1. INTRODUCTION

After the recent Tsunami and earthquake disasters with their devastating effects, the information content of the linear array satellite imageries as a means for the disaster forecasting and management has attracted the worldwide attention more than before. On the other hand, linear array satellite images such as Spot, Ikonos, QuickBird, IRS, etc., with their flexibility in acquiring stereo coverage over any part of the globe, have proven to be an excellent replacement for the other space-borne imaging systems such as digital frame cameras or whiskbroom technologies. The first step for using such data is Geo-coding. High resolution data increase the need for higher accuracy data modeling. Up to now different models with different accuracy have been discussed. These models are divided into two main groups of the so-called rigorous and non-rigorous models. The rigorous approaches are the most accurate but need crucial data such as satellite ephemeris and inner orientation parameters which are not always available. The non-rigorous models such as rational polynomials, DLT or 3D affine transformations on the other hand are less accurate but enjoy the advantage of being independent from the auxiliary information. In line with several other research works already performed by other researchers, this paper sets its main goal to compare the simple 3D affine model, as a replacement transformation for the more sophisticated rational function approach. The adopted strategy is based on generating virtual ground control points using rational polynomials intersection by means of available RPCs. The generated virtual GCPs provide a reliable data for estimating the degree of fitness of the 3D affine model to the rational polynomial transformation. This paper reports the result of the tests conducted on a high resolution stereo IRS-P5 satellite image. Other related issues including different methods for estimating initial values needed for the solution of the rational polynomials intersection, such as DLT, 3D affine and truncated rational polynomials are also presented and discussed.
last section deals with the evaluation of the fitness accuracy obtained on the stereo IRS-P5 images acquired over a test site.

1.1 Rational Function Model

The concept of RFM was developed by Gyer (Sadeghian, 2001). This model projects the 3D object space coordinate into a 2D image coordinate and could be used for any type of images; airborne or space borne. The Rational Function Model is expressed as a ratio of two polynomials:

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= \frac{F_1^r(X, Y, Z)}{F_2^r(X, Y, Z)} \\
y &= \frac{F_3^r(X, Y, Z)}{F_4^r(X, Y, Z)}
\end{align*}
\]  

(1)

Where: \(x, y\) = are the normalized image coordinates 
\(X, Y, Z\) = are the normalized object coordinates 
\(F_i^r\) = is the \(r\) order polynomial 
\(r\) is the order of polynomials which is usually equal to 3 so the rational model would be the ratio of two cubic polynomials and each polynomial has 20 terms making a total of 80 parameters which is reduced to 78: i.e.

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= \frac{(I_X Y Y' X')}{(I_X Y Y' X')} \cdot (a_{00}, a_{01}, a_{02}) \\
y &= \frac{(I_X Y Y' X')}{(I_X Y Y' X')} \cdot (b_{00}, b_{01}, b_{02})
\end{align*}
\]  

(2)

In order to increase the stability of equation, it is essential to normalize the two image coordinates and three object coordinates using shift and scale parameters to fit the range -1 +1. The normalizing equation can be described as:

\[
\begin{align*}
x' &= \frac{x - x_0}{x_s} \\
y' &= \frac{y - y_0}{y_s} \\
X' &= \frac{X - X_0}{X_s} \\
Y' &= \frac{Y - Y_0}{Y_s} \\
Z' &= \frac{Z - Z_0}{Z_s}
\end{align*}
\]  

(3)

Where: \(x_0, y_0\) = are shift values for image coordinate 
\(X_0, Y_0, Z_0\) = are shift values for object coordinate 
\(x_s, y_s, Z_s\) = are the scale value for image coordinate 
\(X_s, Y_s, Z_s\) = are the scale value for object coordinate

The unknown parameters involved in RFM can be determined with or without using the rigorous sensor model. Therefore two computational scenarios are present, terrain dependent and terrain independent (Grodecki et al., 2004).

1.1.1 Terrain dependent scenario: When there is no rigorous sensor model at hand, one has to measure control points and check points from both images and the actual DEM or maps. In this case, the solution is heavily dependent on the actual terrain relief, number of control points and distribution of control points (Tao C V, Hu Y, 2001).

1.1.2 Terrain independent scenario: When the rigorous sensor model is available, the RFCs can be determined via 3D object grid with corresponding image points which are determined through rigorous model. In this case, the solution is actually terrain independent since no terrain information is used (Tao C V, Hu Y, 2001). The method has three main steps:

First, determination of a grid of sufficient image points, second, set up a 3D grid of object points via rigorous model, in this step, rigorous parameters which are measured using on-board GPS receivers and gyro-are used to compute the corresponding object coordinates of image points. Third, RFM fitting, the RPCs are computed using image coordinates and their corresponding object coordinates by applying space resection.

