied how modelling
 395 accuracy of cylinders is impacted by range, resolution, surface reflectance,
 396 shape curvature (i.e. cylinder radius, temperature, time of day (i.e. night-
 397 time or daytime), dew point’ and relative humidity. Their results show that
 398 the top five variables impacting modelling accuracy are distance, resolution,
 399 colour, intensity, and surface curvature. Their comparison of different error
 400 models as well as their limited (albeit interesting) experimental setup also
 401 confirm the difficulty to develop reliable general error models.

402 Among all of the studies mentioned above, most of the reviewed studies in
 403 table 2 referred to Soudarissanane et al.’s approach and considered a threshold
 404 on incident angle in order to assure the LOA they seek to achieve.

405 Soudarissanane et al. [66] studied the influences of α and ρ on single point
 406 precision (for a given scanner while keeping the other parameters constant),
 407 presenting the result in two separate graphs reproduced in Figure 3. These
 408 graphs can serve as baseline for estimating scanning quality results for a
 409 given plan. Although the results cannot be fully generalised (because they
 410 are obtained with a specific scanner and a limited experimental setup), they
 411 have been used to justify rejecting any scanning point for which $\alpha > 70^\circ$, as
 412 precision rapidly deteriorates beyond that angle.

413 The effects of incident angle, range, as well as object colour on point
 414 cloud quality have also been investigated in the manufacturing context for
 415 part inspection [84]. However, such scanning activities employ different types
 416 of scanners (e.g. line scanners mounted on robotic arm) and are conducted in

Figure 3: Measurement precision with respect to (a) the incidence angle of the surface and (b) the range placement of the surface. In both figure, the remaining standard error σ_d is obtained after removal of the incidence angle effect. (Reproduced with permission from [66]).

controlled environments and at much shorter distances (e.g. 1m) than those experienced in the construction domain. Consequently, those results cannot be realistically applied nor extrapolated to the construction domain.

3.2.2. LOD

LOD can be specified by a measure called surface sampling distance (s) [28], which is mainly affected by range (ρ), angular resolution of the scanner (Δ) and incidence angle (α), with the following formula [28] (see also Figure 4):

$$s = \frac{\rho \Delta}{\cos(\alpha)} \quad (1)$$

If necessary, Equation (1) can be applied independently to obtain separate vertical and horizontal sampling distances, using the decomposition of the incidence angle into its corresponding horizontal and vertical components (and the horizontal and vertical scanner resolutions, if they are not identical).

Lichti et al. [85, 86] showed that surface sampling is also effectively impacted by the beamwidth, when the selected angular resolution is high, nearing the beam divergence angle. As a result, they introduced an alternative

Figure 4: Parameters impacting surface sampling (s), as captured in Equation (1): range (ρ), angular resolution of the scanner (Δ) and incidence angle (α).

432 measure, the *Effective Instantaneous Field of View (EIFOV)*, that considers
 433 not only the scanner’s angular resolution but also the laser beamwidth.

434 3.3. Parameters Impacting ‘Registrability’

435 ‘Registrability’ requires that a sufficient number of artificial or natural
 436 targets be visible in adjacent scans and be distributed as widely as possible
 437 avoiding linear configurations [52].

438 Researchers have suggested that this requirement is essentially impacted
 439 by the level of *overlap* between the scans — i.e. the percentage of data
 440 in one scan that is also captured in another scan acquired from another
 441 location [87, 88]. Ahn and Wohn [87] suggest to set such *Level of Overlap*
 442 (*LOO*) specification to 20%, and Equation 2 shows a typical LOO constraint
 443 formula presented by Chen et al. [88]. This equation guarantees that the line
 444 segments LP_i (which represent target vertical building facades on a 2D CAD
 445 model of the building to be scanned) acquired in each selected scan overlap
 446 at least $Overlap\%$ (e.g. 20%) with the line segments acquired in another scan
 447 [88].

$$\min_i \left(\max_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{LP_i \cap LP_j}{LP_i} \right) \right) \geqslant Overlap\% \quad (2)$$

448 It is important to highlight that these previous studies only consider
 449 the overlap between the data acquired of the scanning *targets* (points, lines

450 or surfaces). This certainly guarantees a minimum $Overlap_{\%}$ but it can
 451 also be argued that, given the fact that modern laser scanners can produce
 452 individual scans that cover large FOV ($360^{\circ} \times 290^{\circ}$) [62, 63] with large DOF
 453 ($> 50m$), scan overlap is highly likely to be present between scans acquired
 454 from successive scanning locations (as discussed earlier). Scan overlap is
 455 thus not necessarily a critical performance criterion, and could in fact be
 456 discarded. For this reason, ‘registrability’ can be categorised as a *tertiary*
 457 criterion to assess P4S techniques. Notwithstanding, the error associated
 458 with registration is a source of systematic error impacting overall point cloud
 459 accuracy (as opposed to single point scanning accuracy), and it should be
 460 considered when assessing LOA.

Figure 5: The overlap between the data acquired of the scanning targets (red line) typically constitutes only a part of the total overlap between two scans (hatched area).

461 4. P4S in Construction

462 P4S methods are all formulated as optimisation problems, but with dif-
 463 ferent characteristics of the three main elements of optimisation problems:
 464 input, constraints, and optimisation model. This section reviews significant
 465 prior P4S methods along these three dimensions with a focus on discussing
 466 their strengths and limitations for application in the domain of construction

467 and built environment management. Section 5 then briefly reflects on works
468 published in the manufacturing domain.

469 Table 2 lists those prior works and summarises the key characteristics of
470 prior model-based P4S approaches for application in the built environment.
471 The characteristics of P4S methods are synthesised along three dimensions,
472 as mentioned above:

- 473 • **Input:**
 - 474 – **Model:** whether the approach uses an existing 2D or 3D model
475 of the facility as input to the process.
 - 476 – **Target:** whether the scanning target are points, lines or surfaces.
 - 477 – **Locations:** the set of possible scanning locations.
- 478 • **Constraints:**
 - 479 – **Primary:** whether the approach considers primary parameters,
480 *Visibility*, or more generally *LOC*.
 - 481 – **Secondary:** whether the approach considers secondary param-
482 eters, *LOA*, *Precision* and *LOD*.
 - 483 – **Tertiary:** whether the approach considers tertiary parameters,
484 here *Registrability*.
- 485 • **Optimisation:**
 - 486 – **Objective:** the objective function being optimised.
 - 487 – **Technique:** the optimisation techniques or algorithms employed
488 to solve the scan planning optimisation problem.

489 Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 review generic P4S methods along the three
490 dimensions mentioned above. Section 4.4 covers some P4S methods designed
491 for specific application contexts, such as tunnel construction , inspection and
492 as-built modelling of piping systems..

493 4.1. *Input: Model, Target and Locations*

494 *Model.* Model-based P4S techniques assume that some existing *model* of the
495 asset or environment to be scanned is available as input. That model can be
496 in various forms. As shown in Table 2, a number of previous works assume
497 that the model is a 2D plan view of the asset to be scanned. This assumption
498 is generally justified by the fact that such models are widely available [33] or
499 they can easily be generated from sources like aerial imagery [88].

500 While 2D plan views of buildings are commonly available, they can lack
501 spatial details of the scanned asset or environment for properly guiding the
502 P4S process. In comparison, 3D (BIM) models contain more details of the

503 scene to be scanned, and are increasingly available for applications where
 504 P4S can be model-based (e.g. dimensional quality control).

505 As shown in Table 2, five of the previous works assume a 3D model of
 506 the facility is available. The authors all justify this assumption based on
 507 the rapid development of 3D (BIM) models in that construction domain and
 508 their increasing availability for construction-related applications.

509 *Targets.* We observe that all reviewed methods that assume 2D (CAD) input
 510 model consider line targets. These methods attempt to plan the scanning
 511 of 3D surfaces in the built environment, but they only focus on walls, that
 512 they assume to be vertical 3D surfaces with limited height. While such
 513 assumptions limit the range of application, they enable reducing the 3D
 514 P4S problem to a 2D P4S problem where walls appear as line segments. In
 515 contrast, prior works that assume 3D input models consider targets as either
 516 points or surfaces. Only two of the studies [50, 51] have proposed a P4S
 517 method for surface targets within a 3D model. They however do this using
 518 two different approaches. Heidari Mozaffar and Varshosaz [51] discretised
 519 surfaces with homogeneously distributed point sets, reducing the problem of
 520 surface coverage to point coverage. In contrast, Biswas et al. [50] attempted
 521 to measure actual surface coverage. But, as will be shown later in section
 522 4.3, their optimisation approach in fact presents a significant flaw.

