## Geometric Quality Assessment of CBERS-2

Julio d'Alge Ricardo Cartaxo Guaraci Erthal
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- Monitoring CBERS-2 scene centers
$\square$ Satellite orbit control
- Band-to-band registration accuracy
$\square$ Detection and control
■ System-corrected images (level 2)
$\square$ What to expect of such images?
$\square$ Internal error ... attitude data
$\square$ Positioning error ... ephemerides and attitude data
- Geometric quality of CBERS-2 images


## I mages used in the assessment

- 6 CCD scenes, 159/121, UTM, SAD69
$\square$ December 17, 2003; March 30, 2004; May 21, 2004; July 12, 2004; September 02, 2004; February 05, 2005
- 6 IRMSS scenes, 159/121, UTM, SAD69
$\square$ December 17, 2003; March 30, 2004; May 21, 2004; July 12, 2004; September 02, 2004; February 05, 2005
- 3 WFI scenes, 159/124, Lambert Conformal Conic, SAD69
$\square$ November 04, 2003; March 30, 2004; September 02, 2004
- 2 ortho-rectified ETM images, UTM/WGS84
$\square$ Circa 2000


## Images used in the assessment
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## M onitoring CBE RS-2 scene centers

- Geographic position of scene centers
$\square$ WRS path and row are transformed into nominal geographic coordinates
$\square$ Geographic coordinates of scene centers are computed through the geometric correction process
$\square$ Differences between real and nominal geographic coordinates are calculated
- December 17, 2003 ........ -28km (to west)
- March 30, 2004 .............. -39km (to west)
- May 21, 2004 ................. -21km (to west)
- July 12, 2004 ................. +5 km (to east)
- September 02, 2004 ....... +4km (to east)
- February 05, 2005 ........... +2km (to east)
$\square$ Orbit control and longitudinal drift at equator


## M onitoring CBERS-2 scene centers

- Longitudinal drift at equator computed in the CBERS-2 Control Center Facility at INPE



## M onitoring CBERS-2 scene centers

- Longitudinal drift at equator computed in the CBERS-2 Control Center Facility at INPE



## M onitoring CBERS-2 scene centers



## Band-to-band registration accuracy

- Band-to-band mismatch is estimated by an intensity interpolation method
$\square$ Reference and search windows are defined by sub-images that are resampled to 1 / 11 of the original pixel size
- Cubic convolution interpolation function ( $\alpha=-0.5$ )
$\square$ Reference and search windows are overlaid in all possible positions to determine similarity on selected control points
- Normalized cross-correlation
$\square$ Matching position at each control point is determined by the maximum similarity value
$\square$ Spatial distance between any reference window and the corresponding matching position defines the band-to-band mismatch


# Band-to-band registration accuracy 

## - Example of control points



## Band-to-band registration accuracy

- Estimation of CCD band-to-band registration
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- Estimation of CCD band-to-band registration




## Band-to-band registration accuracy

- Estimation of CCD band-to-band registration




## Band-to-band registration accuracy

- Visual estimation of band-to-band registration


CCD bands 1 and 4


IRMSS bands 1 and 2

- Estimated mismatches are corrected in the CBERS Processing Station


## System-corrected images (level 2)

- Ephemerides
$\square$ Satellite position and velocity on time t
- Attitude data and instrument
$\square$ Viewing direction on time t
- Intersection with earth reference ellipsoid
$\square$ Geographic coordinates of pixel acquired on time t
- Image remapping to a map projection reference system


## System-corrected images (level 2)

- Internal accuracy
$\square$ Relative position of pixels with respect to a map projection system
$\square$ LANDSAT TM/ETM and SPOT HRV/HRG have established the standards
- Mean error of 1.5 pixel
$\square$ Accurate attitude data
- A good internal accuracy allows users to easily integrate images, maps, and other geographic data sources


## System-corrected images (level 2)

- Positioning accuracy
$\square$ Global displacement of the image with respect to the earth surface
$\square$ LANDSAT TM/ETM and SPOT HRV/HRG have established the standards
- Mean error of $1,500 \mathrm{~m}$ for LANDSAT-5
- Mean error of less than 350m for SPOT-5
- Mean error of less than 200m for LANDSAT-7
$\square$ Accurate ephemerides and attitude data
- The positioning accuracy defines how far an image is from its true position


## Internal and positioning accuracy

- System-corrected CCD, IRMSS, and WFI images were imported to a common GIS database
- NASA (ESAD) ortho-rectified ETM images were imported to the same GIS database
$\square$ GeoTIFF converted from MrSID
$\square$ UTM, WGS84
- CBERS-2 and LANDSAT-7 images were remapped to a common reference system
$\square$ Lambert Conformal Conic, WGS84


## Internal and positioning accuracy

- Internal accuracy estimation
$\square$ Measurement of control points
- Control points were selected manually (automatic selection is under development)
- Map projection coordinates were measured on both CBERS-2 and LANDSAT-7 images
$\square$ Geometric transformations
- Similarity and orthogonal-affine transformations were used in the assessment
- Affine transformation was used to investigate image registration possibilities
$\square$ Coordinates calculated through the transformations were compared to the coordinates provided by the reference LANDSAT ETM image
$\square$ Differences were used to compute the internal accuracy


## Internal and positioning accuracy

## - Positioning accuracy estimation

$\square$ Measurement of control points

- Control points were selected manually (automatic selection is under development)
- Map projection coordinates were measured on both CBERS-2 and LANDSAT-7 images
$\square$ Displacements along north-south and east-west directions were calculated by subtracting CBERS-2 coordinates from the reference LANDSAT ETM coordinates
- Average north-south displacement ( $\Delta \mathrm{Y}$ )
- Average east-west displacement ( $\Delta X$ )
$\square$ The resultant of average displacements defines the positioning accuracy
- $\left[(\Delta X)^{2}+(\Delta Y)^{2}\right]^{0.5}$


