

JRC TECHNICAL REPORT

Controls with Remote Sensing in the CAP2020+

Considerations for Member States who continue to operate CwRS On-the-Spot-Checks after 2023

> 2022 Pär Johan Åstrand, Wim Devos, Philippe Loudjani



EUR 30967 EN

This publication is a Technical report by the Joint Research Centre (JRC), the European Commission's science and knowledge service. It aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policymaking process. The scientific output expressed does not imply a policy position of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use that might be made of this publication. For information on the methodology and quality underlying the data used in this publication for which the source is neither Eurostat nor other Commission services, users should contact the referenced source. The designations employed and the presentation of material on the maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the European Union concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Contact information Name: Pär Johan ÅSTRAND par-johan.astrand@ec.europa.eu

EU Science Hub https://ec.europa.eu/jrc

JRC127690

EUR 30967 EN

PDF ISBN 978-92-76-46708-3

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2760/117692

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2022

© European Union, 2022



The reuse policy of the European Commission is implemented by the Commission Decision 2011/833/EU of 12 December 2011 on the reuse of Commission documents (OJ L 330, 14.12.2011, p. 39). Except otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/bv/4.0/). This means that reuse is allowed provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated. For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not owned by the EU, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

All content © European Union, 2022

How to cite this report: ASTRAND P.J. DEVOS Wim, LOUDJANI Philippe, Controls with Remote Sensing in the CAP2020+, EUR 30967 EN. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2022, ISBN 978-92-76-46708-3, doi:10.2760/117692, JRC127690

Contents

Ac	knowledger:	nents	1
Ex	ecutive sum	1mary	2
1	Introductic)n	3
2	Backgroun	d	4
3	Defining th	ne object of procurement	7
	3.1 Techr	nical Requirements of CwRS imagery - Catalogue of current image profiles	8
	3.1.1	The VHR profiles	8
	3.1.2	The HHR profiles	
	3.1.3	Processing levels	
	3.2 Imag	e Specifications	
	3.2.1	Image Specifications, and updating of profiles	
	3.2.2	Benchmarking specifications today	
4	Planning c	onsiderations	
	4.1 Autor	nomous sampling and zoning	
	4.2 Timir	ig issues	
5	Procureme	ent and contracting	
	5.1 Trans	fer to national budget and procurement	
	5.1.1	FWCs vis-à-vis image providers	
	5.1.2	Contracts vis-à-vis executing contractors	
	5.1.3	Aspects on respecting common market provisions and public tendering	
	5.2 Aeria	l versus VHR	
6	Behind the	e doors: Overview of G ⁴ CAP highlighting future MS responsibilities	
	6.1 The C	⁴ CAP web application vs. own application	
	6.2 The v	vorkflow	
	6.3 Imag	e Requests and Feasibility (1)	
	6.3.1	Image Requests	
	6.3.2	Feasibility	
	6.4 Imag	e Acquisition - Image validation (2)	22
	6.5 Deliv	ery, Quality Control (QC), Invoice (3)	25
	6.5.1	Order/Invoice routines	27
	6.6 Data	storage and archiving (4)	
	6.7 Data	use and sharing (5)	
	6.8 Other	r – miscellaneous	
	6.8.1	Keeping statistics (of image acquisition and of OTSCs results)	

	6	5.8.Z	Miscellaneous; consulting, IT services, technology watch	29
7	Conc	lusions	s, Recommendations and way forwards	30
	7.1	Conclu	isions and Recommendations	30
	7.2	Way f	orward	30
8	Refe	rences		32
9	Acro	nyms		33
10	Defi	nitions.		36
11	List	of figu	res	37
12	List	of table	25	38
13	List	of Equa	ations	39
14	Anne	exes		40
	14.1	VHR p	rofiles	40
	14.2	HHR p	rofiles	41

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements to Jakub Veverka (State Agricultural Intervention Fund, SZIF, CZ), Bernd Jacobs (Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture, BMELV, DE), Andreas Guenther (Federal Office for Agriculture and Food, BLE, DE), Alois Schmidtner (Bavarian State Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Forests, DE), and from the JRC: Slavko Lemajic, Csaba Wirnhardt, Gilbert Voican, and Juergen Breunig.

Authors

Pär Johan Åstrand, Wim Devos, and Philippe Loudjani

Executive summary

This document serves as a checklist for the MS who still plan to continue Controls with Remote Sensing (CwRS) as an On-the-Spot-Checks (OTSCs) regime from January 2023 onwards.

The new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) regulation introduces a new delivery model based on delivering performance through a monitoring system, replacing the model based on compliance that has been in place in earlier CAP reforms. The EU based Common Technical Specifications (CTS) for OTSCs can no longer act as technical guidance and the provision of EU financed satellite imagery (Reg. (EU) No 1306/2013 (§.6b, §.21) and Reg. (EU) No. 908/2014 (§ 26.3) to the Member States (MS) will cease.

MSs will still have the possibility to set up and operate an OTSC-like, and obviously a CwRS-like, system as their national control system. Such operation will be under the full responsibility of the MS and could involve:

- Own financing of imagery for their checks (satellite and/or aerial);
- National procedures for running the check processes the current CTS and Image Specifications offer a starting point but each MS/Region will become responsible for the definition, management, and assurance of the checks methods and image choices and to demonstrate that they are adequate and effective for their CAP checks.

This document is intended as a handover file (best practices compiling) of the parts of JRC's CTS knowledge and image provision experience, relevant for:

- substitution / adaptation of the CTS to their CAP OTSCs checks;
- coordination aspects;
- procurement of required services (aerial/satellite image acquisition, OTSC diagnosis, etc.). through tendering procedures;
- specification and validation of effective image profiles;
- verification of the fitness for purpose of newly launched sensors;
- procedures for identifying, ordering and accepting image delivery for control zones with specific acquisition windows (AWs);
- ensuring data storage and archiving;
- aspects of possible data re-use (e.g. licensing conditions, non-disclosure of 'personal information' ...).
- The different chapters of this document provide tips and technical advices for each of the points listed above.

Since the 90's the JRC has operated technological survey and provided technical support to DG AGRI and MS to help implementing the CAP. In mid-90's, the so-called CwRS was introduced thanks to the first availability of civil satellite imagery. The availability of free Sentinel data since 2017/2018, and a substantial IT evolution, has now made it possible to introduce new systems like the Checks by Monitoring (CbM) to answer to the community demand for fairer, more modern, more automated controls solutions.

It is therefore stressed that, as the Commission's guidance will not be provided anymore on OTSC (and CwRS)like systems, such CbM-like controls methods are largely to be preferred in the new CAP in order to take maximum advantage of the new technologies that CwRS cannot benefit from.

1 Introduction

With the new CAP regulation that will enter into force in January 2023, the Commission will introduce a new delivery model based on delivering performance through a monitoring system. Thus, the model based on compliance in place since several CAP reforms will end. The EU based on-the-Spot Checks (OTSC) that was attached to the old model will cease together with the provision of EU financed satellite imagery (current Reg. (EU) No 1306/2013 (§.6b, §.21) and its Implementing Reg. (EU) No. 908/2014 (§ 26.3).

§.6b – " ... Other expenditure, including technical assistance (b) the acquisition by the Commission of the satellite images required for the checks in accordance with Article 21; ..."

§.21 – " ... Acquisition of satellite images: ... The Commission shall supply those satellite images free of charge to the control bodies or to suppliers of services authorised by those bodies to represent them. The Commission shall remain the owner of the satellite images and shall recover them on completion of the work"

§ 26.3 - "...The Commission shall supply free of charge to the authorized agents of the Member States the satellite images which it has acquired. Those agents must observe the provisions on copyright set out in the contracts with the suppliers and return the images on completion of the work".

Nevertheless, Member States (MS) may decide to continue to use an OTSCs like system, whether it is Controls with Remote Sensing (CwRS) or traditional, for their internal controls/assurance system (as part of the subsidiarity principle).

The end of financial support for provision of imagery for OTSCs, implies the end of the JRC technical support to the CwRS and its operation of image provision for the MS. This will occur after completion of the Campaign 2022.

Any MS that will continue with a CwRS like system, shall from their 2023 CAP checks:

- 1. Finance the imagery (satellite and/or aerial) for the checks themselves;
- 2. Set up procedures and relative management of the OTSC process themselves.

Note. This discussion concerns only CwRS as a MS controls option. The provision of imagery financed by the COM for the EC regulated Quality Assurance systems (e.g. LPIS QA) are not covered under this document, and will not end.

This document aims to share with MS Administrations any technical knowledge or best practice, acquired by the JRC through the years of image acquisition. This should ease the development and implementation of a national successor if deemed appropriate. The document aims, through an overview of the whole image acquisition workflow, to explain the underlying options and processes such as the technical requirements, the satellite image profiles and their updating, the planning, the procurement and contracting. The document ends with some recommendations.

In summary, the discussion in this document should help MS with their standalone management of the OTSCs image acquisition workflow. It describes the various complexities, interactions, and connected external activities. These serve as best practices but do no longer represent a Commission position, let alone a legally binding requirement. From 2023, any CwRS process as part of a control system will be under the full responsibility/subsidiarity of each MS.

2 Background

The CwRS were introduced in the 90's benefiting from the early developments of the earth observation (EO) technology (airborne aerial photography) but above all from the emergence of first civil (commercial) satellites. At that time, the initiative was motivated by the need to find an alternative solution to the physical farm checks and that could have a high anti-fraud deterrent effect. After some years of trials and developments with some MS, a methodology was set and since 1993, the EC DG Agriculture has promoted the use of CwRS as appropriate control system within the CAP.

The goal of the on-the-Spot Checks (OTSCs) was to obtain area measurements and eligibility checks from parcels of sampled holdings; the general setting of the CwRS method results from a compromise between different technological, financial and staff resources' constraints. The method was mainly based on the Computer Assisted Photo Interpretation (CAPI) of High Resolution (HR) satellite imagery acquired on 2 to 4 dates spread over the main crop growing seasons over some so-called 'control zones' selected to cover at least 5% of farm dossiers. The full coverage of a country, or the acquisition of tens of dates over a zone, was not technically and financially possible. Dossier sample size, control zones selection and number of dates were assessed and adjusted to reach a sufficient level of representativeness and reliability of results.

Even though maintaining the same basic principles, the CwRS methods have evolved along the years in order to adapt to the changing conditions of land eligibility conditions with the different CAP reforms and also benefiting from the ever growing availability of EO imagery. While in the early years, the CAPI work consisted in crop recognition only, the introduction of decoupled payments has seen the need to identify some landscape elements and land maintenance rules. With the growing introduction of 'greening' requirements, the need to identify more farming practices and quantify landscape elements have also been introduced. In parallel, the access to VHR imagery (<1m) from 2000 onwards has allowed for an evolution of measurements and management of parcels from 1/10.000 to 1/5.000. (See Figure 1)



Figure 1 - Evolution of imagery characteristics jointly with their use in the frame of CAP OTSCs aligned with the different CAP reforms' land eligibility requirements.

