




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

A User Perspective



Prasad S. Thenkabail

Research Geographer, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Flagstaff, Arizona

Lecture @ Boston University, Boston, USA. October 27-29, 2009

Landsat Science Team Data Normalization Workshop



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Overview of Today's Lecture



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Two Main Questions that a Sensor Data User Often Asks

1. How do we get “normalized data” for one sensor over time?;
2. How do we get “normalized data” for multiple sensors over time?;

.....these are 2 questions that always a sensor data user asks (**often, without real answers**)



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

What we Mean by “normalized data”?

A. at-sensor reflectance

Corrections for: (a) sensor degradation\changes, (b) solar elevation, (c) band-width (spectrum at which irradiance is received), (c) Earth-sun distance.

B. Surface reflectance

Corrections for atmospheric effects: (a) cloud removal\composite, (b) haze removal.

C. Inter-sensor Calibrations

Corrections for: (a) pixel resolution (e.g., 30m vs. 80m), (b) band width (e.g., broad-band vs. narrow-band), (c) radiometer (e.g., 8-bit vs. 11-bit).



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Data Normalization Issues

1. at-sensor reflectance

Well understood....quite Straightforward.....yet data providers still do not provide this as a product....making Users life difficult




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

What to Normalize for?

- 1. Satellites**
 - Height of acquisition (e.g., 500 km, 700 km, 36,000 km above earth)
 - orbital parameters
 - 2. Sensors**
 - Radiometry
 - Band-width
 - Optics/design
 - degradation over time
 - nadir, off-nadir viewing
 - 3. Solar flux or irradiance**
 - Function of wavelength
 - 4. Sun**
 - Sun elevation @ time of acquisition
 - 5. Sun-Earth**
 - Distance between earth and sun
 - 6. Stratosphere or Atmosphere**
 - Ozone, water vapor, haze, aerosol
 - Path radiance
 - 7. Surface of Earth**
 - Topography
 - 8. Seasons**
 - Earth-sun distance
- Atmospheric corrections**
- Haze (atmospheric)
 - Haze (dust)
 - Haze (harmattan)




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

What to Normalize for?: e.g., Data in Digital Numbers vs. Surface Reflectance

Radiometric differences across sensors clearly imply the need for normalizations.


IKONOS

11-bit....0 to 2048 levels




Landsat ETM+

8-bit....0 to 255 levels



NOT Normalized

MODIS Surface reflectance product 0-100 % reflectance



Normalized



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

DN's to Radiance

Example: To Convert the ETM+ 8 bit DN's to radiances:

$$\text{Radiance (W m}^{-2}\text{ sr}^{-1}\text{ }\mu\text{m}^{-1}) = \text{gain} * \text{DN} + \text{offset}$$

Note: see data header files for gains and offsets

For a number of sensors, see

Reference: Thenkabail, P.S., Enclona, E.A., Ashton, M.S., Legg, C., Jean De Dieu, M., 2004. Hyperion, IKONOS, ALI, and ETM+ sensors in the study of African rainforests. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 90:23-43.



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

DN to radiance ($\text{W m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$)

Spectral radiance

Spectral radiance (Price, 1987) is computed using the following equation:

$$R_i = \alpha_i \text{DN}_i + \beta_i \rightarrow (1)$$

R_i = spectral radiance in $\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$

α_i = gain or slope in $\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$

β_i = bias or intercept in $\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$

DN_i = digital number of each pixel in TM bands

$i = 1$ to 5 and 7 (except the thermal band 6)

Some References:

1. Chander, G., Markham, B.L., and Helder, D.L. 2009. Summary of current radiometric calibration coefficients for Landsat MSS, TM, ETM+, and EO-1 ALI sensors. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 113(5): 893-903.
2. J. C. Price, "Calibration of Satellite Radiometers and the Comparison of Vegetation Indices," *Remote Sensing of the Environment*, vol. 21, pp. 15-27, 1987.
3. B. L. Markham and J. L. Barker, "Radiometric Properties of U.S. Processed Landsat MSS Data," *Remote Sensing of the Environment*, vol. 22, pp. 39-71, 1987
4. Thenkabail P.S., Smith, R.B., and De-Pauw, E. 2002. Evaluation of Narrowband and Broadband Vegetation Indices for Determining Optimal Hyperspectral Wavebands for Agricultural Crop Characterization. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*. 68(6): 607-621

