



7th Framework Programme

FP7-SEC-2012.4.3-1

**Next Generation Damage and Post-Crisis Needs Assessment Tool for
Reconstruction and Recovery Planning
Capability Project**

**Methodology for integrated satellite and airborne data-based synoptic
damage assessment**

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| Deliverable No. | D4.2 | | |
| Workpackage No. | WP4 | Workpackage Title | Synergistic Damage Assessment with Air- and Space- borne Remote Sensing |
| Author(s) | Norman Kerle, Markus Gerke, Francesco Nex, Anand Vetrivel | | |
| Status | Draft | | |
| Version No. | V1.00 | | |
| File Name | RECONASS_D4.2_Methodology_for_integrated_satellite_and_airborne_data-based_synoptic_damage_assessment_v1.00 | | |
| Delivery Date | 03 10, 2016 | | |
| Project First Start and Duration | Dec. 1, 2013; 42 months | | |



DOCUMENT CONTROL PAGE

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Title | Methodology for integrated satellite and airborne data-based synoptic damage assessment | |
| Authors | Name | Partner |
| | Norman Kerle | ITC |
| | Markus Gerke | ITC |
| | Francesco Nex | ITC |
| | Anand Vetrivel | ITC |
| Contributors | Name | Partner |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Peer Reviewers | Name | Partner |
| | Mata Frondistou | RISA |
| | Rickard Forsén | FOI |
| | | |
| | | |
| Format | Text-MS Word | |
| Language | en-UK | |
| Work Package | WP4 | |
| Deliverable Number | D4.2 | |
| Due Date of Delivery | 31/07/2016 | |
| Actual Date of Delivery | 03/10/2016 | |
| Dissemination Level | PP | |
| Rights | RECONASS Consortium | |
| Audience | <input type="checkbox"/> public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> restricted <input type="checkbox"/> internal | |
| Revision | (none) | |
| Edited by | | |
| Status | <input type="checkbox"/> draft <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consortium reviewed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WP leader accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project coordinator accepted | |
| | | |
| | | |

REVISION LOG

| Version | Date | Reason | Name and Company |
|---------|------------|--|---|
| V0.01 | 26/07/2016 | First draft | Norman Kerle, Markus Gerke, Francesco Nex, Anand Vetrivel (ITC) |
| V0.02 | 15/09/2016 | Review process concluded | Mata Frondistou (RISA), Rickard Forsén (FOI) |
| V0.03 | 22/09/2016 | Review comments addressed, Second draft | Norman Kerle, Markus Gerke, Francesco Nex, Anand Vetrivel (ITC) |
| V1.00 | 03/10/2016 | Final document to be submitted in EC - formatting and final review | Evangelos Sdongos (ICCS) |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Document Control Page | 2 |
| Revision Log | 3 |
| Table of Contents | 4 |
| List of Tables | 6 |
| List of Figures | 7 |
| Abbreviations and Acronyms | 8 |
| Glossary of Terms | 9 |
| Executive Summary | 10 |
| 1 Introduction | 11 |
| 1.1 Objective | 11 |
| 1.2 Structure of the document | 11 |
| Validation of satellite damage maps | 12 |
| 1.3 Background | 12 |
| 1.4 Framework for validation process | 18 |
| 1.5 Examples of the damage mapping functions | 19 |
| 1.5.1 Damage representation of UAV assessments | 19 |
| 1.5.2 Mapping function for point-based damage map | 20 |
| 1.5.3 Mapping function for grid-based damage map | 21 |
| 1.5.4 Mapping function for heat maps | 23 |
| 1.6 Experiment and results | 23 |
| 1.7 Conclusion | 26 |
| Calibration of satellite damage maps | 27 |
| 1.8 Background | 27 |
| 1.9 Conceptual framework for calibration process | 27 |
| 1.9.1 Framework design for calibration | 27 |
| 1.10 Discussion and conclusion: | 29 |
| Automated satellite image segmentation and classification for assessing disaster damage using data-specific features with incremental learning | 30 |
| 1.11 Background | 30 |
| 1.12 Objective | 31 |
| 1.13 Methodology | 31 |
| 1.13.1 Step 1: Over-segmentation of image | 31 |
| 1.13.2 Step 2: Labelling of super-pixels using the information from the UAV assessments | 32 |
| 1.13.3 Step 3: Feature extraction | 32 |
| 1.13.4 Step 4: online classification | 33 |
| 1.14 Experiments and results | 34 |
| 1.14.1 Data used: | 34 |

