

SCENIC: Language-Based Scene Generation

Daniel J. Fremont
Logic and the Methodology of Science
University of California, Berkeley
dfremont@berkeley.edu

Xiangyu Yue
Electrical Engineering and Computer
Sciences
University of California, Berkeley
xyyue@berkeley.edu

Tommaso Dreossi
Electrical Engineering and Computer
Sciences
University of California, Berkeley
tommasodreossi@berkeley.edu

Shromona Ghosh
Electrical Engineering and Computer
Sciences
University of California, Berkeley
shromona.ghosh@berkeley.edu

Alberto L.
Sangiovanni-Vincentelli
Electrical Engineering and Computer
Sciences
University of California, Berkeley
alberto@berkeley.edu

Sanjit A. Seshia
Electrical Engineering and Computer
Sciences & Logic and the
Methodology of Science
University of California, Berkeley
sseshia@berkeley.edu



Figure 1: Three scenes generated from a single ~20-line SCENIC scenario representing bumper-to-bumper traffic.

ABSTRACT

Synthetic data has proved increasingly useful in both training and testing machine learning models such as neural networks. The major problem in synthetic data generation is producing *meaningful* data that is not simply random but reflects properties of real-world data or covers particular cases of interest. In this paper, we show how a *probabilistic programming language* can be used to guide data synthesis by encoding domain knowledge about what data is useful. Specifically, we focus on data sets arising from *scenes*, configurations of physical objects, for example, images of cars on a road. We design a domain-specific language, SCENIC, for describing *scenarios* that are distributions over scenes. The syntax of SCENIC makes it easy to specify complex relationships between the positions and orientations of objects. As a probabilistic programming language, SCENIC allows assigning distributions to features of the scene, as well as declaratively imposing hard and soft constraints over the scene. A SCENIC scenario thereby implicitly defines a distribution over scenes, and we formulate the problem of sampling from this distribution as *scene improvisation*. We implement an improviser for SCENIC scenarios and apply it in a case study generating synthetic data sets for a convolutional neural network designed to detect cars in road images. Our experiments demonstrate the usefulness of our approach by using SCENIC to analyze and improve the performance of the network in various scenarios.

KEYWORDS

scenario description language, synthetic data, deep learning, probabilistic programming, automatic test generation, fuzz testing

1 INTRODUCTION

Machine learning (ML) is increasingly used in safety-critical applications, thereby creating an acute need for techniques to gain higher assurance in ML systems [1, 43, 45]. The traditional ML approach to this problem is to test the learned model¹ in its environment, gathering more data, and retraining if performance is inadequate. However, collecting real-world data can be slow and expensive, as it must be preprocessed and correctly labeled before use. Furthermore, it can be hard to observe and reproduce corner cases that are rare but nonetheless necessary to test against (for example, a car accident). As a result, recent work has investigated training and testing models with *synthetically generated data*, which can be produced in bulk with correct labels and giving the designer full control over the distribution of the data [22, 23, 25, 49].

Generating *meaningful* synthetic data can be a non-trivial task since the input space of ML models is often large and unstructured. This is certainly true of the domain we consider in this paper: *scenes* comprising configurations of objects in space. Suppose we wanted a data set consisting of images of cars on a road. If we simply sampled uniformly at random from all possible configurations of, say, 12 cars, we would get data that was at best unrealistic, with cars facing

¹The term “model” is commonly used in machine learning to refer to the learned classifier/predictor, e.g., a neural network.

sideways or backward, and at worst physically impossible, with cars intersecting each other. Instead, we want scenes like those in Fig. 1, where the cars are laid out in a consistent and realistic way. Furthermore, we may want scenes that are not only realistic but represent particular *scenarios* of interest, e.g., parked cars, cars passing across the field of view, or bumper-to-bumper traffic as in Fig. 1. In general, we need a way to *guide* data generation toward scenes that make sense for our application.

In this paper, we take a programming languages approach, designing a domain-specific *scenario description language*, SCENIC. A scenario is a distribution over scenes. SCENIC is thus a *probabilistic* programming language, allowing the user to programmatically specify a scenario of interest. Furthermore, it allows the user to both construct objects in a straightforward imperative style and impose hard and soft constraints declaratively. SCENIC also provides readable, concise syntax for common geometric relationships that would otherwise require complex non-linear expressions and constraints. In addition, SCENIC provides a notion of classes allowing properties of objects to be given default values depending on other properties: for example, we can define a Car so that by default it faces in the direction of the road at its position. More broadly, SCENIC uses a novel approach to object construction which factors the process into syntactically-independent *specifiers* which can be combined in arbitrary ways, mirroring the flexibility of natural language. Finally, SCENIC provides an easy way to generalize a concrete scene by automatically adding noise.

The variety of constructs in SCENIC makes it possible to write scenarios anywhere on a spectrum from concrete scenes (i.e. individual test cases) to extremely broad classes of abstract scenes (see Fig. 2). A scenario can be reached by moving along the spectrum from either end: the top-down approach is to progressively constrain a very general scenario, while the bottom-up approach is to generalize from a concrete example (such as a known failure case), for example by adding random noise.

Probably most usefully, one can write a scenario in the middle which is far more general than simply adding noise to a single scene but has much more structure than a completely random scene: for example, the traffic scenario depicted in Fig. 1. We will illustrate all three ways of developing a scenario in this paper.

Generating concrete scenes from a SCENIC scenario requires sampling from the probability distribution it implicitly defines. This problem, while closely related to the general probabilistic programming inference problem [21], is interesting in its own right. We call it *scene improvisation*, as it can be viewed as a variant of *control improvisation* [13, 14], a class of problems involving the random generation of sequences subject to hard and soft constraints as well as distribution requirements.




Figure 2: Spectrum of scenarios, general to specific.

We demonstrate the usefulness of SCENIC with a case study testing and improving the reliability of a convolutional neural network designed to perform object detection in autonomous cars. We implemented an improviser for SCENIC scenarios and used it to generate scenes which were rendered into images by Grand Theft Auto V (GTAV [15]), a video game with high-fidelity graphics. Our experiments illustrate several ways SCENIC can be used:

- generating specialized test sets to assess the accuracy of the ML system under particular conditions (e.g. in rain);
- generating instances of hard inputs so that they can be emphasized when retraining, improving accuracy in the hard case without impacting the typical case: we use SCENIC to both identify a deficiency in a state-of-the-art car detection data set [25] and generate a new training set of equal size but yielding significantly better model performance;
- generalizing a known failure case in many directions, exploring the sensitivity of the system to different features and developing a more general scenario for retraining: we use SCENIC to find an image the network misclassifies, discover the root cause, and fix the bug, in the process improving the network's performance on its original test set (again, without increasing training set size).

These experiments show that SCENIC is a very useful tool for understanding and improving the performance of an ML system.

Finally, while data generation is the primary application motivating our work, we believe SCENIC could have other applications in the analysis and verification of systems operating on scenes. SCENIC can be thought of as a specification language for the environments of such systems, for example defining a distribution over environments under which the system is expected to work (or some arbitrary property to hold) with high probability. Composing the system with the SCENIC scene generator, we obtain a closed program which we could potentially prove properties about to establish the correctness of the system.

In summary, the main contributions of this work are:

- SCENIC, a domain-specific probabilistic programming language for describing *scenarios* that are distributions over configurations of physical objects;
- *scene improvisation*, an approach to generating a diverse set of concrete scenes from a SCENIC scenario that draws inspiration from control improvisation [14];
- an implementation of an improviser for SCENIC scenarios, with an interface to GTAV for producing realistic images;
- a case study showing how SCENIC can be used in practice to analyze and improve the accuracy of SqueezeDet [53], a practical deep neural network for autonomous driving, beyond what is achieved by state-of-the-art synthetic data generation methods [25].

The paper is structured as follows: we begin by discussing related work in Sec. 2. Section 3 gives examples highlighting the major features of SCENIC and motivating various choices in its design. In Sec. 4 we describe the SCENIC language in detail, and in Sec. 5 we discuss its formal semantics and the *scene improvisation* problem. Section 6 describes the experimental setup and results of our car

detection case study. Finally, we conclude in Sec. 7 with a summary and directions for future work. An early version of this paper appeared as [12].

2 RELATED WORK

Data Generation and Testing for ML. There has been a large amount of work on generating artificial data sets for specific applications, including text recognition [23], text localization [22], robotic object grasping [49], and autonomous driving [10, 25]. Closely related is work on *domain adaptation*, which attempts to correct differences between synthetic and real-world input distributions. Domain adaptation has enabled synthetic data to successfully train models for several other applications including 3D object detection [29, 46], pedestrian detection [50], and semantic image segmentation [42]. Such work provides important context for our paper, showing that models trained exclusively on synthetic data sets (possibly domain-adapted) can achieve acceptable performance on real-world inputs. The major difference in our work is that we do not focus on any specific application but provide, through SCENIC, a general way to specialize data generation for *any* application whose data derives from scenes.

Some works have also explored the idea of using adversarial examples (i.e. misclassified examples) to retrain and improve models [51, 54]. Some of these methods generate misclassifying examples by looking at the model gradient and by finding minimal input perturbations that lead to a misclassification [18, 33, 36, 48]. Other techniques assume the model to be gray/black-boxes and focus on input modifications or high-level properties of the model [6, 7, 38]. Finally, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [17], a particular kind of neural network able to generate synthetic data, have been used to augment training sets [28, 30]. The difference with SCENIC is that GANs require an initial training set or pretrained model, while SCENIC produces synthetic data requiring only a simulator.

Model-Based Test Generation. Techniques to guide generation towards useful outputs have been proposed in both automated testing and procedural generation [3]. A popular approach is to provide *example outputs*, as in mutational fuzz testing [47] and example-based scene synthesis [11]. While these methods are easy to use, they do not provide fine-grained control over the generated data. Another approach is to give *rules* or a *grammar* specifying how the data can be generated, as in generative fuzz testing [47], procedural generation from shape grammars [34], and grammar-based scene synthesis [24]. While grammars provide much greater control, they are hard to read and write and do not easily allow enforcing global properties. Readability and ease of use can be improved by instead providing a *program* in a domain-specific language with nondeterminism [9]. Conversely, directly writing *constraints* as in constrained-random verification [35] allows global properties but is even more difficult than writing a grammar. SCENIC improves on these methods by simultaneously providing fine-grained control, enforcement of global properties, specification of probability distributions, and the ease of use of an imperative programming language.

Probabilistic Programming Languages. The semantics (and to some extent, the syntax) of SCENIC are similar to that of other probabilistic programming languages such as PROB [21], Church [19], and BLOG [32]. In probabilistic programming the focus is usually on *inference* rather than *generation* (the main application in our case), and in particular to our knowledge probabilistic programming languages have not previously been used for test generation. However, the most popular inference techniques are based on sampling and so could be directly applied to the scene improvisation problem, as we discuss in Sec. 5.

Several probabilistic programming languages have been used to define generative models of objects and scenes: both general-purpose languages such as WebPPL [20] (see [41] for examples) and languages specifically motivated by such applications, namely Quicksand [40] and Picture [27]. The latter languages are thus in some sense the most closely-related to SCENIC, although neither provides specialized syntax or semantics for dealing with geometry. As we will see, the major advantage of SCENIC over these languages is that its domain-specific design, although making SCENIC less general, permits both simple and complex scenarios to be constructed more concisely, readably, and extensibly.

3 OVERVIEW

We use several SCENIC scenarios from our autonomous car case study to motivate and illustrate the main features of the language.

Basics: Objects, Regions, Vector Fields, Distributions, Defaults. To start, suppose we want scenes of one car viewed from another on the road. We can simply write:

```
1 import gtaLib
2 ego = Car
3 Car
```

First, we import a library `gtaLib` containing everything specific to our case study: the definition of `Car` as a type of object, as well as information about locations and directions of roads (from now on we suppress this line). SCENIC itself contains only general geometric operations and predicates that we will see below.

The second line creates a `Car` and assigns it to the special variable `ego` specifying the *ego object* which is the reference point for the scenario. In particular, rendered images from the scenario are from the perspective of the `ego` object.

Finally, the third line creates an additional `Car`. Notice that we have not specified anything about where the cars are or how they are oriented; despite this, the scenario will always yield reasonable scenes: examples are shown in Fig. 3. This is because SCENIC enforces several *default requirements*: all objects must be contained in the workspace, must not intersect each other, and must be visible from the `ego` object (the last requirement ensuring that the object will affect the rendered image; the requirement can be disabled for individual objects or globally, if for example generating non-visual data). Furthermore, SCENIC allows defining *default values* for all object properties. The definition of `Car` in `gtaLib` begins as follows (slightly simplified):

```
1 class Car:
2     position: Point on road
3     heading: roadDirection at self.position
```



Figure 3: Scenes generated from a simple scenario.