## Internal accuracy estimation

| INSTRUMENT | TRANSFORMATION | RMSE_X (m) | RMSE_Y (m) | RMSE (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CCD | Similarity | 79 | 77 | 110 |
|  | Orthogonal-affine | 50 | 45 | 67 |
|  | Affine | 24 | 20 | 31 |
| IRMSS | Similarity | 115 | 126 | 170 |
|  | Orthogonal-affine | 108 | 110 | 154 |
|  | Affine | 28 | 17 | 33 |
| WFI | Similarity | 708 | 668 | 973 |
|  | Orthogonal-affine | 661 | 316 | 733 |
|  | Affine | 618 | 272 | 676 |
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## Internal accuracy estimation

| INSTRUMENT | LENGTH DISTORTION | ANISOMORPHISM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CCD | 0.998 | 0.996 |
| IRMSS | 0.999 | 1.003 |
| WFI | 1.008 | 1.008 |

## Positioning accuracy estimation

| DATE | $\Delta \mathrm{X}(\mathrm{km})$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{km})$ | RESULTANT (km) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| December 17, 2003 | $\leftarrow-7.4$ | $\uparrow+7.7$ | 10.7 |
| March 30, 2004 | $\leftarrow-11.8$ | $\uparrow+5.0$ | 12.8 |
| May 21, 2004 | $\leftarrow-9.7$ | $\uparrow+4.3$ | 10.6 |
| July 12, 2004 | $\leftarrow-10.0$ | $\uparrow+3.7$ | 10.7 |
| September 02, 2004 | $\leftarrow-2.5$ | $\uparrow+4.1$ | 4.8 |
| February 05, 2005 | $\rightarrow+0.7$ | $\uparrow+4.2$ | 4.3 |

## Comments and discussion

- Changes in the geographic position of scene centers must be continuously monitored by the CBERS-2 Control Center Facilities in Brazil and China
- A certain WRS scene should always cover the same portion of the earth surface
- CBERS-2 WRS must be a reliable image search tool for remote sensing users


## Comments and discussion

- INPE is investigating the band-to-band registration issue through a more comprehensive analysis of CCD images
- Band-to-band mismatches have been detected and corrected accordingly in the CBERS station at INPE
- Additional study is also required to verify the occurrence of displacements between arrays of detectors


## Comments and discussion

- Internal accuracies of 110 m for CCD, 170m for IRMSS, and 973 m for WFI images do not follow the standards set by TM/ETM and HRV/HRG images
- But ... results of the affine transformation indicate that image registration is feasible
$\square$ Suggested maximum scale for CCD is 1:100,000
$\square$ Suggested maximum scale for IRMSS is $1: 250,000$
$\square$ Suggested maximum scale for WFI is $1: 1,500,000$
$\square$ An error still remains along the east-west direction after WFI images have been registered by an affine transformation


## Comments and discussion

- INPE is investigating the generation of fully corrected images by automatic registration with ETM ortho-rectified image data


CCD registered with ETM


IRMSS registered with ETM

## Comments and discussion

## - IRMSS forward and reverse scans

$\square$ Mismatch between forward and reverse scans on the extremities of the images
$\square$ Current behavior of IRMSS mirror profile is different from the expected nominal profile?


## Comments and discussion

- CRESDA (China) has proposed an adjustment method that slightly changes time for each segment of the scan mirror profile
$\square$ Read some lines of image raw data, get number of pixels in each segment, and compute scan time for each segment
$\square$ Fit the scan mirror profile to the relative mirror angles of the instrument using a third order polynomial
$\square$ Readjust the scan mirror angles for each segment
$\square$ Offset is about (4.4/1536) ${ }^{\circ}$ per pixel
$\square$ Forward mirror profile after adjustment
- $f(t)=-2.19448+59.85849 t-27.15604 t^{2}+222.16511 t^{3}$
$\square$ Reverse mirror profile after adjustment
- $f(t)=2.19388-59.3667 t+1.65016 t^{2}-38.1988 t^{3}$


## Comments and discussion

- IRMSS forward and reverse scans after adjustment by the CRESDA method
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## Comments and discussion

- Image orientation to the north
$\square$ True north direction and the north direction calculated by the geometric correction process should be the same
$\square$ All tests detected a little misalignment ( $2 \sim 6$ pixels) between the axes of the map projection system that is computed in the geometric correction process and the axes of the reference map projection system
$\square$ Presence of bore-sight angles?
$\square$ Inaccurate attitude data (yaw)?
$\square$ INPE is investigating the problem
- However ... image registration by an affine transformation fixes the problem


## Comments and discussion

- Positioning accuracy between 4 and 12 km does not follow standards set by LANDSAT and SPOT
- However ... a positioning error, no matter it is 10 km or 350 m , always implies an external registration procedure



## Comments and discussion

- Positioning accuracy can be improved by the use of post-processed ephemerides
- Tests have been made that account for:
$\square$ Presence of unexpected bore-sight and attitude angles
$\square$ Computation of a bias-matrix



## Conclusion

- Current developments towards ensuring a good geometric quality for CBERS-2 images
$\square$ Careful control of satellite orbit to avoid unacceptable longitudinal drifts
$\square$ Systematic verification of the band-to-band registration accuracy
$\square$ Use of post-processed ephemerides generated at a regular basis in the CBERS-2 Control Center Facility at INPE
$\square$ Refinement of attitude data by using control points
$\square$ Computation of bore-sight angles by using control points
$\square$ Use of automatic registration techniques to generate fully corrected images

