Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 8045–8089, 2010 www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/7/8045/2010/ doi:10.5194/hessd-7-8045-2010 © Author(s) 2010. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Hydrology and Earth System Sciences (HESS). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in HESS if available.

Multi-scale estimation of surface moisture in a semi-arid region using ENVISAT ASAR radar data

M. Zribi¹, A. Chahbi^{1,2}, M. Shabou^{1,2}, Z. Lili-Chabaane², B. Duchemin¹, N. Baghdadi³, and A. Chehbouni¹

¹CESBIO (CNRS/IRD/UPS/CNES), UMR 5126, 18 avenue Edouard Belin, BPI 2801, 31401 Toulouse cedex 9, France
 ²INAT-LRSTE, 43, Avenue Charles Nicolle 1082, Tunis, Mahrajene, Tunisia
 ³UMR-TETIS, CEMAGREF, Montpellier, France

Received: 23 September 2010 - Accepted: 5 October 2010 - Published: 15 October 2010

Correspondence to: M. Zribi (mehrez.zribi@ird.fr)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.





Abstract

In this paper, we propose an approach for the estimation and monitoring of soil moisture in a semi-arid region in North Africa, using ENVISAT ASAR images. Our approach is based on soil moisture mapping over two types of vegetation covers. The first mapping

- ⁵ process is dedicated solely to the monitoring of moisture variability related to rainfall events. We chose to implement this analysis over areas in the "non-irrigated olive tree" class of land use. The developed approach is based on a simple linear relationship between soil moisture and the backscattered radar signal normalised at a reference incidence angle.
- ¹⁰ The second process is proposed over wheat fields, using an analysis of moisture variability due to both rainfall and irrigation. A semi-empirical model, based on the water-cloud model for vegetation correction, is used to retrieve soil moisture from the radar signal. Moisture mapping is carried out over wheat fields, showing high variability between irrigated and non-irrigated wheat covers.
- ¹⁵ This study is based on the reduction of a large database, including both ENVISAT ASAR and simultaneously acquired ground-truth measurements (moisture, vegetation, roughness), during the 2008–2009 vegetation cycle.

1 Introduction

Soil moisture is a key parameter, influencing the manner in which rainwater is shared
 between the phenomena of evapotranspiration, infiltration and runoff (Engman, 1991;
 Beven et al., 1996; Koster et al., 2004). In the case of semi-arid and arid regions, this parameter is particularly important for irrigation management (Bastiaassen et al., 2000). In order to optimise and protect water resources, which are often very limited, an accurate estimation of the soil's water content is needed, in order to determine the
 expected evapotranspiration flux. Considerable efforts are thus devoted to improving





the evaluation of evapotranspiration, and to understanding its relationship with the vegetation cover and the soil's water content (Simonneaux et al., 2007).

Over the last twenty years, radar remote sensing has demonstrated its strong potential as a tool for soil moisture estimation (Ulaby et al., 1996; Le Hégarat-Mascle et al., 2002; Moran et al., 2004; Wagner et al., 2007). In the particular case of SAR observations, soil moisture can be estimated with a high spatial resolution, which is not the case with other types of remote sensing measurement (Jackson et al., 1996; Baup et al., 2007; Rahman et al., 2008).

In the case of bare soil, the backscattered radar signal strongly depends on soil ¹⁰ moisture and surface roughness (Zribi et al., 2006; Baghdadi et al., 2007). In the case of sparse vegetation, the return signal depends both on the vegetation's backscattering characteristics, and on the attenuation it introduces to backscattering from the soil (Binslish et al., 2001; Le Hégarat-Mascle et al., 2002). In the case of dense vegetation, such as that of forests, the soil contribution is generally very weak in the C band, partic-¹⁵ ularly at high incidence angles (Ulaby et al., 1986). Many models have been developed to describe the physics of interactions between the radar signal and the surface or veg-

- etation parameters. For bare soils, various theoretical and empirical approaches have been developed (Fung et al., 1992; Oh et al., 1992; Dubois et al., 1995; Zribi and Dechambre, 2003; Baghdadi et al., 2006; Thoma et al., 2008). Among these, the "lin-
- ear approach" linking surface soil moisture to calibrated and validated SAR (Synthetic Aperture Radar) measurements (SIRC, ERS, RADARSAT, ASAR, TerraSAR-X ...) is widely used (Quesney et al., 2000; Zribi et al., 2006; Paris et al., 2010). In some studies, e.g. that of Woodhouse and Hoekman (2000), the estimation of soil moisture is based on a simple model using an incoherent combination of vegetation and bare soil
- ²⁵ contributions, weighted according to their respective relative surface areas (as a percentage of the total surface area). The backscattered contribution from the vegetation is determined using physical or empirical models (Wigneron et al., 1999).

Because of the high spatial variability of soil moisture in the studied region, resulting from variable convective phenomena causing the rainfall to be strongly localized in





small areas, and as a consequence of the presence of a large fraction of irrigated areas, we propose a methodology in which soil moisture is estimated from high-resolution SAR radar data.

Our approach in this paper is based on ENVISAT ASAR radar data, acquired simultaneously with in situ measurements of surface parameters (moisture, roughness and vegetation). The developed methodology proposes the use of high spatial resolution mapping, firstly over non-irrigated olive tree fields, followed by mapping over wheat fields.

The present paper is organised as follows: Sect.2 presents the data collected from the Kairouan plain region (Tunisia) under study: the database including satellite and ground-truth measurements is discussed. In Sect. 3, the proposed methodology for soil moisture retrieval is described. The derived results, including the validation of soil moisture estimations and mapping, are then presented. Finally, our conclusions are gathered in Sect. 4.

2 Description of the site and ground-truth measurements

2.1 Description of the site

20

The Kairouan plain (Leduc et al., 2007) is situated in central Tunisia (9°30' E–10°15' E, 35° N, 35°45' N) (Fig. 1). The climate in this region is semi-arid, with an average annual rainfall of approximately 300 mm per year, characterised by a rainy season lasting from October to May, with the two rainiest months being October and March. As is generally the case in semi-arid areas, the rainfall patterns in this area are highly variable in time and space. The mean temperature in Kairouan City is 19.2°C (minimum of 10.7°C in January and maximum of 28.6°C in August). The mean annual potential evapotranspiration (Penman) is close to 1600 mm.