Here road is a *region*, one of SCENIC’s primitive types, defined in gtaLib to specify which points in the workspace are on a road. Similarly, roadDirection is a *vector field* specifying the prevailing traffic direction at such points. The operator F at X simply gets the direction of the field F at point X , so the default value for a car’s heading is the road direction at its position. The default position, in turn, is a *Point* on road (we will explain this syntax shortly), which means a *uniformly random* point on the road.

So our scenario, despite being so brief, will yield images where the cars are positioned realistically. In fact, the rest of the definition of Car in gtaLib specifies reasonable default distributions for car model and color, so these aspects of the cars will also be plausible.

On the other hand, our scenario is still extremely general (“one car, anywhere on the road”), and we might want to specify the cars’ positions more precisely. To create a car that is 20–40 m ahead of the camera, for example, we could write:

```
1 Car offset by (-10, 10) @ (20, 40)
```

The interval notation (X, Y) creates a uniform distribution on the interval, and $X @ Y$ creates a vector from xy coordinates (as in Smalltalk [16]). This vector is then used as an offset to position the Car, and since no reference point is explicitly given the ego object is used. So the car is placed randomly up to 10 m left or right of the ego object and 20–40 m ahead (again, automatically conditioned on the fact that the car does not intersect buildings, etc.). This illustrates another general principle in SCENIC, that *relative positions, headings, and distances are with respect to the ego object by default*. This makes it possible to write compact code by assigning an object to ego and building a local part of the scenario around it (possibly reassigning

ego to construct another part, eventually leaving it assigned to the desired camera location).

Using offset by as above overrides the default position of the Car, but leaves the default orientation (“face along the direction of the road”) unchanged. Suppose for greater realism we don’t want to require the car to be *exactly* aligned with the road, but to be within say 5° . We could try:

```
1 Car offset by (-10, 10) @ (20, 40), \
2   facing (-5, 5) deg
```

but this is not quite what we want, since this sets the orientation of the Car in *global* coordinates (i.e. within 5° of North). Instead we can use SCENIC’s general operator X relative to Y , which can interpret vectors and headings as being in a variety of local coordinate systems:

```
1 Car offset by (-10, 10) @ (20, 40), \
2   facing (-5, 5) deg relative to roadDirection
```

If we wanted the heading to be up to 5° off of the ego car’s orientation, we could simply write $(-5, 5)$ deg relative to ego.

Notice that since roadDirection is a vector field, it defines a different coordinate system at each point, and an expression like 15 deg relative to field does not define a unique heading. The example above works because SCENIC knows that the expression $(-5, 5)$ deg relative to roadDirection depends on a reference position, and automatically uses the position of the Car being defined. This is a feature of SCENIC’s system of *specifiers*, which we explain next.

Readable, Flexible Specifiers. So far we have seen offset by X as a way of specifying relative positions, and facing Y for specifying orientations, but the syntax for these may seem unusual compared to typical constructors in object-oriented languages. There are two reasons why SCENIC uses this kind of syntax: first, readability. The second reason is more subtle and based on the fact that in natural language there are many ways to specify positions, orientations, and other properties, some of which interact with each other. Consider the following ways one might describe the location of an object:

- (1) “is at position X ” (absolute position);
- (2) “is just left of position X ” (position based on orientation);
- (3) “is 3 m left of the taxi” (a local coordinate system);
- (4) “is one lane left of the taxi” (another local coordinate system);
- (5) “appears to be 10 m behind the taxi” (relative to line of sight);

These are all fundamentally different from each other (e.g. (3) and (4) differ if the taxi is not exactly parallel to the lane), and in different situations can each be the most natural way to define a position.

Furthermore, these specifications combine other properties of the object in different ways: to place the object “just left of” a position, we must first know the object’s heading; whereas if we wanted to face the object “towards” a location, we must instead know its position. There can be chains of such *dependencies*: “the car is 0.5 m left of the curb” means that the *right edge* of the car is 0.5 m away from the curb, not the car’s position, which is its center. So the car’s position depends on its width, which in turn depends on its model. In a typical object-oriented language, this might be handled by computing values for position and other properties and passing them to a constructor. For “a car is 0.5 m left of the curb” we might write:

```

1 m = Car.defaultModelDistribution.sample()
2 pos = curb.offsetLeft(0.5 + m.width / 2)
3 Car(pos, model=m)

```

Notice how `m` must be used twice, because `m` determines both the model of the car and (indirectly) its position. This is inelegant and breaks encapsulation because the default model distribution is used outside of the `Car` constructor. The latter problem could be fixed by having a specialized constructor or factory function,

```
1 CarLeftOfBy(curb, 0.5)
```

but these would proliferate since we would need to handle all possible combinations of ways to specify different properties (e.g. do we want to require a specific model? Are we overriding the width provided by the model for this specific car?). Instead of having a multitude of such monolithic constructors, SCENIC factors the definition of objects into potentially-interacting but syntactically-independent parts:

```
1 Car left of spot by 0.5, with model BUS
```

Here `left of X by D and with model M` are *specifiers* which do not have an order, but which *together* specify the properties of the car. SCENIC works out the dependencies between properties (here, position is provided by `left of`, which depends on width, whose default value depends on model) and evaluates them in the correct order. To use the default model distribution we would simply leave off with `model BUS`; keeping it affects the position appropriately without having to specify `BUS` more than once.

Specifying Multiple Properties Together. Recall that we defined the default position for a `Car` to be a `Point` on road: this is an example of another specifier, on `region`, which specifies position to be a uniformly random point in the given region. This specifier illustrates another feature of SCENIC, namely that more complex specifiers can specify multiple properties at a time. Consider the following scenario, which creates a parked car given a region curbed defined in `gtalib`:

```

1 spot = OrientedPoint on visible curb
2 Car left of spot by 0.25

```

The function `visible region` returns the part of the region that is visible from the ego object. The specifier `on visible curb` will then set position to be a uniformly random visible point on the curb. We create `spot` as an `OrientedPoint`, which is a built-in class that defines a local coordinate system by having both a position and a heading. The `on region` specifier can also specify heading if the region has a preferred orientation (a vector field) associated with it, as in our example, where curbed is oriented by `roadDirection`, the nominal traffic direction. So `spot` is, in fact, a uniformly random visible point on the curb, oriented along the road. Then we place the car 0.25 m left of `spot` in `spot`'s local coordinate system, i.e. away from the curb. So as desired we get a car parked on the side of the road at a random place, with a 0.25 m gap between it and the curb regardless of the type of car.

In fact, SCENIC makes it easy to elaborate the scenario without needing to alter the code above. Most simply, we could specify a particular model or non-default distribution over models by just adding with `model M` to the definition of the `Car`. More interestingly, we could produce a scenario for *badly*-parked cars by adding two lines:



Figure 4: Scenes of badly-parked cars.

```

1 spot = OrientedPoint on visible curb
2 badAngle = Uniform(1.0, -1.0) * (10, 20) deg
3 Car left of spot by 0.5, \
4   facing badAngle relative to roadDirection

```

This will yield cars parked 10-20° off from the direction of the curb, as seen in Fig. 4.

Declarative Specifications of Hard and Soft Constraints. SCENIC also allows the user to define additional requirements on generated scenes beyond the default requirements avoiding object overlap and so forth. These requirements can check arbitrary conditions built from various geometric predicates. For example, the following scenario produces a car that is 20–40 m ahead and headed roughly towards us, while still facing the nominal road direction:

```

1 car2 = Car offset by (-10, 10) @ (20, 40), \
2     with viewAngle 30 deg
3 require car2 can see ego

```

Here we have used the X can see Y predicate, which in this case is checking that the ego car is inside the 30° view cone of the second car. If we only need this constraint to hold part of the time, we can use a *soft requirement* specifying the minimum probability with which it must hold:

```
1 require[0.5] car2 can see ego
```

Such hard and soft requirements make it possible to easily generate scenes with properties that are difficult to ensure when constructing explicit distributions in a purely imperative fashion.

Mutations. Finally, SCENIC provides an easy-to-use *mutation* system that adds variety to a scenario without changing its code. This is useful, for example, if we have a scenario encoding a single concrete scene obtained from real-world data and want to quickly generate variations. For instance:

```

1 taxi = Car at 120 @ 300, facing 37 deg, ...
2 ...
3 mutate taxi

```

This will add Gaussian noise to the `position` and `heading` of `taxi`, while still enforcing all built-in and custom requirements. The standard deviation of the noise can be scaled by writing, for example, `mutate taxi by 2` (which adds twice as much noise), and we will see later that it can be controlled separately for `position` and `heading`. The mutation system is quite simplistic, and obviously gives far less control than writing a detailed scenario specifying how every property of every object can vary, but it allows quick exploration of the neighborhood around a scenario of interest.

A Larger Example. We conclude this section with an example illustrating both what a larger SCENIC program can look like and a second application domain, namely generating workspaces to test motion planning algorithms. A robot like a Mars rover able to climb over rocks can have very complex dynamics, with the feasibility of a motion plan depending on exact details of the robot’s hardware and the geometry of the terrain. We can use SCENIC to write a scenario generating challenging cases for a planner to solve.

In Fig. 5, we show a scenario representing a rubble field of rocks and pipes with a bottleneck between the robot and its goal that forces the planner to consider climbing over a rock. The code is broken into four parts: first, we import a small library defining the workspace (here with no fixed obstacles, unlike GTA) and the types of objects, then create the robot at a fixed position and the goal (represented by a flag) at a random position on the other side of the workspace. Second, we pick a position for the bottleneck, requiring it to lie roughly on the way from the robot to its goal, and place a rock there. Third, we position two pipes of varying lengths which the robot cannot climb over on either side of the bottleneck, with their ends far enough apart for the robot to be able to pass between. Finally, to make the scenario slightly more interesting we add several additional obstacles, positioned either on the far side of the bottleneck or anywhere at random.

Several resulting workspaces are shown in Fig. 6. To demonstrate SCENIC’s ability to work with different simulators, we visualized

Table 1: Distributions. All parameters are *scalars* except *value*.

Syntax	Distribution
$(low, high)$	uniform on given interval of \mathbb{R}
<code>Uniform(value, ...)</code>	uniform over given values
<code>Discrete({value: wt, ...})</code>	discrete with given weights
<code>Normal(mean, stdDev)</code>	normal with given μ, σ

these scenes using an interface we wrote between SCENIC and the Webots robotics simulator [31].

This example, the badly-parked car scenario of Fig. 4, and the bumper-to-bumper traffic scenario of Fig. 1 illustrate the versatility of SCENIC in constructing a wide range of interesting scenarios. Complete SCENIC code for the bumper-to-bumper scenario as well as other scenarios used as examples in this section or in our experiments, along with images of generated scenes, can be found in Appendix A.

4 THE SCENIC LANGUAGE

SCENIC is a simple imperative probabilistic programming language, with no conditional control flow constructs or general data structures.² Its syntax is largely devoted to expressing geometric relationships between objects in a concise yet readable manner. Figure 7 gives a formal grammar for SCENIC, which we now describe in detail. For the moment we will only describe the meaning of language constructs informally, giving a precise semantics in the next section.

4.1 Data Types

SCENIC provides several primitive data types:

- Booleans** expressing truth values of requirements to satisfy.
- Scalars** floating-point numbers, which can be sampled from various distributions (see Table 1).
- Vectors** representing positions and offsets in space, constructed from coordinates with the Smalltalk [16] syntax $X @ Y$.
- Headings** representing orientations in space. Conveniently, in 2D these are a single angle (in radians, anticlockwise from North). We use the convention that the heading of a local coordinate system is the heading of its y -axis, so, for example, $-2 @ 3$ means 2 meters left and 3 ahead.
- Vector Fields** associating an orientation to each point in space. For example, the shortest paths to a destination or (in our case study) the nominal traffic direction.
- Regions** representing sets of points in space. These can have a vector field associated with them so that points in the region have preferred orientations (e.g. the surface of an object could have normal vectors, so that objects placed randomly on the surface face outward by default).

In addition, SCENIC provides a lightweight notion of *objects*, mainly used to represent the physical objects present in a scene. Objects are simply immutable maps from *properties* to values; for example, each object has a `position` property whose value is a

²In fact our implementation does support repeat loops, functions, and methods, as well as lists and various other data types, all inherited from Python. But these are not essential to the language and have their usual semantics, so for simplicity we only describe the core of the language here.

```

1 import mars
2 ego = Rover at 0 @ -2
3 goal = Goal at (-2, 2) @ (2, 2.5)
4
5 halfGapWidth = (1.2 * ego.width) / 2
6 bottleneck = OrientedPoint offset by (-1.5, 1.5) @ (0.5, 1.5), facing (-30, 30) deg
7 require abs((angle to goal) - (angle to bottleneck)) <= 10 deg
8 BigRock at bottleneck
9
10 leftEnd = OrientedPoint left of bottleneck by halfGapWidth, \
11         facing (60, 120) deg relative to bottleneck
12 rightEnd = OrientedPoint right of bottleneck by halfGapWidth, \
13         facing (-120, -60) deg relative to bottleneck
14 Pipe ahead of leftEnd, with height (1, 2)
15 Pipe ahead of rightEnd, with height (1, 2)
16
17 BigRock beyond bottleneck by (-0.5, 0.5) @ (0.5, 1)
18 BigRock beyond bottleneck by (-0.5, 0.5) @ (0.5, 1)
19 Pipe
20 Rock
21 Rock
22 Rock

```

Figure 5: A SCENIC scenario for generating workspaces to test a robot motion planner. The scenario represents rubble fields with a bottleneck so that the direct route to the goal requires climbing over rocks.




