

PICSCAR Initiative presentation 14/11/2024 – GSICS

Béatrice Berthelot Patrice Henry





IVOS 27 recommendations (Nov. 2015)

- To establish a task group/project to coordinate the communities work on PICS. With the main objective to improve the characterisation of the sites and enhance calibration methods based on these sites
- Leadership has been taken by Patrice Henry (CNES) with the objective to facilitate the coordination and help prioritise research on PICS and their usage.
- PICSCAR Working group : CNES, SDSU, JPL, Argans, NPL, ESA, USGS





Task 1Inventory of existing data, methods and results







- Priority subjects to adress
 - Based on questionnaire sent to to assess user practices (in terms of site) and identify future needs
 - 1.BRDF behaviour
 - 2.Spectral characterization
 - 3. Atmosphere properties
 - 4. Temporal Stability
 - 5. Combining multiple sites calibration results
 - 6.Revisiting the sites





PICSCAR Outcome

- 14 agencies or companies
- 33 sensors (multi resolution)
- 30 sites of interest

6 CEOS PICS ranked in the top of the list





To concentrate our efforts we firstly choose to focus on Libya 4 site





Task 2 BRDF Modelling





PICS BRDF modelling

- Site stability can be assessed using BOA reflectances corrected from BRDF effects
- Applying a normalisation based on a Snyder BRDF model derived from recalibrated PARASOL data

Snyder BRDF model Site L4, Sensor PA @670 - theta_s 30°



Computation of a 'large scale' BRDF model using POLDER/PARASOL recalibrated long time-series (2005-2013) performed by CNES

- BRDF modelling using Snyder modelling
- Linear model
- 7 parameters
- Fitted in GREEN, RED, NIR wavelengths

BRDF normalisation has been applied to the full dataset



Interest and limitation of the BRDF normalisation







Overcorrected reflectance in backscattering conditions



BRDF normalisation: MISR sensor





Cones

magellium



• Mean residue different between east and west viewing condition (-0.0033/0.0058)









\implies Need for an improved BRDF model

- Improvement of the cloud screening
- > Taking into account different sensors
- New inversion method





Task 3 Sensitivity of the desert intercalibration method (on High Resolution data)







How different can intercalibration results be over the same site ?

- Intercalibration over Libya4 small site of Landsat 8/OLI versus Sentinel 2A/MSI
- 5 groups involved: SDSU, CNES, NASA, ESA MPC, and PICSCAR teams
- Over 8 years regularly published on the PICSCAR portal



Libya4 Small site 20 x 20 km² Centered on 28.55 °N, 23.89 °E

Comparison is assessed by monitoring the ratio of L8 TOA reflectances / S2A TOA reflectance based on different independent and well documented methods





Results of the comparison

Very good coherence versus the official radiometric calibration Slight discrepency for NIR band (-0.5%)

Results are consistent for Red and NIR bands Relatively consistent for Green band, and more different for Blue band.

Temporal trending very similar for all teams (flat !)



Main discrepancies due to: cloud screening and spectral interpolation





 \Rightarrow Stress the need for using several sites to provide intercalibration results



2025

2025

Task 4 Building a PICS Data Base





Building a PICS Data Base

• The study has been extended to 6 PICS from data acquired from launch up to June 2024



- Database has been updated from last collections of sensors over the 6 CEOS selected PICS
- Complete site extraction and storage
- Soon available from PICSCAR portal





Data distribution per sensor and per site



Nearly 200000 site extracted images stored in the data base





Task 5 Cloud coverage of the sites





Cloud screening is necessary in order to assess site stability

• Except for MODIS only official cloud mask at Level 1 is available

Cloud detection is difficult over bright surfaces such as desert





Examples of time series with/without clouds











muillagem

Examples of time series with/without clouds









10/09/2024



məgellium

Examples of time series with/without clouds









10/09/2024



muillagem

Confidence in MODIS cloud mask

- MODIS Cloud Mask level 2 product appears to be rather good over deset areas
- Underdetection is more problematic than over detection, in particular when cloud coverage is low



Mean monthly cloud coverage over Libya4 site

Mean monthly cloud coverage over Algeria3 site



Very high discrepancies for Libya 4

More consistent for Algeria 3



10/09/2024

NB: Level 1 cloud mask used except for MODIS (level 2 MOD/MYD 035)