523 *Locations.* In all reviewed works scanning locations are generated on a 2D
 524 map, typically in the form of a regular 2D grid. Instead of regular 2D grids,
 525 two other studies [33, 88] employed methods that generate locations randomly
 526 in the 2D map and one study [52] presented a hierarchical planning strategy
 527 with an improved greedy method to produce an optimal 2D grid of scanning
 528 locations.

529 Notably, Latimer et al. [49] took a different approach. Instead of specific
 530 scanning locations, they solve the P4S problem by considering as input only
 531 the space of 2D *intersection sets* between the *configuration spaces* calculated
 532 for all scanning targets — a configuration space is the 2D space within which
 533 the target is visible and can be acquired with the desired data quality. If an
 534 intersection set is selected in the final scanning plan, then the optimal scan-
 535 ning location within that intersection set is calculated (see [49] for details).
 536 The number of intersection sets is likely to be smaller than the number of
 537 scanning locations in 2D grids typically employed by other works. There-
 538 fore, using intersection sets helps reduce the complexity of the optimisation
 539 problem.

540 Interestingly, no existing work has yet investigated scanning locations
 541 defined in 3D, including those studies that assume 3D models as inputs.

542 4.2. Constraints: Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Data Quality Criteria

543 *Primary constraints.* First of all, it must be highlighted that point targets
 544 can only be acquired fully or not at all. While the visibility criterion applies
 545 to point targets, the more general LOC criterion is not applicable to them.

546 Looking at the works that consider line targets (in a 2D input model),
 547 they all define their optimisation frameworks with constraints demanding
 548 that all line segments be fully covered by the output scan plans (%100 line
 549 coverage), not just the end points or a portion of those lines. Although
 550 none of these works explicitly makes such suggestion, we note that their
 551 frameworks could easily be adapted to LOC constraints that require only a
 552 portion of lines to be covered.

553 Among all other reviewed model-based scan planning methods that use
 554 3D models as inputs [51, 50] considered surface targets and are thus the
 555 only ones that can meaningfully apply the LOC criterion. Heidari Mozaffar
 556 and Varshosaz [51] applied LOC at scene level, meaning their optimisation
 557 algorithm (Greedy algorithm; see Section 4.3) attempts to optimise surface
 558 coverage irrespective of which object the covered surface comes from. In
 559 contrast, Biswas et al. [50] set LOC requirements per object, which steers
 560 the algorithm to more rapidly ensure all objects get sufficient coverage.

561 *Secondary constraints.* Two main accuracy measures, i.e. single point scan-
 562 ning accuracy and registration accuracy, impact LOA. [27, 48, 49] and [51]
 563 all discarded the LOA criterion in their framework. A number of other scan
 564 planning approaches [18, 23, 33, 50, 52, 53, 87], and [89] took the LOA cri-
 565 terion into account indirectly using a simple model based on incidence angle
 566 α and/or range thresholding (e.g. discard any portion of a line segment for
 567 which $\alpha > 70^\circ$). However, incidence angle is only one of the many factors that
 568 can significantly impact accuracy. Therefore these scan planning approaches
 569 only consider basic metrics for LOA (i.e. incident angle that indirectly affects
 570 measurement accuracy) which is referred by $\times$ in Table 2. On the other hand
 571 some other studies consider more complete metrics for assessing LOA (where
 572 both measurement accuracy and registration accuracy are considered) and
 573 this can be identified through an $\times$ (big) in Table 2.

574 Regarding LOD, [48] and [27] automatically defined ‘feasible spaces’ (i.e.
 575 constraints) within which each given feature can be acquired with the re-

576 quired LOD level. These feasible spaces are then fed into the optimisation
577 engine to generate an optimal scanning plan. Chen et al. [88] utilised sweep-
578 ray algorithm to satisfy LOD along with LOA as part of the visibility check on
579 line targets. Notably, while [27, 48, 87] and [88] considered both range and in-
580 cidence angle to indirectly assess LOD (which is shown by a $\times$ (big) in LOD
581 column in Table 2), the other studies follow a less robust approach by not
582 explicitly considering LOD but by only considering either one [49, 51, 18, 50]
583 or both of the range and the incidence angle [23, 88, 89, 52, 33, 53] as part
584 of their visibility check. [49, 51] only considered range, while [18, 50] con-
585 sidered incident angle only. This is recorded in the LOD column of Table 2
586 with: an $\times$ (small) when α and ρ are both considered; an $\times^*$ when only α is
587 considered; and an $\times^\dagger$ when only ρ is considered.

588 Surprisingly, Blaer and Allen [33] and Biswas et al. [50] do not seem to
589 explicitly consider LOD. Yet, this could have easily been done using the same
590 approach as [87, 88], since they already assessed incidence angles for the LOA
591 criterion.

592 In a different approach, although not explicitly mentioned as LOD, Giorgini
593 et al. [89] defined a 2D cell grid that includes a set of line segments represent-
594 ing elements only above the scanner height, considered as the ground. They
595 then estimate the number of horizontal scan lines in each cell and propose
596 a new function so called ‘ground coverage function’ for every scan station
597 (location). Ground coverage is calculated as the ratio between the difference
598 of the vertical angles of the outer beams that hit the cell, and the vertical an-
599 gular resolution (refer to [89] for the formula). Although the approach does
600 not assess explicitly LOD, the coverage function addresses LOD in some way.

601 *Tertiary Constraints.* Table 2 shows that only one of the approaches designed
602 for a 3D input model takes into account overlap [49]. All the other approaches
603 that account for registrability in their constraints are those designed for a
604 2D (CAD) input model and line targets [87, 88, 33, 52, 89]. In [88] and
605 [33], the authors’ proposed algorithm embeds the overlap constraint as a
606 constraint within the optimisation algorithm. This approach differs from the
607 cases in other studies [49, 89, 52, 87] in which that condition is satisfied only
608 a posteriori, after the optimised set of locations is found. [87] and [88] used
609 the same approach to address the registrability constraint, i.e. overlap of
610 target line segments. In a different approach, Giorgini et al. [89] defined the
611 overlap constraint as a function of cell coverage and calculate the ratio of
612 the ground coverage common between each scan and all previous scans and

613 compares it against a threshold value (33%).

614 In contrast, in [48] and [27], the authors did not attempt to ensure that at
615 least three or more target points acquired in one scan have also been acquired
616 in at least one other scan. Similarly, [50] and [51] did not attempt to ensure
617 that a minimum surface acquired in one scan has also been acquired in at
618 least one other scan. This lack of consideration for overlap seems to be the
619 result of the observation made in Section 3.3 that laser scanners with large
620 panoramic field of views have better chances of generating sufficient over-
621 lapping between successive scans. Nowadays, software packages provided by
622 scanner manufacturers make registration of point cloud very straightforward
623 [51]. As a result, ensuring successful registration is less critical.

624 Jia and Lichti [52] considered artificial targets for the purpose of point
625 cloud registration. The authors' propose a hierarchical design system to
626 provide a near-optimal solution for scanner network configuration as well as
627 target placement. Their target placement algorithm updates the preliminary
628 near-optimal target arrangement to minimise the number of required targets.
629 The algorithm begins with creating a target-point grid in the area of scanning.
630 Then for every potential scanning location (selected view-points obtained in
631 the first stage) the target-points alternatives are saved as potential target-
632 points only if they are visible from the corresponding scanning location. From
633 the potential scanner locations (i.e. first part of the study) the ones that
634 observe the minimum number of target points (set as four) are saved as
635 benchmark geometry. A (near)-optimal target-point selection algorithm for
636 every scanning location of the benchmark geometry picks four randomly-
637 selected potential target-points within the area of that scanning location in
638 every iteration. Near-optimal target point set (i.e 4 target points in this case)
639 are the first ones that satisfy the predefined criterion of not being distributed
640 collinearly or near-collinearly.

641 Then, the algorithm moves to the next potential scanning location and
642 generates the target point set for that location. Finally, some trimming
643 happens in order to remove redundant target points from the final pool of
644 all selected sets for all scanning locations.