Table 1. Radiance values for Landsat-5 TM

Band	$\alpha_i = \text{gain}$ ($\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$)	$\beta_i = \text{bias}$ ($\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$)
1	0.6024314	-1.52
2	1.175098	-2.8399999
3	0.8057647	-1.17
4	0.8145490	-1.51
5	0.1080784	-0.37
7	0.0569804	-0.15000

Your Image header file



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Radiance ($\text{W m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$) to at-sensor Reflectance (%)

$$\text{Reflectance (\%)} = \frac{\text{Energy off Target}}{\text{Energy from the Source}} = \frac{\text{Radiance (W m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m})}{\text{Irradiance (W m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m}^{-1})} * 100$$

$$\text{Reflectance (\%)} = \frac{\pi L_{\lambda} d^2}{ESUN_{\lambda} \cos \theta_s}$$

Where, TOA reflectance (at-sensor or at-satellite exo-atmospheric reflectance)

L_{λ} is the radiance ($\text{W m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$),

d is the earth to sun distance in astronomic units at the acquisition date (see Markham and Barker, 1987),


$ESUN_{\lambda}$ is irradiance ($\text{W m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$) or solar flux (Neckel and Labs, 1984), and

θ_s = solar zenith angle

Note: θ_s is solar zenith angle in degrees (i.e., 90 degrees minus the sun elevation or sun angle when the scene was recorded as given in the image header file).




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Solar Irradiance or Solar Flux ($\text{Wm}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$) (e.g., across electromagnetic spectrum)

Solar Flux (Neckel and Labs, 1984)



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Solar Irradiance or Solar Flux ($\text{Wm}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$) (e.g., for Landsat TM)

Table 2. Solar flux or exo-atmospheric irradiances ($\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$) for Landsat-5 TM wavebands (Markham and Barker, 1985).

Band	Solar Flux or exo-atmospheric irradiances ($\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$)
1	1946.48
2	1812.63
3	1545.95
4	1046.70
5	211.12
6	10.000
7	76.91



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues


Astronomical Units (dimensionless) for Earth-Sun Distance

Julian Day	Distance	Julian Day	Distance	Julian Day	Distance	Julian Day	Distance	Julian Day	Distance
1	.9832	74	.9945	152	1.0140	227	1.0128	305	.9925
15	.9836	91	.9993	166	1.0158	242	1.0092	319	.9892
32	.9853	106	1.0033	182	1.0167	258	1.0057	335	.9860
46	.9878	121	1.0076	196	1.0165	274	1.0011	349	.9843
60	.9909	135	1.0109	213	1.0149	288	.9972	365	.9833




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues at-sensor Reflectance (%)

Allows us to compare across Sensors



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

at-sensor Reflectance (%) Model for Landsat ETM+ written in ERDAS Imagine




Dis-advantages of NOT providing data in Reflectance

1. Not all users want to do this;
2. Not all users have expertise to do this;
3. It is time-consuming;
4. Often users may end up using just digital numbers- leading to serious issues with data interpretation;
5. Providing data in reflectance is a big step forward.



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

at-sensor Reflectance (%) Model for IKONOS written in ERDAS Imagine




Dis-advantages of NOT providing data in Reflectance

1. Not all users want to do this;
2. Not all users have expertise to do this;
3. It is time-consuming;
4. Often users may end up using just digital numbers- leading to serious issues with data interpretation;
5. Providing data in reflectance is a big step forward.



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

at-sensor Reflectance (%) Model for Hyperion (band 1-70) written in ERDAS Imagine



Dis-advantages of NOT providing data in Reflectance

1. Not all users want to do this;
2. Not all users have expertise to do this;
3. It is time-consuming;
4. Often users may end up using just digital numbers- leading to serious issues with data interpretation;
5. Providing data in reflectance is a big step forward.



