CEOS Committee on Earth Observation Satellites	**Analysis Ready Data** *For Land*	**Product Family Specification Aquatic Reflectance (CARD4L-AR)**

Document Status

Product Family Specification, Aquatic Surface Reflectance

This Specification should next be reviewed on: no later than 2 weeks before LSI-VC-11 meeting.

Proposed revisions may be provided to: lsi@lists.ceos.org

Document History

Version	Date	Description of Change	Author
1.0	30 Oct 2020	Initial draft.	*Christopher Barnes (USGS/KBR)*
1.1.	4 Feb 2021	Edits.	*Arnold Dekker (SatDek) reconciling edits by Barbara Bulgarelli (JRC-EC), and Carsten Brockmann (Brockmann Consulting).*
1.2	23 Feb 2021	Edits (sent to A. Dekker 20 to 23 Feb 2021).	*Daniela Gurlin (Wisconsin DNR), Joseph D. Ortiz (Kent State), Igor Ogashawara (IGB Berlin), Anthony Vodacek (RIT), Barbara Bulgarelli (JRC-EC), Nima Pahlevan (NASA), Liesbeth de Keukelare (VITO) - ingested and reconciled by Arnold Dekker (SatDek).*
1.3	28 Feb 2021	Edits after discussion with Water-ForCE and GEO-AW subgroup on adjacency, sun glint, sky glint etc.	*Joseph D. Ortiz (Kent State), Anthony Vodacek (RIT), Barbara Bulgarelli (JRC-EC), Liesbeth de Keukelare & Ils Reusen (VITO), Steef Peters (WaterInsight), Claudia Giardino (CNR), Tiit Kutser (WaterForCE), Igor Ogashawara (IGB Berlin), Carsten Brockmann (Brockmann Consulting) - ingested and reconciled by Arnold Dekker(SatDek).*
1.4	29 Apr 2021	Edits after discussion with C. Barnes and A.G. Dekker.	*Arnold Dekker (SatDek).*
1.5	15 Oct 2021	Edits and addition of references.	*Daniela Gurlin (Wisconsin DNR), Steve Greb (UW-Madison), Joseph D. Ortiz (Kent State), Sindy Sterckx (VITO), Barbara Bulgarelli (JRC-EC), Liesbeth*

			de Keukelare (VITO), Igor Ogashawara (IGB Berlin), Arnold Dekker(SatDek), Claudia Giardino (CNR), Vittorio E. Brando (CNR) - ingested and reconciled by Daniela Gurlin (Wisconsin DNR) and Arnold Dekker(SatDek).

Andreia Siqueira, GA
Christopher Barnes, USGS/KBR, USA
Steve Labahn, USGS USA
Arnold Dekker, SatDek, Australia

Description

Product Family Title: **Aquatic Reflectance (CARD4L-AR)**

Applies to: Data collected with multispectral and hyperspectral sensors operating in the VIS/NIR/SWIR wavelengths over water bodies. These typically operate with ground sample distance and resolution in the order of 10-1000 m however the specification is not inherently limited to this resolution.

Definitions

AR	Aquatic Reflectance
Ancillary Data	Data other than instrument measurements, originating in the instrument itself or from the satellite, required to perform processing of the data. They include orbit data, attitude data, time information, spacecraft engineering data, calibration data, data quality information, and data from other instruments.
Auxiliary Data	The data required for instrument processing, which does not originate in the instrument itself or from the satellite. Some auxiliary data will be generated in the ground segment, whilst other data will be provided from external sources.
Metadata	Structured information that describes other information or information services. With well-defined metadata, users should be able to get basic information about data, without the need to have knowledge about its entire content.
MTF	Modulation Transfer Function
Spectral Resolution	Defines the narrowest spectral feature that can be resolved by a spectrometer.
Spatial Resolution	The highest magnification of the sensor at the ground surface.
Spectral Sampling Distance	Spectral sampling is the interval, in wavelength units, between discrete data points in the measured spectrum.
Spatial Sampling Distance	Spatial sampling distance is the barycentre-to-barycentre distance between adjacent spatial samples on the Earth's surface.

Requirements

General Metadata

These are metadata records describing a distributed collection of pixels. The collection of pixels referred to must be contiguous in space and time. General metadata should allow the user to assess the <u>overall</u> *suitability of the dataset, and must meet the following requirements:*

#	Item	Threshold (Minimum) Requirements	Target (Desired) Requirements	Threshold Self-Assessment	Target Self-Assessment	Self-Assessment Explanation/ Justification	Comments
1.1	**Traceability**	Not required.	Data must be traceable to SI reference standard. *Note 1: Relationship to 3.2. Traceability requires an estimate of measurement uncertainty. Note 2: Information on traceability should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.*				
1.2	**Metadata Machine Readability**	Metadata is provided in a structure that enables a computer algorithm to be used consistently and to automatically identify and extract each component part for further use.	As threshold, but metadata should be provided in a community endorsed standard that facilitates machine-readability, such as ISO 19115-2.				
1.3	**Data Collection Time**	The data collection time is identified in the metadata, expressed in date/time, to the second, with the time offset from UTC unambiguously identified.	Acquisition time for each pixel is identified (or can be reliably determined) in the metadata, expressed in date/time at UTC, to the second.				
1.4	**Geographical Area**	The surface location to which the data relates is identified, typically as a series of four corner points, expressed in an accepted	The geographic area covered by the observations is identified specifically, such as through a set of coordinates of a closely bounding polygon.				

