

PSCDL Challenge 2026

Final Evaluation Report & Winner Announcement

1. Overview

The **PSCDL Challenge 2026** concluded with the evaluation of the **Top 5 shortlisted teams**, each presenting innovative solutions for **Persistent Scene Change Detection (PSCD)**. The submissions were assessed through a comprehensive evaluation framework designed to measure both the **accuracy** and the **practical deployability** of the proposed solutions.

The final rankings were determined based on the following evaluation criteria:

- **Performance on Evaluation Videos**
- **Performance on Blind Test Videos**
- **Inference Time (Runtime Efficiency)**

The objective of the challenge was to identify solutions that not only achieved high detection accuracy but also demonstrated computational efficiency suitable for deployment in real-world surveillance applications.



Winners

Position	Team	Members	Institution
 Winner	Houston	Joseph S Mathew Jiyaro Joseph	Govt. Model Engineering College, Thrikkakara
 Runner-Up	Team MVGR	Pokuri Siva Sai Krishna	MVGR College of Engineering



Top 5 Finalists

The following teams were shortlisted as the **Top 5 Finalists** of the PSCDL Challenge 2026 based on their outstanding performance throughout the competition.

Status	Team	Members	Institution
 Winner	Houston	Joseph S Mathew Jiyaro Joseph	Govt. Model Engineering College, Thrikkakara
 Runner-Up	Team MVGR	Pokuri Siva Sai Krishna	MVGR College of Engineering
 Top 5	Peaks	Ahin Satheesh Harsha P K	Cochin University of Science and Technology
 Top 5	Lens Learners	Patel Shiv Kirankumar Dev Joshi	IIIT Vadodara
 Top 5	Pixel Detectives	Aman Kumar	IIIT Delhi

Evaluation Methodology

Each submission was evaluated using a comprehensive three-stage evaluation process.

1. Evaluation Videos

Each participant's solution was first evaluated on a predefined benchmark dataset consisting of evaluation videos. Standard semantic segmentation metrics were computed to assess detection performance.

2. Blind Test Videos

To evaluate the robustness and generalization capability of each solution, an additional set of unseen blind test videos was used during the final assessment.

3. Inference Time

The runtime efficiency of every submission was measured on identical hardware using the same evaluation environment. This criterion ensured that the proposed methods were suitable for practical deployment in surveillance systems.

The final rankings were determined by considering the overall balance between **detection performance**, **generalization ability**, and **computational efficiency**, rather than relying on a single evaluation metric.



Overall Performance Summary

Team	Evaluation Videos (F1)	Blind Test (F1)	Inference Time (ms/frame)
Houston	0.3432	0.4090	11.32
Team MVGR	0.2348	0.3037	2.54
Peaks	0.2881	0.2556	18.95
Lens Learners	0.1964	0.1640	6.80
Pixel Detectives	0.1361	0.2789	51.54



Detailed Evaluation Metrics

Team	Evaluation Precision	Evaluation Recall	Evaluation F1	Blind Precision	Blind Recall	Blind F1	Inference Time (ms/frame)
Houston	0.3537	0.3333	0.3432	0.5282	0.3336	0.4090	11.32
Team MVGR	0.2192	0.2528	0.2348	0.3728	0.2563	0.3037	2.54
Peaks	0.3656	0.2376	0.2881	0.4311	0.1816	0.2556	18.95
Lens Learners	0.2050	0.1885	0.1964	0.5960	0.0951	0.1640	6.80
Pixel Detectives	0.2012	0.1028	0.1361	0.5653	0.1851	0.2789	51.54