Using Artificial Intelligence Planning to Automate SAR Image Processing for Scientific Data Analysis

Forest Fisher, Steve Chien
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology
4800 Oak Grove Drive, M/S 525-3660
Pasadena, CA 91109-8099
forest.fisher@jpl.nasa.gov

Edisanter Lo, Ronald Greeley
Department of Geology
Arizona State University
P.O. Box 871404,
Tempe, AZ 85287-1404

Abstract

In recent times, improvements in imaging technology have made available an incredible array of information in image format. While powerful and sophisticated image processing software tools are available to prepare and analyze the data, these tools are complex and cumbersome, requiring significant expertise to properly operate. Thus, in order to extract (e.g., mine or analyze) useful information from the data, a user (in our case a scientist) often must possess both significant science and image processing expertise.

This paper describes the use of AI planning techniques to represent scientific, image processing, and software tool knowledge to automate elements of science data preparation and analysis of *synthetic aperture radar (SAR)* imagery for planetary geology. In particular, we describe the Automated SAR Image Processing system (ASIP) which is currently in use by the Dept. of Geology at ASU supporting aeolian science analysis of synthetic aperture radar images. ASIP reduces the number of manual inputs in science product generation by 10-fold, decreases the CPU time to produce images by 30%, and allows scientists to directly produce certain science products.

Introduction

Recent breakthroughs in imaging technology have led to an explosion of available data in image format. However, these advances in imaging technology have brought with them a commensurate increase in the complexity of image processing and analysis technology. When analyzing newly available image data to discover patterns or to confirm scientific theories, a complex set of operations is often required. First, before the data can be used it must often be reformatted, cleaned, and many correction steps must be applied. Then, in order to perform the actual data analysis, the user must manage all of the analysis software packages and their requirements on format, required information, etc.

Furthermore, this data analysis process is not a one-shot process. Typically a scientist will set up some sort of analysis, study the results, and then use the results of this analysis to modify the analysis to improve it. This analysis and refinement cycle may occur many times - thus any reduction in the scientist effort or cycle time can dramatically improve scientist productivity. Consider the goal of studying the soil sediment transport (wind erosion patterns). In order to do this the scientist uses a z0map (described later) to analyze the surface wind velocities using SAR data. In order to generate the z0map the scientist must go through a number of processes:

- data acquisition: getting the data from a proprietary tape format using the CEOS reader software package
- data conversion: the data must be decompressed using yet another software package
- pre-processing: header and label files must be added to the date files
- processing: using the z0map software package a z0 map image is created and
- post processing: depending on the desired data format the z0 map image files may need to be converted to VICAR format (yet another proprietary format).

Unfortunately, this data preparation and analysis process is both knowledge and labor intensive.

In order to correctly be able to produce this science product for analysis, requires knowledge of a wide range of sources including:

- the particular science discipline of interest (e.g., atmospheric science, planetary geology),
- image processing and the image processing libraries available,
- where and how the images and associated information are stored (e.g., calibration files), and

- the overall image processing environment to know how to link together libraries and pass information from one program to another.

It takes many years of training and experience to acquire the knowledge necessary to perform these analyses. Needless to say, these experts are in high demand. One factor which exacerbates this shortage of experts is the extreme breadth of knowledge required. Many users might be knowledgable in one or more of the above areas but not in all the areas. In addition, the status quo requires that users possess considerable knowledge about software infrastructure. Users must know how to specify input parameters (format, type, and options) for each software package that they are using and must often expend considerable effort in translating information from one package to another.

Using automated planning technology to represent and automate many of these data analysis functions (Fayyad96) p. 50 (Chien96) and enables novice users to utilize the software libraries to prepare and analyze data. It also allows users who may be expert in some areas but less knowledgable in other to use the software tools.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. First, we provide a brief overview of the key elements of AI planning. We then describe the ASIP system - which automates elements of image processing for science data analysis of synthetic aperture radar (SAR) images.

Artificial Intelligence Planning Techniques

We have applied and extended techniques from Artificial Intelligence Planning to address the knowledge-based software reconfiguration problem in general, and science data analysis in specific. In order to describe this work, we first provide a brief overview of the key concepts from planning technology [1].