²⁵ The landscape is mainly flat. The vegetation in this area is dominated by agriculture (cereals, olive trees, and market gardens). Crops are various and their rotation is





typical of semi-arid regions. The aquifer of the Kairouan plain represents the largest basin in central Tunisia. It is fed by the infiltration of surface waters during floods in the natural regime, or at the time of dam releases since the construction of the Sidi Saad and El Haouareb dams. Surface and groundwater streams are drained into Sebkha Kelbia, a large salt lake.

2.2 Satellite data

5

2.2.1 Description

In March 2002, the European Space Agency launched the ENVISAT platform, carrying ASAR in its suite of instruments. Compared with ERS/SAR, this instrument has an extended measurement capacity, due to its multiple operating modes (Rosich, 2002). 10 In particular, it has a greatly improved measurement repetition rate, with less than three days between two successive images taken at two different incidence angles, as opposed to a 35-day repeat cycle for ERS/SAR. In the present study, we chose to use the narrow observation mode, which generates high-resolution data $(12.5 \text{ m} \times 12.5 \text{ m})$ pixel spacing). Acquisitions were made between 2008 and 2010, at three different 15 incidence angles (18° "IS1", 23° "IS2" and 27° "IS3") in co-polarized, alternating HH and VV polarization mode. Details of the SAR image characteristics are provided in Table 1. A large number of SPOT/HRV images was acquired simultaneously with the radar soundings. SPOT/HRV is a multi-spectral optical sensor, with two bands in the visible domain, one in the near infrared, and one in the medium infrared. These proved 20 particularly useful for the mapping of land use and vegetation dynamics.

2.2.2 Data processing

Radar data

25

Absolute calibration of the ASAR images was carried out, to transform the radar signals (digitized values) into a backscattering coefficient (σ°). All images were geo-referenced





using a geo-referenced SPOT/HRV image, resulting in an RMS control point error of about 10 m. The registration error of the ASAR images was taken into account in selecting Areas Of Interest (AOI) within each test field.

SPOT data

15

⁵ The SPOT/HRV images were firstly geo-referenced. Radiometric and atmospheric corrections were then applied in order to estimate the reflectance of the vegetation canopy. Finally, for each image, the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) was estimated. This index, given by the ratio between the difference between the visible and near-infrared channels, and the sum of these two channels, is related to the green vegetation photosynthetic activity (Rouse et al., 1973).

2.3 Ground truth measurements

Ground-truth measurements were carried out over different test fields, simultaneously to different satellite acquisitions. Ten test fields were selected for these measurements, to represent different types of land use: wheat fields – P4 (2 ha), P6 (1.5 ha), P7 (6 ha), P9 (3 ha) and Pst2 (2 ha), non-irrigated olive trees fields – P4bis (6 ha), P10 (2 ha), P12 (2 ha), and Pst2 (2 ha), non-irrigated olive trees fields – P4bis (6 ha), P10 (2 ha), P12 (2 ha), P12 (2 ha), P10 (2 ha), P10

(6 ha), and bare soils – P5 (2.5 ha). The studied site is characterised by the reduced size of most fields.

2.3.1 Surface moisture

Moisture measurements were taken simultaneously with the satellite acquisitions. The in situ collection of soil was extremely important in this experiment, as it was needed to validate the soil moisture retrieval algorithm. For each field, we made approximately twenty measurements at the time of each satellite acquisition. These were made using a handheld Thetaprobe, and by means of gravimetric measurements at depths between 0 and 5 cm. Thetaprobe measurements are calibrated with gravimetric





measurements. Table 2 illustrates moisture values over field tests during different ground campaigns.

2.3.2 Soil roughness

Roughness measurements were made using a pin profiler (total length of 1 m, and
resolution of 2 cm). In order to guarantee suitable precision in the roughness computations, approximately 10 profiles were recorded for each field. As the surface height profile is considered to be ergodic and stationary, we can compute the correlation function for each profile (Zribi et al., 1997), and derive two statistical parameters: the rms height (vertical scale of roughness), and the correlation length (/) which represents the
horizontal scale over which similar roughness conditions are detected. The rms height values are approximately equal to 0.7 cm for wheat fields, and are generally greater than 1.5 cm for olive tree fields, as illustrated in Table 3.

2.3.3 Vegetation covers

In order to characterise the vegetation covers, we considered three types of measurement. For the non-irrigated olive fields, we measured the distances between trees and the size of the trees in a large number of test fields. Distance between olive trees is of approximately 20 m, and the mean projected surface area of an adult olive tree, is approximately 16 m² (Fig. 2).

In the case of wheat fields, we implemented two types of measurement:

20 Leaf area index data

25

The Leaf Area Index (LAI) is defined as the total one-sided area of leaf tissue per unit ground surface area. According to this definition, the LAI is a dimensionless quantity characterizing the canopy of an ecosystem. During the 2008/2009 agricultural season, the LAI was derived from hemispherical digital photography based on analysis of the canopy gap fraction (Duchemin et al., 2008). These measurements were applied to





each wheat field, on different days during the vegetation season. Irrigated wheat fields are generally characterised by a higher LAI than non-irrigated wheat fields. Before the end of March, the highest observed LAI was approximately 2. At the end of April we observed the highest vegetation density, with its maximum generally lying in the interval (4–6). Table 4 illustrates measurement values over wheat test fields.

Vegetation water content (VWC) data

The VWC was measured several times in five fields during the 2009 vegetation cycle (Table 4). For each field, measurements were made at three locations, each having a 1 m^2 surface area. The above ground biomass was removed, and wet and dry weights were used to compute the VWC. A mean value was computed from the three measurements.

Land use

5

15

Land use validation was carried out in March 2009, with different fields being selected from the studied region (more than 150 fields) with two parts, a first one for the identification of empirical NDVI limits between different types of vegetation classes, and a second one for the validation of our approach to land use classification.