The JRC as Commission service has always taken the leading role in these developments in order to ensure the technology uptake (e.g. arrival of new satellites), the transfer of innovations among MS and the compliance with evolving regulatory obligations. The main focus of the activity relates to clarifying concepts, assuring quality and respecting the equal treatment principle between MS.

For such purposes, since 1994, the Commission Services decided to centralize the satellite image acquisition (Council Regulation (EC) 165/94 and of the Commission Regulation (EC) 601/94). This task has been managed by the MARS Project at the JRC since 1999. The activity also involved the setting up of specifications, recommendations, performing Quality Controls (QC), auditing selected contractors, and evaluating new methods.

At present, years later, the satellite image acquisition process involves the control site definition within each MS, and a subsequent chain of image acquisition steps over the defined sites including feasibility with image providers (IPs), acquisition, validation, ordering, delivery and final archiving of the imagery (see Chapter 6.2.)

The recent (2015) introduction of free High Resolution Sentinel satellite data (optical and radar), with an unprecedented space and temporal coverage, has allowed the Commission (jointly with some MS) to launch an innovative procedure to substitute the CwRS method with the so-called CbM method. Available since 2018 by MSs, this procedure holds several advantages. Through its comprehensive territorial coverage without sampling, it also avoids risk management and guarantees fairness. It contributes to the reduction of the administrative burden for the paying agencies through the automatic nature of the processing and the possibility to avoid penalty procedures as farmers can modify their applications after an early warning (alert) and application modification.

Even as source for some CwRS methods, the use of free Sentinel data has allowed to reduce the number HR imagery purchased. These are the factors, together with other aspects of the new CAP delivery model, that have led to the Commission to stop promoting the CwRS method and consequently, to stop financing the provision of satellite imagery for such controls purpose.

As already stated, the OTCS methods are not fully banned from the next CAP programming period and MSs will still have the possibility of such solutions under their own full responsibility. What has disappeared is it common and compulsory nature of the process.

This report consists in describing the current JRC image acquisition activities to possibly help MS developing their proper in-house system, when and where it remains relevant. But to be clear, this document does not aim to promote a continuation of CwRS as a major control method, clearly, as the CbM design offers many advantages of new technologies that the CwRS cannot use.

In summary, the CwRS has developed through the years both as method, and in satellite sensor use, satisfying the evolution of the CAP 'compliance based' controls approach. But for the new CAP with its new 'performance based' delivery model, a CbM based method taking maximum advantage of new technologies is largely preferred. The new technology in the CbM design may also be considered a basis for the future Area Monitor System (AMS).

In principle the whole OTSCs workflow can be summarized as in Figure 2 below. The red shaded area is what the JRC did concerning the satellite image acquisition (and MS will need to do by themselves). The MSs will moreover be responsible for the adaptation of the Common Technical Specifications [ref i] governing their whole OTSCs workflow post-2023 (the sand coloured shaded area).



Figure 2 - the OTSCs workflow showing MS / JRC activity.

3 Defining the object of procurement

Necessary imagery will not always be freely available to a MS. If not, it will be mandatory to launch call for tenders for their supply and the associated services in support of the on-the-spot-checks (OTSCs). The supplies/services subject of these calls will have to include some minimum requirements for which the elements considered hereafter should be considered. Imagery refers to both satellite and aerial platforms. Although JRC has only acquired satellite imagery for the MS, technical specifications and procurement procedures for either platforms are similar, so image procurement is treated as one in this document.

The first and main purpose of the satellite images, is to allow the MS to carry out all or part of their CAP OTSCs up to conclusion. For these checks, at least one VHR image is needed to cover the full control zone. In addition to the VHR images used for the area measurement, the MS may use HR imagery (High High Resolution (HHR) profile see 3.1.2 below) to further support the checks, among others, of land cover type, of Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAECs), or of the 'greening' requirements such as crop diversification and measures related to the Ecological Focus Areas (EFAs) [ref i]

The different CAP checks methods used by the MS (see Figure 3) consists of fulfilling satellite image acquisition within one or more discrete multitemporal acquisition windows (AWs) over the zone. The AWs are defined to follow the crop cycle of the particular region, and are optimized for determining required agricultural practices, and therefore allow CwRS of autumn, spring and summer crops, with their relative land cover/GAEC/greening requirements.



Figure 3 - the CwRS approach used in the CAP on-the-spot-checks

The layout in time for the typical CAP checks AWs is described more in detail in Chapter 4, but the layout of this inspection source data may be:

- 1. VHR complemented with a Rapid Field Visits (RFVs),
- 2. the second main used one is the VHR complemented by n HR images,
- 3. In some areas the use of 2 VHR images (with no or fewer HR) have been preferred.

Earlier the COM also allowed the use of an autumn AW but this was discontinued as the free Copernicus Sentinel-2 (S2) imagery became available and well serves the purpose of checking any requirements during autumn or early winter (see Chapter 3.1.2).

In the recent years, the workflow management and in particular the communication between stakeholders has been performed by use of a web application Geomatics for the Common Agricultural Policy (G⁴CAP), which is described in Chapter 6.1, and ref iii.

Each MS will become responsible for the definition, the management, the assurance of the checks methods and the image choices and to demonstrate that they are adequate and effective for their CAP checks

Decisions on above will lie as basis for national specifications for the procurement of any required services (aerial/satellite image acquisition, OTSC diagnosis, etc.) to be set up by the individual MS.

3.1 Technical Requirements of CwRS imagery - Catalogue of current image profiles

In 2014 the JRC introduced the so-called "profile" approach, or satellite sensor independent approach to define satellite imagery needs for the CwRS. Two main types of profiles were retained as necessary. These are then further subdivided [ref i, ii];

- One for VHR imagery suitable for the area measurement required for the regulatory COM requirement at 1:5.000 scale American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS) cartography standards;
- One for HR imagery allowing to perform the different requested land use/land cover related checks and checks of some CAP 'greening' obligations.

The approach holds advantages e.g. easier tendering procedures, less framework contracts (FMCs) (see Chapter 5.1), and also easier introduction of newly launched satellite sensors (see Chapter 3.2) into the fleet of the IP. New sensors that fit a particular profile are simply added to the catalogue after required benchmarking (see Chapter 3.2.2).

The profiles have specifications in terms of a quality level on spatial resolution, radiometric resolution, number of spectral bands, geolocation accuracy with absolute 1-D RMSE thresholds, elevation angle, programming type, processing levels, ease of processing via commercially off-the-shelf software (COTS SW), resampling types, cloud cover (CC) threshold over AOI, ratio of acquired Ground Sampling Distance (GSD) / delivered GSD, and ratio of the final ortho resolution to the delivered GSD etc.

Further details on the profiles and their subdivision used by COM are given in chapters below, but details can be found in Annex Chapter 14 and [ref ii].

The MS are responsible for the definition of the image requirements. The currently adopted solution by the COM with sensor independent profiles is strongly recommended.

3.1.1 The VHR profiles

г

One particular parameter that is considered when defining profiles is the Ground Sampling Distance (GSD) which, for given optics and orbits, is dependent on the elevation angle (the lower the elevation angle, the higher the view or off-nadir angle, giving a coarser GSD). A coarser GSD affects measurement, and therefore the elevation angle (including the effect of the earth curvature) needs to be considered in the specification of the profile. To take an example, Figure 4 below illustrates the VHR profiles defined and where they position themselves, in relation to the curves of some sample VHR satellite sensors used.

The Equations 1 below [ref iv] gives the relation between the GSD and viewing angle (the angle α between nadir and look direction from the satellite) without taking account of the earth curvature (1) and taking account of the earth curvature (2). These equations consider the satellite altitude (h_{sat}), the Instantaneous Field of View (IFOV), and the earth radius (R_E).

 $GSD = h_{sat} \cdot \tan(\alpha + IFOV) - h_{sat} \cdot \tan(\alpha)$, without taking into account the rotundity of the Earth.

$$GSD_{c} = R_{E} \cdot \left[\frac{\left(1 + \frac{h_{eat}}{R_{E}}\right) \cos(\alpha)}{\sqrt{1 - \left(1 + \frac{h_{eat}}{R_{E}}\right)^{2} \sin^{2}(\alpha)}} - 1 \right] \cdot IFOV, \text{ taking into account the rotundity of the Earth.}$$



Equations 1 - Ground Sampling Distance (GSD) calculation without or with earth curvature.



Figure 4 - Ground Sampling Distance (GSD) vs. elevation angle for the VHR profiles.

The most commonly used VHR profile defined by the COM is the A.1 "standard" with a GSD requirement of \leq 75cm (see Annex Table 1) deemed suitable for the "standard" case. There are some specific profiles suitable for checks performed in terrain with challenging topography, or for the checks of particular features. The MS should consider which equivalent profiles to use for their particular agricultural landscape:

- Profile A.2 and A.5; were designed for control zones located in mountainous or complex topology areas applying further restrictions on acquisition angle in order to limit topographic distortion.
- Profile A.6; for controls of the Landscape Features (LF) that are included in the 'greening' of the CAP within the Ecological Focus Areas (EFAs).
- Profile A.7 and A.8; were introduced for the LPIS QA purpose (so not directly in the scope of these CwRS checks), but also for some 'near nadir' acquisition requirements (meaning these are the 'strictest' profiles

and have limits on the GSD, on the elevation angle, and on the output resampling). These strict profiles were applied only to targets where no interference with the planned capture of any other profile would occur since feasibility is particularly challenging.

3.1.2 The HHR profiles

As mentioned above since 2014, the JRC introduced the term "profile" where for the HR it was deemed necessary to have one main profile type defined, called the HHR profile. This is then subdivided in two more specific ones F.1, and F.2 (see Annex Table 2)

The term HR stands for High Resolution, but the profile is named HHR to emphasise the difference in resolution (< 3m) compared to earlier generation of SPOT, IRS, DMC etc. and now Copernicus S2 data (10-20m). It could be an idea for the MS to have both HR and HHR profiles types defined in their future management and definition of the checks methods and the image choices.

The COM financing of above coarse commercial HR imagery (10-20m) was discontinued with the CwRS Campaigns 2017/2018 as in fact the S2 data became available. These data, which are free of charge, are directly downloaded from external on-line cloud archives (e.g. ESA Copernicus Open Access Hub, Copernicus Data and Information Access Services (DIAS) Services, Amazon Web Services (AMS), USGS etc.), and may be used in any AW, but especially for autumn/winter, or HR imagery between the VHR windows (i.e. HRB1, HRB2) where both S2A/S2B are fully 'fit for purpose'.

Recently, PlanetScope DOVE imagery has been introduced in the HHR profile even if it does not include a panchromatic band. Its red-edge band is sometimes appreciated for some checks purposes, and some MS's are using it as a backup/archive solution if acquisitions initially expected from other sensors fails. It fits to the F1. MSP, and F2.MSP HHR profile. See [ref ii] for more details on this.