645 4.3. Optimisation Approaches

646 *Objective Function.* As can be seen in Table 2, most of the prior P4S works
647 set their optimisation objective function to minimise scanning time. All
648 approaches except one [27] assumed fixed scanner settings (e.g., spatial res-
649 olution, noise level parameters at any give scanning locations), which means

Publication	Approach	Year	Model	Input Target	Locations	Primary LOC	Constraints Secondary LOA	LOD	Tertiary Overlap	Objective	Optimisation Method
Zhang et al. [27]		2016	3D	Points	Grid 2D			×		Min. time	D&C + Relaxed Greedy
Song et al. [48]		2014	3D	Points	Grid 2D			×		Min. scans	Greedy
Latimer et al. [49]		2004	3D	Points	Sets 2D			×		Min. sets/scans	Greedy / SA
Soudarissanane et al. [23]		2011	2D	Lines	Grid 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans	Greedy
Giorini et al. [89]		2019	2D	Lines	Grid 2D	×		×		Min. scans	Greedy
Jia and Lichti [52]		2019	2D	Lines	Grid 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans	Weighted Greedy
Chen et al. [88]		2018	2D	Lines	Random 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans	Greedy+ / SA
Ahn and Wohn [87]		2016	2D	Lines	Grid 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans	Greedy (interactive)
Blaer and Allen [33]		2009	2D	Lines	Random 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans	Greedy
Jia and Lichti [18]		2017	2D	Lines	Grid 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans/Min. α	SA/PSO/GA
Kim et al. [53]		2014	2D	Lines	Grid 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans	GA
Heidari et al. [51]		2016	3D	Surfaces	Grid 2D	×		×		Min. sets/scans	Greedy
Biswas et al. [50]		2015	3D	Surfaces	Grid 2D	×	×	×		Min. scans	Integer Programming

Table 2: Scanning criteria and optimisation approaches considered in published model-based P4S works. $\star$: incidence angle only. $\dagger$: range only.

that scanning time is the same at all locations. As a result, these scan planning approaches simply minimise the number of scans. One of the exceptions to this approach is [27], in which the authors set the scanning resolution setting as an additional parameter to be optimised for each selected scan. This means that their algorithm must maintain the objective function as minimising scanning time, but it also has consequences on the complexity of the problem.

Optimisation Method. The P4S problem is normally defined as a constrained non-linear optimisation problem, for which the objective function is generally linear (with the number of locations) but the constraints are non-linear. Solving such optimisation problem is complex. Such complexity is mainly due to the large number of variables and exponentially large number of possible value combinations among them (e.g., combinations of possible spatial resolution values of the scanner and large number of possible scanning locations).

As summarised in Table 2, almost all existing P4S works, except [50, 53, 18] employed a *greedy algorithm* to find a solution in their optimisation model. Greedy algorithms do not normally produce an optimal solution, but have shown in practice to efficiently yield reasonable local optimal solutions. Greedy algorithms are based on iterative processes that employ the heuristic of making a locally optimal choice at each stage. In the case of P4S, the greedy algorithms employed by prior studies usually select the first scanning location by choosing the location that covers the most targets with the required data quality. Then, at each iteration, they select the next scanning location by choosing the one that provides the best improvement towards the fulfilment of the goal, e.g. the coverage of the scanning targets with the specified data, or minimising occluded spaces. The process normally ends once the scanning targets are all visible with the specified data quality, in at least one of the scans. A second termination criterion is normally added that stops the algorithm in cases when the problem is in fact infeasible — i.e. when one or more targets are not visible with the specified quality from any location. A third termination criterion is also sometimes employed to stop the algorithm when the improvement after each iteration is too small.

Song et al. [48], and Blaer and Allen [33] considered a standard greedy algorithm; the other studies proposed some variants or enhanced approaches. Latimer et al. [49] first employ a greedy approach implemented using a depth-first traversal of an intersection set tree, which appears equivalent to the

greedy approaches employed in the other, more recent studies. This process is then followed by a *Simulated Annealing (SA)* algorithm. The *SA* algorithm iteratively alters the initial solution based on their coverage of the scanning targets (to be maximised as the objective function). Sets of locations that collectively cover all the targets of interest are selected as the initial solution candidates. Through the *SA* process, at each iteration, if the randomly selected initial solution shares the same targets covered by another alternative location set, then the algorithm reduces the number of potential solutions to choose from and reflects the change in the next round of location set selection.

Chen et al. [88] investigated two ways to improve the standard greedy algorithm. First, they suggest a *greedy algorithm with backtracking (GS-BT)* which, after the addition of each new scanning location, searches and removes any now-redundant scanning location. Secondly, similarly to Latimer et al. [49], the authors suggest to follow the GS-BT process with a SA algorithm. The SA algorithm randomly removes a scanning location from the GS-BT solution and then assesses whether small changes in this reduced set of scanning locations can yield solutions to the P4S problem. Their experiments show that the GS-BT found a better solution in 50% of the 64 cases considered in their study. Regarding the application of SA, it found a better solution in 15% of the cases, albeit at the cost of almost 10 times longer computing time. From an optimal solution viewpoint, SA thus also seems valuable, although its additional computational time could become a concern for large-scale facilities and workspaces.

Ahn and Wohn [87] employed a human-in-the-loop *interactive* approach to enable the user to contribute additional knowledge to the optimisation. In their approach, the algorithm ranks the best possible next scanning locations, but the user is responsible for selecting the next scanning location. The location selected by the users might not necessarily be the one ranked the highest by the algorithm. Arguably, this makes the approach only semi-automated.

Jia and Lichti [52] proposed a hierarchical strategy along with an improved greedy algorithm (so called *weighted greedy*) to optimally select the scanning view points. In their proposed weighted greedy algorithm each scanning view point is assigned a visibility score, calculated as the weighted sum of objects of interests that are visible from that view point. For each object, the weight is set as one divided by the the total number of locations (view points) that have a clear line of sight to that object. For instance, if one object is visible from three different locations then the visibility score for

each of those three locations is $1/3$. As any other greedy algorithm, the view point with the highest visibility score is selected and the visibility scores are updated for the next iteration.

While most of the works assumed a fixed angular resolution (Δ) setting for all scans, Zhang et al. [27] and Chen et al. [88] did not make that assumption. Zhang et al. [27] relaxed that constraint and instead set Δ as an optimisation parameter. This relaxation makes the optimisation problem significantly more complicated, minimising data collection time now depends not just on the set of possible scanning locations but also on the set of possible scanning resolutions to be selected for each candidate location. The authors solve this new problem by wrapping the greedy algorithm within a *Divide-and-Conquer* ($D+Q$) strategy that splits the overall problem into independent, smaller problems that can be solved faster. In the ‘Divide’ stage, targets (points) with the same data LOD specifications are grouped in clusters according to some visibility analysis. In the ‘Conquer’ stage, within each cluster, the greedy algorithm is employed to find the optimal set of locations. The minimum Δ required to acquire all point targets with their specified LOD is then found, with the same Δ set for all scanning locations within each cluster.

Notably, Zhang et al. [27] also relaxed the local optimisation problem by not requiring that the greedy algorithm finds a solution that covers all targets. Instead, they employ a stronger termination criterion on the minimal improvement in the coverage of targets that each additional location must make to the solution. This leads to targets (points) being discarded from clusters. An additional ‘garbage collection’ process collects the discarded point targets and initiate a search for scans to cover those discarded ‘garbage targets’. That search uses the same local optimisation (greedy) algorithm. This relaxation of the local optimisation problem may in some cases yield better scanning plans (fewer scanning locations), although the authors of that study do not experimentally demonstrate the level of improvement this yields. Besides, it must be highlighted that the $D+Q$ strategy enables the approach to scale well to much larger problems, and is independent of the method used for solving each local optimisation problem.

Chen et al. [88] started with an initial constant angular resolution for all scanning locations. Based on this initial value an initial scan plan is generated. Then that initial angular resolution in the generated scan plan is refined for every scanning location through a greedy search algorithm. The conditions on LOD, visibility, and overlap are satisfied with every refined angular resolution. Although this greedy approach provides flexibility for

763 surveyors in refining the angular resolutions for all scanning positions, the
764 final scan plan would not be optimal. To address this issue it is suggested, for
765 the future work, to consider different angular resolutions while running visi-
766 bility check; This approach would embed angular resolution into the problem
767 formulation [88].

768 *Genetic algorithm (GA)* has been investigated as another optimisation
769 method in [53, 18]. In [18], the authors compared three heuristic optimisation
770 methods for their performance in a small-volume indoor network design of
771 TLS: SA, GA and Particle Swarm Optimisation (PSO) The optimisation
772 goal is set to find the minimum scanning locations that provides complete
773 coverage for the objects of interest with a minimal sum of incident angles. For
774 the problem they defined, SA performs the worst, while GA is the preferred
775 optimisation method as it could provide an optimal solution requiring fewer
776 parameters to tune.

