



Progress on radar processing

Joint UN-REDD GEO Workshop on Measurement Reporting and Verification



Dirk Hoekman Niels Wielaard

UN-REDD/GEO workshop 23.06.2010 Guadalajara, Mexico



Wageningen University

Long-term research radar satellite monitoring tropical forest, training of staff tropical forest countries

SarVision

Unit for systematic operational monitoring implementation and consistent time-series production

Current focus countries:

- Indonesia, Malaysia, (Papua New Guinea)
- Suriname, Guyana, Colombia, Brazil (Amapa, Para)

GEO FCT Product Development Team Borneo, Guyana



IPCC: estimates should be transparent and consistent

-> Persistent cloud cover is a big problem in tropics



Purple-red: consistent Landsat hardly possible... Friedl. Land cover recommendations, GVM workshop, August 2006



Radar in the old days, but what many people still think today...:



In the past 3 years critical improvements have been made:

- New generation radar satellites with much improved information
- New processing and radar classification techniques
- Emergence of semi-automated processing chains



Wageningen Product Development team progress: Semi-automated radar processing chain development

- Horizon-1 Wide-area radar forest and land cover mapping Wall-to-wall map products Borneo and Guyana FCT Verification Site products example Borneo
- 2. Horizon-1 Consistent radar land cover change monitoring
- 3. Progress on forest degradation monitoring using radar Example: Borneo PALSAR Example: Guyana-Brazil TerraSAR-X





1. Forest and land cover Wall-to-wall map products

Wageningen team: Borneo, Guyana

1. Wide area land cover methodology: processing chain



PALSAR K&C strip data **Operational** processing Preprocessing chain has been 1 2 3 4 5 developed for Strip Radiometric Orthorectification Slope Mask selection correction correction preparation systematic mapping of: Geo-referenced data stacks - Forest - non-forest - Land cover (LCCS) Classification 9 8 7 6 Post-LCCS Validation Unsupervised labelling processing segmentation using ALOS PALSAR FBS and FBD strip data Mosaicing Pre-classified Map sheets 10 11 strip maps Tiling Overlay processing 📫



Key features of the PALSAR methodology developed:

1) Data required: **two observations per year**, **dual polarised** data required for best results (exploit extra information due to differences in **wet and dry season** for identification of wetlands and cropland classes);

2) **Slope correction** is critical for deriving reliable classification results;

3) Optimal radar classification: best to use **probabilistic method** based on finite mixture modelling and Markov Random Fields application.

Visual interpretation does not yield acceptable results Best methods not available (yet) in commercial software...

References:

- Hoekman, D.H., T. Tran, and M.A.M. Vissers, 2007, Unsupervised full-polarimetric segmentation for evaluation of backscatter mechanisms of agricultural crops, Proc. of POLinSAR 2007 Workshop, ESA SP-644, 22-26 Jan 2007, Frascati, Italy.
- Hoekman et al,. 2009, Unsupervised full-polarimetric segmentation of multi-temporal SAR data for agricultural crop type and growth stage assessment, IEEE J-STARS (in prep.)



Slope correction/mitigation example



FBS/FBD composite before and after slope correction (same backscatter scale)

Example: Borneo LULC 2007: map result





Borneo LULC map used 50m PALSAR and 250m MODIS (forest regrowth)

Collaboration with local users critical for cluster selection, validation and establishing correct relation between land cover and carbon stock!

Carbon budget Central Kalimantan Peatland							
	Average estimate						
Forest area	613,000 hectare						
Carbon stock	134,860,000 tons						





ALOS PALSAR 2007

LULC classification Borneo

Lowland forest **Riverine forest** Swamp forest Mangrove forest *Nipah* mangrove forest Peat swamp forest (pole) Peat swamp/riverine shrub Forest mosaics/degraded High shrub Medium shrub Ferns / grass Grassland Cropland (upland) Cropland (irrigated) Plantations (oil palm) Tree cover, burnt Water bodies Layover /Shadow No strip coverage Mountain forest





Single-year overall result: 85.5% full agreement and 7.8% 'partial agreement'.