Comparison of PICS cloud coverage as seen by 2 different sensors

PICS mean monthly cloud coverage estimated by MODIS Aqua



Rather consistent for all sites: lowest in summer More significant for Libya 4 Much less for Mauritania1 PICS mean monthly cloud coverage estimated by Sentinel 3B SLSTR



Rather consistent for all sites Except Mauritania1 No strong differences all along the year



Comparison of PICS cloud coverage for morning and afternoon overpass

PICS mean monthly cloud coverage estimated by MODIS Aqua

PICS mean monthly cloud coverage estimated by MODIS Terra



Low differences between morning and afternoon overpasses





Impact of cloud/cloud shadow underestimation

- Intercalibration performed with different levels of cloud screening
- Cloud underestimation introduces a bias
 - Main effect for the blue band (low reflectance)
 - Less than 2% for NIR band



14/11/2024

Ccnes

magellium

Task 6 Sites stability







For 1 site (Libya4), 1 sensor (MODIS AQUA)

BOA normalised reflectance in Green, Red, and NIR channels



Band Npt	mean	std	cv (%) Slo	ope %/year	ао	rmse	r
555 3888	0.329	0.0082	2.494	0.01	0.328	0.008	0.082
645 3888	0.466	0.0098	2.111	0.02	0.464	0.010	0.105
858.5 3888	0.568	0.0095	1.680	0.02	0.566	0.009	0.107





MODIS AQUA stability (Band 4 (645 nm)) – 5 PICS



All sensors (Band 4 - 645 nm) Libya4 site







muillagem

Statistics : for Libya4, all sensors

· · · ·	Green Band			Red Mean			NIR Me	NIR Mean	an
	mean	std	Slope %/year	mean	std	Slope %/year	mean	std	Slope %/year
MERIS	0.345	0.011	-0.015	0.486	0.011	-0.024	0.576	0.023	0.013
MODISA	0.329	0.008	0.011	0.466	0.010	0.017	0.568	0.010	0.016
MODIST	0.329	0.008	0.007	0.461	0.009	0.011	0.570	0.010	0.012
OLCIA	0.374	0.006	-0.021	0.518	0.008	-0.018	0.609	0.009	-0.020
OLCIB	0.367	0.007	-0.029	0.508	0.008	-0.045	0.601	0.010	-0.035
PARASOL	0.351	0.015	0.053	0.479	0.015	0.022	0.563	0.015	0.025
POLDER1	0.330	0.015	0.570	0.463	0.013	0.872	0.542	0.014	0.848
POLDER2	0.334	0.014	-0.316	0.473	0.013	-0.046	0.553	0.014	-0.016
PROBAV				0.471	0.006	0.117	0.563	0.008	0.084
SLSTRA	0.352	0.015	0.194	0.490	0.019	0.122	0.587	0.013	0.316
SLSTRB	0.356	0.007	0.249	0.495	0.009	0.163	0.587	0.011	0.345
VGT1				0.460	0.006	0.037	0.547	0.006	-0.026
VGT2				0.457	0.006	-0.042	0.547	0.007	0.020
LANDSAT8	0.351	0.004	-0.057	0.485	0.005	-0.058	0.583	0.006	-0.070
LANDSAT9	0.350	0.006	2.116	0.484	0.006	2.697	0.581	0.008	3.711
S2A_MSI	0.353	0.041	0.125	0.499	0.032	0.079	0.587	0.025	0.048
S2B MSI	0.352	0.034	0.388	0.495	0.034	0.378	0.580	0.052	0.520





What to be done now ?





What to be done now

- Cloud coverage to be checked for each site/each sensor to remove all potential cloud underdetection and cloud shadow in the data base
- Adjust a new BRDF model
 - PARASOL Data with an improved cloud screening
 - Completed by other sensors information
 - New inversion method
- Site spectral characterization
 - Comparison of existing methods
 - Use of hyperspectral data and sand laboratory characterisation





PICSCAR Portal update for data distribution







PICSCAR Portal update for data distribution



10/09/2024

Ccnes

muillagem

PICSCAR Portal update for data distribution





All information request could be sent to: PICSCAR@magellium.fr