Planning technology relies on an encoding of possible actions in the domain. In this encoding, one specifies for each action in the domain: *preconditions*, *postconditions*, and *subactivities*. Preconditions are requirements which must be met before the action can be taken. These may be pieces of information which are required to correctly apply a software package (such as the image format, availability of calibration data, etc.) Postconditions are things that are made true by the execution of the actions, such as the fact that the data has been photometrically corrected (corrected for the relative location of the lighting source) or that 3-dimensional topography information has been extracted from an image. Subactivities are lower level activities which comprise the higher level activity. For instance, returning to our previous example of analyzing soil sediment transport using SAR data. The different tasks (e.g., data acquisition, data conversion, etc.) are considered subtasks of the overall product generation process. The planner begins with the process of "determining parameters". This in turn is driven by the type of data format or mode of the SAR during data collection. Through this decomposition process parameters to be used in the z0map calculation are initialized. Given this encoding of actions, a planner is able to solve individual problems, where each problem is a current state and a set of goals. The planner uses its action models to synthesize a plan (a set of actions) to achieve the goals from the current state.

Planning consists of three main mechanisms: subgoaling, task decomposition, and conflict analysis. In subgoaling, a planner ensures that all of the preconditions of actions in the plan are met. This can be done by ensuring that they are true in the initial state or by adding appropriate actions to the plan. In task decomposition, the planner ensures that all high level (abstract) activities are expanded so that the lower level (subactivities) are present in the plan. This ensures that the plan consists of executable activities. Conflict analysis ensures that different portions of the plan do not interfere with each other.

The Automated SAR Image Processing (ASIP) System

ASIP automates synthetic aperture radar (SAR) image processing based on user request and a knowledge-base model of SAR image processing using AI automated planning techniques (Fisher97). SAR operates simultaneously in multipolarizations[2] and multi-frequencies to produce different images consisting of radar backscatter coefficients (s0) through different polarizations at different frequencies. ASIP enables construction of an aerodynamic roughness image/map (z0 map) from raw SAR data - thus enabling studies of Aeolian processes.

Studies of Aeolian Processes

The aerodynamic roughness length (z0) is the height above a surface at which a wind profile assumes zero velocity. z0 is an important parameter in studies of atmospheric circulation and aeolian sediment transport (in layman's terms: wind patterns, wind erosion patterns, and sand/soil drift caused by wind) (Greeley87;

---

[1] For Further details on planning the user is referred to (Pemberthy92; Erol94)

[2] There are four combinations of polarization: HH, HV, VH, and VV, where H = Horizontal and V= Verticial.

Greeley87; Greeley91). Estimating z0 with radar is important because it enables large areas to be mapped quickly to study aeolian processes, as opposed to the slow painstaking process of manually taking field measurements (Blumberg95). The final science product is a VICAR image called a z0 map that the scientists use to study the aeolian processes.

Planning to Generate Aerodynamic Roughness Maps

ASIP is an end-to-end image processing system automating data abstraction, decompression, and (radar) image processing sub-systems, that integrates a number of SAR and z0 image processing sub-systems. Using a knowledge base of SAR processing actions and a general-purpose planning engine, ASIP reasons about the parameter and sub-system constraints and requirements: extracting needed parameters from image format and header files as appropriate (freeing the user from these issues). These parameters, in conjunction with the knowledge-base of SAR processing steps(see Figure 1), and a minimal set of required user inputs (entered through a graphical user interface (GUI)), are then used to determine the processing plan. ASIP represents a number of processing constraints (e.g., that only some subset of all possible combinations of polarizations are legal as dependent on the input data). ASIP also represents image processing knowledge about how to use polarization and frequency band information to compute parameters used for later processing of backscatter to aerodynamic roughness length conversions - thus freeing the user from having to understand these processes (see Figure 1).

The design of ASIP focuses on automation to make a variety of software tools function together. In the process of accomplishing this goal, many of the interfaces of the individual tools where modified to provide automated interfaces. Through these new automated interfaces, considerable information, previously entered into each tool through an interactive shell, is passed from one tool to another. In many cases the same information must be provided to many of the tools. In some cases the information is the same but the required format may differ from one tool to another. Many of the parameters provided to the tools are interdependent on as many as five other parameters. As the parameters become more interdependent it becomes more difficult to understand the process. Through these new automated interfaces many of these parameters are passed to the planning system and the knowledge base i sused by the planner to reason about the interdependencies to set the resulting parameters appropriately. Going back to the ASIP design, ASIP actually calls the planner twice. In the first call the planner determines the steps (tools) necessary to accomplish the processing task (goals); and determines how to set parameters needed in generating the header files. Once the data has been extracted and more data has been gathered the planner is called a second time further reason about the parameter settings needed to complete the remainder of the processing goals. The two knowledge bases combined contain 29 rules.

```
(decomprule get_z0map_coef_l-hv
   lhs
     (initialgoals ( (get_z0map_coef l-hv)
                   )
     )
   rhs
     (newgoals ( (m0 -6.419)
                 (m1 9.957)
                 (r_chit  0)
                 (r_psit 90)
                 (r_chir  0)
                 (r_psir  0)
                 (i_polcode 2)
                 (polar l-hv)
               )
     )
   doc [ ]
 )
```

Figure 1: Sample Decomposition Rule from ASIP SAR Domain

Figure 1 shows an example of a task decomposition rule. In the rule *get_z0map_coef_l-hv*, we see that if the *preconditions* spelled out in the *lhs* (left-hand side) are meet then the parameters and coefficients of the *rhs* (right-hand side) are set for later use. Although not shown, the *lhs* of the *get_z0map_coef_l-hv* rule is satisfied by the application of other planning operators and rules.

