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Sensors Used in the Study
L7 ETM+
Terra MODIS
EO-1 Hyperion
ENVISAT SCIAMACHY
Ensuring Data Quality is Paramount

- The ability to detect and quantify changes in the Earth’s environment depends on sensors that can provide accurate, calibrated, consistent measurements of the Earth’s surface over time.

- In order to use remotely sensed data and ensure high science-quality observations, scientists need to know:
  - What part of the EM spectrum they are looking at (Spectral)
  - How much energy the instrument is receiving (Radiometric)
  - Where the energy is coming from
    - Center of pixel location (Geometric)
    - Bounds of the area from which the energy is coming (Spatial)
Need for Cross-calibration

- Tie similar (TM/ETM+) & differing (ETM+/MODIS) sensors onto a common radiometric scale

- Provide mission continuity, interoperability, & data fusion

- Essential where on-board references are not available or where vicarious calibration is not feasible

- Critical to coordinate observations from different sensors, exploiting their individual spatial resolutions, temporal sampling, and information content to monitor surface processes over broad scales in both time and space
Key Specifications (ETM+ & MODIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Terra</th>
<th>Landsat 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensor</td>
<td>MODIS</td>
<td>ETM+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bands</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial resolution</td>
<td>250 m, 500 m, 1 km</td>
<td>15 m, 30 m, 60 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swath</td>
<td>2330 km</td>
<td>183 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectral coverage</td>
<td>0.4~14 μm</td>
<td>0.4~12.5 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixel quantization</td>
<td>12 bit</td>
<td>8 bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch date</td>
<td>18-Dec-99</td>
<td>15-Apr-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbit type</td>
<td>Sun synchronous</td>
<td>Sun synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Crossing Time</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altitude</td>
<td>705 km</td>
<td>705 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Calibration Requirement
  - The calibration uncertainties of ETM+ at-sensor spectral radiances are ±5%
  - The calibration uncertainties of the MODIS Top-of-Atmosphere (TOA) reflectance products are ±2%, whereas a ±5% uncertainty requirement is specified for the at-sensor spectral radiance calibration
ETM+ & MODIS Relative Spectral Response (RSR)
Center Wavelengths are represented by the vertical straight line

- The ETM+ spectral coverage is wider than the MODIS bands
- ETM+ B3 and MODIS B1 have the most agreement in terms of the shape of the RSR profile
- MODIS B2 avoids water absorption feature at 0.836 μm
- Overall, better spectral agreement is in the VNIR bands compared to the SWIR bands
- The RSRs differ significantly, which gave the opportunity to explore, understand, quantify, and compensate for the differences in measurements as obtained from these two sensors
Catalog of Worldwide Test Sites for Sensor Characterization

http://calval.cr.usgs.gov/sites_catalog_map.php
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Scope of Test Sites

- Test sites are critical to any Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) strategy
- Test sites provide a convenient means of obtaining information to verify sensor performance
- Test sites are the only practical means of deriving knowledge of biases between sensors
- Test sites allow, at some level, a means of bridging anticipated data gaps caused by lack of measurement continuity, due to lack of co-evident in-flight sensors

Characteristics of Sensors which can Benefit from Test Sites

- Gain
- Stability
- Modulation Transfer Function (MTF)
- Uniformity
- Spectral
- Polarization
- Spatial-to-Noise Ratio (SNR)
- Geolocation
- Camera model
- Band-to-band
- Internal Geometry

Well-Established Site Selection Criteria for Radiometry Test Sites

- High spatial uniformity over a large area (within 3%)
- Surface reflectance [0.11] greater than 0.3
- Flat-spectral reflectance
- Temporally invariant surface properties (within 2%)
- Horizontal surface with nearly Lambertian reflectance
- At high altitude, far from ocean, urban, and industrial areas
- In arid regions with low probability of cloud cover

CEOS Reference Standard Test Sites

- The instrumented sites are primarily used for field campaigns to obtain radiometric gain. These sites can serve as a focus for international efforts, facilitating traceability and cross-comparison of estimated biases of in-flight sensors in a harmonized manner.
- The pseudo-invariant desert sites have high reflectance with low sensor loading and practically no vegetation. Consequently, these sites can be used to evaluate the long-term stability of a sensor and facilitate cross-comparison of multiple sensors.