		coordinate reference system (e.g., WGS84).	The location to which each pixel refers is identified (or can be reliably determined) with the projection system (if any) and reference datum provided.				
1.5	**Coordinate Reference System**	The metadata lists the coordinate reference system that has been used.	As threshold.				
1.6	**Map Projection**	The metadata lists the map projection that has been used and any relevant parameters required in relation to use of data in that map projection.	As threshold.				
1.7	**Geometric Correction Methods**	Not required. The user is not explicitly advised of the geometric correction source and methods.	Information on geometric correction methods should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page, including reference database and auxiliary data such as elevation model(s) and reference chip-sets.				
1.8	**Geometric Accuracy of the Data**	Not required. The user is not provided with results of geometric accuracy assessments pertaining to the dataset.	The metadata includes metrics describing the assessed geodetic accuracy of the data, expressed units of the coordinate system of the data. Accuracy is assessed by independent verification (as well as internal model-fit where applicable). Uncertainties are expressed quantitatively, for example, as root mean square error (RMSE) or Circular Error Probability (CEP90, CEP95), etc.				

			Note 1: Information on geometric accuracy of the data should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.				
1.9	**Instrument**	The instrument used to collect the data is identified in the metadata.	As threshold, but information should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page with references to the relevant CEOS Missions, Instruments, and Measurements Database record.				
1.10	**Spectral Bands**	The central wavelength and full width at half maximum for each spectral band for which data is included is identified in the metadata, expressed in SI units.	As threshold, with instrument spectral response details (e.g., full spectral response function) also included or directly accessible using details in the metadata. Central wavelength and bandwidth at full-width half maximum value of the relative spectral response function are provided at least. *Note 1: Information on spectral bands should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.*				
1.11	**Sensor Calibration**	Not required. The general metadata does not include sensor calibration details. However, it is essential to know if the sensor has been calibrated (Yes/No).	Sensor calibration parameters are identified in the metadata, or can be accessed using details included in the metadata. Ideally this would support machine-to-machine access. *Note 1: Information on sensor calibration should be available*				

			in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.				
1.12	**Radiometric Accuracy**	Not required, but the number of bits is required (e.g. 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 etc.).	The metadata includes metrics describing the assessed absolute radiometric uncertainty of the version of the data or product, expressed as absolute radiometric uncertainty relative to appropriate, known reference sites and standards (for example, pseudo-invariant calibration sites, rigorously collected field spectra, PICS, Rayleigh, DCC, etc.) *Note 1: Information on radiometric accuracy should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.*				
1.13	**Algorithms**	All algorithms, and the sequence in which they were applied in the generation process, are identified in the metadata. For example, these may be available through Algorithm Theoretical Basis documents. *Note 1: Information on algorithms should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.*	As threshold, but only algorithms that have been published in a peer-reviewed journal. *Note 1: It is possible that high quality corrections are applied through non-disclosed processes. CARD4L does not per-se require full and open data and methods. Note 2: Information on algorithms should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.*				
1.14	**Auxiliary Data**	The metadata identifies the sources of auxiliary data used in the generation	As threshold, but information on auxiliary data should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page and is				

		process, ideally expressed as a single DOI landing page. *Note 1: Auxiliary data includes DEMs, aerosols, land mask, bathymetry, NO$_2$, etc. data sources.*	also available for free online download, contemporaneously with the product or through a link to the source.				
1.15	**Processing Chain Provenance**	Not required.	Information on processing chain provenance should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page containing detailed description of the processing steps used to generate the product, including the versions of software used, giving full transparency to the users.				
1.16	**Data Access**	Information on data access should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page. *Note 1: Manual and offline interaction action (e.g., login) may be required.*	As threshold.				
1.17	**Overall Data Quality**	Machine-readable metrics describing the overall quality of the data are included in the metadata, at minimum the cloud cover extent, i.e.: • Proportion of observations over land and over water affected by non-target phenomena, e.g., cloud and cloud shadows.	As threshold.				

Per-Pixel Metadata

The following minimum metadata specifications apply to each pixel. Whether the metadata are provided in a single record relevant to all pixels, or separately for each pixel, is at the discretion of the data provider. Per-pixel metadata should allow users to <u>discriminate between</u> (choose) observations on the basis of their individual suitability for application.

#	Item	Threshold (Minimum) Requirements	Target (Desired) Requirements	Threshold Self-Assessment	Target Self-Assessment	Self-Assessment Explanation/ Justification	Comments
2.1	**Metadata Machine Readability**	Metadata is provided in a structure that enables a computer algorithm to be used to consistently and automatically identify and extract each component part for further use.	As threshold.				
2.2	**No Data**	Pixels that do not correspond to an observation (e.g., 'empty pixels/invalid observation/below noise floor') are flagged.	As threshold.				
2.3	**Per-pixel Assessment**	The metadata identifies pixels for which the per-pixel tests (below) have not all been successfully completed. *Note 1: This may be the result of missing ancillary data for a subset of the pixels.*	The metadata identifies which tests have, and have not, been successfully completed for each pixel.				
2.4	**Saturation**	Metadata indicates where one or more spectral bands are saturated.	Metadata indicates which pixels are saturated for each spectral band.				
2.5	**Cloud**	Metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed as being cloud.	As threshold, information on cloud detection should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page along				**Threshold references:** N/A **Target references:** Foga et al., 2017; Zhu &