Figure 6: Workspaces generated from the scenario in Fig. 5, viewed in Webots from a fixed camera.

```

scenario := (import file)* (statement)*
boolean := True | False | booleanOperator
scalar := number | distribution | scalarOperator
distribution := baseDist | resample(distribution)
vector := scalar @ scalar | Point | vectorOperator
heading := scalar | OrientedPoint | headingOperator
direction := heading | vectorField
value := boolean | scalar | vector | direction
        | region | instance | instance.property
classDefn := class class[(superclass)]:
              (property: defaultValueExpr)*
instance := class specifier, ...
specifier := with property value | posSpec | headSpec

```

Figure 7: Simplified SCENIC grammar. *Point* and *OrientedPoint* are instances of the corresponding classes. See Tab. 5 for statements, Fig. 9 for operators, Tab. 1 for *baseDist*, and Tables 3 and 4 for *posSpec* and *headSpec*.

vector storing the object’s position. Objects are instances of *classes*, which specify a set of properties their instances must have, together with corresponding default values (see Fig. 7). The classes form a single-inheritance hierarchy, where subclasses may provide new default values for properties defined in superclasses.

Default value expressions are evaluated each time an object is created. Thus in a class definition if we write `weight: (1, 5)` then each instance of this class will have a weight drawn *independently* from `(1, 5)`. Furthermore, default values may use the special syntax `self.property` to refer to one of the other properties of the object, which is then a *dependency* of this default value. In our case study, for example, the width and height of a *Car* are by default derived from its model.

Physical objects in a scene are instances of *Object*, which is the default superclass when none is specified. *Object* descends from the two other built-in classes: its superclass is *OrientedPoint*, which in turn subclasses *Point*. *Point* and *OrientedPoint* represent locations in space, without and with an orientation respectively, and so provide the fundamental properties *position* and *heading*. *Object* extends this by defining a bounding box with the properties *width* and *height*. Table 2 lists all the properties of the built-in classes and their default values.

To allow cleaner notation, *Point* and *OrientedPoint* are automatically interpreted as vectors or headings in contexts expecting these (as shown in Fig. 7). For example, we can write `taxi offset by 1 @ 2 and 30 deg relative to taxi` instead of `taxi.position offset by 1 @ 2 and 30 deg relative to taxi.heading`. Ambiguous cases (e.g. `taxi relative to limo`) are illegal and the more verbose syntax must be used instead.

4.2 Expressions

SCENIC’s expressions are mostly straightforward, largely consisting of the arithmetic, boolean, and geometric operators shown in Fig. 9. The meanings of these operators are largely clear from their syntax, so we defer complete definitions of their semantics to Appendix B. Figure 8 illustrates several of the geometric operators (as well as

Table 2: Properties of Point, OrientedPoint, and Object.

Property	Default	Meaning
<i>position</i>	(0, 0)	position in global coordinates
<i>viewDistance</i>	50	distance for ‘can see’ predicate
<i>mutationScale</i>	0	overall scale of mutations
<i>positionStdDev</i>	1	mutation σ for position
<i>heading</i>	0	heading in global coordinates
<i>viewAngle</i>	360°	angle for ‘can see’ predicate
<i>headingStdDev</i>	5°	mutation σ for heading
<i>width</i>	1	width of bounding box
<i>height</i>	1	height of bounding box
<i>allowCollisions</i>	false	collisions with Objects allowed
<i>requireVisible</i>	true	must be visible from ego

some specifiers, which we will discuss in the next section). Various points to note:

- `X can see Y` uses a simple visibility model where a *Point* can see out to a certain radius, and an *OrientedPoint* restricts this to the circular sector along its heading with a certain angle (see Table 2 for the relevant properties). An *Object* is visible if and only if part of its bounding box is.
- `X relative to Y` interprets *X* as an offset in a local coordinate system defined by *Y*. Thus `-3 @ 0 relative to Y` yields 3 m left of *Y* if *Y* is an *OrientedPoint*, and 3 m West of *Y* if *Y* is a vector. If defining a heading inside a specifier, either *X* or *Y* can be a vector field: it is interpreted as a heading by evaluating it at the position of the object being specified. So we can write for example `Car at 120 @ 70, facing 30 deg relative to roadDirection`.
- `visible region` yields the part of the region visible from the ego object, so we can write `Car on visible road`. The operator `region visible from X` does the same, but viewed from *X*.
- `front of Object`, `front left of Object`, etc. yield the corresponding points on the bounding box of the object, oriented along the object’s heading.

Two types of SCENIC expressions are more complex: distributions and object definitions. As in a typical imperative probabilistic programming language, a distribution evaluates to a *sample* from the distribution. Thus the program

```

1 x = (0, 1)
2 y = x @ x

```

does not give *y* a uniform distribution over the unit box, but rather over its diagonal. For convenience in producing multiple samples from a (potentially complex) distribution, SCENIC provides a `resample(x)` function which returns an independent sample from the same distribution as *x*.

The second type of more complex SCENIC expressions are object definitions. These are the only expressions that have a side effect, namely creating an object that will be included in the generated scene. More interestingly, properties of objects are specified using




Figure 8: Various SCENIC operators and specifiers applied to the ego object and an OrientedPoint P. Instances of OrientedPoint are shown as bold arrows.

```

scalarOperator := max(scalar, ...) | min(scalar, ...)
| -scalar | abs(scalar) | scalar ( + | * ) scalar
| relative heading of heading [from heading]
| apparent heading of OrientedPoint [from vector]
| distance [from vector] to vector
| angle [from vector] to vector
booleanOperator := not boolean | boolean ( and | or ) boolean
| scalar ( == | != | < | > | <= | >= ) scalar
| ( Point | OrientedPoint ) can see ( vector | Object )
| ( vector | Object ) is in region
headingOperator := scalar deg
| vectorField at vector
| direction relative to direction
vectorOperator := vector relative to vector
| vector offset by vector
| vector offset along direction by vector
regionOperator := visible region
| region visible from ( Point | OrientedPoint )
orientedPointOperator := vector relative to orientedPoint
| orientedPoint offset by vector
| follow vectorField [from vector] for scalar
| ( front | back | left | right ) of Object
| ( front | back ) ( left | right ) of Object

```

Figure 9: Operators by result type.

the flexible system of *specifiers* discussed above, which we now detail.

4.3 Specifiers

As shown in the grammar in Fig. 7, an object is created by writing the class name followed by a (possibly empty) comma-separated list of specifiers. The specifiers are combined, possibly adding default

specifiers from the class definition, to form a complete specification of all properties of the object. Arbitrary properties (including user-defined properties with no meaning in SCENIC) can be specified with the generic specifier with *property value*, while SCENIC provides many more specifiers for the built-in properties position and heading, shown in Tables 3 and 4 respectively.

In general, a specifier can be viewed as a function taking in values for zero or more properties, its *dependencies*, and returning values for one or more other properties, some of which can be specified *optionally*, meaning that other specifiers will override them. For example, `on region` specifies position and optionally specifies heading if the given region has a preferred orientation. If road is such a region, as in our case study, then `Object on road` will create an object at a position uniformly random in road and with the preferred orientation there. But since heading is only specified optionally, we can set the orientation ourselves by writing `Object on road, facing 20 deg` (whereas `Object on road, at 3 @ 4` would be illegal because position is specified non-optional twice).

Specifiers are combined to fully specify the properties of an object by evaluating them in an order ensuring that their dependencies are always already assigned. If there is no such order or a single property is specified twice, the scenario is ill-formed. The exact procedure by which the order is found, taking into account properties that are optionally specified and default values, will be described in the next section.

As the semantics of the individual specifiers in Tables 3 and 4 are largely evident from their syntax, we defer exact definitions for most of them to Appendix B. We briefly discuss some of the more complex specifiers, referring to the examples in Fig. 8:

- `behind vector` means the object is placed with the mid-point of its front edge at the given vector, and similarly for `ahead/left/right of vector`.
- `beyond A by O from B` means the position obtained by treating `O` as an offset in the local coordinate system at `A` oriented along the line of sight from `B`. In this and other specifiers, if the `from B` is omitted, the ego object is used by default. So for example `beyond taxi by 0 @ 3` means 3 m directly behind the taxi as viewed by the camera (see Fig. 8 for another example).
- The heading optionally specified by `left of OrientedPoint`, etc. is that of the `OrientedPoint` (thus in Fig. 8, we see that `P offset by 0 @ -2` yields an `OrientedPoint` facing the same way as `P`). Similarly, the heading optionally specified by following `vectorField` is that of the vector field at the specified position.
- `apparently facing H from V` means the object has heading `H` with respect to the line of sight from `V` (as above, the ego object if `V` is omitted). For example, `apparently facing 90 deg` would orient the object so that the camera views its left side head-on.

4.4 Statements

Finally, we discuss SCENIC’s statements, listed in Table 5. Class and object definitions have been discussed above, and variable assignment behaves in the standard way.

Table 3: Specifiers for position. Those in the second group also optionally specify heading.

Specifier	Dependencies
at <i>vector</i>	—
offset by <i>vector</i>	—
offset along <i>direction</i> by <i>vector</i>	—
(left right) of <i>vector</i> [by <i>scalar</i>]	heading, width
(ahead of behind) <i>vector</i> [by <i>scalar</i>]	heading, height
beyond <i>vector</i> by <i>vector</i> [from <i>vector</i>]	—
visible [from (<i>Point</i> <i>OrientedPoint</i>)]	—
(in on) <i>region</i>	—
(left right) of (<i>OrientedPoint</i> <i>Object</i>) [by <i>scalar</i>]	width
(ahead of behind) (<i>OrientedPoint</i> <i>Object</i>) [by <i>scalar</i>]	height
following <i>vectorField</i> [from <i>vector</i>] for <i>scalar</i>	—

Table 4: Specifiers for heading.

Specifier	Dependencies
facing <i>heading</i>	—
facing <i>vectorField</i>	position
facing (toward away from) <i>vector</i>	position
apparently facing <i>heading</i> [from <i>vector</i>]	position

Table 5: Statements.

Syntax	Meaning
pass	no-op
<i>identifier</i> = <i>value</i>	variable assignment
param <i>identifier</i> = <i>value</i> , ...	parameter assignment
<i>classDefn</i>	class definition
<i>instance</i>	object definition
require <i>boolean</i>	hard requirement
require[<i>number</i>] <i>boolean</i>	soft requirement
mutate <i>identifier</i> , ... [by <i>number</i>]	enable object mutation

The statement `param identifier = value` assigns values to global parameters of the scenario. These parameters have no semantics in SCENIC but provide a general-purpose way to encode arbitrary scene-wide information. For example, in our case study we used parameters `time` and `weather` to put distributions on the time of day and the weather conditions during the scene.

The `require boolean` statement requires that the given condition hold in all instantiations of the scenario (equivalently to *observe* statements in other probabilistic programming languages; see e.g. [4, 32]). As mentioned above, SCENIC automatically includes implicit requirements that Objects must lie in the workspace, cannot intersect, and must be visible from the ego object (these can be disabled on a per-object basis: see Table 2). The variant statement `require[p] boolean` adds a *soft* requirement that need only hold with some probability p (which must be a constant). We will discuss the precise semantics of soft requirements in the next section.

Lastly, SCENIC provides an easy way to add variety to a scenario (possibly encoding a single concrete scene obtained from real-world data) with the `mutate instance, ... by number` statement. This causes the listed objects (or every Object, if no list is given) to have Gaussian noise added to their position and heading properties. Importantly, the noise is added at the end of execution, so that noise added to one object A does not affect the properties of another B constructed in a way that depends on A . The standard deviation of this noise is the `positionStdDev/headingStdDev` property (see Table 2) of the object multiplied by the number (if given) in the `mutate` statement. So for example `mutate taxi by 2` would add twice as much noise as `mutate taxi`, and we could keep the heading of the taxi fixed by adding with `headingStdDev 0` when defining it.

5 SEMANTICS AND SCENE GENERATION

In this section we give a precise semantics for SCENIC expressions and statements, building up to a semantics for a complete scenario as a distribution over scenes. We then discuss the computational problem of sampling from that distribution.