1.1.3 The Bias Compensated RPC: Exterior orientation parameters which comprise position and attitude are used to calculate RPCs in terrain independent mode. On-board GPS receivers determine the satellite ephemeris. Star tracker and gyro determine attitude as a function of time. Ephemeris and attitude have finite accuracy, about one meter for ephemeris and one or two arc-second for attitude. As a result, the calculated RPCs in terrain independent mode have bias. Many research works have already been conducted as regards the methods and the accuracy of the bias removal. It has been demonstrated that the bias can be compensated via one shift parameter in line direction and one shift parameter in sample direction (Dial & Grodecki 2002).

\[
\begin{align*}
x + A_x &= \frac{F_1^r(X, Y, Z)}{F_2^r(X, Y, Z)} \\
y + A_y &= \frac{F_3^r(X, Y, Z)}{F_4^r(X, Y, Z)}
\end{align*}
\]  

(4)

The bias compensated RPCs can be computed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
F_1^r(X, Y, Z) &= (a_{00} - b_{00})X + (a_{01} - b_{01})Y + (a_{02} - b_{02})Z \\
&\quad + (c_{00} - d_{00})XZ \\
F_2^r(X, Y, Z) &= (a_{10} - b_{10})X + (a_{11} - b_{11})Y + (a_{12} - b_{12})Z \\
&\quad + (c_{10} - d_{10})XZ \\
F_3^r(X, Y, Z) &= (a_{20} - b_{20})X + (a_{21} - b_{21})Y + (a_{22} - b_{22})Z \\
&\quad + (c_{20} - d_{20})XZ \\
F_4^r(X, Y, Z) &= (a_{30} - b_{30})X + (a_{31} - b_{31})Y + (a_{32} - b_{32})Z \\
&\quad + (c_{30} - d_{30})XZ
\end{align*}
\]  

(5)

The accuracy of this model has been reported less than 0.5 pixels (Hanley & Fraser, 2004). Parameters for drift can also be added.

1.2 3D Affine Transformation

Affine model is a linear transformation which maps the 3D object space into 2D image space through 8 parameters, as shown in equation (5):

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= A_{1x}X + A_{2x}Y + A_{3x}Z + A_{4x} \\
y &= A_{1y}X + A_{2y}Y + A_{3y}Z + A_{4y}
\end{align*}
\]  

(5)

Where \(A_{1x}, A_{2x}, \ldots, A_{4y}\) = affine parameters
Equation 5 accounts for two translations, three rotations and non uniform scaling and skew distortions within image space. It could be regarded as a first order rational function with the denominator equal to one.

Strictly speaking, the imaging geometry of a satellite push broom scanner can be described as perspective in the line of the linear array and parallel in the along-track direction. However, with a very narrow field of view, the assumption that the projection is parallel stands true in practical cases (Fraser & Yamakawa, 2004).

1.3 DLT Model

Direct linear transformation, which is a first order rational function, maps 3D object space into 2D image space via 11 parameters:

\[ x = \frac{L_x + L_y + L_z + L_z}{L_x + L_y + L_z + 1}, \]
\[ y = \frac{L_x + L_y + L_z + L_z}{L_x + L_y + L_z + 1}, \]

Where \( L_x, ..., L_z = \) DLT parameters

DLT parameters can be computed directly using EOP and IOP parameters or indirectly using GCPs. This model is considered as an approximate model for linear array scanner since the EOP parameters are not the same for all image lines (Morgan, 2004).

2. VIRTUAL GCP GENERATION

As explained before, fitness accuracy of the 3D affine model as compared with the RFM model is evaluated by generating virtual GCPs. These points are calculated via the RPCs accessible in the IRS-P5 metadata. This is explained in the section that follows.

2.1 RFM Intersection

The rational function model which is presented as equation (1) is always referred to as forward RPC model which provides a mapping from geographic coordinate of object \((\varphi, \lambda, h)\) to image coordinate \((x, y)\). Denormalizing equation (1) yields:

\[ x = r(\varphi, \lambda, h), y = p(\varphi, \lambda, h) \]

\[ x = \frac{F_y^1(X, Y, Z)}{F_x^2(X, Y, Z)} x, -x_o \]
\[ y = \frac{F_y^1(X, Y, Z)}{F_x^1(X, Y, Z)} y, -y_o \]

Where \( X = \frac{\lambda - \lambda_o}{\lambda}, Y = \frac{\varphi - \varphi_o}{\varphi}, Z = \frac{h - h_o}{h} \)

Because of nonlinearity of the equation, applying the Taylor series expansion gives (Grodecki et al., 2004).

\[ x = r(\varphi, \lambda, h_o) + \frac{\partial r}{\partial w} \bigg|_{w=0} dw \]
\[ y = p(\varphi, \lambda, h_o) + \frac{\partial p}{\partial w} \bigg|_{w=0} dw \]