2.6	**Cloud Shadow**	Metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed as being cloud shadow.	As threshold, but information on cloud shadow detection should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.				Woodcock, 2012; Zhu et al., 2015
2.7	**Land/Water Mask**	The metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed as being land or water. Information on land/water mask should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** Brockmann et al., 2015; Jones, 2019; Mikelsons et al., 2021; Pekel et al, 2016 **Target references:** As threshold.
2.8	**Sea/Lake/River Ice Mask**	The metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed as being sea/lake/river ice or not. Information on sea/lake/river ice mask should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** C-GLOPS2, 2018; Dworak et al., 2021; Liu & Key, 2019; Liu et al., 2016; Robinson et al., 2003 **Target references:** As threshold.
2.9	**Sun Glint**	The metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed as absent or correctable (moderate), or uncorrectable (severe) Sun glint. *Note 1: Sun glint is deemed uncorrectable if the upper limit of the dynamic range of a sensor is reached (i.e., saturation occurs).*	The metadata indicates the amount of Sun glint for each pixel and band.				**Threshold references:** Botha et al., 2016; Bourg, 2014; Kay et al., 2013 **Target references:** Colin, 2014
2.10	**Sky Glint**	Not required.	The metadata indicates the amount of sky glint for each pixel and band.				Sky glint is the at-water-surface reflected component of the

							diffuse downwelling irradiance. **Threshold references:** N/A **Target references:** Colin, 2014
2.11	**Whitecap/Foam Mask**	The metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed as affected by whitecaps or foam as a function of the wind speed or other.	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** Dierssen, 2021; Dierssen, 2019; Frouin et al., 2019; Koepke, 1984; Moore et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2017 **Target references:** As threshold.
2.12	**Solar and Viewing Geometry**	The metadata provides average solar and sensor viewing azimuth and zenith angles.	As threshold.				
2.13	**Adjacency Effects**	When available, provide risk of per-pixel adjacency effects contamination, through flagging to denote per-pixel minimum – medium – high adjacency effects contamination. (Note: often occurring increased turbidity or optically shallow water near shorelines may confuse this assessment). *Note 1: The present state-of-the-art might not yet be mature for it. The wording "best guess" might be added to account for it.*	The metadata indicates the amount of per-pixel adjacency effects contamination. (Note: often occurring increased turbidity or optically shallow water near shorelines may confuse this assessment).				**Threshold references:** Botha et al., 2016; Bulgarelli & Zibordi, 2020; Bulgarelli & Zibordi, 2018a; Bulgarelli & Zibordi, 2018b **Target references:** Botha et al., 2016; Bulgarelli & Zibordi, 2020; Bulgarelli & Zibordi, 2018a; Bulgarelli & Zibordi, 2018b
2.14	**Floating Vegetation/S**	The metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** Matthews et al., 2012;

	urface Scum Mask	as affected by floating vegetation/surface scum.					Bresciani et al., 2014; Matthews & Odermatt, 2015 **Target references:** As threshold.
2.15	**Aerosol Optical Depth Parameters**	Either per-pixel spectral AOD, or per-pixel AOD (550nm) and Angstrom exponent.	As threshold.				This might be an input or an output parameter. **Threshold references:** De Keukelaere et al., 2018; Ilori et al., 2019; Pahlevan et al., 2021; Pahlevan et al., 2017; Vanhellemont, 2019 **Target references:** As threshold.
2.16	**Deep/Shallow Water**	Not required.	The metadata indicates where available: the bottom depth referenced to the mean sea level for the oceans and referenced to mean levels for lakes. Information on bathymetry should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.				
2.17	**Optically Deep or Optically Shallow Assessment**	The metadata indicates, based on likelihood (bathymetry maps and average K_d (preferred) or based on turbidity or Secchi disk transparency), whether water pixels may be optically deep or optically shallow. This will most likely be bathymetry map contour based.	Based on an assessment from an inversion algorithm that estimates the optically deep or optically shallow per- pixel status.				Optically deep = there is no measurable reflectance or radiance signal from the substratum at the water surface; optically shallow= there is a measurable signal from the substratum in the above surface radiance or reflectance **Threshold references:** Kutser et al., 2020

							Target references: Brando et al., 2009; Dekker et al., 2011
2.18	Turbid Water Flag	The metadata indicates whether a pixel is assessed as being turbid or not. Information on turbid water mask should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.	As threshold.				Problem: who determines at which value water is classified as "turbid" and where it applies? **Threshold references:** Morel & Bélanger, 2006; Morel & Gentili, 2008; Robinson et al., 2003 **Target references:** As threshold.
2.19	Bidirectional Reflectance Distribution Function Applied	Not required.	Metadata indicates which pixels are corrected for BRDF effects.				**Threshold references:** N/A **Target references**: Fan et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2011; Mobley et al., 2016; Park and Ruddick, 2005; Soppa et al., 2021
2.20	Altitude (ASL)	The metadata indicates approximate altitude (ASL) of water body pixels is required for atmospheric correction (range = -430 to ~6500m)	As threshold.				

Radiometric and Atmospheric Corrections

The following requirements must be met for all pixels in a collection. The requirements indicate both the necessary outcomes (3.1-3.3) and the minimum steps necessary to be deemed to have achieved those outcomes (3.4 onwards). Radiometric corrections must lead to a valid measurement of aquatic reflectance.