5.1 Notation for State and Semantics

We will precisely define the meaning of SCENIC language constructs by giving a small-step operational semantics. We will focus on the aspects of SCENIC that set it apart from ordinary imperative languages, skipping standard inference rules for sequential composition, arithmetic operations, etc. that we essentially use without change. In rules for statements, we will denote a state of a SCENIC program by $\langle s, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle$, where s is the statement to be executed, σ is the current variable assignment (a map from variables to values), π is the current global parameter assignment (for `param` statements), and O is the set of all objects defined so far. In rules for expressions, we use the same notation, although we sometimes suppress the state on the right-hand side of rules for expressions without side effects: $\langle e, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow v$ means that in the state (σ, π, O) , the expression e evaluates to the value v without side effects.

Since SCENIC is a probabilistic programming language, a single expression can be evaluated different ways with different probabilities. Following the notation of [4, 44], we write \rightarrow^P for a rewrite

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{DISTRIBUTIONS} \\
\hline
\langle \text{params}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \theta \quad v \in \text{dom } \text{baseDist}(\theta) \\
\hline
\langle \text{baseDist}(\text{params}), \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow^{P_\theta(v)} v \\
\\
\text{OBJECT DEFINITIONS} \\
\text{resolveSpecifiers}(\text{class}, \text{specifiers}) = ((s_1, p_1), \dots, (s_n, p_n)) \\
\langle s_1, \sigma[\text{self}/\perp], \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow^{r_1} \langle v_1, \sigma_1, \pi, O_1 \rangle \\
\langle s_2, \sigma_1[\text{self}.p_1/v_1(p_1)], \pi, O_1 \rangle \rightarrow^{r_2} \langle v_2, \sigma_2, \pi, O_2 \rangle \\
\vdots \\
\langle s_n, \sigma_{n-1}[\text{self}.p_{n-1}/v_{n-1}(p_{n-1})], \pi, O_{n-1} \rangle \rightarrow^{r_n} \langle v_n, \sigma_n, \pi, O_n \rangle \\
\text{inst} = \text{newInstance}(\text{class}, \sigma_n[\text{self}.p_n/v_n(p_n)](\text{self})) \\
\hline
\langle \text{class } \text{specifiers}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow^{r_1 \dots r_n} \langle \text{inst}, \sigma, \pi, O_n \cup \{\text{inst}\} \rangle \\
\\
\text{'with' SPECIFIER} \\
\hline
\langle E, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, \sigma, \pi, O' \rangle \\
\hline
\langle \text{with } \text{property } E, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \{\text{property} \mapsto v\} \\
\\
\text{'facing vectorField' SPECIFIER} \\
\hline
\langle \text{vectorField}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow v \quad \langle \text{self.position}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow p \\
\hline
\langle \text{facing } \text{vectorField}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \{\text{heading} \mapsto v(p)\}
\end{array}$$

Figure 10: Semantics of expressions (excluding operators, defined in Appendix B). Here baseDist is viewed as a function mapping parameters θ to a distribution with density function P_θ , and $\text{newInstance}(\text{class}, \text{props})$ creates a new instance of a class with the given property values.

rule that fires with probability p (probability density p , in the case of continuous distributions). We will discuss the meaning of such rules in more detail below.

5.2 Semantics of Expressions

As explained in the previous section, SCENIC's expressions are straightforward except for distributions and object definitions. As in a typical imperative probabilistic programming language, a distribution evaluates to a *sample* from the distribution, following the first rule in Fig. 10. For example, if baseDist is a uniform interval distribution and the parameters evaluate to $\text{low} = 0$ and $\text{high} = 1$, then the distribution can evaluate to any value in $[0, 1]$ with probability density 1.

The semantics of object definitions are given by the second rule in Fig. 10. First note the side effect, namely adding the newly-defined object to the set O . The premises of the rule describe the procedure for combining the specifiers to obtain the overall set of properties for the object. The main step is working out the evaluation order for the specifiers so that all their dependencies are satisfied, as well as deciding for each specifier which properties it should specify (if it specifies a property optionally, another specifier could take precedence). This is done by the procedure resolveSpecifiers , shown formally as Alg. 1 and which essentially does the following:

Let P be the set of properties defined in the object's class and superclasses, together with any properties specified by any of the specifiers. The object will have exactly these properties, and the

Algorithm 1 $\text{resolveSpecifiers}(\text{class}, \text{specifiers})$

```

    ▷ gather all specified properties
1:  $\text{specForProperty} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2:  $\text{optionalSpecsForProperty} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3: for all specifiers  $S$  in  $\text{specifiers}$  do
4:   for all properties  $P$  specified non-optionally by  $S$  do
5:     if  $P \in \text{dom } \text{specForProperty}$  then
6:       syntax error: property  $P$  specified twice
7:      $\text{specForProperty}(P) \leftarrow S$ 
8:   for all properties  $P$  specified optionally by  $S$  do
9:      $\text{optionalSpecsForProperty}(P).append(S)$ 
    ▷ filter optional specifications
10: for all properties  $P \in \text{dom } \text{optionalSpecsForProperty}$  do
11:   if  $P \in \text{dom } \text{specForProperty}$  then
12:     continue
13:   if  $|\text{optionalSpecsForProperty}(P)| > 1$  then
14:     syntax error: property  $P$  specified twice
15:    $\text{specForProperty}(P) \leftarrow \text{optionalSpecsForProperty}(P)[0]$ 
    ▷ add default specifiers as needed
16:  $\text{defaults} \leftarrow \text{defaultValueExpressions}(\text{class})$ 
17: for all properties  $P \in \text{dom } \text{defaults}$  do
18:   if  $P \notin \text{dom } \text{specForProperty}$  then
19:      $\text{specForProperty}(P) \leftarrow \text{defaults}(P)$ 
    ▷ build dependency graph
20:  $G \leftarrow$  empty graph on  $\text{dom } \text{specForProperty}$ 
21: for all specifiers  $S \in \text{dom } \text{specForProperty}$  do
22:   for all dependencies  $D$  of  $S$  do
23:     if  $D \notin \text{dom } \text{specForProperty}$  then
24:       syntax error: missing property  $D$  required by  $S$ 
25:     add an edge in  $G$  from  $\text{specForProperty}(D)$  to  $S$ 
26: if  $G$  is cyclic then
27:   syntax error: specifiers have cyclic dependencies
    ▷ construct specifier and property evaluation order
28:  $\text{specsAndProps} \leftarrow$  empty list
29: for all specifiers  $S$  in  $G$  in topological order do
30:    $\text{specsAndProps}.append((S, \{P \mid \text{specForProperty}(P) = S\}))$ 
31: return  $\text{specsAndProps}$ 

```

value of each $p \in P$ is determined as follows. If p is specified non-optionally by multiple specifiers the scenario is ill-formed. If p is only specified optionally, and by multiple specifiers, this is ambiguous and we also declare the scenario ill-formed. Otherwise, the value of p will be determined by its unique non-optional specifier, unique optional specifier, or the most-derived default value, in that order: call this specifier s_p . Construct a directed graph with vertices P and edges to p from each of the dependencies of s_p (if a dependency is not in P , then a specifier references a nonexistent property and the scenario is ill-formed). If this graph has a cycle, there are cyclic dependencies and the scenario is ill-formed (e.g. Car left of $\emptyset @ \emptyset$, facing roadDirection: the heading must be known to evaluate left of vector, but facing vectorField needs position to determine heading). Otherwise, topologically sorting

$\frac{\text{VARIABLE/PARAMETER ASSIGNMENTS}}{\frac{\langle E, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, \sigma, \pi, O' \rangle}{\langle x = E, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{pass}, \sigma[x/v], \pi, O' \rangle}} \\ \langle \text{param } x = E, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{pass}, \sigma, \pi[x/v], O' \rangle$	
$\frac{\text{HARD REQUIREMENTS}}{\frac{\langle B, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{True}, \sigma, \pi, O' \rangle}{\langle \text{require } B, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{pass}, \sigma, \pi, O' \rangle}}$	$\frac{\text{SOFT REQUIREMENTS}}{\frac{\langle \text{require}[p] B, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow^p \langle \text{require } B, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle}{\langle \text{require}[p] B, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow^{1-p} \langle \text{pass}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle}}$
$\frac{\text{MUTATIONS}}{\langle \text{mutate } obj_i \text{ by } s, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{pass}, \sigma, \pi, O[\sigma(obj_i).mutationScale/s] \rangle}$	
$\text{TERMINATION, STEP 1: APPLY MUTATIONS}$ $\frac{\begin{array}{l} O = \{o_1, \dots, o_n\} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : \\ S_i = O(o_i.mutationScale) \quad ps_i = O(o_i.positionStdDev) \quad hs_i = O(o_i.headingStdDev) \\ \langle \text{Normal}(\emptyset, S_i \cdot ps_i), \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \xrightarrow{r_{i,x}} \langle n_{i,x}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \\ \langle \text{Normal}(\emptyset, S_i \cdot ps_i), \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \xrightarrow{r_{i,y}} \langle n_{i,y}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \quad \langle \text{Normal}(\emptyset, S_i \cdot hs_i), \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \xrightarrow{r_{i,h}} \langle n_{i,h}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \\ pos_i = O(o_i.position) + (n_{i,x}, n_{i,y}) \quad head_i = O(o_i.heading) + n_{i,h} \end{array}}{\langle \text{pass}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \xrightarrow{r_{0,x} r_{0,y} r_{0,h} \dots} \langle \text{DONE}, \sigma, \pi, O[o_i.position/pos_i][o_i.heading/head_i] \rangle}$	
$\text{TERMINATION, STEP 2: CHECK DEFAULT REQUIREMENTS}$ $\frac{\begin{array}{l} O = \{o_1, \dots, o_n\} \\ \forall i : \text{boundingBox}(o_i) \subseteq \text{workspace} \quad \forall i \neq j : o_i.\text{allowCollisions} \vee o_j.\text{allowCollisions} \vee \text{boundingBox}(o_i) \cap \text{boundingBox}(o_j) = \emptyset \\ \forall i : \neg o_i.\text{requireVisible} \vee (\text{ego can see } o_i, \sigma, \pi, O) \rightarrow \text{True} \end{array}}{\langle \text{DONE}, \sigma, \pi, O \rangle \rightarrow \langle \pi, O \rangle}$	

Figure 11: Semantics of statements (excluding class definitions and standard rules for sequential composition). DONE denotes a special state ready for the final termination rule to run.

the graph yields an evaluation order for the specifiers so that all dependencies are available when needed.

The rest of the rule in Fig. 10 simply evaluates the specifiers in this order, accumulating the results as properties of self so they are available to the next specifier, finally creating the new object once all properties have been assigned. Note that we also accumulate the probabilities of each specifier’s evaluation, since specifiers are allowed to introduce randomness themselves (e.g. the on *region* specifier returns a random point in the region).

As noted above the semantics of the individual specifiers are mostly straightforward, and exact definitions are given in Appendix B. To illustrate the pattern we precisely define two specifiers in Fig. 10: the with *property value* specifier, which has no dependencies but can specify any property, and the facing *vectorField* specifier, which depends on position and specifies heading. Both specifiers evaluate to maps assigning a value to each property they specify.

5.3 Semantics of Statements

The semantics of class and object definitions have been discussed above, while rules for the other statements are given in Fig. 11. As can be seen from the first rule, variable assignment behaves in the standard way. Parameter assignment is nearly identical, simply updating the global parameter assignment π instead of the variable assignment σ .

As noted above, the *require boolean* statement is equivalent to an *observe* in other languages, and following [4] we model it by allowing the “Hard Requirement” rule in Fig. 11 to only fire when the condition is satisfied (then turning the requirement into a no-op). If the condition is not satisfied, no rules apply and the program fails to terminate normally. When defining the semantics of entire SCENIC scenarios below we will discard such non-terminating executions, yielding a distribution only over executions where all hard requirements are satisfied.

The statement *require[p] boolean* requires only that its condition hold with at least probability p . There are a number of ways the semantics of such a soft requirement could be defined: we choose the natural definition that *require[p] B* is equivalent to a hard requirement *require B* that is only enforced with probability p . This is reflected in the two corresponding rules in Fig. 11, and clearly ensures that the requirement B will hold with probability at least p , as desired.

Since the mutation statement *mutate instance, ... by number* only causes noise to be added at the end of execution, as discussed above, its rule Fig. 11 simply sets a property on the object(s) indicating that mutation is enabled (and giving the scale of noise to be added). The noise is actually added by the first of two special rules that apply only once the program has been reduced to pass and so computation has finished. This rule first looks up the values of the properties *mutationScale*, *positionStdDev*, and *headingStdDev* for each object. Respectively, these specify the overall scale of the

noise to add (by default zero, i.e. mutation is disabled) and factors allowing the standard deviation for position and heading to be adjusted individually. The rule then independently samples Gaussian noise with the desired standard deviation for each object and adds it to the position and heading properties.

Finally, after mutations are applied the last rule in Fig. 11 checks SCENIC’s three built-in hard requirements. Similarly to the rule for hard requirements, this last rule can only fire if all the built-in requirements are satisfied, otherwise preventing the program from terminating. If the rule does fire, the final result is the output of the scenario: the assignment π to the global parameters, and the set O of all defined objects.