3.1.3 Processing levels

The above mentioned VHR and HHR profiles were defined with specific criteria set on levels of processing: geometric processing accuracies, on resampling kernels to be used, on image dynamic range adjustment (DRA) application, on Atmospheric Compensation algorithms use [ref vi], and on optimal ratio between satellite acquired GSD - delivered GSD - ortho GSD to maintain best information extraction.

The automatically ortho-rectified HHR profile F.2 can also be mentioned as a product making use of the Reference 3D [ref v] for the orthorectification process, which has been benchmarked for use.

3.2 Image Specifications

3.2.1 Image Specifications, and updating of profiles

The image acquisition is today governed by the "living" specifications for the imagery and for the image acquisition workflow [ref ii]. These are revised and updated for every campaign to fit CAP changes, to allow more efficient use of imagery in the controls, and a more efficient image acquisition. The specifications for geometric (and radiometric) benchmarking of a sensor are instead governed by a scientifically proven methodology [ref vii].

3.2.2 Benchmarking specifications today



Figure 5 - Schematic figure of JRC and IP satellite benchmarking methodology (courtesy EUSI)

The geometry benchmark stems from 2014 when the "profile based" approach was introduced by the JRC. The IP was contractually requested to follow a clearly defined methodology, see Figure 5 above. If successful, the IP could add the sensor to his fleet of sensors used for image acquisition. The geometry benchmarking has been under the control of the JRC to keep the guarantee that sensors introduced met the technical specifications [ref ii, vii]. JRC will no longer perform such benchmarks.

From 2023 the responsibility for above mentioned image specifications and benchmarking documents will lie with the PA. It is strongly suggested to implement routines for their updating, and for the validation of new image profiles.

4 Planning considerations

Each year the COM was providing the so-called CTS [ref i]. Its aim was to describe the technical tasks that the MS Administrations are responsible for even if some parts may be entrusted to contractors. It provided technical guidance on how to perform OTSCs in general and much of the information provided concerned the implementation of the Controls with Remote Sensing (CwRS).

From 2023, MS administrations will have the full responsibility to define/adapt their OTSC strategies. Their planning preparations should reflect on following (non-exhaustive list):

- the geophysical/landscape particularities of the country;
- the different farm typologies;
- the resources (staff and budget availability);
- the typologies of the different payment schemes.

The MSs are responsible for the substitution / adaptation of the Common Technical Specifications to their CAP OTSCs checks post-2023.

As part of this they will have to define their image needs and ensure their efficient acquisition and sound use.

4.1 Autonomous sampling and zoning

The Common Technical Specifications (CTS) contains relevant information for the preparation of the On-The-Spot Checks (OTSCs) campaign especially for what concerns the selection criteria of dossier sampling and control zones by use of defined random and risk proportions. It cannot be repeated often enough, that it will be the full responsibility of MSs to make the decisions to set their methods and zones for their OTSCs.

4.2 Timing issues

Up to the introduction of S2 (2017/2018), it was unfeasible technically, but above all financially, to purchase and acquire tens of images over a considered zone. Indeed, one achievement of the "COM financed" CwRS process has been to find the right (optimal) balance between the minimum number of dates (images) necessary to discriminate the main types of crops (limiting the number of and need for RFVs) and to make this at a reasonable (cost efficient) budget (at least cheaper than classical farm check). Another achievement has been to manage the timing to obtain information from imagery prior to rapid field visits in case of doubt.

The combined understanding has led to definition of above mentioned image profiles, and the main AWs layout as shown in Figure 6. Each MSs obviously has adapted this according to the features to check and their phenology, and the manpower available etc.

Any image acquisition campaign (control year, or crop season) with its OTSC diagnosis and payment to farmer is spread over > 1 calendar year (or financial year). Preparations start before the crop season (in year n-1), COM financed image acquisition proceeds through the crop season (in year n), together with the diagnosis (parcel, payment group, and application level), payments, and relative statistics (of image use and OTSC statistics). The overlap of a Campaign (control, crop year) with a calendar year is of high relevance for the financial operations (Chapter 5).

The goal of the planning is that the acquisition of imagery falls in the predefined AW and that the captured image is received without delay. One should nevertheless allow for some flexibility in case some weather or other events induces a shift in the expected phenological cycles. Further details are provided in the Feasibility Chapter 6.3.2 (and in the image specifications [ref ii]).

The Figure 6 below summarizes the calendar through the year, and then two detailed extracts from G⁴CAP (Figure 7, Figure 8) demonstrate how the crop cycle decides on the placement of the satellite AWs for the two main methods of placing the inspection source data (VHR only, and VHR plus 2 HHRs).





Figure 7 - AWs layout covering crop season in the case of [VHR only with RFV] (in dark green acquired satellite imagery, in light green VHR AWs still being programmed for acquisition by IP); (source G4CAP)



Figure 8 - AWs layout covering crop season in the case of [VHR + n HR] (in dark green acquired satellite imagery, in light green VHR AWs being programmed, and in light blue AWs still to be opened); (source G4CAP)

MS PAs should carefully coordinate all financial, contractual, and image collection workflow in order to timely receive imagery for the CwRS activities.

5 Procurement and contracting

5.1 Transfer to national budget and procurement

Today the COM budget allocated for the CwRS stems from a DG AGRI multiannual financial decision. The amount is revised every year according to a specific yearly work programme set up on the basis of the MS annual image requests (received in November year n-1). This budget amount is delegated to the JRC from DG AGRI in the beginning of the Campaign (year n) (see Figure 6 above).

This funding and provision of services by the Commission will stop by end of year 2022. MSs which will opt for keeping a CwRS-like system from 2023 and onwards, will have to finance and thus to set up FWCs or ad hoc contracts by themselves with the IPs and 'value adding contractors' well in time for the Campaign 2023.

The COM via the JRC has always set up FWCs according to the EU Financial Regulation [ref ix] for the image provision. A FWC lasts for normally 2-4 years, and allows definition of the supply and services framework and a total approx. financial envelope within which then specific contracts with detailed specifications are signed and progressively consume budget until ceiling is reached. These specific contracts accept the operational invoicing, and payments as the campaign progresses. The negative issue of making overarching FWCs is that they take some time (several months ...) to set up, and obviously you need to know approximately your financial envelope for the FWC validity. The JRC experience is however positive, and the FWCs have worked efficiently once set up.

It needs to be mentioned that the COM FWCs need to deal with requests for all EU MS participating in the CwRS operations. The set up for individual MS should be of much simpler character, therefore it could be envisaged that simpler 'direct contracts', or even 'commercial off the shelf' (COTS) image buy could be used for the MS yearly imagery. This is a decision for the MS to take.

MSs which will opt for keeping a CwRS-like system from 2023 and onwards, will have to finance and thus to set up FWCs or ad hoc contracts by themselves well in time for the Campaign 2023.

Given the MS is a public body, image purchasing should follow EU or National Financial Regulations and rules in their tendering and purchase procedures.

Budget necessary for the MS controls operations should be carefully planned well in time for the Campaign start. Every year's allocated budget should be enough for (1) the satellite imagery needed for the controls, and (2) the subcontracting of the image preparation, OTSCs diagnosis, etc.

5.1.1 FWCs vis-à-vis image providers

The COM's FWCs with the IP (or operator) implement the profile framework approach detailed above (Chapter 3.1). The object of the procurement is therefore to supply satellite remote sensing VHR or HHR profile imagery according to defined image profiles and including associated planning/scheduling activity [ref viii and ref ix]. Normally, as mentioned above, these FWCs are set up for a validity of 2 + 2 years. A monthly "basket" of collected imagery conform to specifications is created, checked and brought to invoice and payment in line with to the specific contracts signed. In addition to the imagery, technical deliverables to the MS should accompany the monthly reporting in order to control the processes. Below follows a non-exhaustive list of such deliverables as used today by the JRC:

- Improved VHR, HHR Specifications
- Feasibility Result Reporting
- Final Campaign Technical Summary Report
- Final Campaign Financial Summary Report
- Sensor benchmarking Report/s

Sufficient resources need to be planned to manage the FWCs with associated SCs and financial cash-flow.

Today, in its FWC, the COM also sets up clear objectives. A main one is that the IP must reach a minimum of 95% success rate in image acquisition on time, and according to specifications, and another one also stipulates that the IP needs to have minimum two satellite sensors available and active.

The contracts set up by the MS should clearly define deliverables, with specifications and performance thresholds.

5.1.2 **Contracts vis-à-vis executing contractors**

These contracts exist in the current CAP framework, so the MS using them have already a good experience to deal with the contracting / subcontracting of selected services linked to their 'value adding' required in the CwRS operation. Examples (non-exhaustive) are image preparation (e.g. orthorectification), RFVs or OTSC diagnosis. Some MS perform these tasks in-house, other prefer outsourcing this activity.

5.1.3 Aspects on respecting common market provisions and public tendering.

The importance of adhering to EU or National Financial Regulations [ref ix] is here re-iterated. Moreover the contracts set up must comply with EU, National, or ad-hoc rules as follows. JRC is not a legal expert, but following aspects have surfaced during the JRC operations:

- **Confidentiality** the technical management of the image acquisition for the CAP checks is a sensitive issue. The CwRS has a deterrent effect on CAP subsidy fraud and it is therefore of utmost importance that the areas to be controlled in the MS do not become known before or during the campaign (e.g. never shall a zone boundary coordinate file be sent without secure handling). Moreover, it is of utmost importance for the FW Contractor to act correctly, coherently, and transparently in the image provision, and image operations not to favour any of the stakeholders involved in the CAP checks.
- Personal data any issue of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [ref xii]
- Avoidance of **conflict of interest** that could compromise or could be perceived as compromising the impartial and objective performance.
- Clear **Collaboration agreements** e.g. between HHR, VHR IPs who need to cooperate, communicate and coordinate with each other, and with the MS Administrations (and their contractors) for an efficient running of the activities.

MS PAs are in their tendering suggested to carefully follow EU and/or National Financial Regulations, and moreover respect rules on: Confidentiality, Personal data, avoid conflict of interest, and set up necessary Collaboration agreements between relevant stakeholders.

5.2 Aerial versus VHR

The acquisition of aerial imagery for the checks has always been the responsibility of the MS. It is a wellestablished commercial market. COM's interest in any contract has been limited to stakeholder input in G⁴CAP AWs management e.g. requesting a VHR satellite image is unnecessary where an aerial flight is planned, or managing the opening of an HHR AW after an aerial flight acquisition, etc.

If a PA (or their contractor/s) intend to acquire and/or ortho-rectify aerial digital imagery, they should refer to the Best Practice and Quality Checking of Ortho Imagery JRC guidelines [ref vii]. Responsibility to use best practice and to update such specifications lies with the MS.

Historically satellite VHR and aerial VHR have both been used. Both are effective, but experience possibly tends to show that satellite acquisition capacity is more efficient. Indeed experience shows that forecasted satellite image acquisitions have never been converted to aerial, but very often opposite requests were made by MSs.