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

At-sensor Reflectance

1. Quite reliable;
2. A must;
3. Most will agree;
4. Good that the satellite data provider provides this instead of making a user convert this.



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Data Normalization Issues

2. Surface Reflectance

Clouds.....Haze.....Confusion.....Uncertainty.....need clear decisions



Data Normalization Issues

2A. Cloud Removal algorithms

Cloud removal.....data loss.....but provides cloud free data.....only time-compositing over time (e.g., 8-day, monthly) provides some useful data



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Cloud Removal Algorithms

1. Maximum Value NDVI compositing;
2. Blue band reflectivity threshold;
3. Visible band reflectivity threshold; and
4. MODIS First 5 Band reflectivity threshold;




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

8-day time composites of MODIS 250m Surface Reflectance Product




FCC (RGB): 2,1,6 (NIR,red,SWIR1)



Observe Clouds in Each 8-day Composite

Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues


Monthly Maximum Value (NDVI) composite from 8-day time composites of MODIS 250m Surface Reflectance Product to reduce cloud cover



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

First 5 Band (of MODIS 7 band Reflectance product) composite to reduce cloud cover

If (i1 > 20 and i2 > 20 and i3 > 20 and i4 > 20 and i5 > 20) then 255 else null



Significant clouds scenario. July , 27 image of Krishna basin. When reflectance (percent) in band 1 and band 2 and band 3 and band 4 and band 5 is all > 20 percent cloud is present (red areas in right image) else no cloud is present (blue areas in left image). Based on this definition, the image had a high percent of clouds on July 27. The left image is a FCC (RGB) of MODIS bands 2,1,6 (858 nm, 648 nm, and 1640 nm) and shows significant clouds. Each of the first 5 bands should have > 20 percent reflectance for cloud to be present. Thereby the formulae in ERMapper is:


If (i1 > 20 and i2 > 20 and i3 > 20 and i4 > 20 and i5 > 20) then 255 else null



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

First 5 Band (of MODIS 7 band Reflectance product) composite to reduce cloud cover

If ($i_1 > 20$ and $i_2 > 20$ and $i_3 > 20$ and $i_4 > 20$ and $i_5 > 20$) then 255 else null



No cloud scenario. April 30 image of Krishna basin. When reflectance (percent) in band 1 and band 2 and band 3 and band 4 and band 5 is all > 20 percent cloud is present (red areas in left image) else no cloud is present (blue areas in left image). Based on this definition, left image had zero cloud on April 30. The right image is a FCC (RGB) of MODIS bands 2,1,6 (858 nm, 648 nm, and 1640 nm) and shows little or no clouds. Each of the first 5 bands should have > 20 percent reflectance for cloud to be present. Thereby the formulae in ERMapper is:
If ($i_1 > 20$ and $i_2 > 20$ and $i_3 > 20$ and $i_4 > 20$ and $i_5 > 20$) then 255 else null



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues


Blue Band Minimum Reflectivity Threshold for Cloud Removal

- Blue band minimum reflectivity threshold**
If (blue band > 21 % reflectance) then null else I
- Visible band minimum reflectivity threshold**
If (blue band > 22 % reflectance and green band > 21% reflectance and red band > 23 % reflectance) then null else I


Before Cloud Removal Algorithm Day 153 2001




Before Cloud Removal Algorithm Day 185 2001



After Cloud Removal Algorithm Day 153 2001



After Cloud Removal Algorithm Day 185 2001



Results of
the first
Algorithm

Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Surface Reflectance: (a) cloud removal

1. Cleans up cloud areas and provides clean data.....but data loss;
2. Time compositing (e.g., 8-day, monthly) useful;
3. Cloud removal algorithms does not address haze;



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Data Normalization Issues

2B. Atmospheric correction (“eliminate or reduce path radiance” resulting from haze (thin clouds, dust, harmattan, aerosols, ozone, water vapor)





U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

What to Normalize for?



