



CEOS-WGCV39 Terrain Mapping Sub-group: Current Status and Future Uncertainty

Jan-Peter Muller j.muller@ucl.ac.uk

Point-of-Contact, GEOSS Task IN-02 Chairperson, CEOS-WGCV Sub-group on Terrain mapping from satellites Chairperson, ISPRS Commission IV WG on "Global DEM Interoperability" Head, Imaging Group Professor of Image Understanding and Remote Sensing HRSC Science Team Member (ESA Mars Express 2003) Stereo Panoramic Camera Science Team Member (ESA EXOMARS) MODIS & MISR Science Team Member (NASA EOS Project) TerraSAR-X and TANDEM-X science team member (DLR-Astrium) *partially supported by UK Space Agency

CEOS WGCV Terrain Mapping



- What is the mission of the Terrain Mapping Sub-Group (TMSG)?
 - To ensure that characteristics of digital terrain models produced from Earth Observation sensors at global and regional scale are well understood and that products are validated and used for appropriate applications.
- What are the specific objectives of this group?
 - To develop <u>specifications</u> for the generation of 'standardised terrain surface products with known accuracy' from similar sensing systems in the context of data continuity,
 - to specify <u>evaluation methods and statistics</u> which give transparent information about the *quality and heritage of terrain models*.
 - To update the current <u>dossier of test sites</u> and identify new sites, particularly to satisfy the cal/val requirements of future missions and generally improve access to validation data sets.
 - To keep an <u>up to date record</u> of the current status of sensors which produce data for terrain mapping and of the DEMs available.
 - To produce a <u>DEM requirements document</u> with a science rationale, taking into account the output from current space assets.

TMSG Modus Operandi



- Terrain mapping SG linked to ISPRS IV/3 on "Global DEM interoperability" and GEO task IN-02-C2.1 on "Global DEM"
- Annual technical workshops as part of an international conference
 - ISPRS Commission IV Symposium, Orlando, FL, 16-18 November 2010
 - 2011 symposium had to be abandoned due to Japanese tsunami
 - Special session at ISPRS Congress, Melbourne, 26 August 2 September 2012
 - Invited talk & sessions at ISPRS Comm.IV Symposium, Suzhou, 18-20 May 2014
 - Planned sessions at ISPRS 2016 in Prague, Czech Republic, 12-19 July 2016
- News announcements as and when there is relevant news (included news on the release of the SRTM v3 aka SRTM-Plus)
- Emails to collect inputs for WGCV #39 (59 on email list, 4 responses in total)
- Everything done on a "best efforts" basis with minimal funding so limited ambitions to meet specific objectives
- Key goals are the generation of higher spatial resolution spaceborne DEMs (and bathymetric DEMs) and derived DTMs for next generation sensors
- Keen to move forward with studying impacts of DEM uncertainties on derived LPV, IVOS and SAR products

CESS Overview

- Why does GEO need global topography/bathymmetry?
- Current State-of-the-art in DEM production & quality assessment
 - Status of 30m NASADEM (provided by Bob Crippen, JPL)
 - Assessment of UK TanDEM-X (Lang Feng & JPM)
 - Euro-Maps3D (provided by Andreas Uttenthaler, GAF AG)
 - Data fusion using Cosmo-Skymed (provided by M. Liao, Wuhan)
 - Assessment of TanDEM-X i-DEM over CEOS-WGCV test site in Tasmania (provided by Medhavy Thankappan, Geoscience Australia)
- Status of tasks in IN-02-C2.1 Global DEM
- TMSG Future Uncertainty

Why does GEO need global topography/bathymmetry?

- Global DEM required for 6 of the 9 societal benefit areas identified by the Implementation Plan of GEOSS 2005-2015, and for 2015-2025
- Natural disasters all require detailed knowledge of topography
 - either directly for volcanic dome monitoring, flood inundation areal predictions, landslides
 - or for downstream EO processing, e.g. InSAR for earthquake monitoring and possible prediction
- Poor bathymetric and topography knowledge hinders tsunami forecasts



30m height "flood-fill" based on SRTM-DTED1® 3" (≈90m) Working Gro Visible fault Bam Blind fault revealed by ASAR



2' (≈4km) Smith, Walter H.F., and David T. Sandwell, 1997 "Global Sea Floor Topography from Satellite Altimetry and Ship Depth Soundings", Science, 277, 1956-1962, 1997 Working Group on Calibration and Validation



NASADEM

"NASADEM" MEaSUREs Primary Tasks

Making Earth Science Data Records for Use in Research Environments

1. Reprocess the SRTM DEM

Use advanced software to reprocess raw SRTM data primarily to reduce the occurrence of DEM voids.