Regarding pros and cons of the aerial option, the following can be said [ref i]:

Aerial pros:

- Aerial imagery allows covering of large areas (e.g. large administrative units such as full provinces) in a relatively limited period of time,
- Aerial imagery allows covering a large number of small zones in a given region fast
- The use of (natural colour in combination with false colour composites) imagery permits an easier identification of land cover, thus significantly reducing follow-up RFVs for crop identification
- Aerial flights carried out within the present state of the art: the use of GNSS and inertial navigation systems linked to the camera makes it possible to optimise the flight coverage and considerably reduce the costs of further processing.

Aerial cons:

- Aerial imagery may have restrictions over military zones and air traffic lanes.
- Cloud cover is not as restricting for aerial photography as for satellite imagery, but meteorological conditions are in any case affecting the radiometric quality of the images.
- The lead-time in the acquisition/processing of aerial imagery may be longer than that for satellite images.
- More influenced by a pandemic situations since flying might be restricted due to hygienic rules (e.g. COVID-19)

In any case:

- Aerial images acquisition must be organised sufficiently in advance, and the acquisition periods should be relatively early in the year.
- It is the responsibility of the MS to avoid a situation of acquisition of VHR satellite imagery contemporaneously to an aerial acquisition. See comment on stakeholder input in G⁴CAP above in the beginning of this chapter.

There are pros, and cons in using aerial or satellite VHR imagery for the CwRS. MS should define which VHR source is most efficient for their checks, and to use updated specifications for their imagery, flight systems, image processing, and workflow management.

6 Behind the doors: Overview of G⁴CAP highlighting future MS responsibilities.

6.1 The G⁴CAP web application vs. own application

In order to request, acquire and deliver the CwRS images, workflow management and communication between stakeholders is today organised via a dedicated web application, the so-called G⁴CAP [ref iii].

Geomatics for the Common Agricultural Policy (G⁴CAP) is the main communication tool between the CwRS stakeholders during the campaign, making use of automatic e-mail exchange to synchronize actions between different actors. Figure 9 below details responsibilities among the actors within the system.

It is envisaged that MS that opt to continue with CwRS in 2023 will need to substitute a system like the JRC managed G⁴CAP with a much simpler, but still efficient, in-house alternative (web application or other).



Figure 9 - The overall process, the stakeholders, and their interaction in G⁴CAP

6.2 The workflow

The operational workflow of the image acquisition is shown in below schematic diagram (Figure 10). All actions with a blue coloured tag are handled by G⁴CAP. The main activities which will likely fall under the MS responsibility, are described in more detail in the chapters to follow [ref ii, iii].

- 1. Image Requests and Feasibility => AWs
- 2. Image Acquisition Image Validation
- 3. Delivery Quality Control Invoice
- 4. Data storage and archiving
- 5. Data use and sharing



Image use – OTSC Image Acquisition schematic flow diagram

Figure 10 - The OTSCs image acquisition schematic flow diagram

6.3 Image Requests and Feasibility (1)

6.3.1 Image Requests

The current MS Image Request for the campaign is defined in two steps, as formalised with specific deadlines in the current CAP regulation. The two steps are introduced to allow the MS to project their desiderata and to allow distribution of the available budget among the MS. Such deadlines are absent from the new regulations and it will be the MS itself to decide on budget distribution within the MS itself.

- 1. pre-Image Requests (pre-IRs)
- 2. Final IR definition; ZONES, Acquisition Windows (AWs), SHAPES

Step (1) allows to preliminarily decide upon total volume (area, km2) of VHR and HR (HHR profile) satellite data necessary for the MS to perform its checks. It also serves to give a budget need indication of the imagery to be purchased for the campaign (see Chapter 5). This first step is based on following input:

- <u>the MS on-the-spot-checks (OTSCs) information</u> including # applications, total declared area, expected # of OTSCs, expected area of the OTSCs, # checks for 'greening' measures.
- <u>The MS CwRS information</u> including # CwRS applications, total area checked by CwRS, % of control zone used for the checks, expected total AOI area of CwRS zones, expected number of CwRS checks for 'greening', CwRS methods (see Figure 3) and for each method the # zones, and # periods (AWs). At last but importantly the type of profiles required for effective controls (Chapter 3.1) are also be specified.

The EC reminds the MS to pay attention to the effectiveness/efficiency aspects of the image request. It is expected that appropriate justifiable choices fitting the MS particular landscape and CAP OTSC controls scenario are made. Also, the EC encourages the maximum use of S2 data (see Chapter 3.1.2) wherever appropriate. Today, to possibly check the current eligibility criteria, MS should not need more than two HR (HHR profile) AWs in addition to these freely available S2 data, and as few MS as possible should need a second VHR AW.

Step (2) consists of giving final details of the image request. This step includes:

- Definition of final control zones (shape files). See Chapter 4.1 for selection of beneficiaries by random/risk procedures.
- Selection of contractor for each control zone
- Details of final image request for each control zone (EPSG code, type of delivery, AW, image profile, image mode (e.g. pansharpened, bundle, multispectral), earliest starting date, latest start date, dead period, and whether to allow AW extensions. The EC reminds the MS that in their AW definition use suitable dates and window lengths ('normally' for HHR a minimum of 4 weeks, and for VHR a minimum of 6 weeks) fitting to their crop cycles.

Reg. (EU) No 1306/2013 (§.6b, §.21) and its relative Implementing Reg. (EU) No. 908/2014 will no longer be in force. So, the regulatory 2-step image request procedure is no longer applicable and MS can merge the steps when and how appropriate.

However, the two steps procedure is useful since the first gives a budget indication, while the second gives detailed acquisition parameters necessary for the success of the image acquisition itself, and also a detailed prediction of the costs. This expense will lie with the MS Administration.

6.3.2 Feasibility

In order to assess whether a programming request will be successful within an Acquisition Window (AW), a socalled technical and competitive feasibility assessment is made. The IPs (or satellite operator) performs this assessment based on, among other parameters, assessments of satellite characteristics, zone size, zone shape, zone latitude, elevation angle, AW, programming priority level, cloud cover (CC), weather statistics and weather forecast and finally other competitive tasking requests. All tasking is for the CwRS normally placed at priority level.

Such feasibility assessment results in classes of success probability, typically:

- A. GOOD (GREEN) FEASIBLE WITHIN AW approaching 100% probability (≥90%);
- B. MEDIUM (YELLOW) FEASIBLE WITHIN AW ≥70% probability; may need EXTENSION suggestions can be made to improve possibility of success;
- C. LOW (RED) NOT FEASIBLE WITHIN AW with suggestions to make it feasible (e.g. AW extension with the suggestion of a new start/end date, change of profile allowing e.g., a less strict elevation angle, change of a sensor or acceptance of backup) (< 70%).

For the feasibility, G⁴CAP relies on an iterative process involving IP and MS to reach acceptable feasibility for an AW and profile. See Figure 11 below which shows this iterative process [ref ii, iii].

	Commission 71	O'CAP							(14		2			-	
	,	About Us	Settings	Use	rs manager	nent C	ampaign m	anagemen	t Cw	45	Documenta	ition Pillot4	ICAP I	Contact	s Home
	G4	FEASIBILI	тү												
	020														
		Year: 25	21								Feasibility pr	oposals info			3
		Country:	_								-	Avera Fair Viet	Sier	3	
			_									Mante		0/5	
	Peasbility	Period: VH	e.			~									
										-	Pending Feat	abilities info			
			Display just	pending	Feasibilities							Panding Passible		0/8	
												Accepted Feas bill	ties	1/1	
		~	Arrestatio	-	Neiestart	selected					E	Accepted Feat bill Disagneed Fase bill Edil to be teop of	tian Refer	4/1 4/1 4/1	
			Arrest all a		Ngast at	schotter						Accepted Persition Disagneed Pass bit Still to be receive	tier See	4/3 9/3 9/3	
	(mag and see		••••••••••		Sel Kajast at	scherhol					E	Accepted Feasible Diregneet Fase bit Still to be teceve	the Cert	4/1 4/3 4/3	fuori tim
111	r provi del Fessi	Encore Annual Internet Encore for the series Encore for the series	Anna Carlon Anna Carlon Gragne		Ngestaf Inter Coll, 201 Degrad	selected of the percent	at the process	d changes Tan Principal	e brought B	Access	The second se	Accepted Feas bill Diragned Fass bill EXII to be receive Diffy percentage of Accept date - P 1	tee Review	2/1 2/3 2/3	fapori Alek. Actions
e 134	e proje dell'Fessi	Constant Constant			Constant Description Description Start data	ochertent De la company Original Com data	el Tra process Proposed Start data	0 Changes Tax Proposed End data	Program	Accept	Secondaria Conservat Conservat Conservat	Accepted Pears bid Diragness Pass bid BEI to be technic Diffy pergentage wit Accept date - P 1	tiae Reg e2 Inter the serve	4/1 4/3 4/3	Foort Hill
e 134	e positie field Derrite Derrite	Congress Aver Congress Aver Congress Aver			Kojestat Inter Cist, 20 Desemi Sant cist 14/03/2021	achertest Original Des Galacity Capatry 225	Angenet Angenet Start date	Colorgen Hore Proposed Evel diets	n Separate Proposed Photos	Accept	neret in the Feat	Accepted Feal building for the formation of the formation	tan Ree et Interneties Interneties Interneties	4/1 9/2 0/3	Actions Constraints Constrain
e 194	e provi del Fessi Di Informationali Di Informationali Di Informationali Di Informationali	Colored Ave Deliver (Solid Colored Ave Deliver (Solid Deliver (Solid		Main Dec	Topestat Designed Designed Designed Designed Designed Designed Designed Designed	order trad Original Cod datas 	ALTHA STODAN Arayaan Saat data	o changes here Perspected End data	e brought a Programme Profiles	Arrest	ner or the Fell	Access from U.S. Diagram Face in Editors from the form of the formation of the Access form of the 1776 (1884) 2776 (1884)	tae Bae M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M	3/3 9/8 0/3	Actions Actions (actions)
e 174	e grout het fred e de care	Chiganal Ave Chiganal Ave Dalla (Sver		Man De	Kopenst and Desire Casto, prin Constraint Start Alas 14405/2027		Aller Locore	d changes has Proposed End date	Project Project	Accept	rescitute Fel Conseport Changes	Access of Feal UL Disagraphic Plane So Editor be receive Distribute receive Access data Plan 27/01/2021	tee Reg 42 This the serve the the serve the the serve	3/3 2/5 2/5	Attions Constraints Constrain
e D4	forma esterior e processi del Field Del constante a constante co	Contraction of the second seco			Коростия Патер Сана, ран Селения Парадован 14/05/0021 14/05/0021	ordertoot Orderoot date augustysees augustysees augustysees augustysees	Page of the Source of Sour	Chargen II Proposed End Gala	Property Property Profile	Accept	rect of the Fear	Accessed Feat bits Disponse Teacher Edited be tracker Disponse tracker Access data P 1 Access		4/3 2/3 4/3	Paper d des Attime Construints Construints Construints Construints
e 194	orran ar faile orran ar faile orran ar orran ar orran ar	Convertient Conver	and over 1		Court off Court of Sectors Sectors 14/05/000 14/05/000 00/05/0001	adarted Cristel Col data augustypes augustypes augustypes augustypes	Present Present Sat day	Column 12 Propulated End these	e brought a Proposed Profile	Accept	nert it fra Fas	Accessed Feat by Diregrade Teaching Billing berneyter Billing berneyter Access data Pil 17/9/12021 27/9/12021	tee See 42 This the serve oness (AS o		Atland Const Atland Const Const Const Const Const Const Const Const Const Const Const Cons

Figure 11 - G⁴CAP view of a sample feasibility; (source G4CAP)

There are two cases of AWs, and the feasibility assessment differs between the two.