The derivation can be calculated through some partial derivations as follow (Grodecki et al., 2004):

\[ \frac{\partial r}{\partial w} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial r}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial r}{\partial v} \end{bmatrix}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial w} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial p}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial p}{\partial v} \end{bmatrix} \]

Where:

\[ v = [x, y, z], w = [\lambda, \varphi, h] \]

To evaluate the object space coordinate of a point we should measure the image coordinate in at least a stereo image. In this solution we use two stereo forward and afterward images. The equation would read as follow (Grodecki et al., 2004).

\[ x^f = r^f(\varphi, \lambda, h) + e^f \]
\[ y^f = p^f(\varphi, \lambda, h) + e^f \]
\[ x^s = r^s(\varphi, \lambda, h) + e^s \]
\[ y^s = p^s(\varphi, \lambda, h) + e^s \]

The final observation equations follow with (Grodecki et al., 2004).

\[ A dw = L \]

Where:
The unknown object space coordinate is solved for iteratively. At the first iteration, the initial value for coordinates is needed which could be determined through linear equations such as 3D affine or DLT. Alternatively, truncated RPCs can also be used. At each iteration step, application of least squares, results in correction of approximate values of object coordinates, i.e.:

\[
\begin{align*}
dw &= \left(A' A\right)^{-1} A' L \\
w_o^i &= w_o^{i-1} + dw
\end{align*}
\]

### 2.2 Affine Intersection

For evaluating the object space coordinate using affine transformation, one should calculate its 8 parameters of each image at first by applying at least four GCPs:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} X, Y, Z, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, X, Y, Z \end{bmatrix} A_i, A_{i+1, A_{i+1, A_{i+1}}}, A_{i+1, A_{i+1, A_{i+1}}} = \begin{bmatrix} x, y, z \end{bmatrix}
\]

(14)

After evaluation of the parameters, by measuring image coordinate of any point in a stereo image, its object coordinates could be determined via the following relations:

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= A_i A_{i+1} A_{i+1, A_{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} x - A_i \end{bmatrix} \\
Y &= A_i A_{i+1} A_{i+1, A_{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} y - A_i \end{bmatrix} \\
Z &= A_i A_{i+1} A_{i+1, A_{i+1}} \begin{bmatrix} z - A_i \end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

(15)

Iterative least squares solution of Equation 10 yields the object coordinates for the virtual GCPs. This step is then followed by the solution of Equation 14 through which 3D affine parameters are derived using any combination of the well distributed virtual GCPs. Subsequently, for any virtual GCP whose scan and line coordinates is already measured, new object coordinates can be determined via Equation 15. The final fitting accuracy evaluation is then performed by comparing the object coordinates of the GCPs calculated by Equation 10 and the object coordinates computed by Equation 15. Next section presents the result of the tests conducted on IRS-P5 stereo image.

### 3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULT

#### 3.1 Data Set

A stereo orthokit image of the IRS-P5 satellite imagery over the city of Arak, Iran which were acquired in 2007, are used in the test. The RPC parameters were available for both forward and afterward images. Figure 1 shows parts of the stereo dataset used in the project.

Figure1. Afterward (left) and forward (right) images of stereo dataset.

As mentioned before, for the solution of Equation 10 approximate object coordinates are required. The image coordinates of 18 virtual GCPs are measured. Three methods are implemented to generate the approximate coordinates, namely: 3D affine, DLT and truncated RPCs. The achieved results for RPC intersection by applying different method for evaluating the initial values have been presented in Table1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ΔE(m)</th>
<th>ΔN(m)</th>
<th>Δh(m)</th>
<th>Iteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3D affine</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLT</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncated RPC</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table2. Results of RPC intersection, applying different methods for evaluating initial value.

As the Table 1 indicates, all methods of deriving approximate values have produced reasonably accurate initial values and the equations have been successfully converged. It is interesting to note that the affine model for calculating approximate values has lead to smaller number of iterations in the solution of Equation 10. This implies that the affine model generates more accurate results as compared to the other two approaches. Distribution of the generated virtual GCPs is presented in Figure 2.

Having determined the object coordinates of the virtual GCPs, in the next step the 3D affined parameters (Equation14) are solved to derive the 8 affine parameters by applying different number of GCPs and CPs. This is followed by the solution of Equation 15 to derive the object coordinates of all virtual GCPs. The residual vectors for the height and planimetric coordinates when 5 GCPs were used are presented in Figures 3 and 4 respectively.
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CONCLUDING REMARKS

The overall results achieved in this study further supports the conclusions arrived by other researchers as regards the applicability of the 3D affine transformation as a replacement model for the more sophisticated RFM. This statement is true under the proviso that the strip length does not exceed the size of a high resolution satellite frame.
### Table 3. Results of affine intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. GCPs(CPs)</th>
<th>ΔX(m)</th>
<th>ΔY(m)</th>
<th>ΔZ(m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4(14)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(13)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(12)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Total RMSE for affine intersection.