The future direction for LCLUC validation activities

Olga N. Krankina, Oregon State University Curtis Woodcock, Boston University

with contributions from NELDA Project team and GOFC-GOLD Land Cover Implementation Team Environ. Res. Lett. 2 (2007) 045032

R A Houghton et al



Figure 4. (a) Map of Russian forest biomass as predicted by the MODIS land-cover product (MOD12Q1). (b) Map of Russian forest biomass as predicted by the GLC2000 land-cover product (Bartalev *et al* 2003).

Introduction

- As the land cover community matures, an increasing emphasis on validation and accuracy assessment - a difficult, somewhat unpleasant and surprisingly expensive activity
- 2. The GOFC-GOLD LC IT has proposed to support the broader community through validation
- 3. Idea is to collect ground reference data independent of any single land cover product to support validation of many land cover datasets
- 4. Intent is to supplement and complement ongoing validation activities associated with individual land cover datasets

GOFC-GOLD

GLOBCOVER (2005/6)





Beta version in review by GEO task team Dataset release: September 2008

GOFC-GOLD

Supporting Developments

- 1. Prior experiences with global land cover validation
- Emergence of LCCS and its value in promoting consistency in land cover descriptors used in legends for land cover datasets
- 3. Development of community consensus on "best practices" for global land cover accuracy assessment (CEOS WGC report)



International consensus on technical issues

GLOBAL LAND COVER VALIDATION:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EVALUATION AND

ACCURACY ASSESSMENT OF

GLOBAL LAND COVER MAPS



6

"Best Practices

Document"







EUROPEAN COMMISSION



A "Living Reference Dataset"

A set of validation sites distributed around the globe

Based on high resolution (a few meters) imagery interpreted by regional experts (the regional networks)

Checked annually for land cover change, and updated periodically

Limited set of land cover classifiers life form - (trees, shrubs, herbacious) cover leaf type leaf phenology



Categories in existing global datasets

Terminology: land cover classifiers (LCCS)









(Northern Eurasia Landcover Dynamics Analysis)



08/04/2009

Olga N. Krankina, OSU

Approach

- Combine remote sensing data (Landsat, MODIS) and local knowledge of land-cover conditions and change to validate and improve land cover / land-cover change products for Northern Eurasia
 - establish a set of test sites
 - use these sites to validate global and regional land cover / change products
 - produce a new, updated land cover map for Northern Eurasia based on MODIS data

Land Cover of Northern Eurasia

GLC2000

MODIS-IGBP 2001



GLC2000 Global Legend



BOE

Shub Cover, dosed open eventreen Shub Cover, dosed open deciduous Herbaceus: Cover, dosed open Sparse Herbaceus for sparse shub cover Regulary floode, shub and/or herbaceus cover Culvated and manapos areas Mosaic, Croptand, Tree Cover /Cher natural vegetation, 1





iropland/Natural Vegetation Mosaic 🔺

Similarity matrix for the GLC2000 and MODIS-PFT legends

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	0
	GLC-2000.LCCS (rows) MODIS.PFT (columns)	Needleleaf evergreen tree	Broadleaf evergreen tree	Needleleaf deciduous tree	Broadleaf deciduoud tree	Shrub	Grass	Cereal crop	Broadleaf crop	Urban and built-up	Snow and ice	Barren or sparsely vegetatec	Water
1	Tree Cover, broadleaved, evergreen	Т	Т	Т	Т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	lw
2	Tree Cover, broadleaved, deciduous, closed	т	т	т	т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	Iw
3	Tree Cover, broadleaved, deciduous, open	т	т	т	т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	Iw
4	Tree Cover, needle-leaved, evergreen	т	Т	Т	т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	lw
5	Tree Cover, needle-leaved, deciduous		Т	Т	Т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	lw
6	Tree Cover, mixed leaf type		Т	Т	Т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	lw
7	Tree Cover, regularly flooded, fresh water	т	т	т	т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	Iw
8	Tree Cover, regularly flooded, saline water	т	т	т	т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	Iw
9	Mosaic: Tree cover / Other natural vegetation	т	т	т	т	S	н	th	th	tb	tb	tb	Iw
10	Tree Cover, burnt	т	Т	Т	т	ts	th	th	th	tb	tb	tb	lw
11	Shrub Cover, closed-open, evergreen		ts	ts	ts	S	sh	sh	sh	sb	sb	sb	Iw
12	Shrub Cover, closed-open, deciduous	ts	ts	ts	ts	S	sh	sh	sh	sb	sb	sb	lw
13	Herbaceous Cover, closed-open	th	th	th	th	sh	Н	Н	Н	hb	hb	hb	lw
14	Sparse Herbaceous or sparse shrub cover	tb	tb	tb	tb	sb	hb	hb	hb	В	В	В	Iw
15	Regularly flooded shrub and/or herbaceous cover	ts	ts	ts	ts	S	н	н	н	hb	hb	hb	Iw
16	Cultivated and managed areas	th	th	th	th	sh	Н	Н	Н	hb	hb	hb	lw
17	Mosaic: Cropland / Tree Cover / Other natural vegetation	Т	Т	Т	Т	S	н	н	н	hb	hb	hb	Iw