Land use mapping is based on a decision tree, using three types of satellite data: four SPOT images, SRTM data and finally two radar images. We established eight classes of land use: non-irrigated olive trees, irrigated olive trees, irrigated winter vegetables,

- ²⁰ irrigated summer vegetables, bare soils, urban areas, mountainous areas, water cover and areas of coastal salt flats "sebkhas". In the case of vegetables, as previously mentioned, we considered two classes, one for winter and the other for summer. We used empirical NDVI thresholds with the images acquired at the end of December 2008 (NDVI > 0.4) and during July 2009 (NDVI > 0.3). In fact, during these two periods, only
- ²⁵ irrigated vegetables presented a high NDVI. For the wheat classes (irrigated or nonirrigated), we made our analysis on two different dates, the first at the beginning of the





cycle (in December 2008), and the second at the end of the vegetation development period (April 2009). The distinction between irrigated and non-irrigated wheat is based on a NDVI threshold equal to 0.5, since the irrigated class has a higher NDVI. Irrigated and non-irrigated olives are separated using a K-mean approach, based on a single optical SPOT image. The DTM provided by the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM, http://srtm.usgs.gov/) allowed certain zones to be eliminated from our land use analysis. We excluded mountainous areas with an altitude greater than 300 m. We also identified water cover and urban classes. Validation of these remotely sensed classifications, based on ground verification over more than 100 fields with different types of land uses, reveals an accuracy of around 94%. Figure 3 illustrates the results of our land use mapping for the 2008–2009 season. The non-irrigated olive tree class covers 43% of the studied site, and the wheat class corresponds to 12% of the surface area of the studied site.

3 Methodology and results

¹⁵ Our approach to soil moisture estimation and mapping is carried out on two types of land use: non-irrigated olive areas and wheat fields, which represent the two most important land use classes.

3.1 Soil moisture estimation over non-irrigated olive fields

3.1.1 Introduction

²⁰ For the purposes of surface soil moisture estimation, we used the IS1, IS2, IS3 configurations, corresponding to low incidence angles of less than 30°. The aim of this approach was to limit the influence of vegetation and soil roughness, thereby increasing the accuracy of the moisture estimations.

As shown in the following expression, the signal received from the non-irrigated olive tree areas can be written as the incoherent sum of two contributions, weighted by





their respective percentages of terrain coverage. The first of these corresponds to the bare soil contribution, whereas the second corresponds to that from the olive trees, which composed on three terms: the vegetation contribution, the bare soil contribution including the influence of olive vegetation attenuation, and the contribution resulting from interactions between the soil and the vegetation.

$$\sigma_{\text{total}}^0$$
 = (1 - C) × $\sigma_{\text{bare soil}}^0$ + C × σ_{olives}^0

where C is the fraction of the non-irrigated olive field surface covered by olive trees.

Using the estimated distance between olive trees of approximately 20 m, and the mean projected surface area of an adult olive tree, i.e. approximately 16 m^2 , we derive for different incidence angles lower than 30° a value between 4% and 10% for *C* fraction. We make therefore the assumption that the influence of the vegetation on the radar signal is negligible. Based on different developments over disperse vegetation cover (Wagner et al., 1999; Zribi et al., 2006), the radar signal could be modelled with a linear relationship between radar signal and moisture, as:

¹⁵ $\sigma_{\text{total}}^0 \approx \alpha$ (veg) × *Mν* + *g* (Roughness, veg)

5

Where α is related to the parameter *C* and to the attenuation due to the olive trees characteristics.

g is a function of soil roughness and vegetation cover effects on radar signal. Mv is volumetric soil moisture.

- ²⁰ The inversion process is based on four successive steps:
 - 1. Normalisation of all radar images to the same incidence angle (20°).
 - 2. Reduction of roughness and vegetation effects by subtracting the radar data recorded on a dry date, at the beginning of the season, from the data used for the soil moisture estimation.
- Defining a relationship between the ground soil moisture and the processed radar signals from different olive tree test fields.



(1)

(2)



- Application of the inversion approach to the studied site. Moisture estimations are computed within a 100 × 100 pixel grid positioned over each olive tree pixel, in order to avoid local heterogeneity effects.
- 5. Normalisation of the radar signals to an incidence angle of 20°.
- Normalisation of the ASAR data is based on the interpretation of radar signal data, for different incidence angles, recorded over large olive tree AOIs. These areas are selected to be in the olive tree class, and only those radar images recorded on very dry dates are considered, in order to eliminate noise contributed by soil moisture effects. As shown in Fig. 4, we observe a decrease in radar signal with increasing incidence angle.
 The angular dependence of backscattering coefficient is modelled with a mathematical function (Baghdadi et al., 2001), resulting in a high correlation coefficient (respectively *R*² equal to 0.56 and 0.6 for HH and VV polarisations):

$$\sigma^0 = a \cos (\theta)^b$$

15

Using this fit, the data was normalised to a θ_{ref} equal to 20° incidence angle using the following expression:

$$\sigma^{0} (\theta_{\text{ref}}) = \sigma^{0} (\theta) \frac{\cos (\theta)^{b}}{\cos (\theta_{\text{ref}})^{b}}$$

We retrieve *b* respectively equal to 5.5 and 6.3 for HH and VV polarisation.

3.1.2 Roughness and vegetation effect reduction

In order to limit roughness and vegetation effects, we computed the difference between each raw data image and a reference image taken under dry conditions at the beginning of the vegetation season (21 December 2008), with a moisture content of approximately 5% over the studied site.

In the case of the olive tree fields, we observed very small variations during the vegetation cycle, due in particular to the olive trees being evergreen. We thus consider,



(3)

(4)



as an initial hypothesis, that the vegetation has an approximately constant effect on the radar signal.

If we now consider a reference image, with a roughness R_1 and moisture content Mv_1 and a data image with a roughness R and moisture content Mv,

$$\Delta \sigma_{\text{total}}^0 = \alpha \left(Mv - Mv_1 \right) + g \left(\text{veg}, R \right) - g(\text{veg}, R_1)$$
(5)

As for surface roughness, the olive fields generally have a tillage corresponding to ploughed soil with an rms height of around 1.5–3 cm, as shown in ground measurements. Only small variations could be observed after rainfall events. However, the soil is ploughed at different times during the year, which induces low variations on rms heights. For such roughness levels the backscattered radar signals are nearly saturated, as illustrated in IEM simulations of backscattering coefficients realized in its validity domain with rms height lower than 1.1 cm (Fig. 5). The subtraction of a reference image is therefore sufficient to considerably reduce the influence of roughness in the observed pixels, even for cases where there are small differences in roughness between the two images. We can thus simplify the above expression to:

$$\Delta \sigma_{\rm total}^0 \approx \alpha \left(M v - M v_1 \right)$$

3.1.3 Relationship between moisture and processed radar signals

Figure 6 illustrates the linear relationship found between ground surface moisture measurements and radar signals over different test fields. Each point corresponds to a set of two measurements (ground-truth measurement, radar signal) recorded for different test fields. A strong correlation can be seen between the two types of data, for HH and VV polarisations, with a correlation coefficient R^2 equal to 0.67 and 0.53 respectively. The measured moisture contents range between 5% and 22%.