777 In contrast to all other works, Biswas et al. [50] and Giorgini et al. [89]
778 employed a different optimisation algorithm, *Integer Programming (IP)*. The
779 main issue with IP is that it is NP-complete, which means that it does not
780 scale well to large problems. However, Giorgini et al. [89] successfully applied
781 their IP-based model in large scale environments capturing internal struc-
782 tures. Through their experimental evaluation they claim their algorithm,
783 which is purposefully implemented taking advantage of GPU, can achieve
784 the required coverage in reasonable times.

785 Regarding [50], the way the authors formulated their optimisation prob-
786 lem means that IP in fact leads to incorrect solutions. This is because their
787 optimisation model fails to take into account the coverage overlaps between
788 surfaces from the selected scanning locations. Notably, were those coverage
789 overlaps taken into account, the problem would then not be solvable using
790 IP.

791 4.4. Context-specific Approach

792 The above methods aim to solve generic P4S problems. In contrast, Cabo
793 et al. [90] proposed an approach to optimise P4S of tunnels with circular or
794 elliptical sections and straight or curved axis. Their fully automatic method
795 identifies the optimal scanning locations throughout a tunnel while ensuring
796 the satisfaction of LOD and Precision criteria over the entire surface of the
797 tunnel. This approach is specifically designed for tunnels application and
798 does not generalise to other environments (e.g. as buildings). For this reason,
799 we do not include this method in Table 2.

800 5. P4S in Manufacturing

801 P4S approaches have also been proposed for application in manufactur-
802 ing, typically for defining scanning plans for part inspection [22, 91]. Scott
803 et al. addressed some of the early works on sensor-based view planning tech-
804 niques for specified inspection goals [22]. Although the P4S problem in the
805 manufacturing domain outdates that in the construction domain, the solu-
806 tions are not really transferable. In manufacturing, scanners are mounted on
807 a robotic frame or arm and have narrow FOVs — they can only scan indi-
808 vidual points, small lines or small surface areas at a time [92]. Furthermore,
809 the cost (in terms of time) of moving the scanner to any new position and
810 scan from it is small. This implies that the number of scanning locations is
811 not critical, and an optimal scanning location could be defined for distinct
812 target areas of the object. As a result, the P4S problem for part inspection is
813 more about optimising the scanner’s path from one location to the next until
814 all locations have been visited (travelling salesman problem). In contrast, in
815 the context of construction TLS, the (time) cost of moving the scanner and
816 conducting a scan is high, but each scan is 360-degree and can capture data
817 at long distances, so that multiple scanning targets can be acquired from one
818 location at once. This means that, in the construction context, the problem
819 of minimising the number of scanning locations is more meaningful.

820 Despite these significant differences, approaches employed in the manu-
821 facturing domain might still give valuable ideas on how to approach the P4S
822 problem in the construction domain, since they normally work with 3D in-
823 put models. For example, Son et al. [92] propose a laser scanning system for
824 part inspection that assumes a 3D CAD model of the part as input. Their
825 proposed automated system generates a scan plan including the number of
826 scans, the scanning directions, and the scan path. To generate a scanning
827 plan, a ‘Divide and Conquer’ approach is employed where each complex part
828 is initially divided into functional surfaces, and individual scan plans are then
829 generated for each functional surface. Each functional surface is represented
830 by a point set sampled from that surface, and the system aims to minimise
831 the number of scans necessary to capture all those sampled points. After
832 generating the initial scan plan, the algorithm checks DOF (i.e. distance
833 from the laser source to the surface) and occlusion constraints, and modifies
834 the scan plan to assure all the points will be acquired and measured with
835 the expected precision. This ‘Divide and Conquer’ strategy is similar to that
836 employed by Zhang et al. [27].

837 6. Discussion

838 Section 4 reviewed prior approaches to develop automated P4S algorithms
839 for the usage of TLS in construction. In this section, we review these holis-
840 tically to identify gaps in knowledge.

841 6.1. *Input:*

842 While a number of works assume a 2D input model, which is justified
843 by the general availability of such models, recent works have increasingly
844 considered 3D input models. However, while the approaches developed for
845 2D input models are all focused on line targets (which are the 2D represen-
846 tations of vertical surfaces), that line targets have not been considered by
847 any prior work that used 3D input models. Heidari Mozaffar and Varshosaz
848 [51] and Biswas et al. [50] considered surface targets within 3D input models.
849 However, since the optimisation method of [50] gives incorrect solutions, the
850 approach of Heidari Mozaffar and Varshosaz [51] is the only one that fills the
851 gap for solutions to the P4S problem for surface targets in 3D input models.

852 For approaches that consider 2D input model, it is logical that potential
853 scanning locations be also defined in 2D (plan view) only. However, we
854 observe that no work that considers 3D input model has yet attempted to
855 consider scanning locations defined in a 3D space. Although none of the
856 prior authors specifically discuss this decision, it is arguably justified by two
857 observations. First, TLS is a ground-based technology operated on a tripod
858 that can only be extended a few metres, which limits the range of locations
859 the scanner can be positioned at along the vertical axis. Secondly, those prior
860 studies assume only contexts where the environment to be scanned is large
861 with little geometric variation along the vertical axis (e.g. building exteriors),
862 which implies that sampling locations along the Z axis (within the limited
863 extension capability of typical tripods) would unlikely provide any significant
864 benefit. However, these assumptions are arguably inadequate in a number
865 of other contexts, such as when scanning interiors with MEP components or
866 in industrial environments. In such contexts, considering potential locations
867 in 3D may in fact be necessary to ensure that the optimisation problems are
868 feasible.

869 6.2. *Constraints:*

870 *LOA.* The first observation is that there is not yet any general parametric
871 formula relating single point accuracy (LOA) to all factors — or at least the

main factors — that can impact it. This means that the claim from most prior works that their frameworks can account for accuracy is somewhat misleading. In practice, only approximate metrics are used, the main ones being to reject points with incidence angle $\alpha > 70^\circ$ (60° is also suggested) and range higher than a scanner-specific value (e.g. $\rho > 50m$). Shen et al. [75] showed that important factors impacting accuracy also include surface reflectance. Some other studies [73, 80, 81] also included the effects of range and surface properties as well as incidence angle on range precision of TLS.

Therefore, developing more robust single point accuracy models is necessary. Since accuracy can vary widely among scanner, such models should ideally be developed by scanner manufacturers. But, researchers could also contribute by developing more general (albeit maybe still somewhat approximate) models for typical groups of scanners. Furthermore, in contexts where P4S input models are BIM models, information about surface materials could be obtained from the model and factored in the optimisation framework to ensure that objects with challenging materials are scanned accordingly.

LOD. In contrast to accuracy, most prior works are able to account for LOD more robustly. Interestingly, these studies all use an LOD metric that depends solely on the scanner’s angular resolution, with no work having used the Effective Instantaneous Field of View (EIFOV) introduced in [85]. Nonetheless, it seems that employing EIFOV would only be critical in cases of high LOD, where the specified surface sampling distance can be smaller than the beamwidth.

LOC. Although LOC, in particular surface LOC, has been shown to be critical to ensure scanned data can support successful Scan-vs-BIM applications [50, 46], Biswas et al. [50] and Heidari Mozaffar and Varshosaz [51] are the only ones that have attempted to develop a P4S framework that takes surface LOC into account.

However, as mentioned earlier and further discussed below, there remains a significant research gap in P4S solutions that can consider 3D surface targets and corresponding surface LOC specifications.

6.3. Optimisation

Objective Function. All prior works are in agreement that the main P4S objective is to minimise the time necessary to scan all necessary targets with the specified quality (LOA, LOD, LOC). Minimising scanning time is critical

907 to minimise interruptions of other activities on site. In the majority of cases,
908 minimising the number of scans is used as a proxy objective function.

909 The use of such objective functions assumes that all activities on site
910 will be stopped for all scans in the scanning plan to be performed before
911 all activities can resume. This is however likely sub-optimal. Instead, it
912 would be preferable to come up with scanning plans and programmes (order
913 of scans) that can fully utilise the gaps between other on-site tasks (e.g.
914 construction activities) so that those activities do not have to be halted
915 to allow for data collection. This would first require conducting studies
916 to understand how data collection can influence construction productivity
917 (e.g. see [2]). These studies would then inform how the P4S optimisation
918 problem could be revised with additional constraints so that the scanning
919 plans are optimally interwoven with field workflows, fully utilising the idling
920 time gaps and spaces between tasks to achieve an effective balance between
921 data quality, data timeliness, and overall field productivity. Such problem
922 may be approached using some temporal Divide-and-Conquer strategies (as
923 opposed to spatial ‘Divide-and-Conquer’ strategies like the one in [27]).