6.3.2.1 The "normal" feasibility scenario (VHR AWs, HHR (HR-1) AWs)

The "normal" feasibility approach is followed for all VHR Acquisition Windows (AWs), and all HHR HR-1 windows, starting from initially requested AWs, and with no, or little, constraints stemming from a previous AW or a subsequent AW. The IP provides the MS with scenarios, labelled with possible success rates "Good", "Medium" or "Low", and also a "Black" option where acquisition is NOT feasible under those constraints. AW parameters are changed in iteration until the final feasibility agreement between MS, IP is validated by JRC.

5.3.2.2 The "sliding window" feasibility scenario

The "sliding window" approach is applied for the feasibility assessment of the HHR (HRB1, HRB2, HR+1, and any subsequent HR period), since their starting dates depend on the preceding VHR or aerial acquisitions being completed. According to this situation, the IP provides the MS with two scenarios, labelled with possible success rates "Good", "Medium", "Low", or "Black':

- 1. BEST CASE From the earliest start date of window to the latest start date plus the window (4/6 week)
- 2. WORST CASE From the latest start date of window plus the window (4/6 week)

The iterative process proceeds and normally results in a final feasibility agreement between MS, IP and validation by JRC. The situation is however further complicated if there is a delay of the preceding AW (e.g. due to an adverse meteorological situation resulting in a AW "shift"), which necessarily leads to further iterations, indeed also to keep the necessary and important "dead period" preventing imagery to be acquired too close to each other [ref ii].

	Ŗ	e-start	could find		
HR - the 'sliding window' HR+ with 'bestcose', 'worst	VHR PERIOD1	HR PERIOD HR+	AWlength	feasibility 90-100%	accepted
case"; case where acquisition of VAR so AR+ can start e-start			worst case AW	feasibility 70-89%	
		real Aff length			

Figure 12 - The case of a sliding window in HHR AWs feasibility

In conclusion:

The EC suggest to set up a very close communication channel with the IPs to account for feasibility, and analysis of the campaign. This experience will feed into the programming choices for subsequent campaign and will give input to the feasibility evaluation.

Due to the importance and volume of the pan-EU CwRS contracts, the IPs have always considered the requests for the CwRS as "priority tasking". Individual MS volumes will possibly not carry such weight vis-à-vis the IPs and MS should pay attention to this loss of scale while trying to ensure feasibility.

6.4 Image Acquisition - Image validation (2)

After the feasibility, as the AWs open, the campaign proceeds and delivers first a down-sampled browse images of the acquisition, a synthesis image or so-called Quick-Look (QL), uploaded within 2 days, and the full resolution imagery, within 6 days. A MS or its appointed contractor uses the QL to validate the image suitability, and, if validated, the contractual product is delivered, quality controlled, pre-processed and used in the subsequent OTSCs [ref i, ii]. All deadlines are set contractually in the FWC.

The pre-processing of the satellite imagery is either performed by IP before delivery (e.g. in the case of ortho rectified SPOT HHR imagery with Reference3D [ref v]), but most often by the MS contractor (Chapter 5.1.2). This produces 'ready to use' imagery for measurement, and CAPI where it is combined with the LPIS, GSAA and other relevant data for the OTSC diagnosis.

The process which is shown schematically in Figure 10 above, consists of:

• Creation of acquisitions requests (this is the actual implementation of the MS image requests explained in Chapter 6.3.1 above)

- QLs upload, see Figure 13 below. QLs of the collected imagery is shown to the MS, or its appointed contractor, within 2 working days of the acquisition [ref ii].
- Acquisition acceptance and validation, see Figure 14. The acceptance of the acquisition is made upon criteria set in the specifications [ref ii], typically on validated/proposed/retained cloud cover (CC) thresholds over the control zone, on elevation angle allowed (see Figure 4 above), or on backup sensor allowed, etc.



*Figure 13 - G*⁴*CAP view, in its ad-hoc viewer, of typical uploaded cloudy QLs; (source G4CAP)*

	INCIDE ON DR	OUTET										
EDIT ACQU		QUEST							1			_
Commentar										AR de	taïls	
Description							1		C Zone are	Actid 745 Year: 202 ountry: 202 Zonie: 5%, a (km ⁴): 545	21 1	
Acquisition window:	10 (7228-)	u-un 1307/06/2	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	et	control			LPIS(niky/Comple	Profile: A2.	VHR prime ·	
ginal Acquisition Windowi	10 (st.16)-)	v+RtptAsc2	12+340520					4	Accept I Feasibility couired are	status: () s (km²) 540		0
	Automatically a	rtend AW Of	needed) [©] :	• No C	1 week	2 week		-	ove and sur	e (energia sea		_
Acquisition status:	Opened		0.0									
lost ped	Ľ,											
Acquisitions												
XI												
11. HAF 10 Har	e Commit	Server .	Area Pres	Area Desig	CC	Helen Dir	Argelate	Upload data	Provider	Conjuster	Operator	Workflow status
9 wat		0.000		Contraction of	1000	1999		and the second second	Contraction of the		COLUMN 1	Contraction of the
2 💰 sv,21,	100	Weinter?	2122-0		14,20%	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2000002000	- 250 0 Light 0 C 1	Constant of the local of the lo		10000	THE REPORT OF TH

Figure 14 - G^4CAP view of a typical ongoing acquisition acceptance; (source G^4CAP)

It is suggested by the EC that the MS should set up Quality Control Records (QCRs) controlling the image acquisition workflow. These are a set of records that should be made available to the MS by the IP at any time during the image acquisition process and which give important information on the quality and performance of the service. The MS should define these carefully. The following are defined by the JRC, but the MS can add others: [ref viii]:

- List of zone and Acquisition Windows (AW) parameters as of specifications; at any time requested.
- Georeferenced Quick look (QL) (e.g. JPG, GeoTIFF etc.) over any AOI; positional accuracy < 100m RMSE; at any time requested.
- Documented Cloud Cover (CC) assessment over any AOI at any time requested; accuracy level requested better than 1% definition.
- Document containing proven attempts the Image Provider (IP) made over each AOI; attempts remaining over AOI before an AW ends; statistics as to attempts made, re-tasking, adaptations due to weather conditions, etc. at any time requested.
- Campaign status logbook: day-to-day status of acquisitions at any time requested.
- Documented statistics of image delivery: QL upload, production start/end, dispatch, receipt dates, etc. at any time requested.
- Reporting of image quality according, with explanations of Input Data Quality Assessment (IDQA) PASS/FAIL, reasons, and iterations with MS Administrations (or their contractors); at any time requested.

- Documented statistics as to balance of sensors used in the Campaign at any time requested.
- Document giving outline of launch status of new satellite sensors; commissioning information; suggested 2 times / year, or as minimum in conjunction with the launch and commissioning of any new satellite sensor.

The JRC also suggests to set up routines for checking availability of S2 archive imagery and other suitable free of charge satellite imagery for the MS controls. In G⁴CAP a specific module called 'S2alert' is implemented, which alerts the MS whenever there is a suitable S2 acquisition over a specific programmed, or ad-hoc, AW and allows display of the QL (Figure 15 below) [ref iii]. Such services (more or less sophisticated) are now available from ESA or other S2 providers (see above Chapter 3.1.2).



Figure 15 - G4CAP view of S2alert uploaded QL; (source G4CAP)

In conclusion:

Efficient satellite browse image validation routines should be set up by MS in order to initiate delivery of imagery in the predefined optimal time. It is also suggested to have Quality Control Records (QCRs) to be able to follow in detail the image acquisition quality and performance at any time. Good routines for following up availability of Sentinel-2 and other sensors are recommended.

6.5 Delivery, Quality Control (QC), Invoice (3)

The full resolution image that passed the IP's internally defined QA/QC process, arrives to the MS, or its appointed contractor, after a maximum of 6 calendar days. The image delivery is normally via FTP (push or pull), and upon download at MS premises it needs to pass through the MS's Input Data Quality Assessment (IDQA). Images that fail the IDQA will be rejected, and the acquisition is either re-processed by the IP or rejected. The IDQA needs to be done quickly to avoid operational delays. Figure 16 below shows a typical G⁴CAP TAB on an ongoing FTP delivery, and IDQA.

ppean Commission > G*CAP		6.495 B	tagementation Di	ablican cashada	Harr
About US Settings Users man	agement Campaign management	CWRS L	ocumentation Pi	ocacap contacts	Home
Manage Acquisition			Acquis	ition details	
Provider status: Validation	~	1	Id	: 39411	T
Operator status: Accepted	~		Acquisition date Image mode	: 08/06/2021 : Pansharpened	
			Cloud cover Meteo flag Elevation angle	: 5.90% : () : 69.21°	
Download upload XML:			Acquired area (Prov)	: 1177 km²	
Delivered (*): Opposition					
AComp:					
Delivery note:					
FTP:	880.155.2.44/WORLDVIEW/BARD/MARS2021	BARU_EK72100_FL0	0 P01904V		
RESETFIC					
Source					
Source returned: Ownloaded/OK	Source py	ramidised: 스			
Source physical path: 1139 191 148 210 magester	ap(202)	17_12_47)			
(*) Will be set automatically upon delivery note file upload					
I DQA					
IDQA performed: 🛷 11/06/2021 09:18:49					
Received image mode: PSH 🗸 Requested	mode was PSH Received	Sensor imagery:	Wortoview-2 🗸 Stat	ed Sensor is Worldview-2	
Acquired area stated by Provider: 1177 km²	s. Wrang *				
Final decision: Accepted	~				
Post-IDQA comments:				2	

Figure 16 - G^4CAP view of a typical ongoing acquisition delivery, and IDQA; (source G^4CAP)

<u>The IPs internal QC includes</u>: assessment of issues such as data integrity, data completeness, cloud cover, haze or thin clouds, cloud shadows, fog, smoke, smog, snow, flares, etc. It also includes assessing the product geometry, radiometry, image characteristics (dropouts, etc.), the production parameters (resampling algorithm, bit depth), etc.

<u>The MS Input Data Quality Assessment (IDQA) includes</u>: a minimum suggested are the below parameters to be checked (Figure 17). After IDQA accept/pass the product is invoiceable (see below Chapter 6.5.1).