(6)



3.1.4 Validation of the proposed algorithm

Validation of the proposed algorithm is based on a comparison between ground-truth (gravimetric, and handheld Thetaprobe) measurements and estimations derived from ENVISAT ASAR data, for data acquired in 2010 and moisture conditions ranging from

dry to wet, over olive test fields (P4bis, P10, P12). The resulting RMSE is equal to 3.8% for the HH and 4% for the VV polarisations, as illustrated in Fig. 7. Figure 8 illustrates a good coherence between soil moisture estimations with HH and VV radar signals, with an RMSE equal to 2% and bias equal to 1.6% over tested fields. The accuracy of this outcome demonstrates the robustness of the proposed algorithm, in
 spite of its simplicity. Our decision to develop an inversion algorithm, for olive trees only, considerably reduces the influence of roughness and vegetation on the soil moisture estimations. It is thus possible to apply this validated model to each ENVISAT ASAR image, to produce soil moisture maps over fields in the non-irrigated olive tree class.

3.1.5 Mapping of soil moisture

- In order to eliminate the effects of local terrain heterogeneities (due to soil texture, vegetation dispersion heterogeneity, discontinuities between fields, etc.) in the processed radar signal, the soil moisture was estimated over large cells defined by 100 × 100 pixel areas (about 1 km²). For each resulting cell, the soil moisture estimation is applied only if more than 25% of the cell's pixels belong to olive tree fields. The value of
- the computed moisture can be then considered to be representative of the whole cell. To validate these estimations, the ground-truth measurements taken within the same cell are averaged. When the inversion is applied to the HH and VV radar signals, we observe similar results for both polarisations. In order to increase the precision of our estimations, we took the mean value of the two polarisations as the final result in the mapping process.

In Fig. 9, soil moisture maps are shown for three different dates. These maps are directly related to the temporal and spatial variability of the precipitation over this region.





For example, on date 9 December 2009, dry soil is observed over the full studied site, with a low moisture content of around 10%. Indeed, no rainfall was recorded during the 15 days preceding the acquisition of this satellite image. In the case of the image taken on 11 April 2009, strong spatial variability of the surface moisture can be observed. In

- fact, a rainfall event arriving from the West occurred during the afternoon of 11 April. In the Eastern part of this image, the soil moisture remained low. The third image in this figure provides the moisture map produced one day later, on 12 April, showing generalised rainfall throughout the studied site, associated with a global increase in soil moisture with a mean value of around 25%.
- Our approach allows the moisture to be estimated over approximately 50% of the studied site. It is presented particularly in the South East, where irrigated agriculture is absent. The interest of the choice of this class of land use is evident, since the computed moisture has only a small sensitivity to roughness and vegetation, both of which are affected by very limited changes from one year to another. This type of algorithm can thus be applied each year, with no need for it to be adapted to variations
- in local conditions.

3.2 Moisture estimation over wheat fields

3.2.1 Introduction

Following an estimation of soil moisture related to precipitation effects, carried out over non-irrigated olive tree fields, we propose a methodology with high spatial resolution analysis over wheat fields. In fact, because of limited fields scale (generally lower than 2 ha), and high spatial variability of moisture between irrigated and non-irrigated wheat fields, we need to realize moisture estimation in higher spatial resolution. In this case, the inversion algorithm is based on three steps:

- Correction of vegetation effects using a first-order radiative transfer model.





- Analysis of the relationship between surface moisture and the processed radar signal corrected for vegetation effects.
- Application of an inversion approach over wheat fields. The moisture estimations are computed for each cell within a 5 × 5 grid over each wheat field.

5 3.2.2 Vegetation correction

In order to estimate the soil moisture over fields covered by vegetation, we first need to eliminate the vegetation's influence on the backscattered radar signal. We propose to use the water-cloud model developed by Attema and Ulaby (1978). For an incidence angle θ , the backscatter coefficient is represented in the water cloud model by the expression:

$$\sigma^{0} = \sigma^{0}_{\text{canopy}} + \sigma^{0}_{\text{canopy + soil}} + \tau^{2} \sigma^{0}_{\text{soil}}$$

where τ^2 is the two-way vegetation transmissivity. The first term represents scattering due to the vegetation; the second term is linked to multiple scattering effects, and the third term represents the soil scattering attenuated by the vegetation cover. The second term can be neglected in the case of wheat scattering (Ulaby et al., 1986). Expression (Eq. 9) can thus be simplified to:

$$\sigma^0 = \sigma_{\text{canopy}}^0 + \tau^2 \sigma_{\text{soil}}^0 \tag{8}$$

with

$$\tau^2 = \exp(-2B. \text{ VWC. sec }\theta)$$

20 and

15

$$\sigma_{\text{canopy}}^{0} = A. \text{ VWC. } \cos \theta \left(1 - \tau^{2}\right)$$

where VWC is the vegetation water content (kg/m²). 8059



(7)

(9)

(10)



A and *B* are parameters which depend on the type of canopy. This formulation represents a first-order solution for the radiative transfer equation through a weak medium, where multiple scattering is neglected. The parameters *A* and *B* are estimated empirically, using our ground-truth measurements and radar signals measured over wheat test fields (P4, P6, P7, P9 and Pst2) in a part of radar acquisition dates.