5.4 Semantics of a SCENIC Program

As we have just defined it, every time one runs a SCENIC program its output is a *scene* consisting of an assignment to all the properties of each Object defined in the scenario, plus any global parameters defined with `param`. Since SCENIC allows sampling from distributions, the imperative part of a scenario actually induces a *distribution over scenes*, resulting from the probabilistic rules of the semantics described above. Specifically, for any execution trace the product of the probabilities of all rewrite rules yields a probability (density) for the trace (see e.g. [4]). The declarative part of a scenario, consisting of its `require` statements, *modifies this distribution*. As mentioned above, hard requirements are equivalent to “observations” in other probabilistic programming languages, *conditioning* the distribution on the requirement being satisfied. In particular, if we discard all traces which do not terminate (due to violating a requirement), then normalizing the probabilities of the remaining traces yields a distribution over traces, and therefore scenes, that satisfy all our requirements. This is the distribution defined by the SCENIC scenario.

5.5 Scene Improvisation

Since our semantics reduces soft requirements to hard requirements, the problem of sampling scenes from the distribution defined by a SCENIC scenario is essentially a special case of the sampling problem for imperative probabilistic programming languages with observations. While as we discuss below we could apply general techniques for such problems, there are several features that make the special case of SCENIC interesting in its own right: soft requirements, lack of conditional control flow (except for that implicit in soft requirements), and complex hard requirements (even simple geometric relations can involve trigonometric functions, for example). Therefore we propose *scene improvisation*, the task of generating scenes from a Scenic scenario, be studied as a new theoretical problem.

We note that scene improvisation is related to *control improvisation*, an abstract framework capturing various problems requiring synthesis under hard, soft, and randomness constraints (and which inspired the term scene improvisation) [13, 14]. Scene improvisation can be viewed as an extension with a more detailed randomness constraint given by the imperative part of the scenario.

Algorithms to solve control improvisation problems based on counting and sampling solutions to constraints with SAT and SMT solvers have been proposed, and it would be interesting to see whether these could be adapted to scene improvisation. However,

sampling from the highly nonlinear geometric constraints of SCENIC has not yet been handled. A more promising approach would be to adapt Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods (see, e.g., [32, 37, 52]).

In our implementation we use a rejection sampling approach where scenes are generated from the imperative part of the scenario until all requirements are satisfied. While this samples from exactly the desired distribution, it has the drawback that a huge number of samples may be required to yield a single valid scene (in the worst case, when the requirements have probability zero of being satisfied, the algorithm will not even terminate). However, we found in our experiments that all reasonable scenarios we tried required only several hundred iterations at most, yielding a sample within a few seconds. Although not needed for rejection sampling, our implementation does maintain symbolic representations of all distributions so that more intelligent heuristics and sampling methods could easily be added in the future.

6 EXPERIMENTS

We performed experiments illustrating three different uses of SCENIC: assessing the accuracy of an ML system under particular conditions, retraining the system to improve accuracy in hard cases, and exploring the system’s behavior around a known failure case. We begin by describing the general experimental setup.

6.1 Experimental Setup

We generated scenes in the virtual world of the video game Grand Theft Auto V (GTAV)³. We wrote a SCENIC library `gtalib` defining Regions representing the roads and curbs in (part of) this world, as well as a type of object `Car` providing two additional properties:

- `model`, representing the type of car. Over 300 models are supported by GTAV; we used a set of 13 diverse models, with the default distribution over these being uniform.
- `color`, representing the car color. The default distribution was based on car color statistics for North America [8].

(for the full definition of `Car`, see Appendix A; the definitions of `road`, `curb`, etc. are a few lines loading the corresponding sets of points from a map file generated as described below). In addition, we implemented two global scene parameters:

- `time`, representing the time of day. The default distribution was uniform over all 24 hours.
- `weather`, representing the weather as one of 14 discrete types supported by GTAV (e.g. “clear” or “snow”). The default distribution gave all types positive probability, biased towards less extreme weather.

Unfortunately, GTAV does not provide an explicit representation of its map. We obtained an approximate map by processing a bird’s-eye schematic view of the game world⁴. To identify points on a road, we converted the image to black and white, effectively turning roads white and everything else black. We then applied the Sobel filter to detect edges, identifying points on the curb. Finally, we computed the nominal traffic direction by finding for each curb point X the nearest curb point Y on the other side of the road, and

³The publisher of GTA allows non-commercial use of footage of gameplay [39].

⁴<https://www.gtafivemap.com/>

assuming traffic flows perpendicular to the segment XY , in opposite directions on either side of its midpoint (this was more robust than using the directions of the edges in the image). Since the resulting road information was imperfect, some generated scenes placed cars in undesired places such as sidewalks or medians, and we had to manually filter the generated images to remove these. With a more open simulator this would not be necessary.

Our implementation’s interface to GTAV is based on DeepGTAV⁵. To render a scene, we use a series of API calls to create the cars and set the time of day and weather.

Our experiments were done using squeezeDet [53], a convolutional neural network real-time object detector for autonomous driving. We used a batch size of 20 and trained all models for 10,000 iterations unless otherwise noted. Images captured from GTAV with resolution 1920×1200 were resized to 1248×384 , the resolution used by squeezeDet. All models were trained and evaluated on NVIDIA TITAN Xp GPUs.

We now define the metrics used to measure the performance of our models. Let $\hat{y} = f(x)$ be the prediction of the model f for input x . In usual object detection tasks, \hat{y} encodes bounding boxes, scores, and categories predicted by f for the image x . Let B_{gt} be a ground truth box (i.e. a bounding box from the label of a training sample that indicates the position of a particular object) and $B_{\hat{y}}$ be a prediction box (i.e. the box returned by the model). The *Intersection over Union* (IoU) is defined as $IoU(B_{gt}, B_{\hat{y}}) = \text{area}(B_{gt} \cap B_{\hat{y}}) / \text{area}(B_{gt} \cup B_{\hat{y}})$, where $\text{area}(X)$ is the area of a set X . IoU is a common evaluation metric used to measure how well predicted bounding boxes match ground truth boxes. We adopt the common practice of considering $B_{\hat{y}}$ a *detection* for B_{gt} if $IoU(B_{gt}, B_{\hat{y}}) > 0.5$.

Precision and *recall* are metrics used to measure the accuracy of a prediction on a particular image. Intuitively, precision is the fraction of predicted boxes that are correct, while recall is the fraction of objects actually detected. Formally, precision is defined as $tp / (tp + fp)$ and recall as $tp / (tp + fn)$, where *true positives* tp is the number of correct detections, *false positives* fp is the number of predicted boxes that do not match any ground truth box, and *false negatives* fn is the number of ground truth boxes that are not detected. We use *average precision* and *recall* to evaluate the performance of a model on a collection of images constituting a test set.

6.2 Generating Specialized Test Sets

When testing a model, one may be interested in a particular application domain. For instance, in the case of autonomous cars, a manufacturer may be more interested in certain road conditions (e.g. desert vs. forest roads) depending on where its cars will be mainly used. SCENIC provides a systematic way to describe different scenarios of interest and construct corresponding test sets.

To demonstrate this, we first wrote very general scenarios describing scenes of 1–4 cars (not counting the camera), specifying only that the cars face within 10° of the road direction. We generated 1,000 images from each scenario, yielding a training set X_{generic} of 4,000 images, and used these to train a model M_{generic} as described in Sec. 6.1. We also generated an additional 50 images from each scenario to obtain a generic test set T_{generic} of 200 images.

```

1 wiggle = (-10 deg, 10 deg)
2 ego = Car with roadDeviation wiggle
3 c = Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)
4 leftRight = Uniform(1.0, -1.0) * (1.25, 2.75)
5 Car beyond c by leftRight @ (4, 10), \
6   with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)

```

Figure 12: A scenario generating scenes where one car partially occludes another. The property `roadDeviation` is a syntactic convenience, defined in `Car` to mean its heading relative to the `roadDirection`.

Next, we specialized the general scenarios in opposite directions: scenarios for good/bad road conditions fixing the time to noon/midnight and the weather to sunny/rainy respectively. We used these to generate specialized test sets T_{good} and T_{bad} .

Evaluating M_{generic} on T_{generic} , T_{good} , and T_{bad} , we obtained average precisions of 86.1%, 88.5%, and 78.9%, respectively, and average recalls of 94.5%, 96.1%, and 95.0%. These results show that, as might be expected, the model tends to perform better on bright days than on rainy nights. This suggests there might not be enough examples of rainy nights in the training set, and indeed under our default weather distribution rain is less likely than shine. This illustrates how specialized test sets can highlight the weaknesses and strengths of a particular model. In the next section, we go one step further and use SCENIC to redesign the training set and improve model performance.

6.3 Retraining to Improve Performance on Hard Cases

In the synthetic data setting, we are limited not by data availability but by the cost of training. The natural question is then how to generate a synthetic data set that as effective as possible given a fixed size. In this section we show that *over-representing* a type of input that may occur rarely but is difficult for the model can improve performance on the hard case without compromising performance in the typical case. SCENIC makes this possible by allowing the user to write a scenario capturing the hard case specifically.

For our car detection task, an obvious hard case is when one car substantially occludes another. We wrote a simple scenario, shown in Fig. 12, which generates such scenes by placing one car behind the other as viewed from the camera, offset left or right so that it is at least partially visible (sample images are in Appendix A.8). Generating images from this scenario we obtained a training set X_{overlap} of 250 images and a test set T_{overlap} of 200 images.

For a baseline training set we used the “Driving in the Matrix” synthetic data set [25], which has been used to train a car detection network achieving good performance even on real-world images⁶. Like our images, the “Matrix” images were rendered in GTA V; however, they were produced by allowing the game’s AI to drive around while periodically taking screenshots. We randomly selected

⁵<https://github.com/aitorzip/DeepGTAV>

⁶We use the “Matrix” data set since it is known to be effective for car detection and was not designed by us, making the fact that SCENIC is able to improve it more striking. However, we also performed a similar experiment using the SCENIC generic two-car scenario from the last section as the baseline, which yielded the same overall conclusion. See Appendix C for details.

Table 6: Performance of models trained on 5,000 images from X_{matrix} or a mixture with X_{overlap} . The results for the mixture were averaged over 8 training runs with different random selections of which images in X_{matrix} to replace.

Training Data $X_{\text{matrix}} / X_{\text{overlap}}$	T_{matrix}		T_{overlap}	
	Precision	Recall	Precision	Recall
100% / 0%	66.2	60.9	62.6	76.0
95% / 5%	72.2	62.0	78.8	78.8

5,000 of these images to form a training set X_{matrix} , and 200 for a test set T_{matrix} . We trained squeezeDet for 5,000 iterations on X_{matrix} and evaluated it on both T_{matrix} and T_{overlap} . To reduce the effect of jitter during training we used a standard technique [2], saving the last 50 models obtained in steps of 10 iterations and finding the best precision and recall respectively obtained by any of these models. This yielded the results in the first row of Table 6. As can be seen, although X_{matrix} contains many images of overlapping cars, the precision on T_{overlap} is significantly lower than for T_{matrix} , indicating that the network is predicting lower-quality bounding boxes for such cars⁷.

Next we attempted to improve the effectiveness of the training set by mixing in the difficult images produced with SCENIC. Specifically, we replaced a random 5% of X_{matrix} (250 images) with images from X_{overlap} , keeping the overall training set size constant. We then retrained the network on the new training set and evaluated it as above. To reduce the dependence on which images were replaced, we additionally averaged over 8 training runs with different random selections of the 250 images. The results are shown in the second row of Table 6. Even altering only 5% of the training set, performance on T_{overlap} dramatically improves. Critically, the improvement on T_{overlap} is not paid for by a corresponding decrease on T_{matrix} : on the contrary, performance on the original data set actually becomes significantly *better*. Thus, by emphasizing difficult cases, we were able to improve the training set’s effectiveness not only for such cases but even for the “typical” distribution it was originally obtained from.

6.4 Generalizing from a Known Failure Case

In our final experiment, we show how SCENIC can be used to generalize a single input on which a model fails. SCENIC makes it easy to explore the neighborhood of a given scene in a variety of different directions, giving insight into which features of the scene are responsible for the undesired behavior. The original misclassification can then be generalized to a broader scenario describing a class of inputs on which the model misbehaves, and this scenario can be used for retraining.

We selected one scene from our first experiment, consisting of a single car viewed from behind at a slight angle, which M_{generic} wrongly classified as three cars (thus having 33.3% precision and 100% recall). We wrote several scenarios which left most of the features of the scene fixed but allowed others to vary. Specifically,

⁷Interestingly, recall is much *higher* on T_{overlap} , meaning the false-negative rate is better; presumably this is because all the T_{overlap} images have exactly 2 cars and are in that sense easier than the T_{matrix} images, which sometimes have many cars.

Table 7: Performance of M_{generic} on different scenarios representing variations of a single misclassified image.