#	Item	Threshold (Minimum) Requirements	Target (Desired) Requirements	Threshold Self-Assessment	Target Self-Assessment	Self-Assessment Explanation/ Justification	Comments
3.1	**Measurement**	Pixel values that are expressed as a measurement of the Aquatic Reflectance (AR=pi*R_{rs}) or the Remote Sensing Reflectance (sr^{-1}) of the water bodies. This is a dimensionless value.	Aquatic Reflectance or Remote Sensing Reflectance measurements are SI traceable (see also 1.1).				
3.2	**Measurement Uncertainty**	Not required. *Note 1: In current practice, users determine fitness for purpose based on knowledge of the lineage of the data, rather than on a specific estimate of measurement uncertainty.*	An estimate of the uncertainty of the values is provided in measurement units. Following Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement (GUM). *Note 1: This is a requirement for SI traceability. See also 1.1.* *Note 2: Information on measurement uncertainty should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.*				**Threshold references:** N/A **Target references:** JCGM, 2008; Pahlevan et al., 2021; Warren et al., 2021; Xiaohan et al., in press; Zheng & DiGiacomo, 2017
3.3	**Measurement Normalisation**	Not required.	Measurements are normalised for solar and viewing conditions, including BRDF correction (see also 3.14). *Note 1: Information on measurement normalisation should be available in the*				**Threshold references:** N/A **Target references:** Fan et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2011; Mobley et al., 2016; Park and Ruddick, 2005; Soppa et al., 2021

			metadata as single DOI landing page.				
3.4	**Atmospheric Reflectance Correction**	Metadata indicates corrections are applied for molecular (Rayleigh) scattering and aerosol scattering and absorption. Metadata contains a single DOI landing page with references to a citable peer-reviewed algorithm, technical documentation regarding the implementation of that algorithm and the sources of ancillary data used to make corrections. *Note 1: Examples of technical documentation include an Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, product user guide, etc.*	As threshold.				
3.5	**Water Vapour Corrections**	Corrections are applied for water vapour if spectral bands are affected. Metadata contains a single DOI landing page with references to a citable peer-reviewed algorithm, technical documentation regarding the implementation of that algorithm. *Note 1: Examples of technical documentation include an Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, product user guide, etc.*	As threshold.				

3.6	**Ozone Corrections**	Data is corrected for ozone if spectral bands are affected. Relevant metadata must be provided under 1.8 and 1.9. Metadata contains a single DOI landing page with references to a citable peer-reviewed algorithm, technical documentation regarding the implementation of the ozone correction algorithm.	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** De Keukelaere et al., 2018; Harmel et al., 2018; Pahlevan et al., 2021; Pahlevan et al., 2017; Vanhellemont, 2019 **Target references:** As threshold.
3.7	**Other Trace Gaseous Absorption Corrections**	Data is corrected for other trace gaseous absorption if spectral bands are affected. Relevant metadata must be provided under 1.8 and 1.9. Metadata contains a single DOI landing page with references to a citable peer-reviewed algorithm, technical documentation regarding the implementation of the other trace gaseous absorption correction algorithm.	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** De Keukelaere et al., 2018; Harmel et al., 2018; Pahlevan et al., 2021; Pahlevan et al., 2017 **Target references:** As threshold.
3.8	**Sun Glint Correction**	Not required.	The metadata indicates the surface contributions from Sun glint removed from the data if a pixel is assessed as being of correctable (moderate) Sun glint.				Sun glint removal methods can only partially remove sun glint from a pixel. Over or under correction may occur. **Threshold references:** N/A **Target references:** Botha et al., 2016;

							Groetsch et al., 2020; Harmel et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2009; Kutser et al., 2009; Lavender and Kay, 2020
3.9	**Sky Glint Correction**	Sky glint is implicitly corrected for in the atmospheric correction procedure.	Sky glint is separately assessed and corrected for in the data processing. The metadata indicates the surface contributions from sky glint removed from the data.				Sky glint is often modelled in forward models explicitly; it is also often measured with above surface spectroradiometers. However, sky glint is seldom corrected for separately in atmospheric and air-water interface correction methods. **Threshold references:** Gege & Groetsch, 2016; Groetsch et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2017 **Target references:** References still needed.

3.10	Whitecap/Foam Correction	The water leaving reflectance or radiance is corrected for the contribution from surface whitecaps and foam if a pixel is assessed as affected by whitecaps or foam.	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** Dierssen, 2021; Dierssen, 2019; Frouin et al., 2019; Koepke, 1984; Moore et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2017 **Target references:** As threshold.
3.11	Adjacency Effects Correction	Whenever possible pixels affected by non-negligible adjacency effects are identified and flagged. *Note 1: In some cases, the adjacency effects may be stronger when there are steep hill slopes due to the added effect of a surface reflected component of the landscape.*	The metadata indicates the data are corrected for adjacency effects with references to a citable peer-reviewed algorithm, technical documentation regarding the implementation of the adjacency effect correction algorithm, sources of ancillary data.				**Threshold references:** Botha et al., 2016; De Keukelaere et al., 2018; Kiselev et al., 2015; Sterckx et al., 2015 **Target references:** Botha et al., 2016; De Keukelaere et al., 2018; Kiselev et al., 2015; Sterckx et al., 2015
3.12	Floating Vegetation/Surface Scum Correction	The metadata indicates whether a pixel has been corrected for floating vegetation/surface scum or not. In that case information on floating vegetation/surface scum water mask should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** Matthews et al., 2012; Bresciani et al., 2014; Matthews & Odermatt, 2015 **Target references:** As threshold.
3.13	Turbid Water Correction	The metadata indicates whether the atmospheric	As threshold.				**Threshold references:** Gossn et al., 2019;

		correction accounted for a pixel being turbid or not. In that case information on turbid water mask should be available in the metadata as a single DOI landing page.					Moore et al., 1999; Stumpf et al., 2003 **Target references:** As threshold.
3.14	**Bidirectional Reflectance Distribution Function Correction**	Not required.	Data is corrected for BRDF effects (see also 3.3.).				**Threshold references:** N/A **Target references:** Fan et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2011; Mobley et al., 2016; Park and Ruddick, 2005; Soppa et al., 2021

Geometric Corrections

Geometric corrections must place the measurement accurately on the surface of the Earth (that is, geolocate the measurement) allowing measurements taken through time to be compared.