924 *Optimisation Method.* As reported earlier, the greedy algorithm is commonly
925 used to solve P4S problems in the built environment domain. While it does
926 not guarantee optimal solutions, it does commonly achieve reasonable ones.
927 Enhancements to the greedy algorithm, e.g. using weighted greedy, back-
928 tracking or SA, have also shown to be able to effectively find more optimal
929 solutions. We note that other methods for solving constrained non-linear
930 optimisation problems, such as evolutionary algorithms (genetic algorithm,
931 etc.), have hardly been investigated, except for the comparison study of Jia
932 and Lichti [18] and a minimal case study in [53]. They could be employed
933 either on their own or possibly in combination with other methods, such as
934 the greedy algorithm or the Divide-and-Conquer strategy [27].

935 Most existing works have looked at medium-scale and generally reason-
936 ably simple P4S problems (i.e. few P4S inputs, and somewhat simple input
937 3D models). While the greedy algorithm they employ does help maintain
938 P4S problem to tractable levels, the Divide-and-Conquer approach of Zhang
939 et al. [27] offered a solution that better scales up to larger P4S problems. Such
940 approach could be considered more systematically, and possibly alternative
941 Divide-and-Conquer strategies could also be considered.

942 6.4. Other Consideration - Progressive P4S

943 Model-based P4S approaches can only work when the input model matches
944 the real environment well. However, often this may not be the case in prac-
945 tice, due to: (1) *discrepancies*, e.g. due to construction having not progressed
946 as planned or suffered some changes or errors; (2) *clutter* that prevents tar-
947 gets to be scanned from certain locations as expected, or (3) *uncertainties*
948 due to approximations in actual scanner placement on site. This implies
949 that there is a need for solutions to the *Progressive P4S* problem, where the
950 plan is reassessed and potentially altered after the acquisition of each new
951 scan on site. Such problem is in effect an *online* model-based *view planning*
952 (or *NBV*) problem. While the non-model-based view planning problem has
953 received significant interest in the literature (e.g. [93, 94, 95, 96, 97]), solu-
954 tions to the proposed new problem of *Progressive P4S* may require specific
955 adjustments and dedicated research.

956 7. Conclusion

957 In this paper, we first have motivated the need for automated P4S meth-
958 ods for application in the built environment domain. We have then conducted
959 a detailed review of the types of performance criteria that such method should
960 meet (Precision, LOD, LOC and registrability) and of the parameters im-
961 pacting those criteria. This was followed by a review of significant prior
962 P4S methods, with focus on thirteen particular studies published in the last
963 decade (eight of which in the last five years). The types of input, constraints
964 and optimisation problem formulations they consider were detailed, and this
965 led to a final extended discussion on the achievements of those methods and
966 identifications of the remaining key areas where further research is required.
967 The following main conclusions (including areas for further research) are
968 drawn.

969 **3D input models and targets:** While the problem of 2D model-based P4S
970 has been well developed with mature solutions, there is a need for meth-
971 ods to be developed that are able to handle 3D input models, in partic-
972 ular BIM models, and that can provide plans for 3D targets that can
973 be points, but also lines and surfaces. The need for methods that can
974 work with 3D input models is particularly important for complex envi-
975 ronments both indoors (e.g. scanning MEP systems located in ceilings)
976 and outdoors (industrial sites).

977 **Accuracy mathematical models:** Mathematical models for calculating LOD
978 and LOC are robust, but there is also a need to develop better accu-
979 racy models. While such models may still trade robustness for gener-
980 alisability, this would be preferable to the overly simplistic approach of
981 rejecting points on the basis of incidence angle alone. There are also
982 some studies which modelled random error of TLS based on intensity
983 values of laser [73, 80, 81], but they can't be applied to estimate LOA
984 as they deal with precision.

985 **Robust and scalable optimisation methods:** Regarding optimisation meth-
986 ods, the work of Zhang et al. [27] has shown that it is possible to de-
987 velop better methods than the basic greedy algorithm, using additional
988 heuristics or well-designed Divide-and-Conquer strategies. Other opti-
989 misation algorithms, for example evolutionary algorithms, should also
990 be investigated more closely.

991 **Temporal constraints:** We noted that the current P4S problem tends to
992 be approached as a temporally static one. It would however be ben-
993 efitical to extend it with additional temporal constraints to minimise
994 interferences between data collection and other site activities.

995 **Progressive P4S:** Finally, while useful to prepare for site scanning activ-
996 ities, current scanning plans can arguably often be inadequate due to
997 unforeseeable circumstances (discrepancies, clutter) and various uncer-
998 tainties. As a result, there is a need to conduct research developing
999 Progressive P4S methods that are able to reassess and potentially alter
1000 the plans in real time after the acquisition of each new scan on site.

1001 The authors expect that the identification of these gaps in knowledge will mo-
1002 tivate individuals and groups around the world to research them and propose
1003 P4S methods that are better than the current state of the art.

1004 References

- 1005 [1] B. Akinci, F. Boukamp, C. Gordon, D. Huber, C. Lyons, K. Park, A
1006 formalism for utilization of sensor systems and integrated project mod-
1007 els for active construction quality control, *Automation in Construction*
1008 15 (2) (2006) pp. 124–138, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2005.01.008.

- 1009 [2] G. B. Dadi, P. M. Goodrum, K. S. Saidi, C. U. Brown, J. W. Betit, A
1010 case study of 3D imaging productivity needs to support infrastructure
1011 construction, in: Construction Research Congress (CRC) 2012, ASCE,
1012 pp. 1052–1062, doi:10.1061/9780784412329.106, 2012.
- 1013 [3] Y. Turkan, F. Bosche, C. T. Haas, R. Haas, Automated progress track-
1014 ing using 4D schedule and 3D sensing technologies, *Automation in Con-
1015 struction* 22 (2012) pp. 414–421, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2011.10.003.
- 1016 [4] C.-S. Park, D.-Y. Lee, O.-S. Kwon, X. Wang, A framework for proac-
1017 tive construction defect management using BIM, augmented reality and
1018 ontology-based data collection template, *Automation in Construction*
1019 33 (2013) pp. 61–71, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2012.09.010.
- 1020 [5] C. Thomson, G. Apostolopoulos, D. Backes, J. Boehm, Mobile Laser
1021 Scanning for Indoor Modelling, *ISPRS Annals of Photogramme-
1022 try, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences II-5/W2*, doi:
1023 10.5194/isprsannals-II-5-W2-289-2013.
- 1024 [6] F. Bosché, A. Guillemet, Y. Turkan, C. T. Haas, R. Haas, Tracking the
1025 built status of MEP works: Assessing the value of a Scan-vs-BIM system,
1026 *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering* 28 (4) (2014) 05014004, doi:
1027 10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000343.
- 1028 [7] C. Zhang, P. Tang, A divide-and-conquer algorithm for 3D imaging
1029 planning in dynamic construction environments, in: 11th CSCE Con-
1030 struction Specialty Conference, pp. 1–11, doi:10.14288/1.0076422, 2015.
- 1031 [8] V. Pătrăucean, I. Armeni, M. Nahangi, J. Yeung, I. Brilakis, C. Haas,
1032 State of research in automatic as-built modelling, *Advanced Engineering
1033 Informatics* 29 (2) (2015) pp. 162–171, doi:10.1016/j.aei.2015.01.001.
- 1034 [9] Q. Wang, M. Kim, J. Cheng, H. Sohn, Automated quality assessment of
1035 precast concrete elements with geometry irregularities using terrestrial
1036 laser scanning, *Automation in Construction* 68 (2016) pp. 170–182, doi:
1037 10.1016/j.autcon.2016.03.014.
- 1038 [10] C. Chen, L. Tang, C. Hancock, P. Zhang, Development of low-cost mo-
1039 bile laser scanning for 3D construction indoor mapping by using inertial
1040 measurement unit, ultra-wide band and 2D laser scanner, *Engineering*