3.2.3 Relationship between soil moisture and bare soil radar signals

For bare soil backscattering, we consider a simple relationship between moisture and radar signal.

$$\sigma_{\text{soil}}^{0}(\theta) = \beta(\theta) \exp(\gamma(\theta).Mv)$$

5

- ¹⁰ This expresses a linear relationship between soil moisture and the radar signal in dB. The slope of this relationship is estimated from measurements acquired just before the vegetation starts to develop. From the end of December until the end of January, the soils are bare, with no vegetation cover on the wheat fields.
- The constant term β is dependent on the roughness effect which must be precisely estimated to reduce errors in moisture estimation (Alvarez-Mozos et al., 2009; Lievens et al., 2009). After sowing, the farmers do not till the soil again before harvesting. Our roughness ground measurements indicated the presence of smooth soils with an rms height approximately between 0.6 and 0.8 cm. It is reasonable to assume that for some wheat fields roughness could have a small decrease throughout our period
- ²⁰ of inversion. IEM simulations show approximately a 2 dB decrease of backscattering coefficient, at low incidence angles, for surfaces with a rms height going from 0.8 cm to 0.6 cm (Fig. 5). Our hypothesis of a constant mean β value for all wheat fields during period of inversion could then introduce a supplementary maximum error in volumetric moisture estimation of about 3% due to \pm 1 dB error in roughness effect.
- ²⁵ In order to retrieve variations of this constant as a function of incidence angle, we determined the variations in radar signal as a function of incidence angle, at different dates under dry conditions, over wheat fields. In fact, the angular variations in



(11)



radar signal are related only to roughness effects, as illustrated in IEM simulations of backscattering coefficients, with different soil roughness and moisture values (Fig. 10).
Figure 11 presents the angular dependence of HH polarisation data, based on radar acquisitions over a large number of wheat fields at different incidence angles. As for olive trees fields, we use the function (Eq. 3) to model radar signal variation function of incidence angle.

For the proportionality between soil moisture and radar signal, we considered a constant value, independent of incidence angle. This was confirmed by Integral Equation Model (IEM) (Fung et al., 1992), simulations showing very little change in radar signal sensitivity to moisture, for the range of incidence angles used in our analysis, i.e. between 15° and 30° (Fig. 12).

The backscattering model over bare soil thus becomes:

 $\sigma_{\text{soil}}^{0}(\theta) = \beta(\theta) \exp(\gamma . Mv)$

10

25

3.2.4 Validation of moisture estimation

Validation of the proposed algorithm is based on comparisons between ground-truth measurements made in test wheat fields (P4, P6, P7, P9, Pst2) characterised by different soil moistures, ranging between dry and wet conditions, and estimations for the state of vegetation development derived from ENVISAT ASAR radar signal acquisitions, made in 2009 and 2010. The results are illustrated in Fig. 13. We observe more validation points in HH polarisation because of the use of one ASAR image with just this configuration.

The resulting rms error is equal to 5.3% and 6.4%, in the respectively HH and VV polarisations. Although this accuracy could be considered to be adequate, in the case of irrigated fields we often observed a high spatial variation of the soil's moisture content. In addition, our measurements were often carried out within a three hour period before or after the site was overflown by the satellite. Some differences could arise due to a high evaporation rate, and in some cases it is possible that our ground-truth



(12)



measurements were affected by irrigation which commenced during the satellite measurements. Finally, as discussed in the last section, the hypothesis of a constant roughness effect could increase the rms error.

3.2.5 Mapping of soil moisture over wheat fields

For the studied site, application of the inversion algorithm requires some information related to the vegetation's water content. For this reason, we developed an approach based on the interpretation of SPOT satellite optical measurements, linking VWC to LAI and then to NDVI index estimations.

Figure 14 illustrates the relationship between measurements of water content and LAI over different test fields. We observe a good correlation between the two variables, with R^2 equal to 0.61. Therefore, knowledge of the LAI values can be used to estimate the vegetation's water content (VWC), using the following equation:

VWC = 0.46 LAI - 0.004

For the LAI estimations, we made use of the NDVI vegetation index derived from

SPOT images acquired during the full vegetation cycle. We proposed a relationship between NDVI and LAI estimations for wheat, based on a large database of ground and SPOT/HRV satellite measurements.

This expression is:

NDVI = NDVI_{∞} + (NDVI_{soil} - NDVI_{∞}) × e^{-k} LAI

with $NDVI_{\infty} = 0.75$, $NDVI_{soil} = 0.15$ and k = -1.24.

For LAI < 2, we observe an increase in the LAI with NDVI indices. For higher values of LAI, the estimation becomes more complex, with saturation of the NDVI values resulting in reduced accuracy for the LAI estimations. In order to make reliable estimations of the vegetation moisture content, allowing accurate vegetation corrections, we

ran the inversions only for the period between January and March, for which the LAI were still not high (lower than about 1.5). The expressions for water content estimation



(13)

(14)



could then be applied with good accuracy. In the case of dense vegetation cover, it is very difficult to retrieve the soil moisture with sufficient precision. This is also an intrinsic limitation of the use of C-band SAR data, since the radar signal is strongly attenuated by the vegetation.

⁵ Our process thus involves, firstly NDVI mapping from SPOT satellite images, from which the LAI and then vegetation water content are deduced over wheat fields. Finally, after applying corrections for the influence of vegetation, we derive the soil moisture.

All pixels in the wheat class of land use are considered to be valid candidates for soil moisture estimations. However, a radar signal from a minimum number of neighbouring pixels is required to avoid adding speckle noise to the results. We thus considered 5×5 pixel windows (about 0.4 ha) for the computation of effective radar signals in the wheat class, which were then used to estimate the soil moisture.

Figure 15 illustrates the resulting soil moisture maps, computed over wheat fields at different dates. For wet days corresponding to rainfall events, such as that of 16 Jan-

- ¹⁵ uary 2009, a high soil moisture value can be observed for all wheat fields. For dry dates such as 7 March 2009, we observe different moisture values. Increasing moisture values can be observed over irrigated fields. On 24 December 2008 date, non-irrigated wheat fields are found to have soil moisture of approximately 6%. For irrigated wheat fields, the values are generally higher; even very high moistures (around 40%) can
- ²⁰ be observed in some cases. The variability of these moisture observations is in complete agreement with the land use classification, distinguished by two classes, i.e. non-irrigated and irrigated wheat. This type of mapping process, if enhanced by means of high temporal monitoring, could become a very useful tool for the regional analysis of irrigation and water consumption, particularly in semi-arid areas with limited water resources.

3.2.6 Final moisture mapping

10

Figure 16 provides an illustration of our mapping process in a small area of our studied region, in 7 March 2009, in which moisture map computed for non irrigated olive tree





fields and wheat fields are combined. Differences in moisture level can be observed between the two classes. The mean moisture level in the olive tree fields is approximately equal to 10%, as opposed to 15% for the wheat class fields. This difference is not due to irrigation alone, but also to differences in soil texture. In particular, the percentage of sand in the soil of olive fields is higher than in wheat fields, such that soil moisture of the former decreases more rapidly after rainfall events.