#	Item	Threshold (Minimum) Requirements	Target (Desired) Requirements	Threshold Self-Assessment	Target Self-Assessment	Self-Assessment Explanation/ Justification	Comments
4.1	**Geometric Correction**	Sub-pixel accuracy is achieved in <u>relative</u> geolocation, that is, the pixels from the same instrument and platform are consistently located, and are thus comparable, through time. Sub-pixel accuracy is taken to be less than or equal to 0.5-pixel radial root mean square error (rRMSE) or equivalent in Circular Error Probability (CEP) relative to a defined reference image. A consistent gridding/sampling frame is used, including common cell size, origin, and nominal sample point location within the cell (centre, ll, ur). Relevant metadata must be provided under 1.8 and 1.9. *Note 1: The threshold level will not necessarily enable interoperability between data from <u>different</u> sources*	Sub-pixel accuracy is achieved relative to an identified absolute independent terrestrial referencing system (such as a national map grid). A consistent gridding/sampling frame is necessary to meet this requirement. Relevant metadata must be provided under 1.8 and 1.9. *Note 1: This requirement is intended to enable interoperability between imagery from different platforms that meet this level of correction and with non-image spatial data such as GIS layers and terrain models.*				It is useful to note if the sensor is used at its native resolution even before geometric correction or that some resampling has to be done (as will be the case for Sentinel-2 bands at 10, 20 and 60 m resolution).

		as the geometric corrections for each of the sources may differ.				

Summary Self-Assessment Table

	Threshold	Target
1. General Metadata		
1.1 Traceability		
1.2 Metadata Machine Readability		
1.3 Data Collection Time		
1.4 Geographical Area		
1.5 Coordinate Reference System		
1.6 Map Projection		
1.7 Geometric Correction Methods		
1.8 Geometric Accuracy of the Data		
1.9 Instrument		
1.10 Spectral Bands		
1.11 Sensor Calibration		
1.12 Radiometric Accuracy		
1.13 Algorithms		
1.14 Auxiliary Data		
1.15 Processing Chain Provenance		
1.16 Data Access		
1.17 Overall Data Quality		
2. Per-Pixel Metadata		
2.1 Metadata Machine Readability		
2.2 No Data		
2.3 Per-pixel Assessment		
2.4 Saturation		
2.5 Cloud		
2.6 Cloud Shadow		
2.7 Land/Water Mask		
2.8 Sea/Lake/River Ice Mask		
2.9 Sun Glint		
2.10 Sky Glint		
2.11 Whitecap/Foam Mask		
2.12 Solar and Viewing Geometry		
2.13 Adjacency Effects		
2.14 Floating Vegetation/Surface Scum Mask		
2.15 Aerosol Optical Depth Parameters		
2.16 Deep/Shallow Water		
2.17 Optically Deep or Optically Shallow Assessment		
2.18 Turbid Water Flag		
2.19 Bidirectional Reflectance Distribution Function Applied		
2.20 Altitude (ASL)		
3. Radiometric and Atmospheric Corrections		
3.1 Measurement		
3.2 Measurement Uncertainty		

3.3 Measurement Normalisation		
3.4 Atmospheric Reflectance Correction		
3.5 Water Vapour Corrections		
3.6 Ozone Corrections		
3.7 Other Trace Gaseous Absorption Corrections		
3.8 Sun Glint Correction		
3.9 Sky Glint Correction		
3.10 Whitecap/Foam Correction		
3.11 Adjacency Effects Correction		
3.12 Floating Vegetation/Surface Scum Correction		
3.13 Turbid Water Correction		
3.14 Bidirectional Reflectance Distribution Function Correction		
4. Geometric Corrections		
4.1 Geometric Correction		

Guidance

This section aims to provide background and specific information on the processing steps that can be used to achieve analysis ready data. This Guidance material does not replace or over-ride the specifications.

Introduction to CARD4L

What is CEOS Analysis Ready Data for Land (CARD4L) products?

CARD4L products have been processed to a minimum set of requirements and organized into a form that allows immediate analysis with a minimum of additional user effort. These products would be resampled onto a common geometric grid (for a given product) and would provide baseline data for further interoperability both through time and with other datasets.

CARD4L products are intended to be flexible and accessible products suitable for a wide range of users for a wide variety of applications, including particularly time series analysis and multi-sensor application development. They are also intended to support rapid ingestion and exploitation via high-performance computing, cloud computing and other future data architectures. They may not be suitable for all purposes and are not intended as a 'replacement' for other types of satellite products.

When can a product be called CARD4L?

The CARD4L branding is applied to a particular product once:

- that product has been assessed as meeting CARD4L requirements by the agency responsible for production and distribution of the product, and
- that assessment has been peer reviewed by the CEOS Land Surface Imaging Virtual Constellation in consultation with other CEOS working groups as appropriate, including the CEOS Working Group on Calibration and Validation.

Agencies or other entities considering undertaking an assessment process should contact the [Land Surface Imaging Virtual Constellation](#).

A product can continue to use CARD4L branding as long as its generation and distribution remain consistent with the peer-reviewed assessment.

What is the difference between Threshold and Target?