New DEM

2. SRTM-ICESat Synergism

Use precise ICESat elevation profiles to correctly match overlapping SRTM swaths for seamless DEM mosaics.

...and then again fill remaining voids with ASTER GDEM and other best-available alternative DEMs, but with improved methods.



Ayer's Rock area DEM

New-minus-Old DEM (seams in Old)

Results on a single data take – Himalaya Mountains SRTM reprocessing for void reduction



Marco LaValle, 2014

* SNAPHU: Statistical-Cost, Network-Flow Algorithm for Phase Unwrapping (Chen and Zebker, Stanford Radar Interferometry Research Group)





Southeast Panama: Shorelines and Clouds



SRTM Voids & Water Mask Errors

GDEM Clouds & Shoreline Errors

SRTM Plus (v3)

Generally good at replacing bad GDEM with GMTED2010

Use of GMTED2010 in SRTM Plus (NASA v3)



Relates to: * Voids in SRTM (always) * Clouds in GDEM (some places) * Misc Elevation Errors in SRTM / GDEM (e.g. SRTM interferometric unwrapping errors)

SRTM Void Fill Improvements



SRTM2 Release Phases 1 - 6





Mosaic created by L. Feng (UCL-MSSL). Gap due to be filled in August 2015

TanDEM-X: Science Activities

Irena Hajnsek^{1/2}, Manfred Zink¹ and Thomas Busche¹

Knowledge for Tomorrow

Microwaves and Radar Institute, DLR
Institute of Environmental Engineering, ETH

Oberpfaffenhofen, Feb 2014



Announcements of Opportunity

Science Opportunities for the DEM products:

Announcements (release date, closing date)

- Intermediate DEM (from first global coverage, difficult terrain excluded, for selected regions only)

- TanDEM-X DEM

5.12.13, 14.3.14

Autumn 2016??



DEM Products for Scientific Use Intermediate DEM (no global coverage)

DEM Product	Spatial Resolution Absolute	Horizontal Accuracy CE90	Absolute Vertical Accuracy LE90	Relative Vertical Accuracy	
IDEM (intermediate DEM)	~12m (0.4 arcsec @ equator	<10m	<10m	Not specified	
IDEM (1 arcsec)	~30 m (1 arcsec @ equator)	<10m	<10m	Not specified	
IDEM (3 arcsec)	~90 m (3 arcsec @ equator)	<10m	<10m	Not specified	



Intermediate DEM (IDEM): Distribution



Found cells: 2697 Total kbytes: 1517837008 Covered skm: 12656286.0

cell	created
cett	upaatea
cell	archived
cell	reloaded
cell	deleted

EOWEB[®]

https://centaurus.caf.dlr.de:8443/eoweb-ng/template/default/welcome/entryPage.vm

☆ マ C 8 - Google

ዖ 🦊 🏠 🔩

EOWEB – Data Distribution Server







Preliminary assessment of TanDEM-X i-DEM over the UK

Jan-Peter Muller, Lang Feng May 2015

Experiment DEM Input datasets

C E 🌑 S



UK DEMs' coverage





TerraSAR-X+TanDEM-X

-2°

-1

0

3

_4°

-8°

Aerial stereo-photogrammetry **Working Group on Calibration and Validation**



6.6 Approximate WGS84 to OSGB36/ODN transformation

The following Helmert transformation converts WGS84 (or ETRS89 or ITRS, the differences are negligible here) coordinates to 'something like' OSGB36 and 'something like' ODN heights. The error is up to five metres both horizontally and vertically. This is good enough for certain applications. This transformation is for use with equation (3). Note the remarks made about Helmert transformations in section 6.2.

ETRS89 (WGS84) to OSGB36/ODN Helmert transformation							
{tx} (m)	$t{\rm Y}$ (m)	_{tz} (m)	<i>s</i> (ppm)	$r_{\rm x}$ (sec)	$r_{\rm Y}$ (sec)	$r_{\rm Z}$ (sec)	
- 446.448	+ 125.157	- 542.060	+ 20.4894	- 0.1502	- 0.2470	- 0.8421	

NOTE 1: OSGB36 is an inhomogeneous TRF by modern standards. Do not use this transformation for applications requiring better than 5 metre accuracy in the transformation step, either vertically or horizontally. Do not use it for points outside Britain.

NOTE 2: OSGB36 does not exist offshore.



