



Increasing the Robustness of Model Predictions to Missing Sensors in Earth Observation


Francisco Mena, Diego Arenas, Andreas Dengel

University of Kaiserslautern-Landau | DFKI




**ECML
PKDD
2024**

Multi-sensor models in Earth Observation



Missing sensor data





**Mission ends for
Copernicus
Sentinel-1B satellite**

How to handle missing sensors in models at
prediction time?

How to increase the prediction robustness of
model to **missing sensors?**


How to handle missing sensor data?

1. **Impute**: replace the input features of the missing sensors with a numerical value.
 - a. Random [1] or zero [2] value.
2. **Exemplar**: replace the features of the missing sensors with existing values observed in the training set, based on available sensors and a shared space [3].



How to handle missing sensor data?

3. **Reconstruction**: replace the features of the missing sensors with a model that learned to reconstruct [1].



4. **Ignore**: omit the features of the missing sensors by using a dynamic merge function [2].


[1] Efremova, N., Seddik, M. E. A., & Erten, E. (2021). Soil moisture estimation using Sentinel-1/-2 imagery coupled with cycleGAN for time-series gap filing. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing.

[2] Mena, F., Arenas, D., Charfuelan, M., Nuske, M., & Dengel, A. (2024). Impact Assessment of Missing Data in Model Predictions for Earth Observation Applications

Two multi-sensor models using the Impute and Ignore techniques


Input Sensor Dropout

- Motivated by Temporal Dropout [1].
 - We introduce **Sensor Dropout** (SensD).
 - Dropout: zero-masking (**Impute**)
-
- Hyper-parameter:
 - (SensD) dropout ratio
 - No ratio: list all combinations of missing sensors, and select one randomly.



Input Sensor Dropout


- Motivated by Temporal Dropout [1].
 - We introduce **Sensor Dropout** (SensD) at input level.
 - Dropout: zero-masking (**Impute**)
-
- Input-level fusion ML model.



Simulating missing sensor data during training.

Ensemble Sensor Invariant

- Motivated by sensor invariant models [1].
- Sensor invariant: **sharing layers** between sensor-dedicated models.
- We extend the ensemble-based model [2].
 - Independent per-sensor learning.
 - Aggregation during inference (**Ignore**).



$$\hat{\Theta}_s = \arg \min_{\Theta_s} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}(y^{(i)}, \hat{y}_s^{(i)})$$


The diagram shows the equation above with arrows indicating the components: 'Ground truth' points to $y^{(i)}$, and 'Prediction from sensor "s"' points to $\hat{y}_s^{(i)}$.

[1] Francis, A., Mrziglod, J., Sidiropoulos, P., & Muller, J. P. (2021). Sensei: A deep learning module for creating sensor independent cloud masks. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing.

[2] Mena, F., Arenas, D., Charfuelan, M., Nuske, M., & Dengel, A. (2024). Impact Assessment of Missing Data in Model Predictions for Earth Observation Applications.

Ensemble Sensor Invariant

- We extend the ensemble-based model by using a **shared prediction head**.
- Sensor-dedicated encoders are required to match the same spatio-temporal-spectral dimension.
- Multi-sensor learning (parameters attached in the prediction head).



$$\hat{\Theta} = \arg \min_{\{\Theta_s\}_{s \in S}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}(y^{(i)}, \hat{y}_s^{(i)}) .$$

Ground truth

Prediction from sensor "s"

Validation Datasets

- Pixel-wise datasets with temporal features.

Predictive Task	Samples	Where	Temporal length	Temporal sensor	Static sensor
Crop-type classification [1]	69,000	Global	12 months (monthly)	optical (Sentinel-2, 12) radar (Sentinel-1, 2) weather (ERA5, 2)	topographic (SRTM's DEM, 2)
Live fuel moisture content [2]	2,578	USA	4 months (monthly)	optical (Landsat 8, 8) radar (Sentinel-1, 3)	topographic (NED's DEM, 2) soil (UNASP, 3) land cover (GlobCover, 12) canopy height (LIDAR)
Particulate matter 2.5 [3]	167,309	China	3 days (hourly)	atmosphere conditions (3), dynamics (4), precipitation (2)	-

[1] Tseng, G., Zvonkov, I., Nakalembe, C. L., & Kerner, H. (2021, October). Cropharvest: A global dataset for crop-type classification. In Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track.