	Lowland forest	Riverine forest	Swamp forest	Mangrove forest	<i>Nipah</i> mangrove	Peat swamp orest (pole)	Peat swamp/riverine	Forest mosaics/degrad	High shrub	Medium shrub	Ferns / grass	Grassland	Cropland (upland)	Crophand (imigated)	Plantarioris (oil palm)	Tree cover, burnt	Water bodies
Lowland forest	99.3	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.9	0.0	73.2	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Riverine forest	0.0	58.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.7	15.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	0.0
Swamp forest	0.0	0.0	72.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Mangrove forest	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.1	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nipah mangrove forest	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	57.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Peat swamp forest (pole)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	77.2	39.2	0.0	18.1	21.9	0.0	6.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Peat swamp/riverine shrub	0.0	22.3	0.1	0.5	1.3	2.2	59.1	0.0	12.5	24.3	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
Forest mosaics/degraded	0.5	0.2	0.1	9.7	0.0	2.0	0.0	23.0	0.1	19.3	0.0	0.2	3.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
High shrub	0.0	0.1	0.0	5.6	1.8	0.1	1.6	0.1	27.3	6.4	0.3	0.7	22.9	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.0
Medium shrub	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.6	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ferns / grass	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	99.7	10.3	12.4	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grassland	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.2	3.9	0.0	58.0	2.0	0.2	5.6	0.0	0.0
Cropland (upland)	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cropland (irrigated)	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	78.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Plantations (oil palm)	0.0	0.4	4.0	0.1	27.5	0.0	0.1	0.2	24.7	0.6	0.0	24.3	3.0	0.0	93.8	0.0	0.0
Tree cover, burnt	0.0	18.0	11.0	0.0	0.3	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	92.0	0.0
Water bodies	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	3.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Layover /Shadow	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No strip coverage	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mountain forest	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Full agreement = 85,48% Partial agreement = 7,79% Disagreement = 4,10% Minor confusion cases = 2,63%

Note: bare areas and urban areas to be derived from other sensors







Example: Guyana LULC 2007: map result





Tentative LULC map 2007

Vegetation stratification

Vegetation Type	Associated Biomass level	Map Color
Seasonally Flooded Forest	High	
Lowland Mixed forest	High	
Lowland Mixed forest	High - Med	
Lowland Mixed forest	Med	
Montane-mixed forest	High	
Montane-mixed forest	High - Med	
Lowland Shrublands	Med	
Lowland Shrublands	Med - Low	
Upland Shrublands	Med	
Upland Shrublands	Med - Low	
Lowland Savannas	Med - Low	
Lowland Savannas	Low	
Lowland Savannas	Very Low	
Upland Savannas	Med - Low	
Upland Savannas	Low	
Degraded vegetation- flooded	Med-Low	
Agriculture-	Various	
Bare	Very Low	
Water	-	





Left: PALSAR vegetation type map 2007. Dark green: mixed forest high biomass, Light green: mixed forest medium biomass, Mint green: seasonally flooded forest, Orange: shrubland, Yellow: savannah, Red: bare.

Right: Landsat ETM+ 2005.

Example: Guyana LULC 2007: map result





Similarly to Borneo: some shrubland detection problems (slight underestimation)





1. Forest and land cover FCT ND Verification Sites

Wageningen team: Borneo, Guyana Example Borneo BOR-3 Central Kalimantan





ASAR 2009

CosmoSkymed 2009

PALSAR 2009

TerraSAR-X 2009





Landsat 2007

PALSAR 2007

Horizon-1 FNF

Horizon-1 LULC







- Cropland Dry land agriculture
- Cropland Rice paddy fields
- E Forest mosaics, degraded
- Grasslands and ferns (herbaceous)
- Lowland evergreen broadleaved forest (low pole swamp forest)
- Lowland evergreen broadleaved forest (mixed swamp forest)
- Mangrove forest
- Mixed cropland and plantations