Methods of WGS84 to OSGB 1936 ---OSTN02_OSGM02







The datum varies in OSGB36 national grid

CEOS test site in Wales, W4-W3 and N51-N52 (UpperLeft: (-4°, 52°), LowerRight(-3°, 51°)_{Aster30m-bluesky 30m}





UK DEM 30m after registration





b1(r):Aster b2 (g):IDEM b3(b):SRTM b4:BLUESKY mask

Ps:b is band



UK area results-England



Basic Stats		Min		Мах		Mean(m)		Stdev		
SRTM30m- Bluesky30m		-13.751	41.582							
Aster30m-bluesky		Basic Stats		Min		Мах		Mean(m)		Stdev
30m SRTM30m – Aster	0m IDEM30m- SRTM 30m		n- Im	-15.992 25.4.832		2	-0.603		5.829	
30m		IDEM30m- bluesky 30m		-15.911	-15.911 41.819			1.136		7.274
		IDEM30n Aster30r	า - ท	-41.598		26.683		0.729		10.865



Analysis areas in UK

- Birmingham
- ☐ MSSL, Surrey
- Wales
- Swanage, Dorset



Urban building area in Birmingham

Conclusion: in urban area, Bluesky is DTM. IDEM, SRTM, ASTER are higher than Bluesky



Penetration ability to forest

Test area – MSSL –







• Swanage coast area

- Coast area : IDEM has Null values
- Visible optical wavelength can penetrate coastline water





Evaluation of the TanDEM-X Intermediate DEM for Terrain Illumination Correction in Landsat Data

Li, F.¹, Jupp, D.L.B.², Thankappan, M.¹, Wang, L.W.¹, Lewis, A.¹ and Held, A.²

Objectives

- Assess the impact of different sources of spaceborne DEMs on the georadiometric correction of surface spectral BRF (Bi-directional Reflectance Factors)
- Perform qualitative assessments from the "look-andfeel" of the output results as well as explore the correlation between cos (solar_elevation) and BRF
- Assessed the impact of using (a) SRTM at 30m; (b) iDEM at 12m; (c) iDEM at 30m as part of the topographic correction model which includes water vapour (NCEP), aerosols (AATSR) and BRDF (MODIS)

Geographical context & DEM profiles assessment







Landsat mosaics



Mosaic of terrain corrected Landsat false colour images (bands 4, 3, 2 for Landsat 7 and 5, 4, 3 for Landsat 8) using IDEM 12 m

False colour Composite of height, slope and curvature

Examples of terrain illumination correction

CE



iDEM12 and iDEM30m show better georadiometric correction







an e-GEOS (ASI / Telespazio) Company



A Transnational High-Resolution Digital Surface Model











30 km

IRS-P5 Cartosat-1

358 km



PAN-Fore & PAN-Aft 31° stereo viewing angle Nominal B/H ratio 0.62

- Stereo optimized satellite
- Since 2005 continuous collection of stereo data



- Highly reliable photogrammetric optical stereo approach
 - Pixel based Semi-Global Matching
 - Leading to a very sharp representation of the surface





CESS





 Highly standardized and automated workflow benefiting from high data redundancy, leading to very reliable height information







Euro 3 Maps D



GAFAG an e-GEOS (ASI / Telespazio) Company

Full transparency of:

- source data,
- production and
- quality through several qualitytraceability

6

CE 🏟 S

Euro 3 Maps D

Testsite

Kastamonu

Uzunköprü

Nebelhorn-north

Nebelhorn-south

Ankara

Aydin

Arles

Munich

Koblenz

Le Kef 1

Le Kef 2

Sfax

Gafsa

Mlawa

Mostar

Trebinje

Relizane

Gospic Friedrichshafen

Nowy Targ

Tunis

Heidelberg













IRS-P5 Cartosat-1 Stereo Coverage



Euro 3 Maps D

Post spacing	5 m
Spatial reference system	DD or UTM / WGS84
Height reference system	EGM96
Relative vertical accuracy	LE90 <2.5 m
Absolute vertical accuracy	LE90 5-10 m
Absolute horizontal accuracy	CE90 5-10 m
File format	GeoTIFF (16-bit)
Tile-based DSM	0.5° x 0.5° tiles
Base data	IRS-P5
Ortho layer pixel size	2.5 m

HRE80 and HREGP accuracy requirements are fulfilled



Euro-Maps 3D Standard

Product Specifications

Euro 3 Maps D

CE

Digital Surface Model (incl. ortho image layer, quality and traceability layers)	Price per km²
Product < 50,000 km²	€ 7.50
Product > 50,000 km²	€ 4.50