- 1041 Construction and Architectural Management 26 (2019) pp. 1367–1386,
1042 doi:10.1108/ECAM-06-2018-0242.
- 1043 [11] M. Golparvar-Fard, F. Pena-Mora, S. Savarese, Automated progress
1044 monitoring using unordered daily site photographs and IFC-based build-
1045 ing information models, *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering* 29
1046 (2014) 04014025, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000205.
- 1047 [12] S. Tuttas, A. Braun, A. Borrmann, U. Stilla, Comparison of Photogram-
1048 metric Point Clouds with BIM Building Elements for Construction
1049 Progress Monitoring, in: *International Archives of the Photogrammetry,
1050 Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, vol. XL-3, ISPRS, pp.
1051 341–345, doi:10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-3-341-2014, 2014.
- 1052 [13] J. J. Lin, K. K. Han, M. Golparvar-Fard, A framework for model-driven
1053 acquisition and analytics of visual data using UAVs for automated con-
1054 struction progress monitoring, in: *International Workshop on Comput-
1055 ing in Civil Engineering*, doi:10.1061/9780784479247.020, 2015.
- 1056 [14] H. Omar, L. Mahdjoubi, G. Kheder, Towards an automated
1057 photogrammetry-based approach for monitoring and controlling con-
1058 struction site activities, *Computers in Industry* 98 (2018) pp. 172–182,
1059 doi:10.1016/j.compind.2018.03.012.
- 1060 [15] A. Braun, S. Tuttas, A. Borrmann, U. Stilla, A concept for automated
1061 construction progress monitoring using BIM-based geometric constraints
1062 and photogrammetric point clouds., *Journal of Information Technology
1063 in Construction (ITcon)* 20 (8) (2015) pp. 68–79.
- 1064 [16] E. Grafarend, Optimization of Geodetic Networks, *The Canadian Sur-
1065 veyor* 28 (1974) pp. 716–723, doi:10.1139/tcs-1974-0120.
- 1066 [17] C. Fraser, Network design considerations for non-topographic pho-
1067 togrammetry, *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing* 50 (8)
1068 (1984) pp. 1115–1126.
- 1069 [18] F. Jia, D. Lichti, A Comparison of simulated annealing, genetic algo-
1070 rithm and particle swarm optimisation in optimal first-order design of
1071 indoor TLS networks, *ISPRS Annals of Photogrammetry, Remote Sens-
1072 ing and Spatial Information Sciences IV-2/W4* (2017) pp. 75–82, doi:
1073 10.5194/isprs-annals-IV-2-W4-75-2017.

- 1074 [19] V. Chvatal, A combinatorial theorem in plane geometry, Journal of Com-
1075 binatorial Theory, Series B 18 (1) (1975) pp. 39–41, ISSN 0095-8956,
1076 doi:10.1016/0095-8956(75)90061-1.
- 1077 [20] J. O’Rourke, Art Gallery Theorems and Algorithms, Oxford University
1078 Press, Inc., New York, NY, USA, ISBN 0-19-503965-3, 1987.
- 1079 [21] M. K. Reed, P. K. Allen, 3-D Modeling from Range Imagery: An Incre-
1080 mental Method with a Planning Component, Image and Vision Com-
1081 puting 17 (1999) pp. 99–111, doi:10.1016/S0262-8856(98)00114-0.
- 1082 [22] W. Scott, G. Roth, J.-F. Rivest, View planning for automated three-
1083 dimensional object reconstruction and inspection, Association for Com-
1084 puting Machinery 35 (2003) pp.64–96, doi:10.1145/641865.641868.
- 1085 [23] S. Soudarissanane, R. Lindenbergh, Optimizing Terrestrial Laser
1086 Scanning Measurement Set-up, ISPRS - International Archives of
1087 the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sci-
1088 ences XXXVIII-5/W12 (2011) pp. 127–132, doi:10.5194/isprsarchives-
1089 XXXVIII-5-W12-127-2011.
- 1090 [24] S. Soudarissanane, R. Lindenbergh, M. Menenti, P. Teunissen, Scanning
1091 geometry: Influencing factor on the quality of terrestrial laser scanning
1092 points, ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing 66 (4)
1093 (2011) pp. 389 – 399, doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2011.01.005.
- 1094 [25] H. González-Baños, J.-C. Latombe, A randomized art-gallery algorithm
1095 for sensor placement, Proc. 17th ACM Symp. Comp. Geom. (2001) pp.
1096 232–240doi:10.1145/378583.378674.
- 1097 [26] K.-L. Low, A. Lastra, Efficient Constraint Evaluation Algorithms for Hi-
1098 erarchical Next-Best-View Planning, in: Proceedings of the 3rd Interna-
1099 tional Symposium on 3D Data Processing, Visualization, and Transmis-
1100 sion, 3DPVT 2006, pp. 830 – 837, doi:10.1109/3DPVT.2006.52, 2006.
- 1101 [27] C. Zhang, V. S. Kalasapudi, P. Tang, Rapid data quality ori-
1102 ented laser scan planning for dynamic construction environments,
1103 Advanced Engineering Informatics 30 (2) (2016) pp. 218–232, doi:
1104 10.1016/j.aei.2016.03.004.

- 1105 [28] P. Tang, F. S. Alaswad, Sensor modeling of laser scanners for auto-
 1106 mated scan planning on construction jobsites, in: Construction Research
 1107 Congress (CRC) 2012: Construction Challenges in a Flat World, pp.
 1108 1021–1031, doi:10.1061/9780784412329.103, 2012.
- 1109 [29] W. R. Scott, Model-based view planning, Machine Vision and Applica-
 1110 tions 20 (1) (2009) pp. 47–69, doi:10.1007/s00138-007-0110-2.
- 1111 [30] M. Ellenrieder, L. Krger, D. Stel, M. Hanheide, A Versatile Model-Based
 1112 Visibility Measure for Geometric Primitives, Image Analysis 3540 (2005)
 1113 pp. 669–678, doi:10.1007/11499145_68.
- 1114 [31] G. Tarbox, S. Gottschlich, Planning for Complete Sensor Coverage in
 1115 Inspection, Computer Vision and Image Understanding 61 (1) (1995)
 1116 pp. 84 – 111, doi:10.1006/cviu.1995.1007.
- 1117 [32] G. Biegelbauer, M. Vincze, W. Wohlking, Model-based 3D object de-
 1118 tection, Machine Vision and Applications 21 (4) (2010) pp. 497–516,
 1119 doi:10.1007/s00138-008-0178-3.
- 1120 [33] P. S. Blaer, P. K. Allen, View planning and automated data acquisi-
 1121 tion for three-dimensional modelling of complex sites, Journal of Field
 1122 Robotics 26 (2009) pp. 865–891, doi:10.1002/rob.20318.
- 1123 [34] C. Connolly, The determination of next best views, in: Proceedings.
 1124 1985 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation,
 1125 vol. 2, pp. 432–435, doi:10.1109/ROBOT.1985.1087372, 1985.
- 1126 [35] R. Pito, A solution to the next best view problem for automated sur-
 1127 face acquisition, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine
 1128 Intelligence 21 (10) (1999) pp. 1016–1030, doi:10.1109/34.799908.
- 1129 [36] M. K. Reed, P. K. Allen, Constraint-based sensor planning for scene
 1130 modeling, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelli-
 1131 gence 22 (12) (2000) pp. 1460–1467, doi:10.1109/34.895979.
- 1132 [37] K.-L. Low, A. Lastra, Efficient Constraint Evaluation Algorithms for Hi-
 1133 erarchical Next-Best-View Planning, in: Proceedings of the 3rd Interna-
 1134 tional Symposium on 3D Data Processing, Visualization, and Transmis-
 1135 sion, 3DPVT 2006, pp. 830 – 837, doi:10.1109/3DPVT.2006.52, 2006.

