Global Research Journal in Engineering, Science, Technology and Management (GRJESTM)
Volume 02, Issue 02 (March-April) 2026, pp. 346-350
GRJESTM :: An odaswa™ Journal
ISSN : 3107-3611 (Online)

TECHNICAL SERIES | TECHNOLOGY INSIGHT – TN04

Event-Based Vision for UAV Mapping and Autonomous Navigation

Ganeshkumar Baskar*

Technology Snapshot.

Technology	Event-Based Vision / Neuromorphic Imaging
Technology Domain	Computer Vision and Autonomous Systems
Application Area	UAV Navigation and Mapping
Technology Status	Emerging / Active Research
Key Advantage	High temporal resolution, high dynamic range and reduced motion-blur effects
Current Challenge	Event-based 3D reconstruction, sensor fusion and metric accuracy
Future Potential	Autonomous mapping in high-speed and visually challenging environments

Keywords: Event Camera, Neuromorphic Vision, UAV, Event-Based SLAM, Visual-Inertial Odometry, Autonomous Mapping

* Principal Consultant, odaswa Geospatial & Research Services, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

1. Technical Background

Conventional UAV vision systems acquire complete image frames at predefined time intervals. Such frame-based imaging is well established for photogrammetry, visual navigation and three-dimensional reconstruction. However, its performance can deteriorate during rapid platform motion, abrupt illumination changes and operation in environments containing very bright and very dark regions.

Event-based cameras introduce a fundamentally different image-acquisition mechanism. Rather than capturing complete frames, individual pixels operate asynchronously and generate an event when the measured brightness change exceeds a predefined threshold. Consequently, the sensor records temporal changes in the visual environment instead of repeatedly recording complete scene intensity.

2. Relevance to UAV Operation

UAVs represent a particularly suitable platform for event-based vision because aerial vehicles can undergo rapid translational and rotational motion. High-speed manoeuvres can introduce significant motion blur into conventional imagery and reduce the reliability of feature detection and tracking.

Event cameras offer temporal resolution in the microsecond range and do not rely on conventional frame exposure. Moving edges can therefore be recorded with substantially reduced motion-blur effects. High dynamic range is another important characteristic. UAVs frequently encounter rapid illumination transitions when operating around buildings, beneath bridges, inside tunnels, within forests or between outdoor and indoor environments. Event sensors can retain useful temporal information under lighting conditions in which conventional cameras may experience underexposure or saturation.

These properties make event cameras particularly relevant to autonomous UAV applications requiring rapid visual feedback.

3. Event-Based Visual-Inertial Odometry

An event camera alone provides brightness-change observations but does not directly provide an absolute UAV position. For navigation, event information can be integrated with measurements from an Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU).

The basic processing architecture is

Event Stream + IMU Measurements → Feature/Motion Estimation → Sensor Fusion → UAV Pose

The IMU measures angular velocity and linear acceleration at high frequency, while the event camera provides external visual constraints. Combining the two forms Event-Based Visual-Inertial Odometry (EVIO). The estimated state may include UAV position, orientation, velocity and IMU bias parameters. Event observations constrain relative motion, while inertial observations provide high-frequency motion information between visual measurements. This approach is particularly relevant in GNSS-denied environments where absolute satellite positioning cannot be continuously maintained.

4. Event-Based SLAM and 3D Reconstruction

Extending event-based odometry into Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) requires simultaneous estimation of sensor trajectory and environmental structure.

A generalized event-based mapping workflow can be expressed as:

Asynchronous Events
↓
Spatiotemporal Feature Extraction
↓
Motion Estimation
↓
Depth / Structural Estimation
↓
Pose Optimization
↓
3D Map

Three-dimensional information can be estimated through several approaches, including event stereo, motion-based depth estimation, event-assisted visual SLAM and fusion with conventional cameras or depth sensors.

However, reconstruction from events remains more difficult than conventional frame-based photogrammetry. An event represents a local change in brightness rather than an absolute intensity measurement. Static regions with little apparent change may therefore generate insufficient observations for complete surface reconstruction.

For UAV mapping, event information is consequently more likely to complement conventional imaging than replace it completely.

5. Event–Frame Sensor Fusion

Hybrid systems combining event and conventional cameras are receiving increasing research attention. A hybrid architecture can therefore use event data for high-frequency motion estimation while conventional images provide texture, colour and complete scene appearance.

A possible configuration is:

Event Camera + RGB Camera + IMU → Robust Visual-Inertial Estimation

For more demanding mapping applications, LiDAR and GNSS/RTK can also be integrated:

Event + RGB + IMU + LiDAR + GNSS/RTK → Autonomous Georeferenced 3D Mapping

In this configuration, event sensing provides high-frequency temporal information, RGB imagery provides visual appearance, LiDAR provides direct geometric observations and GNSS/RTK establishes absolute spatial reference.

6. Metric Accuracy and Georeferencing

The transition from event-based navigation to event-assisted surveying requires three major developments.

6.1. Drift Control

Visual-inertial odometry estimates relative motion and can accumulate positional and orientation errors over time. Loop closure, global optimization and external observations are required to limit long-term drift.