Minimum AOI size is 700 km²
Minimum width of the AOI is 14 km

See also: http://www.euromap.de/products/prod_001.html



Euro-Maps 3D

Prices







© 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material

© GAF AG All rights reserved



Euro-Maps 3D Kosovo

- Seamless mosaic
- ~ 130 Stereo pairs
- Multiple coverage of up to 8 stereo pairs

11





Euro 3 Area-wide coverages: Maps D Example: Syria-Northern Iraq





Syria + Northern Iraq (Euro-Maps 3D) © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material





Examples: Urban Structures





City of Aleppo, Syria © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material



City of Arbil, Iraq © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material





Examples: Forest structures





Ferdinandovac, Croatia-Hungarian border © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material



Friedrichshafen, Germany © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material







Examples: Geological Structures



Sinjar Mountains, Iraq © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material



an e-GEOS (ASI / Telespazio) Company



Al Sukhnah, Syria © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material



Bandar Abbas, Iran © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material



Aeolian Islands, Italy © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material











Water body editing

River Euphrat Lake Assad © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material









Ortho image & DSM Validation of height values

Friedrichshafen, Germany © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material







Infrastructure planning (cross border)

- Modelling (hydrological, geological, wind,...)
- Urban planning
- Oil & Gas exploration / monitoring
- Telecommunication network planning
- Radio propagation
- Site location assistance (wind turbines,...)
- Calculation of volumina (e.g. open cast mining,..)
- Optimization of fuel consumption (best route assessment,...)

Hazard analysis

- Slope and exposure
- Flood and flow regime

Visualization

- 2D (terrain impressions)
- 3D (fly through; low level flight planning; touristic applications)

Derivation of new data products

- Orthorectification of satellite data
- Digital terrain model creation
- Topographic mapping, e.g. contour lines
- Elevation input for 3D vector data, urban block models....



Application examples











Miningarea, Hamah, Syria © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material

© GAF AG All rights reserved



Mining









Baji Oil Refinery, Iraq © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material

Oil & Gas exploration



Infrastructure Planning



Road construction, Iraq © 2015, GAF AG, includes Antrix material







Fusion of high-resolution DEMs derived from COSMO-SkyMed and TerraSAR-X InSAR datasets

Mingsheng Liao Wuhan University

Task description



- Fuse 10m InSAR DEMs generated from TerraSAR-X and Cosmo-Skymed
- Voids present in both DEMs (6.9% & 5.7% respectively). After fusion ≤0.13% have voids
- Test site of 10 x 10km, located in NW China
- ICESat and national DEMs from 1:50,000 maps used for validation

Acquisition date 3 and 4 June 2009 18 and 29 Apr 2008 Orbit direction (heading angle) Descending (-171.22°) Ascending (-13.40°) Temporal baseline (days) 1 11 Nominal incidence angle (°) 48 28 Normal baseline (m) 63 71 Height of ambiguity (m) 164 59 Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene center) 555 Hz/-243 Hz -2Hz/-13 Hz Azimuth/range bandwidth 3106.9 Hz/73.5 MHz 2765 Hz/150 MHz Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) 2.21 m/1.63 m 1.89 m/0.91 m Ground coverage (a: Figure direction For any of the scene for	Basic information of the two InSAR data pairs used	COSMO-SkyMed	TerraSAR-X	CO CO
Orbit direction (heading angle) Descending (-171.22°) Ascending (-13.40°) Temporal baseline (days) 1 11 Nominal incidence angle (°) 48 28 Normal baseline (m) 63 71 Height of ambiguity (m) 164 59 Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene 555 Hz/-243 Hz -2 Hz/-13 Hz center) Azimuth/range bandwidth 3106.9 Hz/73.5 MHz 2765 Hz/150 MHz Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) 2.21 m/1.63 m 1.89 m/0.91 m Ground coverage (a: TerraSAR-X (b) Further SAR-X	Acquisition date	3 and 4 June 2009	18 and 29 Apr 2008	
Temporal baseline (days) 1 11 Nominal incidence angle (°) 48 28 Normal baseline (m) 63 71 Height of ambiguity (m) 164 59 Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene 555 Hz/-243 Hz -2Hz/-13 Hz center) Azimuth/range bandwidth 3106.9 Hz/73.5 MHz 2765 Hz/150 MHz Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) 2.21 m/1.63 m Ground coverage (a: Range direction Figure 1.89 m/0.91 m Ground coverage (a: Range direction Figure 1.90 m) TerraSAR-X IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Orbit direction (heading angle)	Descending (-171.22°)	Ascending (-13.40°)	
Nominal incidence angle (°) Normal baseline (m) Height of ambiguity (m) Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene center) Azimuth/range bandwidth Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) Ground coverage (a: TerraSAR-X Interfactor TerraSAR-X	Temporal baseline (days)	1	11	
Normal baseline (m) 63 71 Height of ambiguity (m) 164 59 Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene 555 Hz/-243 Hz -2Hz/-13 Hz center) Azimuth/range bandwidth 3106.9 Hz/73.5 MHz 2765 Hz/150 MHz Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) 2.21 m/1.63 m 1.89 m/0.91 m Ground coverage (a: TerraSAR-X Image direction Find of the standard scene for the stan	Nominal incidence angle (°)	48	28	
Height of ambiguity (m) 164 59 Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene center) Azimuth/range bandwidth 3106.9Hz/73.5MHz 2765Hz/150MHz Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) 2.21 m/1.63 m Ground coverage (a: TerraSAR-X (b) Image direction TerraSAR-X	Normal baseline (m)	63	71	
Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene center) Azimuth/range bandwidth 3106.9Hz/73.5MHz 2765Hz/150MHz Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) 2.21 m/1.63 m Ground coverage (a: TerraSAR-X (b) (Figure 1) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c)	Height of ambiguity (m)	164	59	
Azimuth/range bandwidth 3106.9Hz/73.5MHz 2765Hz/150MHz Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) 2.21 m/1.63 m Range direction Fliph I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	Doppler centroid frequency (master/slave at scene center)	555 Hz/-243 Hz	-2 Hz/-13 Hz	
Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look) Ground coverage (a: (a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	Azimuth/range bandwidth	3106.9 Hz/73.5 MHz	2765 Hz/150 MHz	
Ground coverage (a: (a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	Azimuth/range sampling spacing (single-look)	2.21 m/1.63 m	1.89 m/0.91 m	
(a) (a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	Ground coverage (a:	Range direction	Terra	SAR-X
Cosmo-SkyMed + ICESat tracks	(a) (a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	Fat tracks		