- 1136 [38] C. Munkelt, J. Denzler, P. Kuhmstedt, Incorporation of a-priori infor-
1137 mation in planning the next best view, in: Proceedings of the Interna-
1138 tional Workshop Vision, Modeling, and Visualization (VMV), Citeseer,
1139 pp. 261–268, 2006.
- 1140 [39] C. Potthast, G. S. Sukhatme, A probabilistic framework for next best
1141 view estimation in a cluttered environment, *Journal of Visual Com-*
1142 *munication and Image Representation* 25 (1) (2014) pp. 148 – 164, doi:
1143 10.1016/j.jvcir.2013.07.006, visual Understanding and Applications with
1144 RGB-D Cameras.
- 1145 [40] C. Eastman, P. Teicholz, R. Sacks, K. Liston, *BIM Handbook: A Guide*
1146 *to Building Information Modeling for Owners, Managers, Designers, En-*
1147 *gineers and Contractors*, John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, ISBN 978-
1148 0470541371, 2011.
- 1149 [41] GSA Building Information Modeling Guide Series: 03 - GSA
1150 BIM Guide for 3D Imaging, US General Services Administration,
1151 URL <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/102282>, 2009 (accessed
1152 November 10, 2020).
- 1153 [42] P. Tang, D. Huber, B. Akinci, R. Lipman, A. Lytle, Automatic re-
1154 construction of as-built building information models from laser-scanned
1155 point clouds: A review of related techniques, *Automation in Construc-*
1156 *tion* 19 (7) (2010) pp. 829–843, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2010.06.007.
- 1157 [43] V. Tzedaki, J. M. Kamara, Capturing as-built information for a BIM
1158 environment using 3D laser scanner: a process model, in: *AEI 2013:*
1159 *Building Solutions for Architectural Engineering*, ASCE, pp. 486–495,
1160 doi:10.1061/9780784412909.047, 2013.
- 1161 [44] H. Hajian, B. Becerik-Gerber, Scan to BIM: factors affecting operational
1162 and computational errors and productivity loss, *Proceedings of the 27th*
1163 *International Symposium on Automation and Robotics in Construction*
1164 *(ISARC)* doi:10.22260/ISARC2010/0028.
- 1165 [45] H. Son, C. Kim, C. Kim, Fully automated as-built 3D pipeline extrac-
1166 tion method from laser-scanned data based on curvature computation,
1167 *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering* 29 (4) (2014) B4014003, doi:
1168 10.1061/9780784413029.096.

- 1169 [46] D. Rebolj, Z. Pučko, N. Č. Babič, M. Bizjak, D. Mongus, Point cloud
1170 quality requirements for Scan-vs-BIM based automated construction
1171 progress monitoring, *Automation in Construction* 84 (2017) pp. 323–
1172 334, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2017.09.021.
- 1173 [47] R. Maalek, D. D. Lichti, J. Y. Ruwanpura, Automatic Recogni-
1174 tion of Common Structural Elements from Point Clouds for Auto-
1175 mated Progress Monitoring and Dimensional Quality Control in Re-
1176 inforced Concrete Construction, *Remote Sensing* 11 (2019) pp. 1102,
1177 doi:10.3390/rs11091102.
- 1178 [48] M. Song, Z. Shen, P. Tang, Data quality-oriented 3D laser scan planning,
1179 in: *Construction Research Congress (CRC) 2014: Construction in a*
1180 *Global Network*, Elsevier, pp. 984–993, doi:10.1016/j.aei.2016.03.004,
1181 2014.
- 1182 [49] E. Latimer, D. Latimer, R. Saxena, C. Lyons, L. Michaux-Smith,
1183 S. Thayer, Sensor space planning with applications to construc-
1184 tion environments, in: *IEEE International Conference on Robotics*
1185 *and Automation 2004 (ICRA'04)*, vol. 5, pp. 4454–4460, doi:
1186 10.1109/ROBOT.2004.1302419, 2004.
- 1187 [50] H. K. Biswas, F. Bosché, M. Sun, Planning for scanning using building
1188 information models: a novel approach with occlusion handling, in: *Pro-*
1189 *ceedings of the International Symposium on Automation and Robotics in*
1190 *Construction (ISARC)*, vol. 32, pp. 1–8, doi:10.22260/ISARC2015/0047,
1191 2015.
- 1192 [51] M. Heidari Mozaffar, M. Varshosaz, Optimal Placement of a Terrestrial
1193 Laser Scanner with an Emphasis on Reducing Occlusions, *The Pho-*
1194 *togrammetric Record* 31 (2016) pp. 374–393, doi:10.1111/phor.12162.
- 1195 [52] F. Jia, D. D. Lichti, A model-based design system for terrestrial laser
1196 scanning networks in complex sites, *Remote Sensing* 11 (15) (2019) pp.
1197 1749.
- 1198 [53] M. Kim, B. Li, J. Park, S. Lee, H. Sohn, Optimal locations of terrestrial
1199 laser scanner for indoor mapping using genetic algorithm, in: *The 2014*
1200 *International Conference on Control, Automation and Information Sci-*
1201 *ences (ICCAIS 2014)*, pp. 140–143, doi:10.1109/ICCAIS.2014.7020546,
1202 2014.

- [54] H. Son, C. Kim, C. Kim, Fully automated as-built 3D pipeline segmentation based on curvature computation from laser-scanned data, *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering* 29 (2015) pp. 765–772, doi:10.1061/9780784413029.096.
- [55] T. Rabbani, S. Dijkman, F. Heuvel, G. Vosselman, An integrated approach for modelling and global registration of point clouds, *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 61 (2007) pp. 355–370, doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2006.09.006.
- [56] D. Akca, M. Freeman, I. Sargent, A. Gruen, Quality assessment of 3D building data, *The Photogrammetric Record* 25 (132) (2010) pp. 339–355, doi:10.1111/j.1477-9730.2010.00598.x.
- [57] F. Bosché, Plane-based registration of construction laser scans with 3D/4D building models, *Advanced Engineering Informatics* 26 (1) (2012) pp. 90 – 102, doi:10.1016/j.aei.2011.08.009, network and Supply Chain System Integration for Mass Customization and Sustainable Behavior.
- [58] B. Becerik-Gerber, F. Jazizadeh, G. Kavulya, G. Calis, Assessment of target types and layouts in 3D laser scanning for registration accuracy, *Automation in Construction* 20 (2011) pp. 649–658, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2010.12.008.
- [59] P. J. Besl, N. D. McKay, A method for registration of 3-D shapes, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 14 (2) (1992) pp. 239–256, doi:10.1109/34.121791.
- [60] Y. Chen, G. Medioni, Object modelling by registration of multiple range images, *Image and Vision Computing* 10 (3) (1992) pp. 145 – 155, doi:10.1016/0262-8856(92)90066-C, range Image Understanding.
- [61] Z. Zhang, Iterative point matching for registration of free-form curves and surfaces, *International journal of computer vision* 13 (2) (1994) pp. 119–152.
- [62] Leica ScanStation P30/P40 Product Specifications, Leica Geosystems, URL https://w3.leica-geosystems.com/downloads123/hds/hds/general/brochures-datasheet/Leica_ScanStation_P30-P40_Plant_DS_en.pdf, 2017 (accessed November 09, 2020).

- 1236 [63] FARO Laser^{3D}X330 Tech Sheet, Faro Technologies Inc., URL
1237 [https://manchester-metrology.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/](https://manchester-metrology.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/X-330.pdf)
1238 [02/X-330.pdf](https://manchester-metrology.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/X-330.pdf), 2013 (accessed November 09, 2020).
- 1239 [64] S. Tuttas, A. Braun, A. Borrmann, U. Stilla, Acquisition and con-
1240 secutive registration of photogrammetric point clouds for construction
1241 progress monitoring using a 4D BIM, *PFG–Journal of Photogramme-*
1242 *try, Remote Sensing and Geoinformation Science* 85 (1) (2017) pp. 3–15,
1243 doi:10.1007/s41064-016-0002-z, doi:10.1007/s41064-016-0002-z.
- 1244 [65] S. Zollmann, C. Hoppe, S. Kluckner, C. Poglitsch, H. Bischof, G. Re-
1245 itmayr, Augmented Reality for Construction Site Monitoring and Doc-
1246 umentation, *Proceedings of the IEEE* 102 (2) (2014) pp. 137–154, doi:
1247 10.1109/JPROC.2013.2294314.
- 1248 [66] S. Soudarissanane, R. Lindenbergh, M. Menenti, P. Teunissen, Incidence
1249 angle influence on the quality of terrestrial laser scanning points, in:
1250 *Proceedings ISPRS Workshop Laserscanning 2009*, 1-2 Sept 2009, Paris,
1251 France, pp. 183–188, 2009.
- 1252 [67] S. Soudarissanane, J. Ree, A. Bucksch, R. Lindenbergh, Error bud-
1253 get of terrestrial laser scanning: influence of the incidence angle
1254 on the scan quality, in: *Proceedings of 3D-NordOst*, pp. 1–8, doi:
1255 10.13140/RG.2.1.1877.6404, 2007.
- 1256 [68] J. Hiremagalur, K. Yen, T. Lasky, B. Ravani, Testing and performance
1257 evaluation of fixed terrestrial three-dimensional laser scanning systems
1258 for highway applications, *Transportation Research Record: Journal*
1259 *of the Transportation Research Board* 2098 (2009) pp. 29–40, doi:
1260 10.3141/2098-04.
- 1261 [69] D. D. Lichti, S. J. Gordon, Error propagation in directly georeferenced
1262 terrestrial laser scanner point clouds for cultural heritage recording,
1263 *Proc. of FIG Working Week*, Athens, Greece, May (2004) pp. 22–27.
- 1264 [70] W. Boehler, M. B. Vicent, A. Marbs, et al., Investigating laser scanner
1265 accuracy, *The International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sens-*
1266 *ing and Spatial Information Sciences* 34 (Part 5) (2003) pp. 696–701.