15

4/8/2009

Agreement in dominant vegetation cover (54%)



Agreement matrix for GLC-2000 and MODIS.PFT dominant vegetation types excluding water, 1000 km²

	MODIS.PFI					
GLC-2000	Tree	Shrub	Herbaceous	Barren		Agreement
Tree	2,395	1,697	351	7	4,450	54%
Shrub	200	1,922	105	31	2,258	85%
Herbaceous	24	698	160	34	916	17%
Barren	12	973	64	183	1,232	15%
	2,630	5,290	680	255	8,855	
Agreement	91%	36%	23%	72%		<u>53%</u>







NELDA Test Sites







4/8/2009

Olga N. Krankina, OSU



NELDA Test Sites



St. Petersburg



Approaches to validation

- -Visual comparison
- -Comparison of class areas
- -Confusion matrices
 - -% agreement
 - -per-class omission/comission errors



















Comparison of class areas



Carpathians

Chita



Deriving confusion matrix: example for one 1 km pixel



1 km

4/8/2009

Agreement matrix for St. Petersburg site, km²

GLC-2000		NELDA la						
	Trees	Shrubs	Herbaceous	Barren	Water	Commission		
Trees	11,264	1,103	2,635	177	298	4,213		
Shrubs	1	2	2	1	0	5		
Herbaceous	324	444	926	97	32	1,499		
Barren	39	44	96	239	25	404		
Mosaics	535	671	1,349	133	33	2,186		
Water	167	33	87	47	940	1,107		
Omission	1,066	1,194	2,460	517	1,030			
	<u> Agreement = 73.2%, Kappa = 50.5%</u>							

Agreement of coarse resolution and Landsat-based maps at NELDA sites



9.9%

79.2%

74.5%

65.7%

All Pixels



Komi Landsat Classification Comparison to Global Products





Carpathians Landsat Classification Comparison to Global Products

4/8/2009

Take home messages

Map selection matters
Map performance depends on location and classes of interest





40

Olga N. Krankina, OSU

4/8/2009

Percent forest cover loss, 2000 to 2005

Percent forest cover loss, 2000 to 2005





Vegetated

Tree Evergreen Needleleaved Closed
Tree Evergreen Needleleaved Open
Tree Deciduous Needleleaved Closed
Tree Deciduous Needleleaved Open
Tree Deciduous Broadleaved Closed
Tree Deciduous Broadleaved Open



Nonvegetated





E.

Conclusions

- Validation of LC maps is a pressing need
 - currently activities are very limited
- Community consensus on general framework for global land cover validation and accuracy assessment
 - efficiency of validation network is essential
 - independent of any single land cover product to support validation of many land cover datasets
 - global network with stratification by geographic regions, areas where maps differ, important rare land-cover classes
 - quantitative results to guide users (including error matrix for each map and region)
- Details of validation methods are evolving
 - VCF and land cover change maps
- Expanding the network of validation sites requires community effort

4/8/2009

Olga N. Krankina, OSU