Satellite

Sun

$$\text{Reflectance (\%)} = \frac{\text{Energy off Target (\%)}}{\text{Energy from the Source (\%)}}$$

Radiance ($\text{Wm}^{-2}\text{sr}^{-1}\mu\text{m}$) @ TOA
 = Radiance leaving the Ground
 * Transmission factor + path radiance.

Top of Atmosphere (TOA)

Path Radiance

Solar Zenith Angle

Zone of Trouble for RS Data acquisition!

Reflectance

Target @ Ground



U.S. Geological Survey
 U.S. Department of Interior

Note: Transmission factor assumed 1 except in 6S model. Also in arid and semi-arid regions, it is anyway nearly 1.

Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Atmospheric Corrections

Atmospheric correction (“eliminate or reduce path radiance” resulting from haze (thin clouds, dust, harmattan, aerosols, ozone, water vapor)

1. **Dark object subtraction technique** (Chavez et al.);
2. **Improved dark object subtraction technique** (Chavez-Milton);
3. **Radiometric normalization technique: Bright and dark object regression or** (Elvidge et al.); **and**
4. **6S model** (Vermote et al.).






U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues


Atmospheric Corrections: Simple dark-object subtraction Technique based on NIR band



The starting Haze value in NIR band of right image is 9 compared with 1 for the left image in NIR. This is indicative of haze in right image.




Correction:

1. simply deduct SHV in right image from each band,
2. Radiometrically correct the right image (haze affected) image to the left image (clear image).



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues


Atmospheric Corrections: **Simple dark-object subtraction Technique based on blue band**



The starting Haze value in blue band of right image is 73 compared with 62 for the left image in NIR. This is indicative of haze in right image.

Correction:

1. simply deduct SHV in right image from each band,
2. Radiometrically correct the right image (haze affected) image to the left image (clear image).




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Atmospheric Corrections: Improved dark-object subtraction Technique based on Starting Haze Value in Blue Band

The Chavez procedure uses a number of relative scattering models for different atmospheric conditions. The characteristic of the model:

1. Scattering is wavelength dependant (e.g., Rayleigh scattering); Shorter the wavelength greater the scattering theory;
2. Choose a starting haze value (SHV). Blue band preferred, but green band maybe practical as blue band may over correct;
3. Chavez techniques allows the use of digital numbers as SHV;
4. Model can be worked on a spreadsheet. All you need to do is to provide SHV;
5. The end result is a SHV for all bands from the model that will be used to correct
6. each band of each image (unless it is a clear image)
7. For your study area select all images and categorize them as below.



Atmospheric conditions	Exponent of Relative scattering model	TM digital number
Very clear	λ^{-4}	<55
Clear	λ^{-2}	56-75
Moderate	λ^{-1}	76-95
Hazy	$\lambda^{-0.7}$	96-115
Very hazy	$\lambda^{-0.5}$	>115

SHV This stands for the 'starting haze value'. This is the DN value at which the histogram in a short-wavelength band (usually TM band 1) begins to leave the baseline (see figure below).


Band This is the band from which the SHV is chosen.

Chavez, P.S., 1988. An improved dark-object subtraction technique for atmospheric scattering correction of multispectral data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 24, 459-479.

Chavez, P.S., 1989. Radiometric calibration of Landsat thematic mapper multispectral images. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 55, 1285-1294.


Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Atmospheric Corrections: Radiometric Normalization using the Brightest and Darkest Objects



- A. Brightest object in the image (concrete jungle, desert);
- B. Darkest object in image (deep crystal clear water)

Regressions: Reference a very clear image (say 1998) to all other images (e.g., 1986 illustrated here) that are relatively hazy.



C. D. Elvidge, D. Yuan, R. D. Weerackoon, and R. S. Lunetta, "Relative Radiometric Normalization of Landsat Multispectral Scanner (MSS) Data Using an Automatic Scattergram Controlled Regression," *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, vol. 61, pp. 1255-1260, 1995.

Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Atmospheric Corrections: 6S Radiative Transfer Model

Note: Second Simulation of the Satellite Signal in the Solar spectrum (6S)

The screenshot displays several overlapping windows from the 6S Radiative Transfer Model software:

- SixS_MAIN_Menu:** Contains checkboxes for Geometrical Condition, Atmospheric Model, Spectral Conditions, Target & Sensor Altitude, and Ground Reflectance. It also has a 'Start' button and a 'Save results' checkbox.
- GEOM_Menu:** Titled 'Geometrical conditions', it includes a 'User's' dropdown, a text input field 'Enter your own con...', and numerical inputs for Month (.8), Day (.4), Solar zenitha (35.000), Solar azimuth (.117.00), View zenith (.0.0000), and View azimuth (.0.0000). It has 'Apply' and 'Close' buttons.
- ATM_Menu:** Titled 'Atmospheric Profil', it has a 'Uw and Uo3' dropdown and numerical inputs for Uw (g/cm2) (2.0900) and Uo3 (cm-atm) (.0.2780). It also has an 'Aerosol Profile' dropdown set to 'Continental Model'.
- Aircraft_Menu:** Titled 'Sensor & target altitude', it has a 'Target altitude' dropdown and a numerical input for 'Altitude (km)' (.0.4000). It also has a 'Sensor altitude' dropdown set to 'Satellite Level'.
- SPECT_Menu:** Titled 'Spectral base', it shows a list of spectral bands:

21:	hrv2(spot1)	(0.
22:	2nd	(0.
23:	3rd	(0.
24:	pancro	(0.
25:	tm(landsat5)	(0.
26:	2nd	(0.
27:	3rd	(0.

 Below this is a 'Selected spectral' section with a dropdown set to '25: tm(landsat5) (0.4300'. It has 'Apply' and 'Close' buttons.
- GROUND_Menu:** Titled 'Ground Reflectance', it has a 'Homogeneous Ground' dropdown, a 'No Directional Effect' dropdown (with a note 'Constant value or file name'), a 'Target reflect' dropdown set to 'Vegetation', and a 'Target radius' dropdown. It has 'Apply' and 'Close' buttons.

Data needed for the model

From image header files:

Geometry
spectral conditions

Atmospheric information from NVAP and TOMS (course)

Ozone
water vapor concentrations
Haze
Aerosols

Are these input model data measured @ time of acquisition of the image?

Are these input model data measured @ appropriate pixel resolutions?

Reference: E. Vermote, D. Tanre, J. Deuze, M. Herman, and J. Morcrette, "6S User Guide, Version 1," 1995.

Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Surface Reflectance: (a) haze removal

1. Useful data removed?;
2. Over-correction in some places and under-correction in others?;
3. Validation (globally) is key to making this work;
4. Probably, using more than 1 method and cross comparison (apart from point 3) will bring reliability.



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Data Normalization Issues

3. Overarching correction using time-invariant sites




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Normalize based on time-Invariant Site (e.g., Sahara Desert)

calibration factor (method 1) for NDVI



Time (Start:July, 1981; End:September, 2001: month by month)

Note: getting a perfect black body within a Landsat image is not easy. This method ideal for large area studies.



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Surface Reflectance: (c) time-invariant sites

1. Very difficult to get time-invariant sites within landsat scene;
2. How “time invariant” are “time invariant sites”?;
3. Validation (with ground based measurements) is required for reliability of results.



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Data Normalization Issues

4. Overarching correction using Spectral matching Techniques



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Spectral Matching Technique: Ground measured vs. Satellite measured

Spectral Measurements made at ground (no atmospheric effects) using a spectroradiometer.....exactly at same time as Satellite Overpass (with atmospheric effects).....then “match” ground spectra (no atmospheric effect) with satellite sensor spectra (atmospheric effect.....have several 100 or 1000 global ground stations (attached to climate stations?)

2. Spectral matching and rectification

- A. best technique
- B. needs resources



@ 400 to 36,000 kms above Ground moving @ 17,000 km/hr ground



@ ground near stationary



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Surface Reflectance: (d) spectral matching technique

1. This will be ideal to correct for “everything”;
2. Costly;
3. But doable if we can tie with global meteorological stations.