1.14.2 Experimental steps: 34

1.15 Discussion and conclusion..... 36

1.16 Implementation details 37

Conclusions 38

References..... 39

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 2-1. Overview of damage maps produced by different mapping agencies (maps show damage caused by the 2010 Haiti earthquake) | 16 |
| Table 4-1. Implementation details of the methods reported in this chapter | 37 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 2-1. Multi-view UAV images of the damaged church after 2010 earthquake in Mirabello (left) and generated 3D point cloud from these images (right) | 13 |
| Figure 2-2. Impact of viewing direction in damage assessment: building looks undamaged in nadir view but looks severely damaged in oblique-view | 13 |
| Figure 2-3. Impact of spatial resolution in damage assessment: subset of airborne oblique image with average ground sampling distance (GSD) of 14 cm (left) and subset of UAV image with average GSD of 1 cm (right). Both depict the same church in Mirabello, Italy, after the 2012 earthquake..... | 14 |
| Figure 2-4. Synthetically generated 3D model of the building annotated with damages | 18 |
| Figure 2-5. Depiction of mapping UAV assessments from RECONASS to information in the damage map | 19 |
| Figure 2-6. Example of 2D polygon as spatial representation of buildings, and damage evidences which are detected from UAV images..... | 20 |
| Figure 2-7. Example of classifying the UAV damage evidences according to the label classes used in the selected map for validation..... | 21 |
| Figure 2-8. Workflow for validating the grid-based damage map using the UAV assessments..... | 22 |
| Figure 2-9. Subset damage map produced by DLR_ZKI for Port-au-Prince after a 2010 earthquake..... | 24 |
| Figure 2-10. The damage labels from field survey are overlaid on the same grid boundaries used in the damage map. The count of independent labels lying within each grid is depicted in a histogram..... | 25 |
| Figure 2-11. Result of validation process depicting the deviations in the assessments from satellite- and reference-based (e.g., UAV assessments) data sources..... | 25 |
| Figure 3-1. Framework for calibration of damage maps using the information from RECONASS system installed locations | 28 |
| Figure 4-1. Overall work flow | 33 |
| Figure 4-2. The cumulative error, number of samples used to update the classifier and the processing time for 16 online classifiers when associated with GLCM, Gabor and CNN are depicted in plots (a), (b) and (c) respectively. | 36 |

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| ABBREVIATION | DESCRIPTION |
|--------------|----------------------------------|
| CNN | Convolutional Neural Network |
| EMS-98 | European Macroseismic Scale 1998 |
| GLCM | Grey Level Co-occurrence Matrix |
| GIS | Geographical Information System |
| GSD | Ground Sampling Distance |
| SVM | Support Vector Machines |
| UAV | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle |
| VHR | Very High Resolution |
| WP4 | Work Package 4 |

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Histogram | The number of occurrences of each category in a given boundary |
| Nadir | Point on the ground directly in line with the remote sensing system and the centre of the earth. |
| Oblique image | Image acquired with the camera intentionally directed at some angle between horizontal and vertical orientations. |
| Overlap | Extent to which adjacent images or photographs cover the same terrain, expressed as a percentage. |
| Pattern | Regular repetition of tonal variations on an image or photograph. |
| Resolution | Ability to separate closely spaced objects on an image or photograph. Resolution is commonly expressed as the most closely spaced line-pairs per unit distance that can be distinguished. Also called spatial resolution. |
| Scale | Ratio of distance on an image to the equivalent distance on the ground. |
| Scene | Area on the ground that is covered by an image or photograph. |
| Supervised learning | Techniques used to learn the relationship between independent attributes and a designated dependent attribute (the label). Most induction algorithms fall into the supervised learning category. |
| Texture | Frequency of change and arrangement of tones in an image. |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In RECONASS, remote sensing is one of the technologies used for assessing the damage state of the buildings after a disaster event. Pertaining to that, in WP4 of RECONASS, a remote sensing based exterior building damage assessment subsystem was developed solely by ITC and delivered in D4.1. The developed sub-system is fully automatic, requiring only the UAV-captured images as input. From those images, the sub-system automatically generates a so-called 3D point cloud of the scene. Using the images and 3D point cloud, the sub-system automatically identifies the completely collapsed and intact buildings in the scene. The intact buildings are further analysed for the presence of damage evidences, such as spalling and openings in building caused by the damage along every exterior element of the building. Also, the debris and rubble piles around the buildings are detected and quantified in terms of m³.

One of the other objectives of RECONASS is how to determine the use of the local damage assessment provided by the developed sub-system using the UAV images of the RECONASS monitored and neighbouring buildings to validate and calibrate the damage maps produced for larger areas. This objective is proposed because in general, after a disaster event, numerous damage maps are produced by many agencies to aid emergency response actions. However, these maps are often not validated due to lack of ground truth data, which creates challenges for potential stake holders to choose a suitable and reliable damage map. Moreover, assessments in satellite maps are often found to be either under- or overestimating actual damage due to various reasons. Perhaps the variations in assessments could be systematic with respect to some physical or functional entities associated with the damage area. In such case, the systematic variations can be corrected by designing an appropriate calibration procedure. Also, operational damage maps continue to be generated by manual visual interpretation, typically of satellite images. However, with the advancement in the technologies, automated damage detection from satellite images is becoming feasible. For example, supervised learning models developed based on appropriate training samples have been shown to be capable of mapping damage automatically from the images. However, for all the aforementioned processes such as validation, calibration and automated damage mapping from images, a significant number of ground truth samples is required. Manual collection of ground truth data is typically not practical in case of emergency circumstances. The local assessment of damaged buildings with the RECONASS sub-system is considered to be more accurate and reliable compared to the assessment from satellite images, due to the superior characteristics of UAV images. Hence, these assessments can serve as ground-truth for the aforementioned processes. To address these aims two independent conceptual frameworks are developed for validation and calibration of damage maps using the local assessments from RECONASS subsystem, installed in well-distributed geographic locations, as ground-truth. Also, a method for automated classification of satellite image for damage detection is developed using the supervised learning method by considering the aforementioned type of assessments from RECONASS subsystems as ground-truth samples for training the model.