4 Conclusions

5

20

25

Numerous studies have been published on the topic of soil moisture estimation over bare soil, or over land with one type of vegetation, in one spatial direction. The present
 study describes an approach for the two-dimensional estimation of soil moisture, a first one only linked to rainfall, using fields in the "non-irrigated olive tree" land use class. Radar data has been used to clearly identify soil moisture variations resulting from rainfall events. A relationship is established between ground-truth measurements and backscattered radar signals. The proposed inversion approach is based on three main
 steps:

- Normalisation of the ENVISAT ASAR data to one incidence angle.
- Reduction of roughness effects through the subtraction of a reference image corresponding to the 2-D signal obtained on a dry day.
- Implementation of an empirical relationship, enabling the soil moisture to be derived from the processed radar signals.

The validation of this approach has been demonstrated to have good accuracy in terms of moisture estimation. Moisture mapping using this process is shown for several dates, revealing various temporal and spatial variations, linked only to rainfall events. This estimation is proposed at a cell resolution of 100×100 pixels. The approach developed for fields in the non-irrigated olive tree class (about 43% of used land) allows nearly





all areas of the studied region to be covered, from which a quantitative and precise estimation of the spatial variability of soil moisture can de derived. This parameter is essential for rainfed agriculture which represents 90% of agriculture areas in Tunisia. In fact, understanding surface processes over these areas and vegetation resistance, particularly during frequent drought periods or because of climate change, is essential.

5

A second type of moisture estimation is proposed over wheat fields. The principal objective of this estimation is to identify a relationship between moisture variability and irrigation in the studied region. The methodology developed for this application is based on two steps:

- Correction for vegetation effects using a simple first-order radiative transfer model. This correction is based on the relationships established between vegetation water content and optical satellite measurements (SPOT/HRV data).
 - Determination of a linear relationship between ground moisture measurements and processed bare soil radar signals.
- Good agreement is found between the inversion results and the ground-truth measurements, with a mean rms error of about 5.8%. Moisture mapping over wheat fields allows those fields that are irrigated, and thus characterised by generally higher moisture values, to be clearly identified, particularly during dry periods. If associated with temporal monitoring at a high repetition rate, this mapping process could make it possible to implement regional control of irrigation politics. In future studies, we plan to use the soil moisture maps described here, together with other satellite data sources, in particular those describing vegetation dynamics, to estimate the 2D distribution of evapotranspiration effects over the studied site.





Acknowledgements. This study was funded by two programs: the PNTS (French National Remote Sensing Program), and the AUF (Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie) and Institut de Recherche pour le Développement. The authors wish to thank ESA (European Space Agency) and ISIS program for kindly providing ASAR/ENVISAT and SPOT images. ASAR images were

obtained under proposal C1.P 5962. We would like also to thank CTV Chbika, the cereal institute, and the CRDA for their assistance with the ground-truth measurements. We also thank all of the technical 5 teams of the IRD and the INAT for their strong collaboration and support in implementing the ground-truth measurements.



The publication of this article is financed by CNRS-INSU.

References

15

- Álvarez-Mozos, J., Verhoest, N. E. C., Larrañaga, A., Casalí, J., and González-Audícana, M.: Influence of surface roughness spatial variability and temporal dynamics on the retrieval of
- soil moisture from SAR observations, Sensors, 9(1), 463–489, 2009.
- Attema, E. P. W. and Ulaby, F. T.: Vegetation modeled as a water cloud, Radio Sci. 13, 357–364, 1978.

Baghdadi, N., Bernier, M., Gauthier, R., and Neeson, I.: Evaluation of C-band SAR data for wetlands mapping, Int. J. Remote Sens., 22(1), 71–88, 2001.

- Baghdadi, N., King, C., Bourguignon, A., and Remond, A.: Potential of ERS and RADARSAT data for surface roughness monitoring over bare agricultural fields: application to catchments in Northern France, Int. J. Remote Sens., 23(17), 3427–3442, 2002.
 - Baghdadi, N., Holah, N., and Zribi, M.: Soil moisture estimation using multi-incidence and multi-polarization ASAR SAR data, Int. J. Remote Sens., 27(10), 1907–1920, 2006.





8067

- Baghdadi, N., Aubert, M., Cerdan, O., Franchistéguy, L., Viel, C., Martin, E., Zribi, M., and Desprats, J. F.: Operational mapping of soil moisture using synthetic aperture radar data: application to Touch basin (France), Sensors J., 7, 2458–2483, 2007.
- Bastiaanssen, W. G. M., Molden, D. J., and Makin, I. W.: Remote sensing for irrigated agriculture: examples from research and possible applications, Agr. Water Manage., 46, 137–155, 2000.
 - Baup, F., Mougin, E., De Rosnay, P., Timouk, F., and Chênerie, I.: Surface soil moisture estimation over the AMMA Sahelian site in Mali using ENVISAT/ASAR data, Remote Sens. Environ., 109(4), 473–481, 2007.
- Beven, K. J. and Fisher, J.: Remote Sensing and Scaling in Hydrology, Scaling in Hydrology Using Remote Sensing, edited by: Stewart, J. B., Engman, E. T., Feddes, A., and Kerr, Y., Wiley, New York, 93-111, 1996.
 - Bindlish, R. and Barros, A. P.: Parameterization of vegetation backscatter in radar-based soil moisture estimation, Remote Sens. Environ., 76, 130–137, 2001.
- ¹⁵ Dubois, P. C., Van Zyl, J., and Engman, T.: Measuring soil moisture with imaging radars, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 33(4), 915–926, 1995.
 - Duchemin, B., Maisongrande, P., Boulet, G., and Benhadj, I.: A simple algorithm for yield estimates: Evaluation for semi-arid irrigated winter wheat monitored with green leaf area index, Environ. Modell. Softw., 23, 876–892, 2008.
- Engman, E. T.: Applications of microwave remote sensing of soil moisture for water resources and agriculture, Remote Sens. Environ., 35(2–3), 213–226, 1991.
 - Fung, A. K., Li, Z., and Chen, K. S.: Backscattering from a randomly rough dielectric surface, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 30(2), 356–369, 1992.
- Jackson, T.-J., Schmugge, J., and Engman, E.-T.: Remote sensing applications to hydrology: soil moisture, Hydrol. Sci., 41(4), 517–530, 1996.
 - Koster, R. D., Dirmeyer, P. A., Guo, Z., Bonan, G., Chan, E., Cox, P., Gordon, C. T., Kanae, S., Kowalczyk, E., Lawrence, D., Liu, P., Lu, C. H., Malyshev, S., McAvaney, B., Mitchell, K., Mocko, D., Oki, T., Oleson, K., Pitman, A., Sud, Y. C., Taylor, C. M., Verseghy, D., Vasic, R., Xue, Y., and Yamada, T.: Regions of Strong Coupling Between Soil Moisture and Distribution Octavity 2004.
- ³⁰ Precipitation, Science, 305, 1138–1140, doi:10.1126/science.1100217, 2004.
 - Le Hégarat-Mascle, S., Zribi, M., Alem, F., Weisse, A., and Loumagne, C.: Soil moisture estimation from ERS/SAR data: Toward an operational methodology, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 40(10), 1–12, 2002.