CODE	MEANING
DATAREAD	data readability of a source image
GEOMANC	ancillary information to allow ortho-correction (e.g. view angle, orbit RPC, etc.) is present and readable
GEOMGCP	imagery allows GCP placement
CAPIQVIS	image visual quality (haze, contrast, saturation, histogram)
CAPIQCC	cloud on parcel structure

Figure 17 - G⁴CAP Input Data Quality Assessment (IDQA) parameters; (source G⁴CAP)

A typical issue of multispectral bands misalignment discovered during IDQA is shown in Figure 18 below. Such issue may be resolved by IP by a re-processing.



Figure 18 - RED band misalignment detected during image Quality Control (QC).

The EC suggest to set up a very close communication channel with the IPs during image acceptance and image delivery. Understanding the IPs internal Quality Control, setting up a fast and reliable FTP transfer, performing an efficient IDQA, are all guarantees for a successful image acquisition, and efficient image use.

6.5.1 Order/Invoice routines.

Ordering of the satellite imagery by JRC is typically done via framework and specific contracts set up with the IP/IPs (see Chapter 5.1.1). Orders are submitted as soon as the image requests are known, normally in a bulk order and triggered by the start of the acquisition request (AR) at AW opening (see above Figure 14).

After Input Data Quality Assessment (IDQA) completion any image can be invoiced, either by individual image or by grouping the acquired imagery. G⁴CAP handles a so called 'monthly basket' which is sent to the IP allowing them to prepare a monthly invoice supported by the required reporting (deliverable/s). Figure 19 below shows a typical monthly basket.

- 25.2	and a second second	G'CAP										
an Cem	mission) G*GNP											
	About L	Js Sett	tings	Users	management	Campaign m	anagement	CWRS	Documenta	ation Pilot4CAP	Contacts	Ho
	MONTH	Y BASKI	ET									
	Campaign years	2021	¢.					image type	e 💿 All 🤇			
	34 month											
100	fer monen											
	10	RET 2023	~					Honth	Way		Ť	
	Coattry	-						Zone	E DAL			
	and the second s	-										
	Shuki	Displ	ay all ite	etts in just o	one page	- Daswellinet (Lerry				nat distriptive Acquisition	5	
20		Displ	ey all ite	ereg in jyst o	one page	Dasketarino (torra				ула алыстариус жодалыкын	n Arrado	
	Anglin Denne Co	An ite	ey oll ite	ing type	one page	or Ref. Acquired on	Validated on	Provider area - Co	odaxiar area	Accultured Area Becketty	n Merikan X	u te
20	Anne	An ite Displ Displ Vieta	ey all ite	nine Nine PSH w	sme page Semior Prop Iprigrew-3	or flat. Acquired on 20/04/2021	V-04/05/2021	Provider area - Co 112	ACTIVATION AVEN	Acquired Area Baskety*) 123	6 (1	na da
	Acq 10 Zone Co 28792	Ad the Displ Displ Viet Viet Viet Viet Viet	ey ell ite Contra	ing Cove PSH V PSH V	Semicir Prop articlew:3 Geolge:1	or Bet. Account on a 20/04/2621 21/04/2621	Validation of an 03/05/2021 03/05/2021	Provider area G	Codbir Mes 163 202	Activited Ayes Bashetty) 112 112	6 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 20	ne te
	Acq 10 Zone Co 38792 38739	Aditor Depi Depi Veri	And and a second	ingloov PSH V PSH V PSH V	Semon Prop apriprieve3 Geolye-1 Geolye-1	or Bet. Acquired on 20/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021	Validated on 03/05/2021 03/05/2021 04/05/2021	Provider sees. Co 113 340 119		Acquired Ana Bashetty)	6 943671-5C1 940671-5C1 940671-5C1	Pa
	540441	All free Displ Displ vest vest vest vest	ay oll its and an an an an an an	ingeneration (1995) Ingeneration Point Poi	Contract Prop one page one page one page one page one page one page one page one page one page one page	or fiel: Account on 20/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 26/04/2021	Validated for 03/05/2021 03/05/2021 04/05/2021 assestedat	Provider area - 47 112	Codbir Mea 163 202 118 144	Acquired Area Basket(*) 183 190 190 190 191	6 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1	ne da
	ACQ 10 20me Co 36702 38739 38739 38739 382545	All the Displ Displ Viet Viet Viet Viet Viet Viet Viet	ey all its av all its ar ar ar ar ar ar	ing tool PSH V PSH K PSH K PSH K	Senior Prop apriciews Geolye 1 Ceolye 1 Ceolye 1 Senior 24 Senior 24	or Bett Account of annual 20/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021	V. 1012 (m 03/05/2021 03/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021	Provider prez 50 163 - 169 - 1	00 to thir sreat 163 200 118 141 37	Acquired Area Beshet(*)	5 5 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943871-5C1	Pet
	Acq 10 2000 Cm 26702 36702 36702 36704 36704 36504 36504 36504	All the Displ Displ Viet	franka 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	ing loose PSH W PSH W PSH K PSH K PSH K PSH K	Secure Page one page	or Bet. Acquired on 20/04/2021 21/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021	Validated an 03/05/2021 03/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021 05/05/2021 05/05/2021	Provider area - Cr 163	COLOUIT ATM 163 200 198 198 198 198	Acquired Area Bachet(*) 183 183 183 183 183 183 183 183 183 183	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	ter
	540441 4409 10 2044 CO 36702 367725 387735 387735 38733 38833 38833	All for Displ Displ view	Analia An	In Jude of International Inter	Contraction Contr	52500 LEVEL 1001111 20/04/7021 21/04/7021 25/04/7021 25/04/7021 25/04/7021 25/04/7021 25/04/7021 25/04/7021 25/04/7021 25/04/7021	Validated on 03/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021 05/05/2021 05/05/2021	Provider sees 20 163 169 169 169 169 169 169 169 169 169 169	503-Char Meas 163 2002 118 1441 57 198 1237	Acquired Ayes Basket(*) 103 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	6 943671-501 943671-501 943671-501 943671-501 943671-501 943671-501 943671-501	Pat
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	540000 60000 101 20000 100 76702 20000 100 787702 20000 100 787700 20000 10000000000000000000000000000	Add too Displ Displ Vies Vi	An	ang bow PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V	Sensor Prop paga Page aprigree-3 Geolge 1 Geolge 1 Geolge 1 Geolge 2 antidree-2 antidree-2 antidree-2	20/04/2021 20/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021 21/04/2021	V. 1012 (m) 03/05/2021 03/05/2021 04/05/2021 13/05/2021 14/05/2021 04/05/2021	Providing area CO 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1 100 1	Cischer area 163 2002 118 118 1441 1 17 1925 1 127	Acquired Area Basket(*) 118 118 118 147 147 147 147 147 147 147 147	5 5 5 5 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1 943671-5C1	
	Acq 10 Zone Co 287702 387702 28840 28841 28841 28841 28841	Add too Displ Displ Vieto	Available Availa	Ing Cope PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V PSH V	Semon Prop and page and page dationers cestpet 1 cestpet 1 cestpet 3 dationers and there 2 and there 2 and there 2	or Bett. Accounted on 20/04/2021 21/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/04/2021 25/05/2021 02/05/2021 02/05/2021	Validated on 03/05/2021 03/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021 04/05/2021	Proceeding area Cal 163 2 362 2 169 2 161 2 162 2 163 2 164 2 165 2 164 2 165 2 166 2 167 2 168 2 170 2 170	000000000000000000000000000000000000	Actualman Aynus Bashwitty) 1982 - 1983 - 1983 - 1983 - 1985 - 198	в	

Figure 19 - G4CAP view of a 'monthly basket' ready for invoice by IP; (source G4CAP)

The JRC suggest to MS to closely follow up expenditure within one Campaign and also analyse the overall Campaign expenditure to facilitate forecast, cash flow, and follow-up.

6.6 Data storage and archiving (4)

All satellite datasets collected, and processed should be suitably stored together with their metadata, and routines for Long Term data Preservation (LTDP) need to be set up. The infrastructure is to be managed and maintained by the MS, or its appointed contractor, to allow for any audits, and/or MS re-use of the data.

6.7 Data use and sharing (5)

Each contract should hold licensing conditions governing the 'rights of use' of the imagery purchased, either by accepting the IP's proposed End-User License Agreement (EULA) [IP example in ref x], or by setting up adhoc licensing [JRC example in ref xi]. The latter involves a considerable legal effort but has allowed the COM to govern an efficient 'rights of use' policy. There is a need to consider data privacy and personal information governed by the EU legal framework of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [ref xii] in force since May 2018. Digital data, including images, specifically created for controls purposes have a fair likelihood to be classified as personal data.

Data storage should be long term, should allow for data re-use conformal to Licensing Conditions, and should not enable any disclosure of 'personal information'.

6.8 Other - miscellaneous

6.8.1 Keeping statistics (of image acquisition and of OTSCs results)

It is good practice to produce and keep statistics (Figure 10) of both the campaigns image acquisition and of the CwRS results at final diagnosis level to facilitate analysis and improve methodologies efficiency and/or efficacy:

- e.g. statistics on image success, image use, and methods etc. (e.g. no. of zones, AWs, average AOI area, methods, profiles, modes, CC, elevation angles, sensor performances, providers performances, and feasibility accuracies and proposals' goodness etc.)
- e.g. details regarding applications (no. of applications, applications by scheme, by controls method, results at application level, group, and parcel level etc.).

6.8.2 Miscellaneous; consulting, IT services, technology watch ...

The JRC reminds that a sound management of all above operations linked with the CwRS is of importance, and suitable choices of whether internal or outsourced IT systems and IT services, or other consulting services need to be made carefully by the MS.

MSs are also advised to do the necessary technological survey to seek for the adaptation, improvement of their methods (e.g. introduction of micro satellites constellation data, sampling and image acquisition based on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), Remotely-piloted aircraft systems (RPAS), or High Altitude Platform Systems (HAPS) ...).

7 Conclusions, Recommendations and way forwards

7.1 Conclusions and Recommendations

With the entry into force of the new CAP regulation in 2023 the legal basis for EU financed satellite imagery for the CAP checks as of Reg. (EU) No 1306/2013 (§.6b, §.21) and its relative Implementing Reg. (EU) No. 908/2014 (§ 26.3) will not be in force any longer. This document serves as a guideline for the MSs which decide to continue On-the-Spot-Checks (OTSCs) like methods after this date and set up an individual management of this process.