Online Test Site Catalog

Summary

- The test site catalog provides a comprehensive list of prime candidate terrestrial targets for consideration as benchmark sites for the postlaunch calibration of space-based optical sensors
- The online test site catalog provides easy-to-use Web site access to this vital information for the global community
- The incompleteness of available information on even these prime test sites is an indication that much more coordination and documentation are still needed to facilitate the wider use of calibration test sites in remote sensing

Proposed Future Plans

- Gather complete site characterization data & define core measurements (e.g., Instruments)
- Create an operational network of land sites (“Landnet”) & develop online data access infrastructure
- Encourage agencies to acquire, archive, and provide data over the CEOS sites
- Integrate the catalog into the CEOS CalVal portal
- Establish traceability chains for primary site data
- Develop “test practice” guidance on site characterization and its use
The Pseudo-Invariant Calibration Sites (PICS) located in the Sahara Desert in Africa were used for the cross-cal study. These sites exhibit good spatial, temporal uniformity, with no vegetation, low aerosol loading, and has minimal cloud cover.
The full swath MODIS B3 and ETM+ B321 image over the Libya 4 test site

The ETM+ area is marked as a rectangular box in the MODIS image

The region inside the red rectangle ROI is used for calculating statistics

ROIs within image were selected such that view was nadir
Methodology and Data Processing

- Reprojection of MODIS Level 1B (L1B) data products

- Exclusion of ETM+ SLC-off fill values and images that are contaminated due to saturation

- Selection of a homogeneous Region of Interest (ROI)

- Conversion of calibrated DN to TOA Reflectance ($\rho$)

- Outlier rejection conditions
  - Excluded images that were possibly contaminated with clouds using a brightness temperature threshold of 290 K
  - Excluded ROIs that have an image standard deviation (STD) greater than 0.05 reflectance units
The Libya 4 TOA $\rho$ spectrum is increasing over the VNIR bands
- Average $\rho$, as sampled by ETM+ VNIR bands, will be larger
- Except for ETM+ B4 because of water vapor absorption feature

In the SWIR bands, the Libya 4 TOA $\rho$ spectrum has a Gaussian shape with the peak in the middle (near the MODIS narrow band)
- Average $\rho$, as sampled by MODIS SWIR bands, will be larger
TOA $\rho$ trending over the Libya 4 site

- Measured TOA $\rho$ from MODIS (red squares) ETM+ (blue crosses)

- The slope of the fitted lines were $\sim 10^{-7}$/day, indicating very stable long-term response changing by no more than 0.02% per year (except B1) in their TOA reflectance.

- Major contributions to offsets are caused by a combination of the spectral signature of the ROI, atmospheric composition, and the RSR of each sensor.

- The periodic seasonal oscillations in the TOA $\rho$ trending is caused by the BRDF effects (while satellite zenith angle is nadir, the solar zenith angle varies significantly with season).
Due to 30 min difference between the overpass times, the MODIS ρ start at SZA of 14°, and the ETM+ ρ at SZA of 23°.

The BRDF effect is caused by changes in the illumination geometry due to varying SZAs.
The first order cross-cal compared the TOA $\rho$ between the two sensors without taking into account the spectral differences.

The differences in RSR leads to a systematic band offset when comparing data from two sensors over the same target.

For the Libya 4 site, the percent difference between the ETM+ and MODIS TOA $\rho$:

- in Band 1, is 1.23%;
- in Band 2, 5.52%;
- in Band 3, 2.47%;
- in Band 4, −4.55%;
- in Band 5, −10.41%; and
- in Band 7, −15.64%.

For the PICS, the average percent difference in intercept from long-term trends range from 2% to 15%.
Formulation for Spectral Band Adjustment Factor (SBAF)

- A compensation for differences in RSR can be made after having some prior knowledge of the spectral signature of the target.
  - This adjustment factor needed to compensate for the RSR differences is named as SBAF.
- The simulated $\rho$ can be calculated by integrating the RSR of the sensor with the spectral signature of the target at each sampled wavelength, weighted by the respective RSR.