Scenario	Precision	Recall
(1) varying model and color	88.4	100
(2) varying background	63.7	100
(3) varying local position and orientation	74.2	100
(4) varying position but staying close	68.8	99.3
(5) any position, same apparent angle	74.3	98.6
(6) any position and angle	81.2	100
(7) varying background, model, and color	74.4	100
(8) staying close, same apparent angle	64.1	100
(9) staying close, varying model	71.7	100

scenario (1) varied the model and color of the car, (2) left the position and orientation of the car relative to the camera fixed but varied the absolute position, effectively changing the background of the scene, and (3) used the mutation feature of SCENIC to add a small amount of noise to the car’s position, heading, and color (see Appendix A.6 for code and the original misclassified image). For each scenario we generated 150 images and evaluated M_{generic} on them. As seen in Tab. 7, changing the model and color improved performance the most, suggesting they were most relevant to the misclassification, while local position and orientation were less important and global position (i.e. the background) was least important.

To investigate these possibilities further, we wrote a second round of variant scenarios, also shown in Tab. 7. The results confirmed the importance of model and color (compare (2) to (7)), as well as angle (compare (5) to (6)), but also suggested that being close to the camera could be the relevant aspect of the car’s local position. We confirmed this with a final round of scenarios (compare (5) and (8)), which also showed that the effect of car model is small among scenes where the car is close to the camera (compare (4) and (9)).

Having established that car model, closeness to the camera, and view angle all contribute to poor performance of the network, we wrote broader scenarios capturing these features. To avoid overfitting, and since our experiments indicated car model was not very relevant when the car is close to the camera, we decided not to fix the car model. Instead, we specialized the generic one-car scenario from our first experiment to produce only cars close to the camera. We also created a second scenario specializing this further by requiring that the car be viewed at a shallow angle.

Finally, we used these scenarios to retrain M_{generic} , hoping to improve performance on its original test set T_{generic} (to better distinguish small differences in performance, we increased the test set size to 400 images). To keep the size of the training set fixed as in the previous experiment, we replaced 400 one-car images in X_{generic} (10% of the whole training set) with images generated from our scenarios. As a baseline, we used images produced with classical image augmentation techniques implemented in `imgaug` [26]. Specifically, we modified the original misclassified image by randomly cropping 10%–20% on each side, flipping horizontally with probability 50%, and applying Gaussian blur with $\sigma \in [0.0, 3.0]$.

Table 8: Performance of M_{generic} after retraining, replacing 10% of X_{generic} with different data.

Replacement Data	Precision	Recall
Original (no replacement)	85.9	94.8
Classical augmentation	82.6	94.4
Close car	89.8	94.0
Close car at shallow angle	87.6	94.8

The results of retraining M_{generic} on the resulting data sets are shown in Tab. 8. Interestingly, classical augmentation actually *hurt* performance, presumably due to overfitting to relatively slight variants of a single image. On the other hand, replacing part of the data set with specialized images of cars close to the camera significantly improved performance (while the improvement for the “shallow angle” scenario was less, perhaps due to overfitting to the restricted angle range). This demonstrates how SCENIC can be used to improve performance by generalizing individual misclassifications into scenarios that capture the essence of the problem but are broad enough to prevent overfitting during retraining.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced SCENIC, a probabilistic programming language for specifying distributions over configurations of physical objects. We showed how SCENIC can be used to generate synthetic data sets useful for deep learning tasks. Specifically, we used SCENIC to generate specialized test sets, improve the effectiveness of training sets by emphasizing difficult cases, and generalize from individual failure cases to broader scenarios suitable for retraining. In particular, by training on hard cases generated by SCENIC, we were able to boost the performance of a car detector neural network significantly beyond what could be achieved by prior synthetic data generation methods [25] given a fixed training set size.

In future work we plan to extend our interface between SCENIC and the Webots simulator, demonstrated in our Mars rover example above, to enable experiments with driving scenarios that require more control than GTA provides. We are also interested in interfacing SCENIC to other simulators such as CARLA [5], an open-source simulator for autonomous driving. Finally, we plan to extend the SCENIC language itself in several directions: allowing user-defined specifiers, describing 3D scenes, and encoding dynamics to enable generation of videos instead of static scenes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Ankush Desai and Jonathan Ragan-Kelley for helpful discussions. This work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-1106400, NSF grants CNS-1545126 (VeHiCaL), CNS-1646208 and CNS-1739816, DARPA under agreement number FA8750-16-C0043, the DARPA Assured Autonomy program, Berkeley Deep Drive, and TerraSwarm, one of six centers of STARnet, a Semiconductor Research Corporation program sponsored by MARCO and DARPA.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul F. Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. 2016. Concrete Problems in AI Safety. *CoRR* abs/1606.06565 (2016). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06565>
- [2] Sylvain Arlot and Alain Celisse. 2010. A survey of cross-validation procedures for model selection. *Statist. Surv.* 4 (2010), 40–79. <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-SS054>
- [3] Manfred Broy, Bengt Jonsson, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Martin Leucker, and Alexander Pretschner. 2005. *Model-Based Testing of Reactive Systems: Advanced Lectures (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA.
- [4] Guillaume Claret, Sriram K Rajamani, Aditya V Nori, Andrew D Gordon, and Johannes Borgström. 2013. Bayesian inference using data flow analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2013 9th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering*. ACM, 92–102.
- [5] Alexey Dosovitskiy, German Ros, Felipe Codevilla, Antonio Lopez, and Vladlen Koltun. 2017. CARLA: An Open Urban Driving Simulator. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, CoRL. 1–16.
- [6] Tommaso Dreossi, Alexandre Donzé, and Sanjit A. Seshia. 2017. Compositional Falsification of Cyber-Physical Systems with Machine Learning Components. In *NASA Formal Methods, NFM*. 357–372. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57288-8_26
- [7] Tommaso Dreossi, Somesh Jha, and Sanjit A. Seshia. 2018. Semantic Adversarial Deep Learning. In *30th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV)*.
- [8] DuPont. 2012. Global Automotive Color Popularity Report. https://web.archive.org/web/20130818022236/http://www.2.dupont.com/Media_Center/en_US/color_popularity/Images_2012/DuPont2012ColorPopularity.pdf
- [9] Tayfun Elmas, Jacob Burnim, George Necula, and Koushik Sen. 2013. CONCUR-RIT: a domain specific language for reproducing concurrency bugs. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 48. ACM, 153–164.
- [10] Artur Filipowicz, Jeremiah Liu, and Alain Kornhauser. 2017. *Learning to recognize distance to stop signs using the virtual world of Grand Theft Auto 5*. Technical Report. Princeton University.
- [11] Matthew Fisher, Daniel Ritchie, Manolis Savva, Thomas Funkhouser, and Pat Hanrahan. 2012. Example-based Synthesis of 3D Object Arrangements. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2012 (SIGGRAPH Asia '12)*.
- [12] Daniel Fremont, Xiangyu Yue, Tommaso Dreossi, Shromona Ghosh, Alberto L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, and Sanjit A. Seshia. 2018. *Scenic: Language-Based Scene Generation*. Technical Report UCB/ECS-2018-8. ECS Department, University of California, Berkeley. <http://www2.eecs.berkeley.edu/Pubs/TechRpts/2018/ECS-2018-8.html>
- [13] Daniel J. Fremont, Alexandre Donzé, and Sanjit A. Seshia. 2017. Control Improvisation. arXiv preprint. [arXiv:1704.06319](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.06319)
- [14] Daniel J. Fremont, Alexandre Donzé, Sanjit A. Seshia, and David Wessel. 2015. Control Improvisation. In *35th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundation of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS) (LIPIcs)*, Vol. 45. 463–474.
- [15] Rockstar Games. 2015. Grand Theft Auto V. Windows PC version. <https://www.rockstargames.com/games/info/V>
- [16] Adele Goldberg and David Robson. 1983. *Smalltalk-80: The Language and its Implementation*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts.
- [17] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2672–2680.
- [18] Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. 2014. Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples. *CoRR* abs/1412.6572 (2014). [arXiv:1412.6572](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6572)
- [19] Noah Goodman, Vikash K. Mansinghka, Daniel Roy, Keith Bonawitz, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. 2008. Church: A universal language for generative models. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 24 (UAI)*. 220–229.
- [20] Noah D Goodman and Andreas Stuhlmüller. 2014. The Design and Implementation of Probabilistic Programming Languages. <http://dippl.org>. Accessed: 2018-7-11.
- [21] Andrew D Gordon, Thomas A Henzinger, Aditya V Nori, and Sriram K Rajamani. 2014. Probabilistic programming. In *FOSE 2014*. ACM, 167–181.
- [22] Ankush Gupta, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. 2016. Synthetic Data for Text Localisation in Natural Images. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*. 2315–2324. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2016.254>
- [23] Max Jaderberg, Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. Synthetic Data and Artificial Neural Networks for Natural Scene Text Recognition. *CoRR* abs/1406.2227 (2014). [arXiv:1406.2227](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.2227)
- [24] Chenfanfu Jiang, Siyuan Qi, Yixin Zhu, Siyuan Huang, Jenny Lin, Lap-Fai Yu, Demetri Terzopoulos, and Song-Chun Zhu. 2018. Configurable 3D Scene Synthesis and 2D Image Rendering with Per-pixel Ground Truth Using Stochastic Grammars. *International Journal of Computer Vision* (2018), 1–22.
- [25] Matthew Johnson-Roberson, Charles Barto, Rounak Mehta, Sharath Nittur Sridhar, Karl Rosaen, and Ram Vasudevan. 2017. Driving in the Matrix: Can virtual worlds replace human-generated annotations for real world tasks?. In

- International Conference on Robotics and Automation, ICRA*. 746–753. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA.2017.7989092>
- [26] Alexander Jung. 2018. imgaug. <https://github.com/aleju/imgaug>
- [27] Tejas Kulkarni, Pushmeet Kohli, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Vikash K. Mansinghka. 2015. Picture: A probabilistic programming language for scene perception. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 4390–4399.
- [28] Xiaodan Liang, Zhiting Hu, Hao Zhang, Chuang Gan, and Eric P Xing. 2017. Recurrent Topic-Transition GAN for Visual Paragraph Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.07022* (2017).
- [29] Joerg Liebelt and Cordelia Schmid. 2010. Multi-view object class detection with a 3D geometric model. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*. 1688–1695. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2010.5539836>
- [30] Marco Marchesi. 2017. Megapixel Size Image Creation using Generative Adversarial Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.00082* (2017).
- [31] Olivier Michel. 2004. Webots: Professional Mobile Robot Simulation. *International Journal of Advanced Robotic Systems* 1, 1 (2004), 39–42.
- [32] Brian Milch, Bhaskara Marthi, and Stuart Russell. 2004. BLOG: Relational modeling with unknown objects. In *ICML 2004 workshop on statistical relational learning and its connections to other fields*. 67–73.
- [33] Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard. 2016. DeepFool: A Simple and Accurate Method to Fool Deep Neural Networks. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*. 2574–2582. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2016.282>
- [34] Pascal Müller, Peter Wonka, Simon Haegler, Andreas Ulmer, and Luc Van Gool. 2006. Procedural modeling of buildings. In *ACM Transactions On Graphics*, Vol. 25. ACM, 614–623.
- [35] Yehuda Naveh, Michal Rimón, Itai Jaeger, Yoav Katz, Michael Vinov, Eitan Marcus, and Gil Shurek. 2006. Constraint-Based Random Stimuli Generation for Hardware Verification. In *Proc. of AAAI*. 1720–1727.
- [36] Anh Mai Nguyen, Jason Yosinski, and Jeff Clune. 2015. Deep neural networks are easily fooled: High confidence predictions for unrecognizable images. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*. 427–436. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2015.7298640>
- [37] Aditya V Nori, Chung-Kil Hur, Sriram K Rajamani, and Selva Samuel. 2014. R2: An Efficient MCMC Sampler for Probabilistic Programs. In *AAAI*. 2476–2482.
- [38] Kexin Pei, Yinzi Cao, Junfeng Yang, and Suman Jana. 2017. DeepXplore: Automated Whitebox Testing of Deep Learning Systems. In *Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP*. 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132747.3132785>
- [39] Stephan R Richter, Vibhav Vineet, Stefan Roth, and Vladlen Koltun. 2016. Playing for data: Ground truth from computer games. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 102–118.
- [40] Daniel Ritchie. 2014. Quicksand: A Lightweight Embedding of Probabilistic Programming for Procedural Modeling and Design. In *3rd NIPS Workshop on Probabilistic Programming*. <https://dritchie.github.io/pdf/qs.pdf>
- [41] Daniel Ritchie. 2016. *Probabilistic programming for procedural modeling and design*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University. <https://purl.stanford.edu/vh730bw6700>
- [42] Germán Ros, Laura Sellart, Joanna Materzynska, David Vázquez, and Antonio M. López. 2016. The SYNTHIA Dataset: A Large Collection of Synthetic Images for Semantic Segmentation of Urban Scenes. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*. 3234–3243. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2016.352>
- [43] Stuart Russell, Tom Dietterich, Eric Horvitz, Bart Selman, Francesca Rossi, Demis Hassabis, Shane Legg, Mustafa Suleyman, Dileep George, and Scott Phoenix. 2015. Letter to the Editor: Research Priorities for Robust and Beneficial Artificial Intelligence: An Open Letter. *AI Magazine* 36, 4 (2015).
- [44] Nasser Saheb-Djahromi. 1978. Probabilistic LCF. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*. Springer, 442–451.
- [45] Sanjit A. Seshia, Dorsa Sadigh, and S. Shankar Sastry. 2016. Towards Verified Artificial Intelligence. *CoRR* abs/1606.08514 (2016). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.08514>
- [46] Michael Stark, Michael Goesele, and Bernt Schiele. 2010. Back to the Future: Learning Shape Models from 3D CAD Data. In *British Machine Vision Conference, BMVC*. 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5244/C.24.106>
- [47] Michael Sutton, Adam Greene, and Pedram Amini. 2007. *Fuzzing: Brute Force Vulnerability Discovery*. Addison-Wesley.
- [48] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian J. Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. 2013. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *CoRR* abs/1312.6199 (2013). [arXiv:1312.6199](http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199>
- [49] Josh Tobin, Rachel Fong, Alex Ray, Jonas Schneider, Wojciech Zaremba, and Pieter Abbeel. 2017. Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world. In *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, IROS*. 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2017.8202133>
- [50] David Vazquez, Antonio M Lopez, Javier Marin, Daniel Ponsa, and David Geronimo. 2014. Virtual and real world adaptation for pedestrian detection. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 36, 4 (2014), 797–809.
- [51] Sebastien C Wong, Adam Gatt, Victor Stamatescu, and Mark D McDonnell. 2016. Understanding data augmentation for classification: when to warp?. In *Digital Image Computing: Techniques and Applications (DICTA), 2016 International Conference on*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [52] Frank Wood, Jan Willem Meent, and Vikash Mansinghka. 2014. A new approach to probabilistic programming inference. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. 1024–1032.
- [53] Bichen Wu, Forrest N. Iandola, Peter H. Jin, and Kurt Keutzer. 2017. SqueezeDet: Unified, Small, Low Power Fully Convolutional Neural Networks for Real-Time Object Detection for Autonomous Driving. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, CVPR Workshops*. 446–454. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPRW.2017.60>
- [54] Yan Xu, Ran Jia, Lili Mou, Ge Li, Yunchuan Chen, Yangyang Lu, and Zhi Jin. 2016. Improved relation classification by deep recurrent neural networks with data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.03651* (2016).