Products that meet all threshold requirements should be immediately useful for scientific analysis or decision-making.

Products that meet target requirements will reduce the overall product uncertainties and enhance broad-scale applications. For example, the products may enhance interoperability or provide increased accuracy through additional corrections that are not reasonable at the *threshold* level.

Target requirements anticipate continuous improvement of methods and evolution of community expectations, which are both normal and inevitable in a developing field. Over time, *target* specifications may (and subject to due process) become accepted as *threshold* requirements.

Procedural Examples

Processes to produce Threshold Aquatic Reflectance CARD4L:

The following correction processes would typically be applied to produce CARD4L-AR Threshold:

- *No example processes are provided at this time.*

The following additional processes could be applied to produce CARD4L-AR Target:

- *No example processes are provided at this time.*

Specific Examples

Processes to produce Threshold Aquatic Reflectance CARD4L.

- *No example processes are provided at this time.*

Reference Papers

The following papers provide scientific and technical guidance:

Botha, E.J., Brando, V.E., & Dekker, A.G., 2016. Effects of per-pixel variability on uncertainties in bathymetric retrievals from high-resolution satellite images. Remote Sens. 8(6), 459, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8060459.

Bourg, L., 2014. Sentinel-3 OLCI Level-0 and Level-1B ATBD. Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document S3-ACR-TN-007, Issue 5.0, ACRI, 10 December 2014.

Brando, V.E., Anstee, J.M., Wettle, M., Dekker, A.G., Phinn, S.R., & Roelfsema, C., 2009. A physics based retrieval and quality assessment of bathymetry from suboptimal hyperspectral data. Remote Sens. Environ. 113(4), 755-770, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2008.12.003.

Bresciani, M., Adamo, M., De Carolis, G., Matta, E., Pasquariello, G., Vaičiūtė, D., & Giardino, C., 2014. Monitoring blooms and surface accumulation of cyanobacteria in the Curonian Lagoon by combining MERIS and ASAR data. Remote Sens. Environ. 146, 124-135, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2013.07.040.

Brockmann, C., Kirches, G., Militzer, J., & Stelzer, K., 2015. SENTINEL 3 – LAND-WATER MASK, Version 1.2. Technical Note S3_LandWaterMask_v1_2.docx, Brockmann Consult GmbH, 14.08.2015.

Bulgarelli, B. & Zibordi, G., 2018a. On the detectability of adjacency effects in ocean color remote sensing of mid-latitude coastal environments by SeaWiFS, MODIS-A, MERIS, OLCI, OLI and MSI. Remote Sens. Environ. 209, 423-438, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.12.021.

Bulgarelli, B. & Zibordi, G., 2018b. Seasonal impact of adjacency effects in ocean color radiometry at the AAOT validation site. IEEE Geosci. Remote. Sens. Lett. 15(4), 488-492, https://doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2017.2781900.

Bulgarelli, B. & Zibordi, G., 2020. Adjacency radiance around a small island: implications for system vicarious calibration. Appl. Opt. 59(10), C63-C69, https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.378512.

C-GLOPS-2, 2018. Lake Ice Extent (LIE) collection 250m Baltic Sea region, Version 1.0.1. Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document CGLOPS2_QAR_LIE-250m-V1.0.1, I1.03, Copernicus Global Land Service, 09.11.2018.

Colin F.M., 2014. Glint Avoidance and Removal in the Maritime Environment. Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology, accessed from https://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses/8301/ on 27. September 2021.

De Keukelaere, L., Sterckx, S., Adriaensen, S., Knaeps, E., Reusen, I., Giardino, C., Bresciani, M., Hunter, P., Neil, C., Van der Zande, D., & Vaiciute, D., 2018. Atmospheric correction of Landsat-8/OLI and Sentinel-2/MSI data using iCOR algorithm: validation for coastal and inland waters. Eur. J. Remote Sens. 51(1), 525-542, https://doi.org/10.1080/22797254.2018.1457937.

Dekker A.G., Phinn S.R., Anstee J.M., Bissett P., Brando, V.E., Casey, B., Fearns, P., Hedley, J., Klonowski, W., Lee, Z.P., Lynch, M., Lyons, M., Mobley, C. & Roelfsema, C., 2011. Intercomparison of shallow water bathymetry, hydro-optics and benthos mapping techniques in Australian and Caribbean coastal environments. Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods 9(9), 396-425, https://doi.org/10.4319/lom.2011.9.396.

Dierssen, H.M., 2019. Hyperspectral measurements, parameterizations, and atmospheric correction of whitecaps and foam from visible to shortwave infrared for ocean color remote sensing. Front. Earth Sci. 7(14), https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2019.00014.

Dierssen, H.M., 2021. Corrigendum: Hyperspectral measurements, parameterizations, and atmospheric correction of whitecaps and foam from visible to shortwave infrared for ocean color remote sensing. Front. Earth Sci. 9(683136), https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2021.683136.

Dworak, R., Liu, Y., Key, J., & Meier, W.N., 2021. A blended sea ice concentration product from AMSR2 and VIIRS. Remote Sens. 13(15), 2982, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13152982.

Fan, Y., Li, W., Voss, K.J., Gatebe, C.K., & Stamnes, K., 2016. Neural network method to correct bidirectional effects in water-leaving radiance. Appl. Opt. 55(1), 10-21. https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.55.000010.

Foga, S., Scaramuzza, P.L., Guo, S., Zhu, Z., Dilley, R.D., Beckmann, T., Schmidt, G.L., Dwyer, J.L., Hughes, M.J., & Laue, B., 2017. Cloud detection algorithm comparison and validation for operational Landsat data products. Remote Sens. Environ. 194, 379-390, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.03.026.

