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Preface

Dear Participants,

Confronted with the ever-increasing complexity of technical processes and the growing demands on their efficiency, security and flexibility, the scientific world needs to establish new methods of engineering design and new methods of systems operation. The factors likely to affect the design of the smart systems of the future will doubtless include the following:

- As computational costs decrease, it will be possible to apply more complex algorithms, even in real time. These algorithms will take into account system nonlinearities or provide online optimisation of the system’s performance.
- New fields of application will be addressed. Interest is now being expressed, beyond that in “classical” technical systems and processes, in environmental systems or medical and bioengineering applications.
- The boundaries between software and hardware design are being eroded. New design methods will include co-design of software and hardware and even of sensor and actuator components.
- Automation will not only replace human operators but will assist, support and supervise humans so that their work is safe and even more effective.
- Networked systems or swarms will be crucial, requiring improvement of the communication within them and study of how their behaviour can be made globally consistent.
- The issues of security and safety, not only during the operation of systems but also in the course of their design, will continue to increase in importance.

The title “Computer Science meets Automation”, borne by the 52nd International Scientific Colloquium (IWK) at the Technische Universität Ilmenau, Germany, expresses the desire of scientists and engineers to rise to these challenges, cooperating closely on innovative methods in the two disciplines of computer science and automation.

The IWK has a long tradition going back as far as 1953. In the years before 1989, a major function of the colloquium was to bring together scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain. Naturally, bonds were also deepened between the countries from the East. Today, the objective of the colloquium is still to bring researchers together. They come from the eastern and western member states of the European Union, and, indeed, from all over the world. All who wish to share their ideas on the points where “Computer Science meets Automation” are addressed by this colloquium at the Technische Universität Ilmenau.

All the University’s Faculties have joined forces to ensure that nothing is left out. Control engineering, information science, cybernetics, communication technology and systems engineering – for all of these and their applications (ranging from biological systems to heavy engineering), the issues are being covered.

Together with all the organizers I should like to thank you for your contributions to the conference, ensuring, as they do, a most interesting colloquium programme of an interdisciplinary nature.

I am looking forward to an inspiring colloquium. It promises to be a fine platform for you to present your research, to address new concepts and to meet colleagues in Ilmenau.

Professor Peter Scharff
Rector, TU Ilmenau

Professor Christoph Ament
Head of Organisation
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Assessment of differences in multi-sensory remote sensing imageries caused by discrepancies in the relative spectral response functions

INTRODUCTION

Spectral vegetation indices derived from satellite observations in the near infrared and visible wavelengths, are widely used within the remote sensing community. Most commonly applied for analysing temporal and spatial vegetation dynamics is the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) [1], defined as:

\[ NDVI = \frac{(NIR - RED)}{(NIR + RED)} \]  

where RED and NIR denote the spectral reflectance measurements acquired in the red and near-infrared spectrum. Vital green plants absorb solar radiation in the photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) spectral region, which is their source of energy for the photosynthesis process. On the other hand leaf cells scatter (e.g., reflect and transmit) solar radiation in the near-infrared spectral region. The energy level per photon in that domain would result in over-heating the plant and possibly damage the tissues when absorbed. Hence, vital green plants exhibit rather high NDVI values, while diseased vegetation or non-vegetated areas feature rather low or even negative NDVI values (e.g., water).

For multi-temporal vegetation monitoring or change analysis, a combination of multi-sensory NDVI is often necessary. However, due to different sensor characteristics (e.g., sensor geometry, spatial or radiometric resolution and relative spectral response functions (RSR)) the NDVI can vary. Within this study the focus will be laid on the relative spectral response functions. Whereby, signature variations are introduced because the sensors receive slightly different components of the reflectance spectra of the illuminated target. Several studies have analysed the offset in data products caused by these spectral
characteristics and introduced approaches to minimize those variations [2]-[6].
For the analysis multispectral bands of the satellites Landsat 5 TM, SPOT 5, Aster and QuickBird were simulated by the use of hyperspectral bands from the airborne HyMap sensor. Variations to original satellite data caused by different spatial resolution or other effects are not considered by the sensor simulation and will not be taken into account for the intercalibration process.
After generating each simulated image the NDVI was calculated and the resulting NDVI-varieties were analysed. An empirical cross-calibration method was finally chosen for the intercalibration process.

METHODS AND DATA

Data for sensor simulation
The flight campaign with the airborne Hyperspectral Mapper (HyMap) took place on 28th May 2005 (12.00). HyMap acquires data in 128 bands, with a bandwidth of 15nm in the VIS and NIR region by a geometric resolution of 4m. HyVista corp. and the DLR (German Aerospace Center) carried out the orthorectification and atmospheric correction of the data.

Sensor characteristics of the simulated satellites
Spectral bands are characterized by their spectral range, bandwidth, center wavelength and full width at half maximum (FWHM). The relative spectral response function takes all these features into account and is defined by the effective spectral quantum efficiency (QE) of the detector, including features like the type-dependent sensitivity of the CCD, losses due to light reflecting and transmitting components of the detector (e.g. optics, mirrors, filters, coatings etc.) [7].