Method applied



CE

DEMs + Phase Coherence products



Validation using ICESat & National DEN

Table 2 Statistical error indicators of the result DEMs with respect to the GLAS data

Elevation differences	COSMO-S	COSMO-SkyMed DEM			TerraSAR-X DEM			Fused DEM		
	Mean (m)	Median (m)	SD (m)	Mean (m)	Median (m)	SD (m)	Mean (m)	Median (m)	SD (m)	
$Diff_1$ (GLAS elevation value—elevation value at the center of the 3 \times 3 window)	-6.41	-5.56	6.81	-6.33	-5.47	6.48	-6.36	-5.50	6.24	
$Diff_2$ (GLAS elevation value—min. elevation value within the 3 × 3 window)	-4.43	-4.34	6.14	-4.22	-4.15	5.86	-4.29	-4.17	5.75	
$Diff_3$ (GLAS elevation value—median elevation value within the 3 × 3 window)	-6.41	-5.45	6.42	-6.29	-5.38	6.19	-6.33	-5.44	6.15	
<i>Diff</i> ₄ (GLAS elevation value—max. elevation value	-9.52	-7.83	6.95	-7.90	-6.63	6.87	-8.29	-6.75	6.86	





GEO Task IN-02: Global Datasets Role for Global DEM

- IN-02 Earth datasets consist of 2 sub-tasks:
 - C1: Advances in Life-cycle Data Management
 - C2: Development of Regional/Global Information and Cross-cutting Datasets
- IN-02 Point of Contact: Mike Abrams (JPL, ASTER PI)
- Proposed on 1-Feb-14 to CEOS Executive Officer, Kerry Sawyer, that activity continue into the next 3 year implementation period under CEOS wing to cover
 - 2014/15 release of SRTM V2 at 1 arc-second (≈30m)
 - 2016/17 release of TanDEM-X DEM at 3 arc-seconds (≈90m)
 - 2015/16 release of ALOS-PRISM DEM at 1 arc-seconds (≈30m)
 - 2017 release of re-processed NASADEM at 1 arc-seconds (≈30m)
 - Unknown dates for creation of bathymetry of continental shelves using SAR & high resolution EO, once support is released
- What is the status of this recommendation?





- UK Space Agency recently performed review of CEOS commitments (report not yet available) for EOAC
- Decided to re-focus on WG Climate and withdraw support from TMSG
- JPM will have to step down at the end of WGCV39 if no space agency support can be found as without any support it will be impossible to continue
- UKSA not interested in supporting any TMSG-promoted activities
- CEOS-WGCV should review whether it wishes to continue with TMSG and if it does, seek a new chair for the future