Regularly flooded herbaceous cover (sedges) Regularly flooded shrub cover 📕 Shrub cover, burnt Shrubland and forest regrowth Swamp forest and woodland (riverine) 📕 Tree cover, burnt 🔲 Urban Water bodies

Example: ND Verification Site: BOR-3 Central Kalimantan







- Cropland Dry land agriculture
- Cropland Rice paddy fields
- Forest mosaics, degraded
- E Grasslands and ferns (herbaceous)
- Lowland evergreen broadleaved forest (low pole swamp forest)
- Lowland evergreen broadleaved forest (mixed swamp forest)
- 🔜 Mangrove forest
- Mixed cropland and plantations

Regularly flooded herbaceous cover (sedges)
 Regularly flooded shrub cover
 Shrub cover, burnt
 Shrubland and forest regrowth
 Swamp forest and woodland (riverine)
 Tree cover, burnt
 Urban
 Water bodies

Example: ND Verification Site: BOR-3 Central Kalimantan





Example: ND Verification Site: BOR-3 Central Kalimantan









2. Change monitoring

Wageningen team: Borneo, Guyana

2. Consistent radar change monitoring





Operational processing chain is under development for systematic mapping of consistent time-series of change:

- Forest non-forest (Horizon-1)
- Land cover (LCCS) (Horizon 2)

using ALOS PALSAR FBS and FBD strip data (50 m) and SLC (≤ 25m) data



Finding: moisture variations through time should be corrected for!

Even signatures of <u>stable</u> cover class can <u>change</u> through time



2. Consistent radar change monitoring





2007

2008

2009

2009: FBD-HH -Drops in South -Stable in North

2009: FBD-HV -Drops in South -Slight increases in North



Finding: time-series processing better than series of yearly maps



Consistent **Time Series Classification**

2007

2008

2009





3. Progress degradation

ALOS PALSAR at 25m TerraSAR-X at 1-6 m

























TerraSAR-X Spotlight mode – 1 m 1 information channel





TerraSAR-X Spotlight mode – 1 m 1 information channel





TerraSAR-X Spotlight mode – 1 m 1 information channel





TerraSAR-X Stripmap mode – 6 m 2 information channels

Used to map selective logging impact: tree felling canopy gaps, (some large) skid trails, and log markets



TerraSAR-X at 1m resolution: significant REDD+ potential

TerraSAR-X can provide information on changes at the individual tree level: systematic samplingscheme provides key input for Degradation monitoring



Left Spotlight images: R: 20080420; G: 20090817; B: 20090817. Right: logging gaps classification using simple thresholding. **Courtesy Kohl and Baldauf, Institute for World Forestry, and Infoterra**.



- Wide-area operational radar monitoring is feasible, yielding spatially consistent and timely wall-to-wall coverage of key vegetation types and changes required
- Radar time-series processing should be performed, with caution: consider moisture and use (automated) assessment of "differential radar signatures" to adjust radar signatures
- Potential for forest degradation with PALSAR and particularly TerraSAR-X individual tree monitoring on sampling basis
- Interoperability with optical sensors is strongly recommended.
 Achieving comparable results using different sensors will help to achieve the confidence required for operational monitoring



Thank you!

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the support from CEOS, GEO-FCT, JAXA-METI/EORC, European Space Agency (ESA), USGS LPDAAC, NASA/University of Maryland, colleagues of the ALOS Kyoto and Carbon Initiative, Netherlands Ministry of Environment, Indonesian Ministry of Forestry, Provincial Government of Central Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan Peatlands Project (managed by Wetlands International and funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS)), WWF Indonesia, BOS Foundation, Conservation International Guyana, UNDP-IUCN Guiana Shield Initiative.

dirk.hoekman@wur.nl wielaard@sarvision.nl

















WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

www for a living plane







WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

wwf for a living plane



