Figure1 illustrates the RSR functions of the different used satellite sensors (Landsat 5 TM, SPOT 5, Aster, QuickBird). The curves differ in shape, central wavelength location and the degree of overlap between the bands. Especially in the region of the red edge (red-NIR translation) (680–800 nm) the sensors vary from each other.
SENSOR SIMULATION

For the differences assessment within the imageries caused by variable RSR-functions the four satellite sensors were simulated using the hyperspectral image. In the first step each HyMap center wavelength was assigned to the mean RSR-value (in the range of FWHM of the hyperspectral band) of the simulating band. In a second step the hyperspectral reflectance values of each pixel were multiplied by the corresponding RSR-values of the simulating band. The sum of these products was then divided by the sum of the band-specific RSR-values. For the multispectral sensor simulation, each band was simulated according to the following equation:

\[
R_{\text{sim}_b} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i RSR_{b,i} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} RSR_{b,i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} RSR_{b,i}} \quad 1 \leq n \geq 126
\]

with \( R_{\text{sim}_b} \) as the simulated pixel reflectance value of the simulated band, \( R \) pixel reflectance value of the HyMap band and \( RSR_{b,i} \) relative spectral response value of the simulating band at each HyMap corresponding wavelength [7].

The validation of the simulation performance was analysed on the basis of a pre-processed Landsat 5 TM scene (28.05.05; 10.30 am) and the simulated Landsat 5 TM image based on an airborne HyMap scene (28.05.05; 12.00 am) [7].
The calculated reflectance and NDVI differences are very marginal with an absolute NDVI difference of 0.626% (Tab. 1). Regarding the real differences between original sensors, they range from 1 ~ 4% for e.g. Landsat 5 TM and Landsat 7 ETM+ [8]. With the marginal differences achieved here, this accurate simulation method is appropriate for analyzing the impact of different RSR functions on the NDVI.

Table 1. NDVI differences between the simulated and the original imagery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIMULATED</th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>STDEV</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDVI</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NDVI-INTERCALIBRATION**

In Table 2 variations between the NDVI of the four simulated sensors are displayed. Differences between SPOT5 and the other sensors feature the widest divergences. Another obvious feature is that the differences between Aster and QuickBird are the smallest both having similar RSR curves.

The general relationships between all sensors can be described as followed. SPOT5 features the highest NDVI values, then Landsat 5 TM, Aster, and the lowest NDVI values exhibits QuickBird.

Table 2. MIN, MAX and MEAN NDVI differences and % difference between the simulated sensors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min NDVI differences</th>
<th>Max NDVI differences</th>
<th>Mean NDVI differences</th>
<th>Differences (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPOT5-Aster</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT5-Landsat 5TM</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>1.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT5-QuickBird</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>7.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat 5TM-Aster</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat 5TM-QuickBird</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuickBird-Aster</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general a similar result was found by [4] when trying to model the NDVI inter-sensor relationship. They proposed to model the relationship with a higher polynomial order. The regression coefficients $[R^2]$ for polynomials of different order vary between $R^2=0.73$ and $R^2=0.98$ depending on the sensor pairs compared and the order of polynomial. The best correlation results were found for a polynomial of the sixth order.
VALIDATION OF THE NDVI-INTERCALIBRATION

In Table 3 the differences between the sensors after the cross-calibration are displayed. The results for the intercalibration feature a great enhancement in regard to the non-calibrated sensors (Tab. 2). Thus the differences between SPOT5 and QuickBird, which were the biggest difference before intercalibration, decreased from 7.09 % to −0.15 % or 0.16 %, depending on which sensor was taken as the target. Overall, the best results with the smallest bias errors were achieved for translating SPOT5 into Aster and QuickBird. In general the magnitudes of error from translating the sensors into each other lie between -0.15 and 0.61 %, which are good result when comparing it with the results from [3], who reached a precision of 1-2% or [4] with an accuracy of ~2%.

When comparing the results of the sixth order intercalibration with the ones of a second order approach [9] it becomes obvious that the sixth order is able to model the differences in a more accurate way. For the second order modeling the NDVI difference after the intercalibration were in the range of −0.91 to 0.80 %, being now significantly smaller.

Table 3. MIN, MAX, MEAN differences and % difference between the original NDVI imagery and the cross-calibrated image. Differences were taken between the original sensor and the cross-calibrated sensor, which is still named after its origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>original minus cross-calibrated NDVI image</th>
<th>Min NDVI differences</th>
<th>Max NDVI differences</th>
<th>Mean NDVI differences</th>
<th>Mean NDVI differences (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPOT5-Aster</td>
<td>-0.445</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT5-Landsat 5TM</td>
<td>-0.797</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT5-QuickBird</td>
<td>-0.3307</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat 5TM-Aster</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat 5TM-QuickBird</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat 5TM-SPOT5</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuickBird-Aster</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuickBird-Landsat 5TM</td>
<td>-0.609</td>
<td>0.0784</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuickBird-SPOT5</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster-Landsat 5TM</td>
<td>-0.675</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster-QuickBird</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster-SPOT5</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The sensor simulation method using airborne hyperspectral data performed well. The residual NDVI differences between the simulated and an original Landsat 5 TM image, added up to only 0.62%. When comparing the simulation result with actually proven discrepancies between different satellite sensors [8] the differences between the simulated
image and an original image were significantly smaller then the actually discovered NDVI differences of 1% to 4%.

The analysed differences in NDVI between the source and target sensors were found to have rather complex patterns, which could be best modelled by sixth order polynomials as supposed by [4] and [9]. The chosen empirical NDVI correction method then performed well, reducing the NDVI differences by 98% for the comparison SPOT5 vs. QuickBird (best case) and by 50% for the relationship QuickBird vs. Aster (worst case). When comparing these results with a second order intercalibration, reducing the differences round 94% for SPOT5 vs. QuickBird or by 5% for QuickBird vs. Aster the sixth order method, performed significantly better [9]. Also when comparing it with the results from [4], who reduced the differences by 80% and 65%, respectively the higher order polynomial performed better. Generally, the results indicate that the NDVI intercalibration is a reasonable first step of a processing chain for multi-sensoral satellite data to ensure the comparability of achieved results.
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