Frouin, R.J., Franz, B.A., Ibrahim, A., Knobelspiesse, K., Ahmad, Z., ..., & Zhai, P.-W., 2019. Atmospheric correction of satellite ocean-color imagery during the PACE era. Front. Earth Sci. 7(145), https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2019.00145.

Gege, P. & Groetsch, P., 2016. A spectral model for correcting sun glint and sky glint. Conference paper: Ocean Optics XXIII, Oct. 23-28, 2016, Victoria, Canada.

Gossn, J.I., Ruddick, K.G., & Dogliotti, A.I., 2019. Atmospheric correction of OLCI imagery over extremely turbid waters based on the red, NIR and 1016 nm bands and a new baseline residual technique. Remote Sens. 11(3), 220, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11030220.

Groetsch, P.M.M., Foster R., & Gilerson, A., 2020. Exploring the limits for sky and sun glint correction of hyperspectral above-surface reflectance observations. Appl. Opt. 59(9), 2942-2954, https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.385853.

Harmel, T., Chami, M., Tormos, T., Reynaud, N., & Danis, P.-A, 2018. Sunglint correction of the Multi-Spectral Instrument (MSI)-SENTINEL-2 imagery over inland and sea waters from SWIR bands. Remote Sens. Environ. 204, 308-321, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.10.022.

Harmel, T., Chami, M., Tormos, T., Reynaud, N., & Danis, P.-A., 2018. Sunglint correction of the Multi-Spectral Instrument (MSI)-SENTINEL-2 imagery over inland and sea waters from SWIR bands. Remote Sens. Environ. 204, 308-321, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.10.022.

Ilori, C.O., Pahlevan, N., & Knudby, A., 2019. Analyzing performances of different atmospheric correction techniques for Landsat 8: Application for coastal remote sensing. Remote Sens. 11(4), 469, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11040469.

JCGM, 2008. Evaluation of measurement data - Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement. JCGM 100:2008, GUM 1995 with minor corrections, First edition, September 2008.

Jones, J.W., 2019. Improved automated detection of subpixel-scale inundation - Revised Dynamic Surface Water Extent (DSWE) partial surface water tests. Remote Sens. 11(4), 374, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11040374.

Kay, S., Hedley, J., & Lavender, S., 2013. Sun glint estimation in marine satellite images: a comparison of results from calculation and radiative transfer modeling. Appl. Opt. 52(23), 5631-5639, https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.52.005631.

Kay, S., Hedley, J.D., & Lavender, S., 2009. Sun glint correction of high and low spatial resolution images of aquatic scenes: a review of methods for visible and near-infrared wavelengths. Remote Sens. 1(4), 697-730, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs1040697.

Kiselev, V., Bulgarelli, B., & Heege, T., 2015. Sensor independent adjacency correction algorithm for coastal and inland water systems. Remote Sens. Environ. 157, 85-95, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.07.025.

Koepke, P., 1984. Effective reflectance of oceanic whitecaps. Appl. Opt. 23(11), 1816-1824, https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.23.001816.

Kutser, T., Hedley, J., Giardino, C., Roelfsema, C., & Brando, V., 2020. Remote sensing of shallow waters - A 50 year retrospective and future directions. Remote Sens. Environ. 240, 111619, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.111619.

Kutser, T., Vahtmäe, E., & Praks, J., 2009. A sun glint correction method for hyperspectral imagery containing areas with non-negligible water leaving NIR signal. Remote Sens. Environ. 113(10), 2267-2274, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2009.06.016.

Lavender, S. & Kay, S., 2010. Sentinel-3 OLCI Glint Correction ATBD. Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document S3-L2-SD-03-C09-ARG- ATBD, Issue 2.0, ARGANS, 08 April 2010.

Lee, Z., Du, K., Voss, K.J., Zibordi, G., Lubac, B., Arnone, R., & Weidemann, A., 2011. An inherent-optical-property-centered approach to correct the angular effects in water-leaving radiance. Appl. Opt. 50, 19, 3155-3167, https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.50.003155.

Liu, X., Steele, C., Simis, S., Warren, M., Tyler, A., Spyrakos, E., Selmes, N., & Hunter, P., 2021. Retrieval of Chlorophyll-a concentration and associated product uncertainty in optically diverse lakes and reservoirs. Remote Sens. Environ., 267, 112710, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112710.

Liu, Y. & Key, J.R., 2019. Ice Surface Temperature, Ice Concentration, and Ice Cover, Version 1.2. Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document ATBD_GOES-R_IceConcentration_v1.2_Feb2019, NOAA NESDIS Center for Satellite Applications and Research, February 8, 2019.

Liu, Y., Key, J., & Mahoney, R., 2016. Sea and freshwater ice concentration from VIIRS on Suomi NPP and the future JPSS satellites. Remote Sens. 8(6), 523, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8060523.

Matthews, M.W. & Odermatt, D., 2015. Improved algorithm for routine monitoring of cyanobacteria and eutrophication in inland and near-coastal waters. Remote Sens. Environ. 156, 374-382, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.10.010.

Matthews, M.W., Bernard, S., & Robertson, L., 2012. An algorithm for detecting trophic status (chlorophyll-a), cyanobacterial dominance, surface scums and floating vegetation in inland and coastal waters. Remote Sens. Environ. 124, 637-652, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2012.05.032.

Mikelsons, K., Wang, M., Wang, X.L., & Jiang, L., 2021. Global land mask for satellite ocean color remote sensing. Remote Sens. Environ. 257, 112356, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112356.