[2] Rao, K., Williams, A. P., Flefil, J. F., & Konings, A. G. (2020). SAR-enhanced mapping of live fuel moisture content. Remote Sensing of Environment.

[3] Chen, S.: PM2.5 Data of Five Chinese Cities. UCI Machine Learning Repository (2017).


Baselines & Evaluation

- Impute
 - Input: as the counterpart of **ISensD** without SensD technique.
 - ITempD: input-level fusion model with temporal dropout.
- Exemplar
 - Feature: feature-level fusion model. Missing sensors are replaced with a similarity-based search at feature-level.
- Ignore:
 - Ensemble: as the counterpart of **ESensI** without the sensor invariant component.
- 10-fold cross validation stimulating missing sensors in validation fold.
- Focus on the effect of missing temporal sensors.
- Performance Robustness Score [1]

$$\text{PRS}(y, \hat{y}_{miss}, \hat{y}_{full}) = \min \left(1, \exp \left(1 - \frac{\text{RMSE}(y, \hat{y}_{miss})}{\text{RMSE}(y, \hat{y}_{full})} \right) \right)$$

PRS on classification datasets

Crop-type classification




The decrease in PRS is mostly linear for all methods when the number of samples with missing sensors increases.


PRS on regression dataset

- In regression, the robustness effect is more variable.

Live fuel moisture content



Particulate matter 2.5



Input-level fusion models have an exponential decay in PRS

Full-sensor predictive performance




Table 1: Predictive performance on a full-sensor evaluation, i.e. no missing features, on different datasets. The F1 is shown in classification and R^2 in regression.

Dataset	Input	ITempD	Feature	Ensemble	ISensD	ISensD (NR)	ESensI
CH	0.648	0.642	0.576	0.605	0.598	0.611	0.615
LFMC	0.714	0.717	0.650	0.313	0.655	0.545	0.326
PM25	0.917	0.882	-0.354	0.308	0.525	0.496	0.232

- ISensD performs worse than its counterpart, Input.
- ESensI outperforms its counterpart, Ensemble, in two out of three datasets.
 - Overall performance is quite low.

Ablation on ISensD dropout ratio

- The best ratio value depends on the dataset and sensor missing.



Ablation ESensI

- The best configuration of ESensI method depends on the dataset.

Table 2: Predictive performance results of different configurations in the ESensI model. The results are obtained in the full-sensor evaluation.

Shared weights	Sensor encoding	Normalize	Others	CH (F1)	LFMC (R^2)	PM25 (R^2)
-	-	-		0.603	0.313	0.308
✓	-	-		0.595	0.281	0.281
✓	✓	-		0.606	0.309	0.274
✓	✓	✓	add	0.598	0.317	0.241
✓	✓	✓	concat	0.595	0.297	0.196

Conclusion



We introduce two methods that increase the robustness of its counterpart to missing sensors.



Limitation in the full-sensor scenario.

- ISensD
 - Full-sensor scenario is a minority.
- ESensI
 - Individual predictions in regression are not effective.



The effectiveness of the SensD value is highly variable, as it depends on the dataset and the missing sensor.

- The “no ratio” version is a good parameter-free alternative.



Future work: combine good components of both approaches.



Increasing the Robustness of Model Predictions to Missing Sensors in Earth Observation

Francisco Mena, Diego Arenas, Andreas Dengel

University of Kaiserslautern-Landau | DFKI



**ECML
PKDD
2024**

Implementation



- For input-level fusion methods.
 - Temporal features are aligned, and static are repeated across time.
 - For sensors with temporal features: 1D CNN.
 - Similar results are observed with other architectures.
 - For sensors with static features: MLP.
-
- Architecture configuration: 2 layers, 128 units, 20% dropout.
 - Optimization: ADAM, 128 batch size.