\[
\bar{\rho}_{\lambda,\text{(sensor)}} = \frac{\int \rho_{\lambda} \ RSR_{\lambda} \ d\lambda}{\int RSR_{\lambda} \ d\lambda}
\]

\[
SBAF = \frac{\bar{\rho}_{\lambda(A)}}{\bar{\rho}_{\lambda(A)}} = \frac{\left(\int \rho_{\lambda} \ RSR_{\lambda(A)} \ d\lambda\right) / \left(\int RSR_{\lambda(A)} \ d\lambda\right)}{\left(\int \rho_{\lambda} \ RSR_{\lambda(B)} \ d\lambda\right) / \left(\int RSR_{\lambda(B)} \ d\lambda\right)}
\]

\[
SBAF = \frac{\bar{\rho}_{\lambda(\text{ETM}+)}^{\text{MODIS}}}{\bar{\rho}_{\lambda(\text{MODIS})}} = \frac{\left(\int \rho_{\lambda} \ RSR_{\lambda(\text{ETM}+)}^{\text{MODIS}} \ d\lambda\right) / \left(\int RSR_{\lambda(\text{MODIS})} \ d\lambda\right)}{\left(\int \rho_{\lambda} \ RSR_{\lambda(\text{MODIS})} \ d\lambda\right) / \left(\int RSR_{\lambda(\text{MODIS})} \ d\lambda\right)}
\]

\[
\bar{\rho}_{\lambda(\text{ETM}+)} = \bar{\rho}_{\lambda(\text{ETM}+)} / SBAF
\]
EO-1 Hyperion Overview

• The NASA EO-1 satellite was launched on Nov 21, 2000, as part of a one-year technology demonstration mission

• Hyperion is a push-broom satellite hyperspectral sensor
  – Spectral range: 0.4 to 2.5 μm
  – Spectral bands: 242
  – Spectral resolution: ~10 nm
  – Spatial resolution: 30 m
  – Swath Width: 7.7 km

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ bands</th>
<th>Bandpass (μm)</th>
<th>Number of Hyperion bands</th>
<th>MODIS bands</th>
<th>Bandpass (μm)</th>
<th>Number of Hyperion bands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45-0.52</td>
<td>7 (B11 - B17)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.459-0.479</td>
<td>2 (B12 - B15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.53-0.61</td>
<td>8 (B19 - B26)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.545-0.565</td>
<td>2 (B20 - B21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63-0.69</td>
<td>6 (B28 - B33)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.620-0.670</td>
<td>5 (B28 - B32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.78-0.90</td>
<td>12 (B43 - B64)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.841-0.876</td>
<td>4 (B49 - B52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.55-1.75</td>
<td>20 (B141 - B160)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.628-1.652</td>
<td>3 (B148 - B150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.09-2.35</td>
<td>26 (B194 - B219)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.105-2.155</td>
<td>5 (B196 - B200)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The Level 1 Hyperion product is generated by the USGS EO-1 Product Generation System (EPGS)
  – The EPGS uses the Hyperion pre-launch calibration coefficients to radiometrically process the data
TOA $\rho$ Profile of 108 Libya 4 Images

- Individual profiles over the Hyperion ROI
- Average TOA $\rho$ profile of 108 Hyperion images acquired over the Libya 4 site at every 10 nm Hyperion center wavelength
- Temporal STD of the TOA $\rho$ over the 108 profiles
SBAF with Lifetime Hyperion Data

- A 5% STD in the lifetime TOA $\rho$ profiles from the Hyperion sensors over Libya 4 was reduced to <1% STD in SBAFs.

- Summarizes the SBAF for the PICS.

- Even for similar desert land cover types, the SBAFs are not identical from site to site.

- The STD generated using lifetime Hyperion profiles was less than 1%.
  - Higher in SWIR bands because of absorption features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Simulated TOA $\rho_{ETM+}$</th>
<th>Simulated TOA $\rho_{MODIS}$</th>
<th>SBAF Average</th>
<th>STD of 108 SBAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Libya 4</th>
<th>Mauritania 1</th>
<th>Mauritania 2</th>
<th>Algeria 3</th>
<th>Algeria 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Libya 4</th>
<th>Mauritania 1</th>
<th>Mauritania 2</th>
<th>Algeria 3</th>
<th>Algeria 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOA ρ trending after SBAF compensation over the Libya 4 site
ENVISAT SCIAMACHY Overview

- The SCanning Imaging Absorption SpectroMeter for Atmospheric CartograpHY (SCIAMACHY) is an atmospheric sensor aboard the European Environmental Satellite (ENVISAT) launched in March 2002.

- The solar radiation transmitted, backscattered, and reflected from the atmosphere is recorded at relatively high resolution (0.2 to 0.5 nm) over the range 0.24 to 1.7 µm, and in selected regions between 2.0 and 2.38 µm.