The key consequences are:

- Any MS that continues with CwRS shall from their 2023 years CAP checks:
 - Finance satellite imagery for the checks;
 - Set up procedures and relative management of the OTSC process.
- The currently provided COM Guidance documentation such as the CTS, or the Image Specifications will lose their official status and no longer be updated. Each MS will be responsible for definition, management, and assurance that its checks methods, and image choices, are adequate and effective (i.e. producing the intended or expected result) for their CAP checks.
- Each MS is from 2023 responsible for setting up the procurement of any required services (aerial/satellite image acquisition, OTSC diagnosis, etc.) to perform their checks

The main recommendations are:

- MS are suggested to carefully coordinate all financial, contractual, and image collection workflow in order to be ready for the necessary CwRS activities.
- MS must plan the budget timely and appropriately for (1) the satellite imagery needed for the controls and (2) the subcontracting of the image preparation, OTSCs diagnosis, etc.
- The image supply contracts set up by the MS must clearly define objectives, and contractual thresholds. As an example the COM defines the main one to be: "a minimum of 95% success rate of image supply on time, and according to specifications". The MS needs moreover to control the supply and related services by use of efficient Quality Control Records (QCRs).
- The MS are responsible for the definition of the image requirements. The currently adopted solution by the COM with sensor independent profiles is strongly recommended. They should constitute a main element of the technical specification for the image provision contract.
- The image requests procedure may suitably divided in two steps where the first gives a price indication for the MS CwRS imagery, while the second gives detailed acquisition parameters necessary for the success of the image acquisition itself, and also a better prediction of the pricing. A price which is paid by the MS Administration and not by the EU.
- MS are suggested to set up a very close communication channel with the IPs for the image acquisition execution: planning, feasibility, acceptance and delivery.
- Data storage should be long term, and allow reasonable access
- MSs are advised to make necessary technological watch to seek for the adaptation, improvement of their methods (e.g. introduction of micro satellites constellation data, sampling and image acquisition based on UAV/RPAS fleets, etc.).

7.2 Way forward

Since the 90's the JRC has operated technological survey and provided technical support to DG AGRI and MS to help implementing the CAP. In mid-90's, the so-called CwRS was introduced thanks to the first availability of civil satellite imagery.

The availability of free Sentinel data since 2017/2018 has now made possible the introduction of a new systems (e.g. CbM, AMS) to answer to the community demand for fairer, more modern, and more automated solutions. It should therefore be re-iterated that such methods are largely preferred in order to take advantage of the new technologies that CwRS cannot.

8 References

- The wiki cap URL in general contains reference material; Guidance documents, validations methods and JRC Common Technical Specifications (CTS) for the On-The-Spot Checks (OTSC) and area measurement according to Art. 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 of Regulation (EU) No 809/2014 as amended by Regulation (EU) 2018/746; WikiCAP: <u>https://marswiki.jrc.ec.europa.eu/wikicap/index.php/Main_Page</u> https://marswiki.jrc.ec.europa.eu/wikicap/index.php/Guidance_CTS
- ii. VHR, HHR Specifications. Require EU Login (contact author); see documentation page: https://g4cap.jrc.ec.europa.eu/g4cap/
- iii. G4CAP manual reference. Requires EU Login (contact author); see documentation page: <u>https://g4cap.jrc.ec.europa.eu/g4cap/</u>
- iv. SPOT Imagery User Guide; Airbus, Defence and Space *intelligence*; (Chapter C.1.2.1 p56, Chapter C.4.1 p 64): <u>https://www.intelligence-airbusds.com/en/8718-user-guides</u>
- Reference3D is a global, geocoded database developed jointly by Spot Image and the French mapping and survey agency, IGN:
 <u>https://www.intelligence-</u>
 <u>airbusds.com/files/pmedia/public/r469 9 reference3d product description 201105.pdf</u>
- vi. Digital globe atmospheric compensation, white paper. Available online: <u>http://digitalglobe-marketing.s3.amazonaws.com/files/documents/AComp_WP_ACOMP.pdf</u>
- vii. Best Practice and Quality Checking of Ortho Imagery; JRC Geometry Guidelines: https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC48904
- viii. FWC VHR, and HHR Tender specifications sample used by the COM: <u>https://etendering.ted.europa.eu/document/document-old-versions.html?docId=78157</u> <u>https://etendering.ted.europa.eu/cft/cft-documents.html?cftId=4150&page=2</u>
- ix. FR EU Financial Regulation REGULATION (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 OF THE EUROPEAN
 PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 18 July 2018 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018R1046&from=EN
- x. Sample commercial licensing conditions (EULA): <u>https://www.intelligence-airbusds.com/files/pmedia/public/r13117_9_eula-pleiades-vuk-october2017.pdf</u> <u>https://www.maxar.com/legal/product-terms-and-conditions</u>
- xi. EC Licensing Terms and Conditions (EULA): https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC69261
- xii. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) REGULATION (EU) 2016/679 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 27 April 2016, on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679&from=EN
- xiii. CbM; WikiCAP / DS-CDP-2017-03, DS-CDP-2018-17, DS-CDP-2018-18 <u>https://marswiki.jrc.ec.europa.eu/wikicap/images/c/ce/JRC108353.pdf</u> <u>https://marswiki.jrc.ec.europa.eu/wikicap/images/d/d1/JRC112918_published.pdf</u> <u>https://marswiki.jrc.ec.europa.eu/wikicap/images/b/b9/JRC112913.pdf</u>

9 Acronyms

Abbreviation	Description
AL	Arable Land
AMS	Area Monitoring System
AOI	Area of Interest
AR	Acquisition Request
ASPRS	American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (and Geospatial Information Society)
AW	Acquisition Window
AWS	Amazon Web Services
САР	Common Agricultural Policy
CAPI	Computer Assisted Photo Interpretation
СЬМ	Checks by Monitoring
СС	Cloud Cover
CD	Crop diversification
CESTEM	Cubesat-Enabled Spatio-Temporal Enhancement Method
CIAS	Campaign Image Acquisition Statistics module of the Web application G ⁴ CAP
СОМ	European Commission (EC)
COTS	commercially off-the-shelf
CTS	Common Technical Specifications (OTSCs)
CwRS	Controls with Remote Sensing
DIAS	Copernicus Data and Information Access Services
DN	Digital Number
DRA	dynamic range adjustment
ECA	European Court of Auditors
EFA	Ecological Focus Area
EO	Earth Observation
ESA	European Space Agency
EULA	End-User License Agreement
EU	European Union
FWC	Framework contract
FR	Financial Regulation
G ⁴ CAP	Geomatics for the Common Agricultural Policy (see definition in Chapter 10)
GAEC	Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GTCAP	Guidance and Tools for CAP implementation

Abbreviation	Description
GSAA	Geo-spatial aid application
GSD	Ground Sampling Distance
HAPS	High Altitude Platform System
HRB AW	HR image with acquisition window lying <u>Between</u> two VHR acquisition windows (e.g. HRB1, HRB2)
HHR	High-High Resolution image
HR	High Resolution image
IDQA	Input Data Quality Assessment
IFOV	Instantaneous Field of View
IP	Image Provider
IR	Image Request
JRC	Joint Research Centre of the EC
L2A	Level-2A (processing level of S2 data)
LC	Land Cover
LPIS QA	Land Parcel Identification System Quality Assurance
LTDP	Long Term Data Preservation;
LUT	Lookup table
MS	Member State
MSP	Multispectral (image)
OTSC	On-The-Spot Checks
РА	(MS or MS Regional) Paying Agency
PAN	Panchromatic
prelR	Campaign pre-Image Requests parameters which are filled in at the beginning of the Campaign in $G^4\mbox{CAP}$
postIR	Campaign post-Image Requests, parameters which are filled in at the end of the Campaign in $G^4\mbox{CAP}$
QA	Quality Assurance.
QC	Quality Control; aims to detect non-conformities in a product.
QL	Quick Look or down-sampled browse image
RFV	Rapid Field Visit
RP	Reference Parcel
RPAS	Remotely-piloted aircraft system
S1	Sentinel-1 (radar) satellite sensor
S2	Sentinel-2 (optical) satellite sensor
SC	Specific Contract

Abbreviation	Description
SW	Software
UAV	Unmanned aerial vehicle
VHR	Very High Resolution image

10 Definitions

Term	Description
DOVE	Triple-CubeSat miniature satellites built by Planet Labs, Inc., US; see PlanetScope below
G⁴CAP	Web-based application used to manage the whole CAP OTSC CwRS Campaign workflow. It is the main communication tool between the CAP checks actors during the campaign, making use of automatic e-mail exchange to synchronize actions between different actors.
GSD	Ground Sampling Distance, the nominal size of one sensor pixel projected onto the imaged surface
PlanetScope	PlanetScope satellite constellation consists of multiple launches of groups of individual cubesats (DOVEs); Constellations: the classic DOVE, the next generation Dove-R, and the SuperDove.
Reference3D	Reference3D is a global, geocoded database developed jointly by Spot Image and the French mapping and survey agency, IGN. It can be used as an accurate source for producing orthoimages 100% automatically. Reference3D comprises three registerable layers of data:
	 - an HRS orthoimage with a resolution of near five metres - a full layer of quality and traceability data, including 2 performance maps

11 List of figures

Figure 1 - Evolution of imagery characteristics	4
Figure 2 - the OTSCs workflow showing MS / JRC activity	6
Figure 3 - the CwRS approach used in the CAP on-the-spot-checks	7
Figure 4 - Ground Sampling Distance (GSD) vs. elevation angle for the VHR profiles	9
Figure 5 - Schematic figure of JRC and IP satellite benchmarking methodology (courtesy EUSI)	11
Figure 6 - Campaign year summary over time	13
Figure 7 - AWs layout covering crop season (1)	14
Figure 8 - AWs layout covering crop season (2)	14
Figure 9 - The overall process, the stakeholders, and their interaction in G^4CAP	
Figure 10 - The OTSCs image acquisition schematic flow diagram	19
Figure 11 - G ⁴ CAP view of a sample feasibility; (source G4CAP)	21
Figure 12 - The case of a sliding window in HHR AWs feasibility	22
Figure 13 - G ⁴ CAP view, in its ad-hoc viewer, of typical uploaded cloudy QLs; (source G4CAP)	23
Figure 14 - G ⁴ CAP view of a typical ongoing acquisition acceptance; (source G ⁴ CAP)	24
Figure 15 - G4CAP view of S2alert uploaded QL; (source G4CAP)	25
Figure 16 - G ⁴ CAP view of a typical ongoing acquisition delivery, and IDQA; (source G ⁴ CAP)	26
Figure 17 - G ⁴ CAP Input Data Quality Assessment (IDQA) parameters; (source G ⁴ CAP)	27
Figure 18 - RED band misalignment detected during image Quality Control (QC)	27
Figure 19 - G4CAP view of a 'monthly basket' ready for invoice by IP; (source G4CAP)	28

12 List of tables

Table 1 -	· VHR profiles adopted within the CAP CwRS checks	41
Table 2 -	HHR Profiles adopted within the CAP CwRS checks	41