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Data Normalization Issues

5. Derived products for Correction



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Normalize based on Derived Products (e.g., NDVI)

Note: The idea here is that derived products like NDVI ought to be same for same biomass (example) over clear and hazy areas (or other differences like topography) through corrections.

Atmosphere	Red	NIR	NDVI
Clear	47	76	0.24
Hazy	49	80	0.24

Red	NIR	NDVI
-----	-----	------

1. Atmosphere

Paddy	Clear	28	132	0.65
Paddy	Hazy	32	149	0.65

2. Topography

Paddy	Elevation 40 m	19	164	0.79
Paddy	Elevation 120 m	17	145	0.79



Data Normalization Issues

6. Inter-sensor Calibrations




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

What Happens when Sensors Migrate (e.g., AVHRR to MODIS)



Develop inter-sensor relationships for obtaining continuous time-series data when we migrate from one sensor to another




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

What Happens when Sensors Migrate (e.g., AVHRR to MODIS)



Apply inter-sensor relationships for obtaining continuous time-series data when we migrate from one sensor to another



Data Normalization Issues

7. Inter-sensor Calibrations




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Multiple Sensors: How do we Address Sensor of **various pixel-resolutions?**


Note 1: all datasets geolinked to 4 m IKONOS (which is not in full resolution)




8 km, AVHRR




1 km, AVHRR



57 m, MSS




60 m, ETM+




30 m, ETM+



4 m, IKONOS



1 m, IKONOS



Single pixel





U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Multiple Sensors: How do we Address Sensor of **various band-widths?**

Broad-band (e.g., ETM+) vs. Narrow-band (e.g., MODIS)
Lead to differences in radiance measured off the same target.



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues


Multiple Sensors: How do we Address Sensor of various radiometry?

IKONOS

NDVI:
0 to 0.56

Dynamic
range:
0.56


(a) Broad-bands at
NIR and red; (b)
11-bit data



ETM+ NDVI:
-0.17 to 0.45

Dynamic
range:
0.62

(a) Broad-bands at
NIR and red; (b) 8-bit
data




ALI NDVI:

-0.1 to
0.67

Dynamic
range:
0.68

(a) Broad-bands at
NIR and red; (b)
16-bit data




Hyperion

NDVI:
-0.2 to
0.62


Dynamic
range:
0.82

(a) Narrow-bands at NIR
and red; (b) 16-bit data




Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues


Inter-sensor comparisons so that we can use multiple-sensor data in analysis




IKONOS: Feb. 5, 2002 (hyper-spatial)



ETM+: March 18, 2001 (multi-spectral)



ALI: Feb. 5, 2002 (multi-spectral)



Hyperion: March 21, 2002 (hyper-spectral)




U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

Inter-sensor relationships: **ETM+ vs. IKONOS** acquired on same Dates in Different Eco-regions





Kayawa village, Northern Guinea Savanna, Nigeria (Cyan in plots below)

Eglime, Derived Savanna, Benin (green in plots below)

Akok village, Humid Forests, Cameroon (magenta in plots below)

Eco-regions from which the Data for plots is taken



U.S. Geological Survey
 U.S. Department of Interior



Conclusions



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

A User's Concluding Thoughts

1. at-sensor reflectance

is a must as a minimum for all future Landsat and/or other satellite sensor data delivery;

2. Surface reflectance

will be ideal..... But there are issues that needs to be discussed before we take this route. How reliable is it?.....this maybe acceptable route to take, if we have ground calibration and validation (but is that feasible?);

3. Mosaics

We should consider delivering Landsat data as mosaics (e.g., country, state);

4. Metadata

should include precise locations of time-invariant sites, darkest object, brightest object?.



Satellite Sensor Data Normalization Issues

A User's Concluding Thoughts

.....Data normalization should be more holistic.....we should think of not Landsat sensor alone, but all sensor data.....but Landsat could set the standards.....this will enable user to use data from multiple sensors for their applications with true understanding of inter-sensor relationships.....



U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of Interior