Figure 2 shows an aerodynamic roughness length map of a site near Death Valley, California generated using the ASIP system (the map uses the L band (24 cm) SAR with HV polarization). Each of the greyscale bands indicated signifies a different approximate aerodynamic roughness length. This map is then used to study aeolian processes at the Death Valley site.

Application Use and Payoffs

Since the ASIP system was fielded in January 1997, it has proven to be very useful in the use of generating aerodynamic roughness maps with three major benefits.



Figure 2: Aerodynamic Roughness Length Map Produced Using ASIP

- First, ASIP has enabled a 10 fold reduction in the number of manual inputs required to produce an aerodynamic roughness map.
- Second, ASIP has enabled a 30% reduction in CPU processing time to produce such a map (by producing more efficient plans).
- Third, and most significantly ASIP has enabled scientists to process their own data (previously programming staff were required).

By enabling scientists to directly manipulate that data and reducing processing overhead and turnaround, science is directly enhanced.

Application Development, Deployment and Maintenance

The development of the ASIP system took approximately six months. During that time period the system was developed and deployed using an iterative waterfall development cycle containing three incremental deployments. The development team consisted of one AI Planning researcher from JPL and one SAR domain expert from ASU, who later became one of the users of the system after deployment to the ASU Planetary Geology Department. The system was both developed and deployed on a Sun UNIX workstation using a combination of C, FORTRAN, and TCL/TK.

The maintenance of the ASIP system, is done by the users of the system at ASU. Because of the nature of the SAR domain modifications to the knowledge-base are not expected to be frequent, but in the event that through greater understanding of SAR data the values of the coefficients change this an easy modification to make.

Related Work

Related work can be broadly classified into: related image processing languages, related automated image processing work, and related AI planning work. In terms of related image processing languages, there are many commercial and academic image processing packages - such as IDL, Aoips,and Merlyn. Generally, these packages have only limited ability to automatically determine how to use different image processing programs or algorithms based on the problem context (e.g., other image processing goals and initial image state). These packages only support such context sensitivity for a few pre-anticipated cases.

However, there are several previous systems for automatic image processing that use a domain independent mechanism. The work at the Canadian Centre for Remote Sensing (CCRS) (Charlebois91) differs from ASIP in that they use a case-based reasoning approach in which a problem is solved by searching for a previous problem and solution. Grimm and Bunke (Grimm93) developed an expert system to assist in image processing within the SPIDER library of image processing routines. This system uses many similar approaches in that: 1. it classifies problem types similar to the fashion in which ASIP performs skeletal planning; and 2. it also decomposes larger problems into subproblems which ASIP performs in decomposition planning. This system is implemented in a combination of an expert system shell called TWAICE (which includes both rules and frames) and Prolog. Previous work on automating the use of the SPIDER library includes (Sakaue85) which performs constraint checking and step ordering for a set of conceptual image processing steps and generation of executable code. This work differs from ASIP in that: 1. they do not infer missing steps from step requirements; 2. they do not map from a single abstract step to a context-dependent sequence of image processing operations; and 3. they do not reason about negative interactions between subproblems. ASIP has the capability to represent and reason about all 3 of these cases. Other work by Jiang and Bunke (Jian94) involves generation of image processing procedures for robotics. This system performs subgoaling to construct image processing plans. However their algorithm does not appear to have a general way of representing and dealing with negative interactions between different subparts of the plans. In contrast, the general Artificial Intelligence Planning techniques used by ASIP use conflict resolution methods to guarantee correct handling of subproblem interactions.

Another piece of related work is the SATI system (Capdevielle94) which uses an interactive dialogue with the user to drive an automated programming approach to generating code to satisfy the user request. OCAPI (Clement93), a semantically integrated automated image processing system, while being very general provides no clear way to represent the large number of logical constraints associated with the problems ASIP was designed to solve. Another image processing system (Matsuyama89) provides a means for representing knowledge of image analysis strategies in an expert system but does not use the more declarative AI planning representation. Perhaps the most similar planning and image processing system is COLLAGE (Lansky95). The COLLAGE planning differs from ASIP in that COLLAGE uses solely the decomposition approach to planning.