13 List of Equations

14 Annexes

14.1 VHR profiles

image Profile D	Description	Spatial resolution complement (*)	Fadlarestric reachtfort (**) and spectral bands	Moureare Elevation Argle restriction (***)	Threshold also. 1.D mean to be proven in generality hereformatio	Charaf Cover (CC) over ADR	Assumption and the second seco	Faranging	Farmerles	Theorem of second							
	Care the below and	680 x 0.75m	FAIL	+10	NY 6 2m	S 1PN	Priority	Sensor Argendent	- Nanoland CwRs pcolite								
AL WR prime - Corth [stat]	(Fundhe)	650 x 3m	MSP (or lease 4 hands)							WV3. WV7. (E1. R1. R5A. generative others not							
	Pen-sharpened	PAN 660 ± 0.75au MSP 65D 5 3m	At least 4 bands						0.200940	Statistical by							
	Pan-Maltapectual	530 × 0.1%++	E44					1.995									
ASL VHR prime - CodS [VHR+][8]	(hundle)	090 s 3m	MSP (at hast 8 bands)	+10	4,4.5.24	5.0%	Priority programming	200		WV3, WV2, possibly others not benchmarked yet							
1000	Pan-sharpered	PAN GSD x 0.75m MKP GSD x 3m	Al leave 8 benchs					0.50m		And Suite Stephy							
	PaniMultispectral	EbD S D, Phere	PAN	See panaghaph				2		WV1, WV2, 521, 51, 504,							
A2. Will prime -	(Isrein)	(00.53m	MSP (at least 4 bandis)	betweercoft wath/vlavation angle cestributions for the A2 portile (see also Appendie 1 to Technical Specifications)													
(Topographic) (see strict that dis)	Panaharpuned	PAN GSD n.D. Thim MSP (SSD n.J.m.	At least 4 bands		for the A2 profile (see also Appendie 1 to Technical Specifications)	or the A2 profile ne also Appendia 1 to Technical Specifications]	8.104	programming	dependent		plottickly others rolt. Benchmarked pri						
AS VIR prime - CullS (Pan only)	Pas	660 x 0.75e)	EM	+50	ny 6.2m	± 11%	Priority programming	Sensor dopendent		WV3, WV7, GE1, WV1, possibly others not be alterated per							
	Pan-Multispectul (Surdie)	(552 × 0.75#)	PAN	According to P specifications	a,γ 5 ∂m	\$ 32%	Priority antipositivity										
A4. VIIR prive - CoRS Status		650 s 3m	MSP (at heast 4 bands)					Secon dependent		WVI, WVI, GEI, possibly others not interchangeling yet							
	Panahapanad	PAN GSD (r 11.75m) MSP GSD (r 3m)	Át linnet 4 kanda.			1.2001010102	1.1000001000	1.1906.001002	12003000	1. Marco (51653)	1.2506351658	1.1900.0010.00			Tradition of		
1	Pan-Multispectral (Nordel) DID 4 (0.50m) FAH (000 4.30m) MSF (a) heart 4 bandel Pan-Multispectral (MA 000 in 0.50m) MSF (a) heart 4 bandel	(25D x 0.50m)	1941	+0				0.46m									
AS. VHR prime - CwRS (VHB+ Topographic)		010 s.3m	MSP (a) haard 4 banda)	+67	Net In	<100 €	Priority programming	1,09#		WV2, WV2, GE1, psyciably others not benchmarked yet							
		+ 67		27640		2.40m	[
	PassiAkdropertral	USD CIUSDer	FILM	* 67	syeān				5.43+								
ASL VHR prime - Coll5 (VHR Topographic SH	(Eventhe)	099 5.24	MSP (at least 8 bendis)	×10		0.10%	Priority programming	7.60 %		WVC, WVZ, possibly others not burntnearked yet							
	Pas-sharpered	PAN 030 ± 0.58 m NSP 130 ± 2m	Witerid & hands	+0			1000 - 000	8.40×									

torage Profile ID	Cestrotion	Spatial modulus regularization (*1	Fadioestric resultion (**) and questial hereb	Meanur Destion Argie remistion (***)	Threaticid also, I-D once to be proven to presently bandwark	Cloud Cover (CC) sets A28	Anastetien programming	ferenging	Ferrarbs	Extension of surnova	
	Panthampertia	555 x 0.10er	PAN					6.54w			
AL VHE prime - CoRS [VHE_EFA_IF]	(Europh)	GAD # 244	MSP (at least 4 hands)	+58	xy=15m	+185	Priority	žn.		WVI, WV2, GE1, possibly others not benefanarized yet	
	Pan-sharpened	PAN 680 s 0.56m MSF 050 5 2m	At least 4 bands					0.56m			
	Partitution	680 x 0.50m	ISAN :					1.54 m			
ASI, VHR prime - CwRS (VHR, SFA, 17](R)	(foralle)	120 a 2m	MSP (at least & lands).	+10	sy ±12m	0.025	Priority progitimening	In.		WhO, WV2, penaloly others not beechysacked yet	
	Pan-wharpened	MM 560 ± 0.50m M5 050 ± 2m	At least & bands				879910705	8.50m		0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	
	Pan-Maltagemal	GND x 0.5Dev	E&M	3.00				2.56%	Imger angalation window typically Microbologically (hosen iny IP within longe arous given by (8).	WVL-WXL-SEL prositivy zetters not benäterseked yet	
A7. WIE prive - new nudr	(Junzie)	(30 s.2m	MSP (ar least 4 bands)	+ 10	wy 0.1.5es	Ny 61.544 Ny 61.544 Bate See, Better than 5.199	(P) best programming,	24			
broade failed used and route	Patrilucpeced	MAN 030-s 0.50m MSF 010 6 2m	Ar inant it lands.	2.00	205-2065		when service available	R.Mes.			
	Par-Maligema Gardej	055 x 0.50m	E A.M	+ 20	sysian			6.59+		WV3. WV2. 181. prosibly	
A71. VHR prime - over name		050 S 2m	MSP (at hear 4 freeds)	(100)		4.12% Printing	Privity	ील.			
bound (num (num (nu)	Passitapeted	PAN 680 5 056m MSP 680 5 2m	fe iner 4 kauds	>10	2324		\$ 58m		Considering provident and date		
	Fan-Mahapeoral (Donate)	END S DADAY	PAN	+ 80		Ky 8.1.2m Units to find the fit for the fi		2.40+	kinger acquition window typically Marth-August, VOI showen by IP willian Facge attoc gives by 382	WV3, GC1, provably othery out here breaked put	
All. Vitili prime - new made		USD ± 1.00er	MSP (at least 4 barrie)	+ 82	xys12n		(FT best programming,	1.894			
Bengge (DHUTUNTEDT PAU	Pan-vharpened	PAN 680 ± 0.40m MSP 680 ± 1.4m	At least 4 bands.	× 82	- 40		when somer pushable	2489			
	ParerMadimenetrad	(Ab 5 0.40m	PAN.	+ 60	zų tilas				D45e		
ABI VISI prime - near cada profile (s144_113(_83)	(Dunitle)	650 ± 1.60m	M5 (at loast 4 loarsh)	> HD		+ 12%	Priority	3.65+	1	WVI, GEI, possible others not	
	Panahapered	MAN GSD # D.40m MSP GSD % 1,6m	At least 4 bands	• 10				herderson of	0.43m		

lange Poolfie II	Description	Spartal resultation regularisant (*)	Waddamatick: resolution (**) and spectral barate	Minaman Electrico Angle settistico (***)	Threshold also. 1-D more to be proven in generatry benchmark	Clevel Cover (CC) seer AOI	Association programming	heartplag	Records.	Entropic of accura
R. Vill achive	An any of stans	As any of shows	As any of above		An any of allows	n orgatizan	Action	Section Reporters	Used for archive essents for any jacoble	WV3, WV3, GE3, K3, K34, possibly others rear beschtraßed get
	As any of about	As any of above	As any of abase		As any of aliant	at any of above	Priority programming	Sensor dependent	Used for ce-task for any proble	WVI, WVZ, GEL, KI, KDA, groundly others rust becarbacked get
	As any of show	As any of above	In any of above		to any of share	10% e Ú < 30%	Priority programming	Sesso dependent	Proposet for any profile	WVI, WVI, GEX, KI, KIA, possibly others not benchmaned art
E Will lack up	Pan-Maltapactual	680 e 3m	560				Ditarity programming	Serior Higherdent	Bash up for any profile	WVO, WVO, GETI, KO, KOA, possibly others not benchmarked yet
	Ownellet	URD i: 12m	MSP (at least 3 bamble)		10000	e 12%				
	Panchesevatic	tilde a lan	PAN		xy #5.00					
	Panishapanad	(ND 5 3m	At hard 3 hands.							8.0350-000-20-

(*) GED is both directions (scross track, olong track) including the effect of earth curvature should antigy this orderion

(**) Dynamic range, estructure it 12 bits/plast

(****) Departum angle of any optimated strip of on anywhittee should satisfy this effector

Table 1 - VHR profiles adopted within the CAP CwRS checks

14.2 HHR profiles

Image Profile ID	Description (Image MODI)	Spetial Resolution (*) GSD	Radiometric resolution (**) and minimum spectral bands	ehs. S-D RMSE	Cloud Caser (CC) over AOI	Acquisition programming	Remarks	Exemple of sensors
FJ. HHR prime - CwRS (HHR)	Bundle (PAN plus MSP bands), PSH	65D-5 Jm	PAN bend plus 4 MSP bands including B, G, R, Nill	x,y s 5m (machable with sH the shell sw suite and performed by MS Administration or its contractor)	s 1% validated (profile F11)	Printhe	for PSH mode the GSD of the PAN band is applied for GSD threatestd	MPOT 6/7, Delinee 2, enc
	MSP bands only	630 6 12m	4 bunds including N. G. R. NH	s,y < 1.5 x GSD (reschable with off the shell we units and performed by MS Administration or its contractor)	s Sin proposed (profile F12) 4 20% retained (profile F13) archive (profile F34)	programming (excluding F14)	for MSP mode the GSD of the MSP hand is applied for GSD threshold	SPOT fs/7, Planet Senpe, Detmon-2, etc.
F2, HHR prime - Cwills (ORTHO)	Bundle (PAN plus MSP bands), PSH	650 s 3m	PAN band plus 4 MSP bands including 8, 6, 8, 168	s,y s Sen (orthocovacted by image provider) s 1% said	s 1% validated (profile F21)	Priority programming (excluding f14)	for PSH mode the GND of the IVAN band is applied for GND threshold	SPOT 6/7, Geimon 2, etc
	MSP bands only	680 I 12m	4 hands industry B. S. R. NR	x.y \$ 10m (orthocorrected by image provider)	(5% proposed (profile F22) 5 20% onained (profile F23) anthre (profile F34)		for MSP mode the GSD of the MSP band is applied for GSD threshold	SPOT is/7, Manut Scope, Deimos-2, atc.

(*) - the maximum BSD is calculated including the effect of the earth curvature (**) - minimum 8 bits/pixel, preferably 11-12.

Table 2 - HHR Profiles adopted within the CAP CwRS checks

GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

In person

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: <u>https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en</u>

On the phone or by email

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),

- at the following standard number: +32 22999696, or

- by electronic mail via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

Online

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: <u>https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en</u>

EU publications

The European Commission's science and knowledge service Joint Research Centre

JRC Mission

As the science and knowledge service of the European Commission, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to support EU policies with independent evidence throughout the whole policy cycle.



EU Science Hub ec.europa.eu/jrc

• @EU_ScienceHub

f EU Science Hub - Joint Research Centre

in EU Science, Research and Innovation

EU Science Hub

doi:10.2760/117692 ISBN 978-92-76-46708-3