A GALLERY OF SCENARIOS

This section presents SCENIC code for a variety of scenarios from our autonomous car case study, along with images rendered from them. The scenarios range from simple examples used above to illustrate different aspects of the language, to those representing interesting road configurations like platoons and lanes of traffic.

CONTENTS

A.1	The gtaLib Module	18
A.2	The Simplest Possible Scenario	19
A.3	A Single Car	20
A.4	A Badly-Parked Car	21
A.5	An Oncoming Car	22
A.6	Adding Noise to a Scene	23
A.7	Two Cars	24
A.8	Two Overlapping Cars	25
A.9	Four Cars, in Poor Driving Conditions	26
A.10	A Platoon, in Daytime	27
A.11	Bumper-to-Bumper Traffic	28

A.1 The gtaLib Module

All the scenarios below begin with a line (not shown here) importing the gtaLib module, which as explained above contains all definitions specific to our autonomous car case study. These include the definitions of the regions road and curb, as well as the vector field roadDirection giving the prevailing traffic direction at each point on the road. Most importantly, it also defines Car as a type of object:

```

1 class Car:
2     position: Point on road
3     heading: (roadDirection at self.position) \
4         + self.roadDeviation
5     roadDeviation: 0
6     width: self.model.width
7     height: self.model.height
8     viewAngle: 80 deg
9     visibleDistance: 30
10    model: CarModel.defaultModel()
11    color: CarColor.defaultColor()
```

Most of the properties are inherited from Object or are self-explanatory. The property roadDeviation, representing the heading of the car with respect to the local direction of the road, is purely a syntactic convenience; the following two lines are equivalent:

```

1 Car facing 10 deg relative to roadDirection
2 Car with roadDeviation 10 deg
```

The gtaLib library also defines a few convenience subclasses of Car with different default properties. For example, EgoCar overrides model with the fixed car model we used for the ego car in our interface to GTA V.

A.2 The Simplest Possible Scenario

This scenario, creating a single car with no specified properties, was used as an example in Sec. 3.

- 1 ego = Car
- 2 Car



Figure 13: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing a single car (with reasonable default properties).

A.3 A Single Car

This scenario is slightly more general than the previous, allowing the car (and the ego car) to deviate from the road direction by up to 10° . It also specifies that the car must be visible, which is in fact redundant since this constraint is built into SCENIC, but helps guide the sampling procedure. This scenario was also used as an example in Sec. 3.

```

1 wiggle = (-10 deg, 10 deg)
2 ego = EgoCar with roadDeviation wiggle
3 Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)

```



Figure 14: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing a single car facing roughly the road direction.

A.4 A Badly-Parked Car

This scenario, creating a single car parked near the curb but not quite parallel to it, was used as an example in Sec. 3.

```

1 ego = Car
2 spot = OrientedPoint on visible curb
3 badAngle = Uniform(1.0, -1.0) * (10, 20) deg
4 Car left of spot by 0.5, facing badAngle relative to roadDirection

```



Figure 15: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing a badly-parked car.

A.5 An Oncoming Car

This scenario, creating a car 20–40 m ahead and roughly facing towards the camera, was used as an example in Sec. 3. Note that since we do not specify the orientation of the car when creating it, the default heading is used and so it will face the road direction. The require statement then requires that this orientation is also within 15° of facing the camera (as the view cone is 30° wide).

```

1 ego = Car
2 car2 = Car offset by (-10, 10) @ (20, 40), with viewAngle 30 deg
3 require car2 can see ego

```



Figure 16: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing a car facing roughly towards the camera.

A.6 Adding Noise to a Scene

This scenario, using SCENIC’s mutation feature to automatically add noise to an otherwise completely-specified scenario, was used in the experiment in Sec. 6.4 (it is Scenario (3) in Table 7). The original scene, which is exactly reproduced by this scenario if the mutate statement is removed, is shown in Fig. 18.

```

1 param time = 12 * 60    # noon
2 param weather = 'EXTRASUNNY'
3
4 ego = EgoCar at -628.7878 @ -540.6067, \
5     facing -359.1691 deg
6
7 Car at -625.4444 @ -530.7654, facing 8.2872 deg, \
8     with model CarModel.models['DOMINATOR'], \
9     with color CarColor.byteToReal([187, 162, 157])
10
11 mutate

```



Figure 18: The original misclassified image in Sec. 6.4.



Figure 17: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario adding noise to the scene in Fig. 18.

A.7 Two Cars

This is the generic two-car scenario used in the experiments in Secs. 6.2 and 6.3.

- 1 wiggle = (-10 deg, 10 deg)
- 2 ego = EgoCar with roadDeviation wiggle
- 3 Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)
- 4 Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)



Figure 19: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing two cars, facing close to the direction of the road.

A.8 Two Overlapping Cars

This is the scenario used to produce images of two partially-overlapping cars for the experiment in Sec. 6.3.

```

1 wiggle = (-10 deg, 10 deg)
2 ego = EgoCar with roadDeviation wiggle
3
4 c = Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)
5
6 leftRight = Uniform(1.0, -1.0) * (1.25, 2.75)
7 Car beyond c by leftRight @ (4, 10), with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)

```



Figure 20: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing two cars, one partially occluding the other.

A.9 Four Cars, in Poor Driving Conditions

This is the scenario used to produce images of four cars in poor driving conditions for the experiment in Sec. 6.2. Without the first two lines, it is the generic four-car scenario used in that experiment.

```

1 param weather = 'RAIN'
2 param time = 0 * 60 # midnight
3
4 wiggle = (-10 deg, 10 deg)
5 ego = EgoCar with roadDeviation wiggle
6 Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)
7 Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)
8 Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)
9 Car visible, with roadDeviation resample(wiggle)

```



Figure 21: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing four cars in poor driving conditions.

A.10 A Platoon, in Daytime

This scenario illustrates how SCENIC can construct structured object configurations, in this case a platoon of cars. It uses a helper function provided by `gtalib` for creating platoons starting from a given car, shown in Fig. 22. If no argument `model` is provided, as in this case, all cars in the platoon have the same model as the starting car; otherwise, the given model distribution is sampled independently for each car. The syntax for functions and loops supported by our SCENIC implementation is inherited from Python.

```

1 param time = (8, 20) * 60          # 8 am to 8 pm
2 ego = Car with visibleDistance 60
3 c2 = Car visible
4 platoon = createPlatoonAt(c2, 5, dist=(2, 8))

1 def createPlatoonAt(car, numCars, model=None, dist=(2, 8), shift=(-0.5, 0.5), wiggle=0):
2     lastCar = car
3     for i in range(numCars-1):
4         center = follow roadDirection from (front of lastCar) for resample(dist)
5         pos = OrientedPoint right of center by shift, \
6             facing resample(wiggle) relative to roadDirection
7         lastCar = Car ahead of pos, with model (car.model if model is None else resample(model))

```

Figure 22: Helper function for creating a platoon starting from a given car.



Figure 23: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing a platoon of cars during daytime.

A.11 Bumper-to-Bumper Traffic

This scenario creates an even more complex type of object structure, namely three lanes of traffic. It uses the helper function `createPlatoonAt` discussed above, plus another for placing a car ahead of a given car with a specified gap in between, shown in Fig. 24.

```

1 depth = 4
2 laneGap = 3.5
3 carGap = (1, 3)
4 laneShift = (-2, 2)
5 wiggle = (-5 deg, 5 deg)
6 modelDist = CarModel.defaultModel()
7
8 def createLaneAt(car):
9     createPlatoonAt(car, depth, dist=carGap, wiggle=wiggle, model=modelDist)
10
11 ego = Car with visibleDistance 60
12 leftCar = carAheadOfCar(ego, laneShift + carGap, offsetX=-laneGap, wiggle=wiggle)
13 createLaneAt(leftCar)
14
15 midCar = carAheadOfCar(ego, resample(carGap), wiggle=wiggle)
16 createLaneAt(midCar)
17
18 rightCar = carAheadOfCar(ego, resample(laneShift) + resample(carGap), offsetX=laneGap, wiggle=wiggle)
19 createLaneAt(rightCar)

1 def carAheadOfCar(car, gap, offsetX=0, wiggle=0):
2     pos = OrientedPoint at (front of car) offset by (offsetX @ gap), \
3         facing resample(wiggle) relative to roadDirection
4     return Car ahead of pos

```

Figure 24: Helper function for placing a car ahead of a car, with a specified gap in between.



Figure 25: Scenes generated from a SCENIC scenario representing bumper-to-bumper traffic.

B DETAILED SEMANTICS OF SPECIFIERS AND OPERATORS

This section provides precise semantics for SCENIC's specifiers and operators, which were informally defined above.

CONTENTS

B.1	Notation	30
B.2	Specifiers for position	31
B.3	Specifiers for position and optionally heading	32
B.4	Specifiers for heading	32
B.5	Operators	33

B.1 Notation

Since none of the specifiers and operators have side effects, to simplify notation we write $\llbracket X \rrbracket$ for the value of the expression X in the current state (rather than giving inference rules). Throughout this section, S indicates a *scalar*, V a *vector*, H a *heading*, F a *vectorField*, R a *region*, P a *Point*, and OP an *OrientedPoint*. Figure 26 defines notation used in the rest of the semantics. In *forwardEuler*, N is an implementation-defined parameter specifying how many steps should be used for the forward Euler approximation when following a vector field (we used $N = 4$).

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle x, y \rangle &= \text{point with the given XY coordinates} \\
 \text{rotate}(\langle x, y \rangle, \theta) &= \langle x \cos \theta - y \sin \theta, x \sin \theta + y \cos \theta \rangle \\
 \text{offsetLocal}(OP, v) &= \llbracket OP.\text{position} \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(v, \llbracket OP.\text{heading} \rrbracket) \\
 \text{Disc}(c, r) &= \text{set of points in the disc centered at } c \text{ and with radius } r \\
 \text{Sector}(c, r, h, a) &= \text{set of points in the sector of } \text{Disc}(c, r) \text{ centered along } h \text{ and with angle } a \\
 \text{boundingBox}(O) &= \text{set of points in the bounding box of object } O \\
 \text{visibleRegion}(X) &= \begin{cases} \text{Sector}(\llbracket X.\text{position} \rrbracket, \llbracket X.\text{viewDistance} \rrbracket, \\ \quad \llbracket X.\text{heading} \rrbracket, \llbracket X.\text{viewAngle} \rrbracket) & X \in \text{OrientedPoint} \\ \text{Disc}(\llbracket X.\text{position} \rrbracket, \llbracket X.\text{viewDistance} \rrbracket) & X \in \text{Point} \end{cases} \\
 \text{orientation}(R) &= \text{preferred orientation of } R \text{ if any; otherwise } \perp \\
 \text{uniformPointIn}(R) &= \text{a uniformly random point in } R \\
 \text{forwardEuler}(x, d, F) &= \text{result of iterating the map } x \mapsto x + \text{rotate}(\langle 0, d/N \rangle, \llbracket F \rrbracket(x)) \text{ a total of } N \text{ times on } x
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 26: Notation used to define the semantics.