- 1267 [71] A. Kukko, S. Kaasalainen, P. Litkey, Effect of incidence angle on laser
1268 scanner intensity and surface data, *Appl. Opt.* 47 (7) (2008) pp. 986–992,
1269 doi:10.1364/AO.47.000986.
- 1270 [72] S. Kaasalainen, A. Krooks, A. Kukko, H. Kaartinen, Radiometric cali-
1271 bration of terrestrial laser scanners with external reference targets, *Re-
1272 mote Sensing* 1 (3) (2009) pp. 144–158.
- 1273 [73] D. Wujanz, M. Burger, M. Mettenleiter, F. Neitzel, An intensity-
1274 based stochastic model for terrestrial laser scanners, *ISPRS Journal of
1275 Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 125 (2017) pp. 146 – 155, doi:
1276 10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2016.12.006.
- 1277 [74] P. Tang, B. Akinci, D. Huber, Quantification of edge loss of laser scanned
1278 data at spatial discontinuities, *Automation in Construction* 18 (8), doi:
1279 10.1016/j.autcon.2009.07.001.
- 1280 [75] Z. Shen, P. Tang, O. Kannan, Y. K. Cho, As-built error modeling for
1281 effective 3D laser scanning on construction sites, *Computing in Civil
1282 Engineering* (2013) pp. 533–540doi:10.1061/9780784413029.067.
- 1283 [76] D. D. Lichti, Error modelling, calibration and analysis of an
1284 AM–CW terrestrial laser scanner system, *ISPRS Journal of Pho-
1285 togrammetry and Remote Sensing* 61 (5) (2007) pp. 307–324, doi:
1286 10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2006.10.004.
- 1287 [77] I. Elkhachy, W. Niemeier, Stochastic assessment of terrestrial laser
1288 scanner, in: *Proceedings of the ASPRS Annual Conference*, Reno,
1289 Nevada, USA, pp. 1–5, 2006.
- 1290 [78] M. Zámečníková, A. Wieser, H. Woschitz, C. Ressler, Influence of surface
1291 reflectivity on reflectorless electronic distance measurement and terres-
1292 trial laser scanning, *Journal of applied geodesy* 8 (4) (2014) pp. 311–326,
1293 doi:10.1515/jag-2014-0016.
- 1294 [79] S. Wu, W. Sun, P. Long, H. Huang, D. Cohen-Or, M. Gong, O. Deussen,
1295 B. Chen, Quality-driven Poisson-guided Autoscanning, *ACM Transac-
1296 tions on Graphics* 33 (6), ISSN 0730-0301, doi:10.1145/2661229.2661242.

- 1297 [80] B. Schmitz, C. Holst, T. Medic, D. Lichti, H. Kuhlmann, How to Effi-
1298 ciently Determine the Range Precision of 3D Terrestrial Laser Scanners,
1299 *Sensors* 19 (6) (2019) pp. 1466, doi:10.3390/s19061466.
- 1300 [81] T. Lambertus, D. Belton, P. Helmholz, Empirical investigation of a
1301 Stochastic model based on intensity values for terrestrial laser scanning,
1302 *AVN Allgemeine Vermessungs-Nachrichten* 125 (2018) pp. 43–52.
- 1303 [82] D. D. Lichti, A method to test differences between additional parameter
1304 sets with a case study in terrestrial laser scanner self-calibration stability
1305 analysis, *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 63 (2)
1306 (2008) pp. 169–180, doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2007.08.001.
- 1307 [83] G. Kavulya, F. Jazizadeh, B. Becerik-Gerber, Effects of color, distance,
1308 and incident angle on quality of 3D point clouds, in: *ASCE International*
1309 *Workshop on Computing in Civil Engineering* (2011), ASCE, pp. 169–
1310 177, doi:10.1061/41182(416)21, 2011.
- 1311 [84] N. Vukašinović, D. Bračun, J. Možina, J. Duhovnik, The influence of
1312 incident angle, object colour and distance on CNC laser scanning, *The*
1313 *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* 50 (1-4)
1314 (2010) pp. 265–274, doi:10.1007/s00170-009-2493-x.
- 1315 [85] D. D. Lichti, S. Jamtsho, Angular resolution of terrestrial laser scan-
1316 ners, *The Photogrammetric Record* 21 (114) (2006) pp. 141–160, doi:
1317 10.1111/j.1477-9730.2006.00367.x.
- 1318 [86] D. D. Lichti, A resolution measure for terrestrial laser scanners, in: *IS-*
1319 *PRS Archives*, Vol. 35, Part B5, pp. 216–221, 2004.
- 1320 [87] J. Ahn, K. Wohn, Interactive scan planning for heritage recording,
1321 *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 75 (7) (2016) pp. 3655–3675, doi:
1322 10.1007/s11042-015-2473-0.
- 1323 [88] M. Chen, E. Koc, Z. Shi, L. Soibelman, Proactive 2D model-based scan
1324 planning for existing buildings, *Automation in Construction* 93 (2018)
1325 pp. 165–177, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2018.05.010.
- 1326 [89] M. Giorgini, S. Marini, R. Monica, J. Aleotti, Sensor-Based Optimiza-
1327 tion of Terrestrial Laser Scanning Measurement Setup on GPU, *IEEE*

- 1328 Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters 16 (9) (2019) pp. 1452–1456,
1329 doi:10.1109/LGRS.2019.2899681.
- 1330 [90] C. Cabo, C. Ordóñez, R. Argüelles-Fraga, An algorithm for optimizing
1331 terrestrial laser scanning in tunnels, Automation in Construction 83
1332 (2017) pp. 163–168, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2017.08.028.
- 1333 [91] X. Fan, L. Zhang, B. Brown, S. Rusinkiewicz, Automated view and path
1334 planning for scalable multi-object 3D scanning, ACM Transactions on
1335 Graphics (TOG) 35 (6) (2016) pp. 239, doi:10.1145/2980179.2980225.
- 1336 [92] S. Son, H. Park, K. H. Lee, Automated laser scanning system for
1337 reverse engineering and inspection, International Journal of Machine
1338 Tools and Manufacture 42 (8) (2002) pp. 889–897, doi:10.1016/S0890-
1339 6955(02)00030-5.
- 1340 [93] K. Nagatani, T. Matsuzawa, K. Yoshida, Scan-point planning and 3-
1341 D map building for a 3-D laser range scanner in an outdoor environ-
1342 ment, in: A. Howard, K. Iagnemma, A. Kelly (Eds.), Field and Service
1343 Robotics, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, ISBN 978-3-
1344 642-13408-1, pp. 207–217, 2010.
- 1345 [94] K. Klein, V. Sequeira, View planning for the 3D modelling of real world
1346 scenes, in: Proceedings. 2000 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on In-
1347 telligent Robots and Systems (IROS 2000) (Cat. No.00CH37113), vol. 2,
1348 pp. 943–948 vol.2, doi:10.1109/IROS.2000.893140, 2000.
- 1349 [95] K. Kawashima, S. Yamanishi, S. Kanai, H. Date, Finding the next-
1350 best scanner position for as-built modeling of piping systems, Inter-
1351 national Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spa-
1352 tial Information Sciences - ISPRS Archives 40 (2014) pp. 313–320, doi:
1353 10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-5-313-2014.
- 1354 [96] S. Prieto, B. Quintana Galera, A. Adan, A. Vazquez, As-is building-
1355 structure reconstruction from a probabilistic next best scan approach,
1356 Robotics and Autonomous Systems 94 (2017) pp. 186–207, doi:
1357 10.1016/j.robot.2017.04.016.
- 1358 [97] L. Díaz-Vilariño, E. Frías, J. Balado, H. González-Jorge, Scan plan-
1359 ning and route optimisation for control of execution of as-designed BIM,

1360 ISPRS - International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sens-
1361 ing and Spatial Information Sciences XLII-4 (2018) pp. 143–148, doi:
1362 10.5194/isprs-archives-XLII-4-143-2018.