- Leduc, C., Ben Ammar, S., Favreau, G., Béji, R., Virrion, R., Lacombe, G., Tarhouni, J., Aouadi, C., Zenati Chelli, B., Jebnoun, N., O. M., Michelot, J. L., and Zouari, K.: Impacts of hydrological changes in the Mediterranean zone: environmental modifications and rural development in the Merguellil catchment, central Tunisia, Hydrolog. Sci. J., 52(6), 1162–1178, 2007.
- Lievens, H., Vernieuwe, H., Alvarez-Mozos, J., De Baets, B., and Verhoest, N. E. C.: Error in SAR-derived soil moisture due to roughness parameterization: An analysis based on synthetical surface profiles, Sensors, 9(2), 1067–1093; doi:10.3390/s90201067, 2009.
 - Magagi, R. D. and Kerr, Y. H.: Retrieval of soil moisture and vegetation characteristics by use of ERS-1 wind scatterometer over arid and semi-arid areas, J. Hydrol., 188–189, 361–384, 1997.
 - Moran, M. S., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Watts, J. M., and McElroy, S.: Estimating soil moisture at the watershed scale with satellite-based radar and land surface models, Can. J. Remote Sens., 30, 805–826, 2004.

Oh, Y., Sarabandi, K., and Ulaby, F. T.: An empirical model and an inversion technique for radar scattering from bare soil surfaces, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 30(2), 370–381, 1992.

Paris Anguela, T., Zribi, M., Baghdadi, N., and Loumagne, C.: Analysis of local variation of soil surface parameters with TerraSAR-X radar data over bare agricultural fields, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 48(2), 874–881, 2010.

Quesney, A., Le Hégarat-Mascle, S., Taconet, O., Vidal-Madjar, D., Wigneron, J. P., Loumagne,

- 20 C., and Normand, M.: Estimation of watershed soil moisture index from ERS/SAR data, Remote Sens. Environ., 72, 290–303, 2000.
 - Rahman, M. M., Moran, M. S., Thoma, D. P., Bryant, R., Holifield, Collins, C. D., Jackson, T., Orr, B. J., and Tischler, M.: Mapping surface roughness and soil moisture using multi-angle radar imagery without ancillary data, Remote Sens. Environ., 112(2), 391–402, 2008.

²⁵ Rosich, B.: ASAR Validation Review, ESRIN, Frescatti, 11–12 December, 2002.

10

15

Rouse, J. W., Haas, R. H., Schell, J. A., and Deering, D. W.: Monitoring vegetation systems in the great plains with ERTS, Third ERTS Symposium, NASA SP-351 I, 309–317, 1973.
Simonneaux, V., Duchemin, B., Helson, D., ER-Raki, S., Olioso, A., and Chehbouni, A. G.: The use of high-resolution image time series for crop classification and evapotranspiration

³⁰ estimate over an irrigated area in central Morocco, Int. J. Remote Sens., 29(1–2), 95–116, doi:10.1080/01431160701250390, 2007.





- Thoma, D. P., Moran, M. S., Bryant, R., Rahman, M. M., Holifield Collins, C. D., Keefer, T. O., Noriega, R., Osman, I., Skrivin, S. M., Tischler, M. A., Bosch, D. D., Starks, P. J., and Peters-Lidard, C. D.: Appropriate scale of soil moisture retrieval from high resolution radar imagery for bare and minimally vegetated soils, Remote Sens. Environ., 112(2), 403–414, 2008.
- ⁵ Ulaby, F. T., Moore, R. K., and Fung, A. K.: Microwave Remote Sensing Active and Passive, Artech House, inc., 1986.
 - Wagner, W., Lemoine, G., and Rott, H.: A method for estimating soil moisture from ERS Scatterometer and soil data, Remote Sens. Environ., 70, 191–207, 1999.
 - Wagner, W., Blöschl, G., Pampaloni, P., Calvet, J.-C., Bizzarri, B., Wigneron, J.-P., and Kerr, Y.:
- ¹⁰ Operational readiness of microwave remote sensing of soil moisture for hydrologic applications, Nord. Hydrol., 38, 1–20, 2007.
 - Wigneron, J. P., Ferrazzoli, P., Olioso, A., Bertuzzi, P., and Chanzy, A.: A Simple Approach To Monitor Crop Biomass from C-Band Radar Data, Remote Sens. Environ., 69(2), 179–188, 1999.
- ¹⁵ Woodhouse, I. H. and Hoekman, D. H.: Determining land surface parameters from the ERS-1 wind-scatterometer, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 38(1), 126–140, 2000.
 - Zribi, M., Taconet, O., Le Hégarat-Mascle, S., Vidal-Madjar, D., Emblanch, C., Loumagne, C., and Normand, M.: Backscattering behavior and simulation comparison over bare soils using SIRC/XSAR and ERASME 1994 data over Orgeva, Remote Sens. Environ., 59(2), 256–266, 1997.
 - Zribi, M. and Dechambre, M.: A new empirical model to retrieve soil moisture and roughness from Radar Data, Remote Sens. Environ., 84(1), 42–52, 2003.
 - Zribi, M., Saux-Picart, S., André, C., Descroix, L., Ottlé, O., and Kallel, A.: Soil moisture mapping based on ARSAR/ENVISAT radar data over a sahelian site, Int. J. Remote Sens., 28(16), 3547–3565, 2006
- ²⁵ **28(16)**, **3547–3565**, **2006**.