Finally, the most closely related system to ASIP is MVP (Chien96). The greatest similarity being MVP and ASIP use the same AI Planning techniques to capture and reason about the knowledge of image processing. The primary differences lie in the domains and in the packaging. MVP produces VICAR procedure definition files (PDFs) for VICAR image processing (LaVoie89), while ASIP performs end-to-end closed loop integration of all the tools for SAR image processing.

Conclusions

This paper has described knowledge-based reconfiguration of data analysis software using AI planning techniques. In particular, we have described the ASIP system which automates production of aerodynamic roughness maps to support geological science analysis. ASIP reduces the number of manual inputs in science product generation by 10-fold, has reduced the CPU processing time by 30%, and has enabled scientists to directly produce certain science products.

Acknowledgements

Portions of this work were performed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Other portions of this work were performed at the Department of Geology, Arizona State University under JPL Contract 960559. The authors would also like to acknowledge other contributors to the ASIP project including: Dan Blumberg (ASU), Anita Govindjee (JPL), John McHone (ASU), Keld Rasmussen (ASU), and Todd Turco (JPL).

References

D. Blumberg and R. Greeley, “Field Studies of Aerodynamic Roughness Length,” Jnl. Arid Environ. (1993) 25:39-48.

O. Capdevielle, P. Dalle, “Image Processing Chain Construction by Interactive Goal Specification,” Proceedings of the First IEEE Int. Conf. on Image Processing, Austin, TX, Nov 1994, Vol. 3, pp. 816-819.

D. Charlebois, J. DeGuise, G. Goodenough, S. Matwin, and M. Robson, “A Case-based Planner to Automate Reuse of ES Software for Analysis of Remote Sensing Data,” Internation Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), Vol 3, pp. 1851-1854, 1991.

S. A. Chien and H. B. Mortensen, “Automating Image Processing for Scientific Data Analysis of a Large Image Database,” IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 18 (8): pp. 854-859, August 1996.

V. Clement and M. Thonnat, “A Knowledge-based Approach to Integration of Image Processing Procedures,” Image Understanding, 57:166-184, March 1993.

K. Erol, J. Hendler, and D. Nau, “UMCP: A Sound and Complete Procedure for Hierarchical Task Network Planning,” Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on AI Planning Systems, Chicago, IL, June 1994, pp. 249-254.

U. Fayyad, G. Piatetsky-Shapiro, P. Smyth, “From Data Mining to Knowledge Discovery in Databases,” AI Magazine, Vol 17 No. 3, Fall 1996, pp. 37-54.

F. Fisher, E. Lo, S. Chien, R. Greeley, “Using Artificial Intelligence Planning to Automate SAR Processing for Planetary Geoplogy”, NASA Science Information Systems, March/April 1997, Issue 42

R. Greeley and J.D. Iversen, ”Measurements of Wind Friction Speeds over Lava Surfaces and Assessment of Sediment Transport,” G.R.L. 14 (1987):925-928.

R. Greeley, P.R. Christensen, and J.F. McHone, “Radar Characteristics of Small Craters: Implications for Venus,” EMP 37 (1987):89-111.

R. Greeley, L. Gaddis, A. Dobrovolskis, J. Iversen, K. Rasmussen, S. Saunders, J. vanZyl, S. Wall, H. Zebker, and B. White, “Assessment of Aerodynamic Roughness Via Airborne Radar Observations,” 1991, Acta Mechanica Suppl.2, 77-88.

F. Grimm and H. Bunke, “An Expert System for the Selection and Application of Image Processing Subroutines, “ Expert Systems, May 1993, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 61-74.

X. Jian and H. Bunke, “Vision Planner for an Intelligence Multisensory Vision System,” Technical Report, University of Bern (extended version of a paper appearing in ICPR 1994).

A. Lansky, M. Friedman, L. Getoor, S. Schmidler, and N. Short Jr., “The Collage/Khoros Link: Planning for Image Processing Tasks,” Proceedings of the 1995 AAAI Spring Symposium on Integrated Planning Applications, March 1995, pp. 67-76.

S. LaVoie, D. Alexander, C. Avis, H. Mortensen, C. Stanley, and L. Wainio, “VICAR User’s Guide, Version 2,” JPL Internal Document D-4186, Jet Propulsion Lab., California Institute of Tech., Pasadena, CA, 1989.

T. Matsuyama, “Expert Systems for Image Processing: Knowledge-Based Composition of Image Analysis Processes,” Computer Vision, Graphics, and Image Processing 48, (1989), pp. 22-49.

J. S. Pemberthy and D. S. Weld, “UCPOP: A Sound Complete, Partial Order Planner for ADL,” Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, Oct 1992.

K. Sakaue and H. Tamura, “Automatic Generation of Image Processing Programs by Knowledge-based Verification,” IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pp. 189-192, 1985.