- The SCIAMACHY mission objective is to perform global measurements of trace gases in the troposphere and in the stratosphere.
Comparison of SCIAMACHY and Hyperion derived TOA $\rho$ profile

- The fine spectral resolution SCIAMACHY profile captures the absorption features better in the strong absorption bands
- The TOA $\rho$ measured by Hyperion is higher than SCIAMACHY
- Both the Hyperion and SCIAMACHY profiles have identical temporal STD of $<3\%$ for most wavelengths used by LRS
- In the wavelengths corresponding to ETM+ and MODIS bands, the SCIAMACHY profile is spectrally smoother than the Hyperion
Comparison of 1 nm Sciamachy spectra with Hyperion 10 nm spectra

Band 1

Band 2

Band 3

Band 4

Relative Spectral Response (RSR) vs. Wavelength (μm)
### Hyperion 10 nm, SCIAMACHY 1 nm and SCIAMACHY 10 nm spectra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Hyperion 10 nm</th>
<th>SCIAMACHY 1 nm</th>
<th>SCIAMACHY 10 nm</th>
<th>HYP 10 nm and SCI 1 nm</th>
<th>SCI 1 nm and SCI 10 nm</th>
<th>HYP 10 nm and SCI 10 nm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>-3.10%</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
<td>-3.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
<td>10.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>8.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Hyperion 10 nm</th>
<th>SCIAMACHY 1 nm</th>
<th>SCIAMACHY 10 nm</th>
<th>HYP 10 nm and SCI 1 nm</th>
<th>SCI 1 nm and SCI 10 nm</th>
<th>HYP 10 nm and SCI 10 nm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>-7.88%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>-7.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>8.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
<td>-0.09%</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>11.83%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Hyperion 10 nm</th>
<th>SCIAMACHY 1 nm</th>
<th>SCIAMACHY 10 nm</th>
<th>HYP 10 nm and SCI 1 nm</th>
<th>SCI 1 nm and SCI 10 nm</th>
<th>HYP 10 nm and SCI 10 nm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
<td>-0.11%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>-3.01%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>-2.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effects of SBAF on lifetime Libya 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Measured TOA $\rho_{ETM+}$ (E)</th>
<th>Measured TOA $\rho_{MODIS}$ (M)</th>
<th>Adjusted TOA ETM+ ($E^*$)</th>
<th>% difference (E-M)/M% before SBAF</th>
<th>% difference ($E^*$-M)/M% after SBAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>-5.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>-0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>-4.55%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results using an average lifetime
Hyperion 10 nm derived SBAFs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Measured TOA $\rho_{ETM+}$ (E)</th>
<th>Measured TOA $\rho_{MODIS}$ (M)</th>
<th>Adjusted TOA ETM+ ($E^*$)</th>
<th>% difference (E-M)/M% before SBAF</th>
<th>% difference ($E^*$-M)/M% after SBAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>-0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>-4.55%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results using an average lifetime
SCIAMACHY 1 nm derived SBAFs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETM+ Bands</th>
<th>Measured TOA $\rho_{ETM+}$ (E)</th>
<th>Measured TOA $\rho_{MODIS}$ (M)</th>
<th>Adjusted TOA ETM+ ($E^*$)</th>
<th>% difference (E-M)/M% before SBAF</th>
<th>% difference ($E^*$-M)/M% after SBAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>-0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>-4.55%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results using an average lifetime
SCIAMACHY 10 nm derived SBAFs
Summary and Lessons Learned

- This study focused on using near-simultaneous observations from ETM+ and MODIS sensors in the reflective solar band spectral domain
- Cross-cal based on TOA reflectances ranged from 2% to 15% (without taking into RSR differences)
- Spectral issues with this cross-cal approach were investigated
  - The RSR adjusted ETM+* TOA $\rho$ were found to agree with MODIS TOA $\rho$ to within 6% or better for all bands using Hyperion derived SBAFs
  - These differences were reduced to less than 1% for all VNIR bands (except Band 2) by using SCIAMACHY derived SBAFs

Lessons Learned from SBAF

- Relative spectral radiometric calibration of the hyperspectral sensor is more critical than its spectral resolution
- SBAFs are more affected by the shape of the spectral profile of the target than by the magnitude the profile
- Even for similar land cover types, the SBAFs are not identical from site to site