B.2 Specifiers for position

Figure 27 gives the semantics of the position specifiers. The figure writes the semantics as a vector value; the semantics of the specifier itself is to assign the position property of the object being specified to that value. Several of the specifiers refer to properties of `self`: as explained in Sec. 4, this refers to the object being constructed, and the semantics of object construction are such that specifiers depending on other properties are only evaluated after those properties have been specified (or an error is raised, if there are cyclic dependencies).

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{at } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{offset by } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \text{ relative to ego.position} \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{offset along } H \text{ by } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{ego.position offset along } H \text{ by } V \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{left of } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{left of } V \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{right of } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{right of } V \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{ahead of } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{ahead of } V \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{behind } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{behind } V \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{left of } V \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(\langle -\llbracket \text{self.width} \rrbracket / 2 - \llbracket S \rrbracket, 0 \rangle, \llbracket \text{self.heading} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{right of } V \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(\langle \llbracket \text{self.width} \rrbracket / 2 + \llbracket S \rrbracket, 0 \rangle, \llbracket \text{self.heading} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{ahead of } V \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(\langle 0, \llbracket \text{self.height} \rrbracket / 2 + \llbracket S \rrbracket \rangle, \llbracket \text{self.heading} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{behind } V \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(\langle 0, -\llbracket \text{self.height} \rrbracket / 2 - \llbracket S \rrbracket \rangle, \llbracket \text{self.heading} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{beyond } V_1 \text{ by } V_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{beyond } V_1 \text{ by } V_2 \text{ from ego.position} \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{beyond } V_1 \text{ by } V_2 \text{ from } V_3 \rrbracket &= \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(\llbracket V_2 \rrbracket, \arctan(\llbracket V_1 \rrbracket - \llbracket V_3 \rrbracket)) \\
\llbracket \text{visible} \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{visible from ego} \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{visible from } P \rrbracket &= \text{uniformPointIn}(\text{visibleRegion}(P))
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 27: Semantics of position specifiers, given as the value v such that the specifier evaluates to the map position $\mapsto v$.

B.3 Specifiers for position and optionally heading

Figure 28 gives the semantics of the position specifiers that also optionally specify heading. The figure writes the semantics as an `OrientedPoint` value; if this is `OP`, the semantics of the specifier is to assign the position property of the object being constructed to `OP.position`, and the heading property of the object to `OP.heading` if heading is not otherwise specified (see Sec. 4 for a discussion of optional specifiers).

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{in } R \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{on } R \rrbracket = \begin{cases} \text{OrientedPoint}(x, \llbracket \text{orientation}(R) \rrbracket(x)) & \text{orientation}(R) \neq \perp \\ \text{OrientedPoint}(x, \perp) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \text{ with } x = \text{uniformPointIn}(\llbracket R \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{ahead of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{ahead of (front of } O) \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{behind } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{behind (back of } O) \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{left of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{left of (left of } O) \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{right of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{right of (right of } O) \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{ahead of } OP \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{ahead of } OP \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{behind } OP \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{behind } OP \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{left of } OP \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{left of } OP \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{right of } OP \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{right of } OP \text{ by } \emptyset \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{ahead of } OP \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \text{OrientedPoint}(\text{offsetLocal}(OP, \langle 0, \llbracket \text{self.height} \rrbracket / 2 + \llbracket S \rrbracket \rangle), \llbracket OP.heading \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{behind } OP \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \text{OrientedPoint}(\text{offsetLocal}(OP, \langle 0, -\llbracket \text{self.height} \rrbracket / 2 - \llbracket S \rrbracket \rangle), \llbracket OP.heading \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{left of } OP \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \text{OrientedPoint}(\text{offsetLocal}(OP, \langle -\llbracket \text{self.width} \rrbracket / 2 - \llbracket S \rrbracket, 0 \rangle), \llbracket OP.heading \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{right of } OP \text{ by } S \rrbracket &= \text{OrientedPoint}(\text{offsetLocal}(OP, \langle \llbracket \text{self.width} \rrbracket / 2 + \llbracket S \rrbracket, 0 \rangle), \llbracket OP.heading \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{following } F \text{ for } S \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{following } F \text{ from ego.position for } S \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{following } F \text{ from } V \text{ for } S \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{follow } F \text{ from } V \text{ for } S \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 28: Semantics of position specifiers that optionally specify heading. If o is the `OrientedPoint` given as the semantics above, the specifier evaluates to the map $\{\text{position} \mapsto o.\text{position}, \text{heading} \mapsto o.\text{heading}\}$.

B.4 Specifiers for heading

Figure 29 gives the semantics of the heading specifiers. As for the position specifiers above, the figure indicates the heading value assigned by each specifier.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{facing } H \rrbracket &= \llbracket H \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{facing } F \rrbracket &= \llbracket F \rrbracket(\llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{facing toward } V \rrbracket &= \arctan(\llbracket V \rrbracket - \llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{facing away from } V \rrbracket &= \arctan(\llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket - \llbracket V \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{apparently facing } H \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{apparently facing } H \text{ from ego.position} \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{apparently facing } H \text{ from } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket H \rrbracket + \arctan(\llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket - \llbracket V \rrbracket)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 29: Semantics of heading specifiers, given as the value v such that the specifier evaluates to the map $\text{heading} \mapsto v$.

B.5 Operators

Finally, Figures 30–35 give the semantics for SCENIC’s operators, broken down by the type of value they return. We omit the semantics for ordinary numerical and Boolean operators (\max , $+$, or , \geq , etc.), which are standard.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{relative heading of } H \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{relative heading of } H \text{ from ego.heading} \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{relative heading of } H_1 \text{ from } H_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket H_1 \rrbracket - \llbracket H_2 \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{apparent heading of } OP \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{apparent heading of } OP \text{ from ego.position} \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{apparent heading of } OP \text{ from } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket OP.\text{heading} \rrbracket - \arctan(\llbracket OP.\text{position} \rrbracket - \llbracket V \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{distance to } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{distance from ego.position to } V \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{distance from } V_1 \text{ to } V_2 \rrbracket &= |\llbracket V_2 \rrbracket - \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket| \\
\llbracket \text{angle to } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{angle from ego.position to } V \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \text{angle from } V_1 \text{ to } V_2 \rrbracket &= \arctan(\llbracket V_2 \rrbracket - \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 30: Scalar operators.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket P \text{ can see } O \rrbracket &= \text{visibleRegion}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) \cap \text{boundingBox}(\llbracket O \rrbracket) \neq \emptyset \\
\llbracket V \text{ is in } R \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \rrbracket \in \llbracket R \rrbracket \\
\llbracket O \text{ is in } R \rrbracket &= \text{boundingBox}(\llbracket O \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket R \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 31: Boolean operators.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket F \text{ at } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket F \rrbracket(\llbracket V \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket F_1 \text{ relative to } F_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket F_1 \rrbracket(\llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket) + \llbracket F_2 \rrbracket(\llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket H \text{ relative to } F \rrbracket &= \llbracket H \rrbracket + \llbracket F \rrbracket(\llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket F \text{ relative to } H \rrbracket &= \llbracket H \rrbracket + \llbracket F \rrbracket(\llbracket \text{self.position} \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket H_1 \text{ relative to } H_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket H_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket H_2 \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 32: Heading operators.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket V_1 \text{ offset by } V_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket V_2 \rrbracket \\
\llbracket V_1 \text{ offset along } H \text{ by } V_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(\llbracket V_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket H \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket V_1 \text{ offset along } F \text{ by } V_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket + \text{rotate}(\llbracket V_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket F \rrbracket(\llbracket V_1 \rrbracket))
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 33: Vector operators.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{visible } R \rrbracket &= \llbracket R \text{ visible from ego} \rrbracket \\ \llbracket R \text{ visible from } P \rrbracket &= \llbracket R \rrbracket \cap \text{visibleRegion}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) \end{aligned}$$

Figure 34: Region operators.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket OP \text{ offset by } V \rrbracket &= \llbracket V \text{ relative to } OP \rrbracket \\ \llbracket V \text{ relative to } OP \rrbracket &= \text{OrientedPoint}(\text{offsetLocal}(OP, \llbracket V \rrbracket), \llbracket OP.\text{heading} \rrbracket) \\ \llbracket \text{follow } F \text{ for } S \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{follow } F \text{ from ego.position for } S \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{follow } F \text{ from } V \text{ for } S \rrbracket &= \text{OrientedPoint}(y, \llbracket F \rrbracket(y)) \text{ where } y = \text{forwardEuler}(\llbracket V \rrbracket, \llbracket S \rrbracket, \llbracket F \rrbracket) \\ \llbracket \text{front of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle 0, \llbracket O.\text{height} \rrbracket / 2 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{back of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle 0, -\llbracket O.\text{height} \rrbracket / 2 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{left of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle -\llbracket O.\text{width} \rrbracket / 2, 0 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{right of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle \llbracket O.\text{width} \rrbracket / 2, 0 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{front left of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle -\llbracket O.\text{width} \rrbracket / 2, \llbracket O.\text{height} \rrbracket / 2 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{back left of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle -\llbracket O.\text{width} \rrbracket / 2, -\llbracket O.\text{height} \rrbracket / 2 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{front right of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle \llbracket O.\text{width} \rrbracket / 2, \llbracket O.\text{height} \rrbracket / 2 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \text{back right of } O \rrbracket &= \llbracket \langle \llbracket O.\text{width} \rrbracket / 2, -\llbracket O.\text{height} \rrbracket / 2 \rangle \text{ relative to } O \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

Figure 35: OrientedPoint operators.

C ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS

This section describes an experiment analogous to that of Sec. 6.3 but using the generic two-car SCENIC scenario as a baseline. Specifically, we generated 1,000 images from that scenario, obtaining a training set X_{twocar} . We also generated 1,000 images from the overlapping scenario to get a training set X_{overlap} .

Note that X_{twocar} did contain images of overlapping cars, since the generic two-car scenario does not constrain the cars’ locations. However, the average overlap was much lower than that of X_{overlap} , as seen in Fig. 36 (note the log scale): thus the overlapping car images are highly “untypical” of generic two-car images. We would like to ensure the network performs well on these difficult images by emphasizing them in the training set. Therefore we constructed various *mixtures* of the two training sets, fixing the total number of images but using different ratios of images from X_{twocar} and X_{overlap} . We trained the network on each of these mixtures and evaluated their performance on 400-image test sets T_{twocar} and T_{overlap} from the two-car and overlapping scenarios respectively.

To reduce the effect of randomness in training, we used the maximum precision and recall obtained when training for 4,000 through 5,000 steps in increments of 250 steps. Additionally, we repeated each training 8 times, using a random mixture each time: for example, for the 90/10 mixture of X_{twocar} and X_{overlap} , each training used an independent random choice of which 90% of X_{twocar} to use and which 10% of X_{overlap} .

As the results in Tab. 9 show, the model trained purely on generic two-car images has high precision and recall on T_{twocar} but has drastically worse recall on T_{overlap} ; essentially, the network has difficulty detecting the partially-occluded car. However, devoting 20% of the training set to overlapping cars gives a large 8% improvement to recall on T_{overlap} while leaving performance on T_{twocar} essentially the same. This again demonstrates that we can improve the performance of a network on difficult corner cases by using SCENIC to increase the representation of such cases in the training set.




Figure 36: Intersection Over Union (IOU) distribution for two-car and overlapping training sets (log scale).

Table 9: Performance of models trained on mixtures of X_{twocar} and X_{overlap} and tested on both, averaged over 8 training runs. 90/10 indicates a 9:1 mixture of $T_{\text{twocar}}/T_{\text{overlap}}$.

Mixture	T_{twocar}		T_{overlap}	
	Precision	Recall	Precision	Recall
100/0	96.5 ± 1.0	95.7 ± 0.5	94.6 ± 1.1	82.1 ± 1.4
90/10	95.3 ± 2.1	96.2 ± 0.5	93.9 ± 2.5	86.9 ± 1.7
80/20	96.5 ± 0.7	96.0 ± 0.6	96.2 ± 0.5	89.7 ± 1.4
70/30	96.5 ± 0.9	96.5 ± 0.6	96.0 ± 1.6	90.1 ± 1.8