6.2. Absolute Georeferencing

Event-derived trajectories and maps are fundamentally relative unless constrained by absolute observations. Survey control, GNSS/RTK observations, LiDAR reference data or known spatial features can provide the required transformation into a geospatial coordinate system.

6.3. Independent Accuracy Assessment

Survey applications require quantitative validation against independent reference observations. Horizontal and vertical errors, trajectory error and reconstructed geometric accuracy should therefore be evaluated separately from navigation success.

This is an important research requirement because many event-camera studies primarily evaluate trajectory estimation, reconstruction quality or autonomous-navigation performance rather than conventional surveying accuracy.

7. Onboard Neuromorphic Processing

Event-based sensing also provides a potential pathway toward energy-efficient onboard processing. Because events are generated primarily where temporal changes occur, event streams can be sparse compared with continuously processing complete high-resolution frames. This property is compatible with neuromorphic processors and Spiking Neural Networks (SNNs), which perform computation using event-driven architectures.

For UAVs, the combination could potentially reduce perception latency and computational energy requirements.

A future onboard architecture may consist of:

Event Sensor → Neuromorphic Processor → Motion/Obstacle Perception → Flight Controller

Such processing is particularly attractive for small autonomous UAVs where payload, battery capacity and onboard computational resources are limited. Nevertheless, event density can increase substantially in highly dynamic environments, and practical energy advantages depend on both sensing conditions and processing architecture.

8. Technical Limitations

Several issues presently restrict wider adoption of event-based vision for UAV surveying. Event streams require specialized processing algorithms and cannot be handled directly by conventional photogrammetric software. Sensor noise and background activity can produce unwanted events. Performance may also decrease in scenes containing insufficient brightness variation.

Another important issue is the lack of mature standards for evaluating event-derived geospatial products. Conventional photogrammetry has established procedures for ground control, bundle adjustment, check-point validation and positional accuracy assessment. Equivalent workflows for event-based survey products remain under development. Sensor calibration, event–IMU temporal synchronization and accurate relative orientation between multiple sensors are also critical for multisensor UAV systems. The principal challenge is therefore not simply improving event-camera hardware. It is developing a complete measurement framework connecting event sensing, localization, reconstruction, georeferencing and accuracy validation.

9. Technology Outlook

Event-based vision provides UAV systems with a sensing capability fundamentally different from conventional imaging. Its high temporal resolution, high dynamic range and resistance to motion-blur effects make it particularly suitable for rapid autonomous flight and operation under challenging illumination.

Its present technological strength lies primarily in motion perception, visual-inertial odometry and autonomous navigation. The use of event data for dense, metrically reliable and georeferenced UAV mapping remains a developing research area.

For surveying applications, the most promising architecture is likely to be multisensor rather than event-only:

Event Camera + RGB + IMU + LiDAR/GNSS

Within such a system, the event camera can provide high-frequency motion information, while conventional imaging and ranging sensors maintain the geometric and radiometric information required for mapping.

The key research transition can therefore be summarized as:

Event-Based Vision → Robust Localization → Multisensor 3D Reconstruction → Georeferencing → Metric Validation

Successful integration across these stages could extend autonomous drone surveying into high-speed, GNSS-denied and illumination-challenging environments that remain difficult for conventional UAV mapping systems.

References

[1] G. Gallego, T. Delbruck, G. Orchard, C. Bartolozzi, B. Taba, A. Censi, S. Leutenegger, A. J. Davison, J. Conradt, K. Daniilidis and D. Scaramuzza, "Event-Based Vision: A Survey," IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, Volume. 44, Issue. 1, pp. 154–180, 2022.

[2] D. Tejero-Ruiz, D. Solís-Martín, F. J. Pérez-Grau and J. Borrego-Díaz, "Indoor UAV Navigation Using Event Cameras and Intermediate Frame Reconstruction," Computer Vision and Image Understanding, Volume. 264, Article 104650, 2026.

[3] A. Elamin, A. El-Rabbany and S. Jacob, "Event-Based Visual/Inertial Odometry for UAV Indoor Navigation," Sensors, Volume. 25, Issue. 1, Article 61, 2025.

[4] A. Rosinol Vidal, H. Rebecq, T. Horstschaefer and D. Scaramuzza, "Ultimate SLAM?

Combining Events, Images, and IMU for Robust Visual SLAM in HDR and High-Speed Scenarios," IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters, Volume. 3, Issue. 2, pp. 994–1001, 2018.

[5] G. Gallego, J. E. A. Lund, E. Mueggler, H. Rebecq, T. Delbruck and D. Scaramuzza, "Event-Based, 6-DOF Camera Tracking from Photometric Depth Maps," IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, Volume. 40, Issue. 10, pp. 2402–2412, 2018.

[6] H. Rebecq, T. Horstschaefer, G. Gallego and D. Scaramuzza, "EVO: A Geometric Approach to Event-Based 6-DOF Parallel Tracking and Mapping in Real Time," IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters, Volume. 2, Issue. 2, pp. 593–600, 2017.