Mobley, C.D., Werdell, J., Franz, B., Ahmad, Z., & Bailey, S., 2016. Atmospheric Correction for Satellite Ocean Color Radiometry. NASA Tech. Memo. 20160011399, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, 06/01/2016, https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/20160011399.

Moore, G.F., Aiken, J., & Lavender, S.J., 1999. The atmospheric correction of water colour and the quantitative retrieval of suspended particulate matter in Case II waters: Application to MERIS. Int. J. Remote Sens. 20(9), 1713-1733, https://doi.org/10.1080/014311699212434.

Moore, K.D., Voss, K.J., & Gordon, H.R., 2000. Spectral reflectance of whitecaps: Their contribution to water-leaving radiance. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 105(C3), 6493-6499, https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JC900334.

Morel, A. & Bélanger, S., 2006. Improved detection of turbid waters from ocean color sensors information. Remote Sens. Environ. 102(3-4), 237-249, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2006.01.022.

Morel, A. & Gentili, 2008. Practical application of the "turbid water" flag in ocean color imagery: Interference with sun-glint contaminated pixels in open ocean. Remote Sens. Environ. 112(3), 934-938, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2007.07.009.

Pahlevan, N., Mangin, A., Balasubramanian, S.V., Smith, B., Alikas, K., ..., & Warren, M., 2021. ACIX-Aqua: A global assessment of atmospheric correction methods for Landsat-8 and Sentinel-2 over lakes, rivers, and coastal waters. Remote Sens. Environ. 258, 112366, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112366.

Pahlevan, N., Schott, J.R., Franz, B.A., Zibordi, Z., Markham, B., Bailey, S., Schaaf, C.B., Ondrusek, M., Greb, S., & Strait, C.M., 2017. Landsat 8 remote sensing reflectance (Rrs) products: Evaluations, intercomparisons, and enhancements. Remote Sens. Environ. 190, 289-301, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.12.030.

Park, Y.-J. & Ruddick, K., 2005. Model of remote-sensing reflectance including bidirectional effects for case 1 and case 2 waters. Appl. Opt. 44(7), 1236-1249, https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.44.001236.

Pekel, J.-F., Cottam, A., Gorelick, N., & Belward, A.S., 2016. High-resolution mapping of global surface water and its long-term changes. Nature 540, 418-422, https://doi.org/10.1038/nature20584.

Robinson, W.D., Franz, B.A., Patt, F.S., Bailey, S.W., & Werdell, P.J., 2003. Masks and Flags Updates. Chapter 6 In: Patt, F.S., et al., 2003: Algorithm Updates for the Fourth SeaWiFS Data Reprocessing. NASA Tech. Memo. 2003--206892, Vol. 22, Hooker, S.B. & Firestone, E.R, Eds., NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Soppa, M.A., Silva, B., Steinmetz, F., Keith, D., Scheffler, D., Bohn, N., & Bracher, A., 2021. Assessment of Polymer atmospheric correction algorithm for hyperspectral remote sensing imagery over coastal waters. Sensors 21(12), 4125, https://doi.org/10.3390/s21124125.

Sterckx, S., Knaeps, E., Kratzer, S., & Ruddick, K., 2015. SIMilarity Environment Correction (SIMEC) applied to MERIS data over inland and coastal waters. Remote Sens. Environ. 157, 96-110, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.06.017.

Stumpf, R.P., Arnone, R.A., Gould, Jr., R.W., Martinolich, P.M., & Ransibrahmanakul, V. 2003. A partially-coupled ocean-atmosphere model for retrieval of water-leaving radiance from SeaWiFS in coastal waters. Chapter 9 In: Patt, F.S., et al., 2003: Algorithm Updates for the Fourth SeaWiFS Data Reprocessing. NASA Tech. Memo. 2003--206892, Vol. 22, Hooker, S.B. & Firestone, E.R., Eds., NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.

Vanhellemont, Q., 2019. Adaptation of the dark spectrum fitting atmospheric correction for aquatic applications of the Landsat and Sentinel-2 archives. Remote Sens. Environ. 225, 175-192, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.03.010.

Wang, M., Liu, X., Jiang, L., & Son, S.H., 2017. Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) Ocean Color Products, Version 1.0. Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document ATBD_OceanColor_v1.0, NOAA NESDIS Center for Satellite Applications and Research, June 5, 2017.

Warren, M.A., Simis, S.G., & Selmes, N., 2021. Complementary water quality observations from high and medium resolution Sentinel sensors by aligning chlorophyll-a and turbidity algorithms. Remote Sens. Environ. 265, 112651, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112651.

Zhang, X., He, S., Shabani, A., Zhai, P.-W., & Du, K., 2017. Spectral sea surface reflectance of skylight. Opt. Express 25(4), A1-A13, https://doi.org/10.1364/OE.25.0000A1.

Zheng, G. & DiGiacomo, P.M., 2017. Uncertainties and applications of satellite-derived coastal water quality products. Prog. Oceanogr. 159, 45-72, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2017.08.007.

Zhu, Z. & Woodcock, C.E, 2012. Object-based cloud and cloud shadow detection in Landsat imagery. Remote Sens. Environ. 118, 83-94, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.10.028.

Zhu, Z., Wang, S., & Woodcock, C.E., 2015. Improvement and expansion of the Fmask algorithm: cloud, cloud shadow, and snow detection for Landsats 4-7, 8, and Sentinel 2 images. Remote Sens. Environ. 159, 269-277, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.12.014.