20

	HES 7, 8045–8	HESSD 7, 8045–8089, 2010						
	Multi- estimation moistu semi-ari M. Zrib	Multi-scale estimation of surface moisture in a semi-arid region M. Zribi et al.						
5		Page						
-	Abstract	Introduction						
	Conclusions	References						
2	Tables	Figures						
	14							
5	•	•						
-	Back	Close						
	Full Scre	en / Esc						
0	Printer-frien	dly Version						
2	Interactive	Discussion						



)iscussion Pa	HESSD 7, 8045–8089, 2010					
	ıper Discu	Multi- estimation moistu semi-ario	scale of surface re in a d region				
	ssion P.	M. Zrib	i et al.				
or	aper	Title F	Page				
	—	Abstract	Introduction				
	Discu	Conclusions	References				
	ussion	Tables	Figures				
	Pap	14	►I.				
	er	•	•				
		Back	Close				
	iscussi	Full Scree	en / Esc				
	on P	Printer-frien	dly Version				
	aper	Interactive I	Discussion				

СС () ву

 Table 1. Characteristics of ENVISAT ASAR and SPOT data used in this study.

	Number	Pixel size	Mode/incidence angles	Polarisation/bands	Orbit
ENVISAT ASAR data	24	12.5 m × 12.5 m	Alternating polarisation Incidence angle: IS1, IS2, IS3	(HH, VV), HH	Ascending or descending
SPOT/HRV	10	10 m × 10 m	Incidence angle < 11°	Four bands B1:NIR B2:Red B3:Green B4:MIR	_

						,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,		
Field	P4	P4bis	P6	P7	P9	P10	P12	Pst2
23 December	_	6.26	6.11	7.23	6.3	5.78	5.9	_
16 January	31.65	23.68	16.4	32.04	18.62	17.7	17.56	_
21 January	40.43	36.15	34.77	39.64	33.75	28.34	28.57	_
31 January	28.65	21.17	18.91	29.7	18.07	14.55	18.8	_
6 February	21.38	18.63	18.28	20.67	14.86	12	_	17.56
18 February	15.61	14.97	14.57	16.98	13.2	12.15	11.5	16.35
25 February	14.07	14.1	12.96	15.97	11.5	10.94	8.43	_
4 March	20.57	11.2	8.98	24.85	11.75	-	-	20



Table 2. Gravimetric volumetric soil moisture measurements (%) over test fields.



Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

HESSD

 Table 3. Roughness Rms height (cm) measurements.

Field	P4	P4bis	P6	P7	P9	P10	P12
24 March	0.8	2.5	0.8	0.6	0.7	1.5	1.6

Discussion Pap	HESSD 7, 8045–8089, 2010							
oer Discussion	Multi-scale estimation of surface moisture in a semi-arid region M. Zribi et al.							
Paper	Title	Page						
—	Abstract	Introduction						
Disc	Conclusions	References						
ussion	Tables	Figures						
Pape	I							
Ū,	•	•						
	Back	Close						
iscussion F	Full Screen / Esc Printer-friendly Version							
aper	Interactive	Discussion						



Field	P4		I	P6 P7		P7	7 P9			Pst2	
	LAI	VWC (Kg/m ²)	LAI	VWC (Kg/m ²)	LAI	VWC (Kg/m ²)	LAI	VWC (Kg/m ²)	LAI	VWC (Kg/m ²)	
21 January		_		-		-	0.01	_		_	
2 February	0.55	_	0.030	_	0.074	_	0.045	-	0.19	-	
18 February	0.64	0.38	0.59	0.160	0.80	0.670	0.04	0.08	0.33	0.532	
4 March	0.70	_	0.37	_	0.46	_	0.1	_	0.55	_	
24 March	2.17	0.913	1.37	0.705	1.71	1.15	0.93	0.313	1.62	0.689	
30 April	1.48	0.726	3.70	0.738	2.33	0.722	0.52	0.585	3.21	_	

 Table 4. Leaf Area Index and vegetation water content measurement.







Fig. 1. Location of the studied site $(9^{\circ}30' \text{ E}-10^{\circ}15' \text{ E}, 35^{\circ} \text{ N}, 35^{\circ}45' \text{ N})$.







Fig. 2. View of a typical non irrigated olive tree field.















CC () BY





Fig. 5. Illustration of backscattering coefficient IEM simulations function of surface roughness (rms height) for HH and VV polarisations.



Discussion Paper

HESSD







Fig. 6. Processed ASAR/ENVISAT signals (in decibels) versus measured volumetric moisture over olive tree fields, (a) HH polarization, (b) VV polarization.





Fig. 7. Soil moisture estimations from ASAR/ENVISAT data, expressed as a function of the soil moisture derived from ground-truth measurements, for fields in the "olive tree" class of land use, **(a)** HH polarisation, **(b)** VV polarisation.



Fig. 8. Inter-comparison between HH and VV radar signal moisture estimations.



Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Fig. 9. Illustration of moisture mapping for an area containing fields in the "olive tree" class of land use, (a) 11 April 2009, (b) 12 April 2009, (c) 9 December 2009.







Fig. 10. IEM simulations of backscattering coefficient variation as a function of incidence angle, for different moisture and roughness values.



Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Fig. 11. Illustration of ASAR HH polarisation data over bare soils after wheat sowing, as a function of incidence angle.



Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Fig. 12. IEM simulations as a function of soil moisture in HH polarisation, for three incidence angles: 15°, 22.5° and 30°.









Fig. 13. Soil moisture estimations from ASAR/ENVISAT data, versus soil moisture derived from ground truth measurements, for different test wheat fields.

8086



Fig. 14. Vegetation water content as a function of Leaf Area Index measured over wheat fields.







Fig. 15. Example of moisture mapping over wheat fields on three different dates: (a) 24 December 2008, (b) 16 January 2009, (c) 7 March 2009.



Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Title Page

Introduction

References

Figures

Close



Fig. 16. Example of moisture mapping, showing soil moisture estimations for fields in the "olive tree" and "wheat" classes of land use on 7 March 2009.

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion