

# Earth+: on-board satellite imagery compression leveraging historical earth observations

Kuntai Du<sup>1</sup>, Yihua Cheng<sup>1</sup>, Peder Olsen<sup>2</sup>, Shadi Noghabi<sup>2\*</sup>, Ranveer Chandra<sup>2</sup>, Junchen Jiang<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>The University of Chicago    <sup>2</sup>Microsoft Research

## ABSTRACT

With the increasing deployment of earth observation satellite constellations, the downlink (satellite-to-ground) capacity often limits the freshness, quality, and coverage of the imagery data available to applications on the ground. To overcome the downlink limitation, we present Earth+, a new satellite imagery compression system that, instead of compressing each image individually, pinpoints and downloads only recent imagery changes with respect to the history reference images. To minimize the amount of changes, it is critical to make reference images as *fresh* as possible. Earth+ enables each satellite to choose fresh reference images from not only its own history images but also past images of other satellites from an entire *satellite constellation*. To share reference images across satellites, Earth+ utilizes the limited capacity of the existing uplink (ground-to-satellite) by judiciously selecting and compressing reference images while still allowing accurate change detection. In short, Earth+ is the *first* to make reference-based compression efficient, by enabling constellation-wide sharing of fresh reference images across satellites. Our evaluation shows that Earth+ can reduce the downlink usage by a factor of 3.3 compared to state-of-the-art on-board image compression techniques while not sacrificing image quality, or using more on-board computing or storage resources, or more uplink bandwidth than currently available.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Fresh and high-quality satellite imagery is key to many applications, from digital agriculture [19, 44, 56, 57], environmental monitoring [5, 35, 53, 66, 67], to automatic road detection [21, 47, 68], and many more. As a result, large constellations of Low-Earth-Orbit (LEO) earth observation satellites have been deployed [37, 58, 64] to capture high-quality imagery for any location multiple times a day [37, 58, 64].

However, most satellite imagery data captured by these satellites are currently *not* received on the ground due to the limited *downlink* (satellite-to-ground) capacity. According to a recent estimate, only 2% of the total image data observed by each satellite can be downloaded to the ground [37]. Some

mission-specific satellites handle the downlink-capacity limitation by filtering images onboard the satellite [38, 64] to focus only on mission-specific areas prepaid by the customer. However, this approach is not sufficient for *general-purpose* satellite constellations (e.g., Sentinel-2 [40], Doves [58]), whose goal is to capture and download satellite imagery over wide geographical regions to serve more applications.

This paper aims to improve *onboard compression* for satellite imagery.<sup>1</sup> We are inspired by the observation that the terrestrial content changes slowly between two consecutive satellite visits at the same location [61, 69]. Thus, to compress a new image, we can compare it with a recent image of the same region, called a *reference* image, to detect the geographic *tiles* (defined in §3) within the region that has changed and then only compress and download the changed tiles. Our measurement on Planet dataset [58] shows that without the interference of clouds, only 20% of the tiles in each image have changed in the previous five days on average, which ideally can save downlink usage by up-to 5× (§3).


Yet, realizing the *reference-based* encoding for onboard imagery compression can be challenging because the reference image should be as *fresh* and contain as little *cloud* as possible (§3). Typically, the last cloud-free image captured by the same satellite [58] can be over 50 days old on average (§3). With such a large time gap, the reference image and the new image may have substantial differences (more than 50% of the tiles will have significant changes as shown in §3), making reference-based encoding less effective.

We present Earth+, a *constellation-wide* reference-based encoding system, where the reference images can be selected from historical images of *any satellites* in the constellation. By broadening the set of potential reference images, Earth+ increases the probability of obtaining fresh and cloud-free reference images. For example, with images from an entire constellation [58], cloud-free images can be obtained every 4.21 days on average, instead of every 50 days with one satellite (§4.1).

To enable image sharing across satellites in a constellation, Earth+ leverages the existing *uplinks* (ground-to-satellite) to *upload* fresh and cloud-free reference images that have been downloaded from different satellites as illustrated in Figure 1.

<sup>1</sup>Better imagery compression can also improve filtering-based solutions like [64].

\* This work is done while in Microsoft Research.



**Figure 1: Contrasting Earth+ with traditional satellite imagery compression.** (a) The traditional approach compresses images by satellites using their local onboard information. (b) Earth+’s reference-based encoding uses reference images from any satellites in the constellation and uploads the reference images to the satellite to pinpoint the changed areas and only downloads their content.

(§4.2 will discuss the rationale of using uplinks, as opposed to alternatives like inter-satellite links.) The key challenge facing Earth+ is that existing uplinks of earth observation satellites have *limited capacity* (e.g., 250kbps [39]).

We present two techniques (§4.3) to reduce the uplink usage of Earth+ without sacrificing the savings on the downlink.

First, Earth+ uploads reference images at a low resolution while still allowing the satellites to detect the most changed tiles (§4.3). The rationale is that low-resolution images are sufficient to decide which tiles have changed, which is easier than quantifying how much each pixel in the tile has changed.

Second, Earth+ does not need to store those unchanged tiles when capturing new imagery, which frees up the storage space. We utilize this freed storage space to cache reference images locally on-board, which allows Earth+ to further reduce the uplink usage by only uploading tiles that have changed relative to the on-board cached reference images.

Besides the two aforementioned techniques, our implementation of Earth+ (§5) also entails techniques to handle satellite-specific issues, including cloud detection, on-board computation constraints, handling different bands of satellite imagery, and bandwidth variations.

To put Earth+’s contribution into perspective, while the observation of redundancy across satellite imagery may not be new, prior work on onboard imagery compression has focused on optimizing the compression within each satellite. In contrast, Earth+ is the first to make reference-based compression efficient, by enabling constellation-wide sharing of fresh reference images across satellites.

We evaluate Earth+ on *real-world* satellite specifications (uplink and storage capacities) of the Doves constellation [15] from Planet Labs. We test Earth+’s compression efficiency on two datasets. The first dataset is collected from Sentinel-2 dataset [40], with 3.6 TB data covering 110 thousand km<sup>2</sup> from Washington State. We use this dataset to test Earth+ under a wide range of contents (e.g., mountains, forests, and cities), seasons, and under multiple imagery bands (13 bands in total). Since Sentinel-2 only contains two satellites, we further test Earth+’s performance using the Planet dataset [58], from which we obtain images from 40 satellites for one sampled location (due to the download limit) of 64 km<sup>2</sup> in the U.S. for three months. Our evaluation shows that:

- Compared to the state-of-the-art onboard compression schemes, Earth+ reduces the downlink bandwidth usage by 1.3-3.3× without hurting the imagery quality on all bands. This can reduce the reaction delays of ground applications (e.g., forest-fire alerts) by upto 3×.
- These improvements are achieved *without* using more uplink bandwidth than currently available or more compute or storage resources than the baselines.
- With more satellites in a constellation, Earth+ can further reduce the amount of downlink bandwidth usage.

That said, Earth+’s reference-based encoding is not a good fit for applications that require lossless satellite imagery (§8).

**This work does not raise any ethical issues.**

## 2 MOTIVATION


We start with the background on satellite imagery and earth observation satellite constellations.

### 2.1 Background

Many applications can benefit from frequently updated (e.g., daily) and high-resolution satellite imagery. For example, precision agriculture ideally needs daily access to satellite imagery with each pixel corresponding to a 5m × 5m area on Earth [12, 20] to help timely decisions on the distribution of fertilizers, pesticides, and water. Also, wildfire monitoring requires the imagery to be updated frequently with sufficient resolution to promptly detect and respond to fire outbreaks, mitigating potential damage [64].

To provide fresh, high-resolution satellite imagery, many LEO satellites (e.g., >100 satellites [58]) are deployed to form satellite constellations. We characterize two features:

- *High-resolution imagery*: LEO satellites are close to the ground (due to their low earth orbits) and can capture imagery with low ground-sampling distance (GSD for short, lower GSD means higher resolution).



**Figure 2:** Illustration of a LEO satellite constellation: the satellites follow a sun-synchronous orbit, and the ground station downloads imagery data from a satellite when the satellite passes through it.

- *Frequent revisit:* With a large number of satellites, any location on the earth’s surface will be frequently revisited (e.g., daily [58]), while a single satellite can only revisit one location once every ten days [24].

Figure 2 shows an illustrative example of such a large-scale LEO satellite constellation, where multiple satellites are located in a sun-synchronous orbit<sup>2</sup> and these satellites can potentially stream data to the ground when they are close enough to one of the ground stations (we only plot one ground station in the figure for simplicity).

Note that in the following text, we denote *the ground* as the ground stations that the constellation can potentially contact and the computation and networking infrastructures around these ground stations.

## 2.2 Downlink bottleneck and our objective

**Downlink capacity gap:** Despite more images being captured by the satellites, only a small fraction of data are downloaded to the ground due to the limited capacity of the downlink (satellite-to-ground).<sup>3</sup> Specifically, we refer to *downlink bandwidth* as the average download speed from satellites to the ground during each ground contact. The exact gap between the downlink capacity and the imagery data varies with the constellation, and a recent study shows only about

<sup>2</sup>A sun-synchronous orbit ensures that each location on the earth is approximately revisited once per day, at approximately the same time local time, allowing the constellation to capture images with similar illumination condition once per day.

<sup>3</sup>To put this gap in perspective, we use the data from the Doves constellation in 2017 [58], where each satellite image covers an area of 400 km<sup>2</sup> (assuming 6600×4400 resolution [42] and a GSD of 3.7 meters [42]) so after scanning the whole earth’s surface, we would accumulate 1.275 million images or 191.25 TB of data (with each image being 150 MB [16]). To estimate how much data can be downloaded, we make the idealized assumption that the satellite always has a stable connection of 200 Mbps [39] with a ground station. Now, each satellite scans the whole Earth’s surface every ten days [24], so under the idealized assumption, the satellite can only transmit 21.6 TB of data to the ground, which is less than 12% of the 191.25 TB of data accumulated during that period of time.

2% of the images captured by satellites are actually downloaded to the ground [37].

Further, the downlink demand is constantly growing, with higher resolution (e.g., a GSD of 0.5m [22]) and more bands found to be useful (e.g., vegetarian red edge band and water vapor band [23]). In contrast, the downlink grows slowly due to the long deployment cycle of satellites. These trends suggest that the gap between the demand for downlink bandwidth and its actual capacity will likely persist if not increase.

**Optimization objective:** We aim to address the downlink bottleneck of satellite constellations by better *satellite image compression*. More specifically, we aim to use much less bandwidth to download the same amount of satellite imagery, measured in the number of photoed locations and frequencies, without compromising image quality. To measure the quality of the downloaded images, we use Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR for short), which aligns with satellite imagery compression literature [41, 43, 45, 62].

**On-board constraints:** While optimizing for the image quality and reducing the downlink consumption, we stick to real-world on-board storage, computation, and uplink constraints. We describe the real-world satellite specification that we used for our evaluation in §6.

## 2.3 Existing solutions

There are several approaches to addressing the downlink bandwidth bottleneck.

The first is to physically increase the downlink capacity by upgrading the infrastructure, e.g., building more ground stations [58] or adding more satellites to parallelize the downloading of multiple satellites [37, 40, 58]. The costs of such infrastructure changes can be prohibitive, and they can be slow. For context, it takes tens of millions of dollars to build and send just one single satellite [9].

An alternative is to filter the imagery onboard the satellite [37, 38, 64]. For the mission-specific constellations that focus on specific regions, this approach can filter out most of the imagery. For instance, the Biomass mission targets forest areas to monitor forest coverage changes [2], while the IceBridge mission observes polar ice to gauge climate change impacts [1]. However, they must exclude data useful for other applications. For example, the Biomass mission omits about 91% of the Earth’s surface [8, 11], such as city areas (which are useful for smart city applications) and agriculture areas (useful for digital agriculture).

This work focuses on the third approach: onboard imagery compression. It is complementary to the first two approaches. Existing solutions include augmenting single-image codecs [25–27, 46, 52, 59, 60, 73] and developing more expensive neural-based codecs such as autoencoders [28, 30, 36, 75, 76].

However, most techniques focus on compressing single imagery from a single satellite, so they fall short in leveraging the *redundancies* between images to achieve higher compression efficiency.

### 3 REFERENCE-BASED ENCODING


Next, we introduce reference-based encoding, a seemingly promising idea that leverages a reference image to pinpoint and download only regions that have recently changed. As we will see, directly applying this approach to a satellite does not work well as images locally available to each satellite may not be recent enough or contain too much cloud to realize the benefit of reference-based encoding.

**Background on reference-based encoding:** Reference-based encoding is commonly used to compress a sequence of images whose content changes slowly and gradually with respect to time [31, 55, 61, 63, 69, 70], such as video streams. Existing reference-based encoding systems (e.g., video codecs [31, 55, 63, 70]) typically select some of the images as the *reference* and encode the remaining images by encoding their difference concerning the reference images. As existing codecs encode the images at the granularity of *tiles* (a tile is a block of pixels, where we use a 64×64 pixel block as a tile by default), and the difference is separately calculated per tile.

Since the satellite imagery captured for the same location also changes slowly over time (as shown in prior work [61, 69]), there is some recent work to apply reference-based encoding in onboard satellite imagery compression [61, 69]. Given a new image, it compares the image with a reference image of the location from the past and pinpoints the changed tiles with a pixel difference greater than the threshold compared to the reference. It then encodes those changed tiles and downloads the tiles in their entirety.<sup>4</sup> Our work follows this approach when encoding changed tiles (§5).


**Reference images need to be fresh:** While reference-based encoding seems to be a good fit for imagery compression, it is only effective if the *age* of the reference image—the time gap between the reference image and the currently observed image—is as low as possible. Reference image with high age leads to more changed areas in the currently observed image, which must be downloaded to the ground. Figure 3 provides an illustrative example, where the changes that happened on Day 3 compared to Day 1 are much less than on Day 30 compared to Day 1. To make it more concrete, we use three months of cloud-free (explained shortly) images

<sup>4</sup>Unlike conventional video frame encoding, the changed tiles are downloaded in their original pixel values rather than the pixel differences between the new image and the reference. This is mainly because the reference images are downsampled due to limited onboard storage, thus encoding the tile itself and the difference concerning its reference requiring a similar amount of bits.



(a) Captured image (Day 30) (b) Fresh reference (Day 27) (c) Older reference (Day 1)

**Figure 3:** An example illustrating why reference images need to be fresh. Comparing a captured image from Day 30 with a fresh reference from Day 27 reveals much fewer changes than when comparing it with an older reference from Day 1. Image © 2023 Planet Labs PBC.




**Figure 4:** More changes need to be downloaded when the age of the reference image gets larger.

from the Planet dataset [40] on one randomly sampled location in the U.S. Here, we say a tile has changed if it has an average pixel differences greater than 0.01 after aligning the illumination (§5).<sup>5</sup> Figure 4 shows a steady increase in the percentage of changed areas with the age of the reference image: *the percentage of changed tiles will increase by 3× if increasing the age of the reference image from 10 days to 50 days.*

**Reference images should be cloud-free:** If some tiles in the reference image are covered by clouds, they are not useful as a reference to detect changes. As a consequence, the corresponding tiles in the current image can only be deemed as changed and downloaded to the ground. This greatly compromises the benefit of reference-based encoding.

**Why reference-based encoding is challenging?** In practice, however, there may not always exist a reference in the satellite’s history images that is *both* fresh and covered by little cloud. For example, existing work [61, 69] stores a fixed

<sup>5</sup>The pixel differences are computed after we normalize pixel values to [0,1]. The threshold of 0.01 means that those areas deemed “unchanged” would be above 40, which is very high in satellite imagery compression literature [32] and provides almost the same results as the uncompressed image in applications like satellite imagery compression [48].



**Figure 5:** Measuring the age of reference images under two strategies: updating the reference using historical images locally captured by the satellite (“Satellite-local”) and updating the reference using images from any satellites in the constellation (“Constellation-wide”). It shows that the constellation-wide approach can reduce the average age of the reference image from 51 days to 4.2 days, a 12 $\times$  reduction.

reference image on-board, which will get older over time and make most of the areas being counted as changed and downloaded to the ground, negating the benefit of reference-based encoding. Moreover, *even if* a satellite were able to choose the reference image from all of its historical images, the most recent reference image with less than 1% cloud coverage would still be tens of days old. For instance, Figure 5 shows the age distribution of the closest reference images that are covered by less than 1% cloud if the satellite chooses the reference image by itself (*i.e.*, the “Satellite-local” curve in the figure). We note that the age of the most recent cloud-free reference image is 51 days on average. The reason for the high ages of recent cloud-free images is two-fold:

- A single satellite revisits the same location at a low frequency (once every 10-15 days [24]). This is because LEO satellites can only capture a small area on Earth at a time (since their size is small [64] and they are close to Earth), necessitating extended periods to complete a full scan of the Earth before revisiting the same locations.
- Since, on average, 2/3 of the earth is covered by clouds [10], so even if the most recent image of the same location is ten days old, it may likely be (partly) covered by cloud and are not ideal choice for reference images.<sup>6</sup>

## 4 EARTH+: CONSTELLATION-WIDE REFERENCE-BASED ENCODING

To improve onboard satellite imagery compression, we present Earth+, a reference-based encoding system that obtains fresh and cloud-free reference images from images captured by any satellites in the **whole constellation**, rather than the history images of the same satellite. This section introduces the idea of constellation-wide reference sharing (§4.1) and

<sup>6</sup>Compared to picking a complete image as the reference, choosing a different reference for each tile may lower the age of the reference, but in practice this reduction is marginal because when the cloud is present, it often covers most of an image and the remaining content, if any, will be influenced by its shadow, making change detection difficult.

an overview of Earth+ (§4.2). We then present the design of Earth+ that makes constellation-wide reference-based encoding practical (§4.3).

### 4.1 Constellation-wide reference selection

Compared to the prior work, which only refers to local images observed by the same satellite, Earth+ *augments* the set of reference images that reference-based encoding can choose from and thus potentially reduces the age of reference images, leading to fewer changes to be downloaded to the ground.

To illustrate the benefits and challenges of Earth+, we contrast two designs.

- *Satellite-local reference:* Pick the latest cloud-free image observed by the same satellite as the reference image.
- *Constellation-wide reference:* Pick the latest cloud-free image observed by **any satellite in the whole constellation** as the reference image.

Note that the latter is not practical because it needs a large amount of bandwidth to share the reference images, a challenge we will tackle soon in §4.3.


Figure 6 gives an illustrative example of this contrast with a constellation of three satellites (in different colors). The goal is to compress images taken by these satellites for the same location. To simplify the discussion, all images in this example are cloud-free. Each satellite takes a cloud-free image every 30 days, so the satellite-local reference (Figure 6(b)) will be 30 days old. Consequently, in the last three images (Day 31, 41, and 51), 45%-65% of tiles are deemed as changed and need to be downloaded.

In contrast, with constellation-wide reference Figure 6(c), since the reference image can be from any satellite, the freshest reference is only ten days old rather than 30 days. As a result, two of the three last images do not have any changed tiles and one has only 45% changed tiles, *i.e.*, only 15% are changed tiles on average. In short, the ability to pick reference images from any satellite in the constellation reduces the age of reference images by 3 $\times$  (30 days to 10 days) compared to the satellite-local design, and this reduces the changed tiles to download by 3.6 $\times$  (55% area to 15% area).

### 4.2 Earth+ workflow

Earth+ is a concrete design of constellation-wide reference-based encoding. It answers two basic questions: (1) which reference images should be shared between different satellites, and (2) how to share these reference images using the existing infrastructure.

To answer the first question, Earth+ reuses the images downloaded to the ground from all satellites and *selectively uploads* these images as reference images to the satellites. Figure 7(b) illustrates this workflow.



**Figure 6:** Contrasting two reference image uploading strategies: (a) using satellite-local images as reference images and (b) uploading reference images using uplink. By uploading images using uplink, one can reduce the average age of the reference image by 3 $\times$  (from 30 days to 10 days) and the downloaded areas by 3.6 $\times$  (55% to 15%) in this example.


- During **previous** ground contact, the ground station **uploads** latest cloud-free images (that can come from any satellite in the constellation) as reference images for the locations that the satellite will fly by before the next ground contact<sup>7</sup>.
- When passing over a location, the satellite captures the imagery, removes clouds, detects changes using the reference images, and encodes the changes.
- During the next ground contact, the satellite downloads the encoded changes to the ground.

Compared to the workflow of traditional satellite imagery processing pipelines, which capture images and download them to the ground (as depicted in Figure 7(a)), Earth+ **uploads** the reference images from the ground to the satellite. We rely on ground stations as an “overlay” point to share images downloaded from each satellite with other satellites. The rationale is two-fold:

1. The ground stations can access any historical image observed by the whole constellation, allowing Earth+ to select reference images constellation-wide.
2. The ground station has sufficient computing resources to more accurately detect clouds and upload only cloud-free images to satellites as the reference (§3).

A seemingly promising alternative to enable constellation-wide reference is to let satellites share data via inter-satellite links (ISL). Earth+ does not use ISL because it is currently not available for earth observation satellites [64]. Further, the scale of existing earth observation constellations (less than 200 satellites) is insufficient to guarantee a stable ISL

<sup>7</sup>It is feasible to upload reference images for geographical locations that the satellite will visit in the future, as these locations can be accurately predicted by, for example, Two Line Element data available in Celestrak [3].




**Figure 7:** Contrasting between the satellite imagery compression workflow of prior work [37] and Earth+.

connection between any two satellites, as providing such a guarantee typically requires thousands of satellites (e.g., Starlink [54]).

### 4.3 Tackling limited uplink bandwidth

However, using the uplink to upload reference images to the satellites is not without challenges—the uplink has limited bandwidth (e.g., only 250 Kbps in DOVEs constellation [39]). Earth+ tackles this challenge with three ideas. Put together, they allow enough reference images to be sent to the satellites under the limited uplink bandwidth while allowing Earth+ to realize sizable downlink savings.

**Downsampling reference images:** First, Earth+ compresses reference images by downsampling (i.e., lowering resolution). Consequently, Earth+ also detects changed tiles at a low resolution. For instance, if the original resolution of the captured image is 4000 $\times$ 4000, and the uploaded reference image is downsampled to 500 $\times$ 500, then the satellite will also




**Figure 8:** An example measurement based on the Planet dataset showing how many changed tiles that are undetected given different reference image compression ratios, while fixing the total number of tiles being downloaded. It highlights that only 1.7% of the tiles failed to be detected as changed when compressing the reference images by 2601 $\times$ .

downsample the captured image to 500 $\times$ 500 before calculating the pixel difference in each tile. (Here, we assume both images have been preprocessed by cloud removal and illumination alignment, which will be described in §5.) We then mark the tiles with average pixel difference over a threshold  $\theta$  (explained shortly) as changed tiles. Finally, the changed tiles will be saved and compressed before being sent to the ground. Please refer to §5 on how Earth+ encodes these tiles.

However, detecting changes via downsampled reference images will not be as accurate as detecting changes using full-resolution reference images. Fortunately, under appropriate illumination alignment, if a tile does not change significantly from the reference, it will still have a low difference at a low resolution. So only changed tiles might be mis-detected as unchanged (*i.e.*, false negatives). This can happen when the pixel changes in a tile are averaged out when downsampling the new and reference images.

To minimize the false negatives, Earth+ uses a low threshold  $\theta$  to detect more changed tiles without misclassifying an unchanged tile as changed. To demonstrate this, Figure 8 shows that when detecting changed tiles under different resolutions, we can always choose a threshold  $\theta$  such that about 40% of tiles are labeled as changed with almost no unchanged tiles being misclassified (*i.e.*, they are actually unchanged tiles when seen at a higher resolution). For instance, when an image is downsampled by over 2600 $\times$ , only 1.7% of tiles are mislabeled. In our experiments, we choose a static threshold  $\theta$  based on the data in the first year and evaluate it on the data in the second year.

**Only uploading changed areas:** As Earth+ applies reference-based encoding, which does not encode the unchanged areas in the captured satellite imagery, this saves the on-board storage space used for storing captured imagery by about 80% (as 80% of the areas do not need to be encoded on average, as shown in §6) and enables Earth+ to use the following optimization to further reduce the usage of uplink. Concretely, Earth+ locally *caches* the reference images onboard the satellite for all locations the satellite will visit and only uploads



**Figure 9:** Two satellite images captured consecutively do have similar content on the ground, but the pixel difference can still be significant due to cloud and illumination differences. Image © 2023 Planet Labs PBC.

changed areas when uploading a new reference image to the satellite. The overhead of such caching is marginal (about 9%, detailed estimation in §A compared to the existing storage space used to store all reference images on-board), and thus fits into the storage space conserved by reference-based encoding. Also, caching reference images on-board allows Earth+ to handle occasional uplink disconnection (more details in §5).

**Uploading only cloud-free areas:** Earth+ requires *cloud-free* reference images to detect terrestrial changes. However, accurately identifying cloud-free imagery can be computationally expensive, as it requires sequences of images as the input and tens of layers of the neural network to accurately detect light haze and faint clouds [74]. As a result, the satellite does not have sufficient computation on board to accurately detect cloud-free imagery.

Earth+ takes an alternative design that identifies cloud-free imagery by letting the ground stations *re-detect* the cloud in the imagery downloaded from satellites using a more compute-intensive but more accurate cloud detector. This allows Earth+ to accurately detect cloud-free images without incurring extra computation costs on the satellite.

## 5 IMPLEMENTATION

**Illumination and cloud:** In satellite imagery, the time gap between two consecutively-captured images can be hours [58] or days [40]. As a result, two consecutive images in the image sequence can differ a lot in terms of pixel values due to the illumination condition and the cloud condition difference (as shown in Figure 9), making the general-purpose change detector (like the change detector in videos [34, 49, 63, 70]) no longer suitable for satellite imagery compression.

Note that there are other potential sources (*e.g.* sensor noise, image misalignment) that can also trigger large pixel differences. Earth+ does not explicitly address them, as they only appear in raw data sensed by the satellite, which is not accessible in public datasets.

**On-board change detector:** To be robust to different cloud and illumination conditions, Earth+ employs the following change detection workflow:

- Cloud removal: detect highly cloudy areas in the satellite imagery using a decision tree classifier, and remove this part of the data (by filling the corresponding pixels with zero pixel value).
- Image dropping: drop those images with cloud coverage greater than 50%.
- Illumination alignment: align the illumination between the reference image and the captured image on less-cloudy areas using standard linear regression (since the illumination condition affects the pixel value linearly [72]).
- The difference detection process is mentioned in §4.3.
- Encoding: encode the changed tiles.

Note that the abovementioned pipeline drops those images that are highly cloudy. Acknowledging that this makes Earth+ less applicable in cloud-sensitive applications like weather forecasting, we argue that a wide range of applications (e.g., autonomous road detection, precision agriculture, etc) treat highly cloudy data as of low value and will typically filter them out as they are focusing on the geographical content on the ground rather than the cloud. Prior work also makes similar observations [37, 61].

**Encoding changed tiles:** Earth+ encodes those changed tiles by selecting the changed tiles as region-of-interest and runs region-of-interest encoding on the whole image using an off-the-shelf JPEG-2000 encoder (Kakadu [13]). While encoding such images, Earth+ makes sure that the bit spent on each encoded tile is a constant  $\gamma$  by configuring the bit-per-pixel parameter of the Kakadu encoder as  $\gamma$  times the percentage of tiles that are changed.

**Choosing parameters for Earth+:** Earth+ introduces two parameters: change detection threshold  $\theta$  (§4.3) and bit-per-pixel  $\gamma$  for each downloaded imagery. Earth+ chooses  $\theta$  by profiling last year’s data on one single location, and uses this parameter on this year’s data for all locations. Earth+ then varies  $\gamma$  to trade-off between the downlink usage and the imagery quality.

**Fitting into on-board computation constraint:** In the change detector of Earth+, both illumination alignment and difference detector can be cheaply done on-board. However, accurate cloud detection can be compute-intensive, as it typically requires using a series of images as input and tens of layers of neural network to accurately detect thin clouds [74].

To reduce the computation cost of the on-board cloud detector, the main observation of Earth+ is that it is tolerable if the cloud detector fails to detect some clouds (as they will be detected as changed and downloaded to the ground, which is tolerable as long as the downlink saving of Earth+ is still sizable), but it is harmful if the cloud detector wrongfully

detect non-cloudy area as cloudy as it will trigger Earth+ to discard these areas, where there may be changes. Using this observation, Earth+ only detects those easy-to-detect clouds (e.g., heavy clouds), which can be done by a cheap decision-tree-based detector (as the temperature of heavy clouds significantly differs from the nearby ground and can be easily detected using the InfraRed band) while still ensuring that almost all areas that the cloud detector detects are cloudy. Further, Earth+ also detects the cloud under a down-sampled version of the captured imagery (64×, width and height) as Earth+ only uses the cloud detection to identify which 64×64 tiles need to be downloaded.

After these optimization techniques, Earth+ can make cloud detection faster compared to running JPEG-2000 encoding, while making sure that over 99% of areas detected are actually cloudy.

**Handling different bands:** Unlike traditional RGB images, satellite imagery typically has multiple bands (e.g., near-infrared band and short-wave infrared band) and the amount of changes of different bands (B1 – B12) on cloud-free areas are different. This is because some of the bands aim to monitor the air quality and thus do not change significantly in cloud-free areas (e.g., B9), while some of the bands change a lot due to their temperature sensitivity (e.g., vegetation bands such as B7, B8, and B8a measures the concentration of chlorophyll, which is sensitive to temperature). To handle such heterogeneity between bands, Earth+ treats each band separately, which means that Earth+ detects changes band-by-band and updates the reference images band-by-band, allowing Earth+ to mark different areas as changed and download different amounts of changes for different bands.

**Handling bandwidth fluctuation:** We introduce how Earth+ handles the fluctuation of uplink and downlink bandwidth.

We first handle uplink alteration. As Earth+ locally caches the reference images, when the capacity of the uplink alters, Earth+ can skip the updating of some reference images (the skipped images are randomly chosen) and rely on the old reference images cached on-board for change detection, with a slight increase on the downlink capacity.

We then handle downlink alteration. Earth+ relies on the *layered codec* to handle the alteration of downlink. The characteristic of layered codec is that by encoding the images to multiple layers, Earth+ can smoothly trade-off between downlink bandwidth and the quality of downloaded imagery quality: the ground can download more layers to receive high-quality imagery when having sufficient downlink bandwidth or download fewer layers to the ground when the downlink bandwidth is limited. The feature of layered codec is widely supported by existing imagery encoders on the satellite (e.g., JPEG-2000 encoders [7, 13]). We note that Earth+ downloads



Section	Properties	Values
Connectivity	Ground contact duration	<i>10 minutes</i> [14, 33]
	Ground contact per day	<i>7 times</i> [33]
	Uplink bandwidth	250 kbps [39]
	Downlink bandwidth	200 Mbps [39]
Hardware	On-board storage	<i>360 GB</i> [17]
Image	Image resolution	6600×4400 [42]
	Image channels	RGB + InfraRed [42]
	Raw image file size	<i>150 MB</i> [16]
	Ground sampling distance	3.7 meters [42]

**Table 1:** Characterizing the specifications of Doves constellation from the year 2017 to the year 2018. Some of the data are not publically available and we infer them from other sources (we italicized the data that we inferred, with the corresponding sources cited next to the inferred data).

the same amount of layers for all locations that Earth+ will download during one ground contact.

**Guaranteed downloading:** As some changed tiles will not be downloaded to the ground by Earth+ (§4.3), Earth+ performs guaranteed downloading that downloads cloud-free imagery in its entirety at a low frequency (once every month).

## 6 EVALUATION

In this section, we pick two state-of-the-art satellite imagery compression systems as our baseline and evaluate Earth+ against on two satellite imagery datasets. The key takeaway of our evaluation is three-fold:

- Compared to the state-of-the-art onboard compression schemes, Earth+ reduces the downlink bandwidth usage by 1.3-3.3× without hurting the imagery quality on all bands.
- These improvements are achieved without using more uplink bandwidth than currently available, or more compute or storage resources than the baselines.
- With more satellites in a constellation, Earth+ can further reduce the amount of downlink bandwidth usage.

### 6.1 Experimental setup

**Dataset:** We evaluate Earth+ on two datasets (Table 2 illustrates the details of these two datasets):

- **Rich-content dataset:** we collect 1-year images on 11 geographical locations in Washington State (where each location is of size 1600 km<sup>2</sup>) from Sentinel-2 dataset [40]. We sample images from Washington State as it contains a wide variety of geographical contexts, including fluvial landscapes, agricultural areas with varied irrigation systems, mountainous regions with large elevation changes, etc, as shown in Figure 10a-e.

To handle the large volumn of this dataset, we down-sample the images in this dataset by 4×, width and height, where we confirmed on one location that such down-sampling does not affect the savings of Earth+.

However, Sentinel-2 dataset [40] only contains two satellites in its constellation. To further show the potential of Earth+’s constellation-wide change-based encoding, we incorporate another dataset with lower coverage but with more satellites available.

- **Large-constellation dataset:** we use Planet dataset [58] that contains multiple satellites in its constellation to showcase the potential of Earth+’s constellation-wide change-based encoding. Due to the quota limit of the Planet dataset, we only sample images on one randomly sampled location in the U.S. (the content is illustrated in Figure 10f), with cloud coverage smaller than 5%. The dataset we sampled contains 48 satellites in total.

**Real-world satellite specifications:** We show the satellite specifications in Table 1.

**Modelling uplink and downlink:** We evaluate Earth+ using the uplink and downlink specifications from Doves constellation. Specifically:

- Uplink: we assume that the uplink is of a constant bandwidth (250 kbps [39]) and the connection duration is 10 minutes [14, 33]. Here we assume that the uplink bandwidth is a constant, as the uplink leverages the S-band to communicate [6], which is of low frequency, and thus severe weather conditions do not significantly affect its bandwidth [65].
- Downlink: we assume that the ground contact duration is 10 minutes [14, 33] and calculate the minimum average bandwidth required to download a fixed amount of images.

**Metrics:** Earth+ aims to reduce the downlink demand without hurting the quality of downloaded images. We measure the required downlink bandwidth by dividing the amount of data needed to be streamed during one ground contact by the ground contact time (10 minutes [14, 33]) and measure the image quality by using Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR for short). This aligns with satellite compression literature [41, 43, 45, 62]. Further, prior work shows that a higher Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio typically leads to higher application-side performance [32, 48].


**Baselines:** We consider two state-of-the-art baselines for on-board satellite imagery compression:

- **Kodan** [37]: drop low-value cloud data and download remaining non-cloudy areas.
- **SatRoI** [61]: running reference-based encoding using a fixed reference image.


We evaluate Earth+ on the standard JPEG-2000 image encoder, which is already used by existing satellites [4, 18].

	Why using this dataset	Number of satellites included in our dataset	Locations	Coverage of each location	Ground sampling distance (GSD)	Duration	Number of bands	Cloud coverage
Planet	Show that Earth+ saves more downlink when there are more satellites	48	1	36 km <sup>2</sup>	3.0 - 4.1 m	3 months	4	<5%
Sentinel-2	Test Earth+ on a wide range of content	2	11	1600 km <sup>2</sup>	10 m	1 year	13	≤100%

**Table 2:** The datasets used in our evaluation. One from Planet [40] and the other from Sentinel-2 [58].



(a) Sentinel-2: River (b) Forest (c) Mountain (d) Agriculture (e) City (f) Planet: Coastal  
**Figure 10:** Snapshots of images at sampled locations in our testing datasets, which show a variety of geographical content.




(a) Sentinel-2 dataset (b) Planet dataset  
**Figure 11:** (KD) Redo sentinel-2 results Earth+ requires less downlink bandwidth without sacrificing the image quality (measured in PSNR). The vertical and horizontal bar shows the standard deviation of the mean (some of the horizontal bars are occluded as they are too short).

While there is a line of work on single satellite imagery encoders (e.g., augmenting traditional image codecs [25–27, 46, 52, 59, 60, 73] or developing neural-based codecs such as autoencoders [28, 30, 36, 75, 76]), Earth+ is in parallel with this line of work (as Earth+ focuses on leveraging the redundancy between images for further compression) and one can use Earth+ on top of existing single satellite imagery encoders.


## 6.2 Experimental results

**Saving downlink bandwidth without hurting PSNR:** We show that Earth+ has a better PSNR–downlink demand trade-off compared to the baselines. As shown in Figure 11a, Earth+ saves 1.3-2.0× downlink bandwidth without hurting the PSNR of the images compared to the strongest baseline in the Sentinel-2 dataset. Earth+ further saves downlink bandwidth by 2.8-3.3× in the Planet dataset, as shown in Figure 11b. The



**Figure 12:** The CDF of the percentage of downloaded tiles and the PSNR of Earth+ and baselines. We can see that Earth+ downloads much fewer tiles compared to the baselines while achieving higher PSNR.

reason behind such improvement is that Earth+ uses fresh reference images to detect and encode changes in the imagery, while Kodan needs to encode all non-cloudy regions (including those regions that are not changed), and SatRol uses a fixed reference image that nearly detects all regions as changed. Also, Earth+ has more savings on the Planet dataset. This is because the Planet dataset contains more than 40 satellites, while Sentinel-2 only contains two satellites, and Earth+’s constellation-wide encoding scheme can




**Figure 13:** The time series of the percentage of downloaded tiles and the PSNR of Earth+ and baselines on one location.

This is because the Planet dataset has more satellites than the Sentinel-2 dataset, and Earth+’s constellation-wide design can benefit from more satellites.

Figure 12 further shows the cumulative distribution of the percentage of downloaded tiles and the PSNR of Earth+ and baselines. For more than 60% of the images, Earth+ downloads less than 20% tiles. In contrast, the baseline needs to download more than 80% of tiles for over 70% of images. This is because Earth+ can effectively detect and download only those changed tiles, while Kodan may download those cloud-free but unchanged tiles, and SatRoI cannot effectively detect changes. Kodan needs to download all the non-cloudy areas, and SatRoI may detect and download a lot of changed areas because it uses an older reference frame. In contrast, Earth+ only downloads the detected changes using a fresher reference image. There are 20% of images fully downloaded by Earth+ because of the guaranteed downloading mechanism (§5).

Figure 13 shows an illustrative timeseries of the downloading behavior of Earth+ and the baselines for one year. Earth+ downloads 5-10× fewer areas than the baselines most of the time. It only occasionally performs the guaranteed downloading that downloads the full image to keep a high image quality.

**Downlink saving across different locations:** We then calculated Earth+’s saving on the downlink (defined as the strongest baseline with lower PSNR than Earth+, divided by the downlink usage of Earth+) grouped by 11 different locations in Washington State. Figure 14 shows that Earth+




**Figure 14:** The improvement of Earth+ across different locations and bands in the Sentinel-2 dataset.


is better than the strongest baseline at 10 out of 11 locations. However, Earth+ does not improve on H and has only marginal improvement on D, as these two locations are highly snowy during winter and spring, and snow albedo (*i.e.*, the reflectance of snow) is constantly changing (*e.g.*, old snow has a lower albedo than fresh snow, and dirty snow has a lower albedo than clean snow). Thus, Earth+ tends always to detect changes and download those tiles that contain snow, lowering the improvement of Earth+.

**Downlink saving across different bands:** We further evaluate the downlink saving of Earth+ across different bands of the images (*i.e.*, the downlink usage of the strongest baseline with lower PSNR than Earth+, divided by the downlink usage of Earth+). We show the bandwidth saving of Earth+ compared to the strongest baseline. As shown in Figure 14, Earth+ can improve on all 13 bands in Sentinel-2 images. We also observe that the improvement of Earth+ varies between bands. We show that Earth+ can significantly improve on ground-related bands (*e.g.*, RGB bands B2-4) but less significantly on bands that observe the air (*e.g.*, water vapor bands).


**Storage overhead:** Based on Dove [15] constellation specification, we calculate the storage requirements for Earth+ and two baselines. As shown in Figure 15, the onboard storage requirements are 30 GB, 255 GB, and 24 GB for SatRoI, Kodan, and Earth+, respectively. We note that Earth+ spends less storage space to store the captured imagery, as Earth+ only stores the *changed tiles* on-board. Further, Earth+ needs much less storage space for reference images, as Earth+ downsamples the reference images to low resolution. This is because Earth+ stores only changed areas on-board, thus squeezing out storage space to store reference images.




**Figure 15:** Breaking down the storage usage of Earth+ and the baselines. Earth+ saves changed areas on-board rather than whole images like Kodan, which leaves some space for storing reference images.




**Figure 16:** Benchmarking the runtime of Earth+ and baselines to process one single satellite imagery. The runtime of Earth+ is lower than the baselines.



**Figure 17:** Earth+ compresses the reference image by over 10,000x so that they can fit in the limited uplink capacity, indicated by the black vertical line.



**Figure 18:** Earth+ can further reduce the downlink bandwidth usage by 22 Mbps by increasing the uplink bandwidth to 4 Mbps (as indicated by the red arrow).



**Figure 19:** Earth+ can compress the images with a higher compression ratio when more satellites are in the constellation.

**Uplink overhead:** We then evaluate the effectiveness of techniques proposed in §4.3 that reduce the update bandwidth usage based on the Sentinel-2 dataset and Dove specification. Figure 17 shows that after applying reference image downsampling and uploading the changed tiles in reference images, Earth+ compresses the reference image by over 10000x and meets the requirement of the limited uplink bandwidth.

**Computation overhead:** We also measure the runtime that Earth+ and the baselines take to process one imagery. We use an AMD EPYC 7452 CPU with 16 cores to test the runtime. As shown in Figure 16, the runtime of Earth+ is the lowest. Concretely, both Earth+ and the baselines take 0.65 seconds to encode the imagery. However, Kodan uses an expensive cloud detector that takes 0.39 seconds to run, while Earth+ and SatRoI use the same cheap cloud detector that only takes 0.12 seconds to run. Further, Earth+ uses *down-sampled* reference images to detect changes, allowing the change detection process to run faster than SatRoI’s change detection process using full-resolution reference images.

**More uplink, more improvement:** The performance of Earth+ (in terms of PSNR – downlink bandwidth trade-off) can be further improved with more uplink capacity, as shown in Figure 18. We highlight that Earth+ can further reduce the downlink bandwidth usage by 22 Mbps by increasing the uplink to 4 Mbps.

**More satellites, more improvement:** Earth+’s *constellation-wide* encoding scheme allows Earth+ to compress satellite imagery with a higher compression ratio when there are more satellites in the constellation. To verify this, we conduct a simulation based on the Planet thumbnail images (we use thumbnail images to bypass the quota limit of the Planet dataset). We download these images by downloading cloud-free images in Denver from July 1st, 2023 to October 1st, 2023. As the pixel values of these thumbnail images is not linearly correlated to the original pixel values sensed by the

satellite (due to visual enhancing algorithms like contrast enhancement), we instead calculate the change by normalizing the pixel values to 0-1 and run change detection algorithms on top of these normalized images. Those changed areas will be downloaded to the ground. We then calculate the compression ratio based on the average changed areas (e.g., 10% changed areas on average corresponds to 10× compression)<sup>8</sup>. We plot how the compression ratio (Y-axis) varies with the number of satellites in the constellation (X-axis) in Figure 19. We highlight that the compression ratio of Earth+ will increase from 3× to 10× when the constellation size increases from 1 to 16.

## 7 RELATED WORK

**Single-image compression:** A wide range of prior work has focused on single-image compression by augmenting traditional image codecs like JPEG-2000 [25–27, 46, 52, 59, 60, 73] or developing neural-based codec such as autoencoders [28, 30, 36, 75, 76]. However, this kind of work falls short in leveraging the redundancy *between* images, while satellite imagery remains largely unchanged between two consecutive captures of the same location.

**Change-based encoding:** A rich set of literature aims to further compress images by detecting changes *between* images. A line of work builds video-based codecs (e.g., H.264 [70], H.265 [63], VP8 [31], VP9 [55] and autoencoders [50, 51, 71]) to leverage such redundancy, with the assumption that two consecutive captures of one location are pixel-wise highly similar. This is not true for satellite imagery due to varying cloud and illumination conditions. Another line of work [61, 69] develops change-based encoding that is robust to varying cloud and illumination conditions. However, this approach can only update the reference image using single-satellite information. approach only uses images available for this one location In contrast, Earth+ allows the satellite to update its reference image using images from *all* the satellites in the same constellation, resulting in a fresher reference image and, thus, better change-based encoding quality.

**In-orbit computing:** An alternative way to reduce the total downlink capacity is to have a concrete application in mind and drop out images that are irrelevant to this application (e.g., Kodan [37] and OEC [38]). However, this approach may drop out images that are crucial for other applications. In contrast, Earth+ drops areas that are unchanged, allowing Earth+ to be used by a wider range of applications.

<sup>8</sup>We point out that this is a rough estimation, as in practice image codec’s compression efficiency decreases when only encoding a small amount of areas.

## 8 LIMITATION

While Earth+ improves satellite imagery compression, several concerns remain.

**Lossy compression:** Earth+’s compression is lossy. While it allows downloading more images, lossy compression may not be applicable to applications that require lossless compression.

**Control messages:** Earth+ uses the uplink bandwidth that is currently reserved for control messages to upload reference images. We believe this is not a serious practical concern as the ground-to-satellite control messages (e.g., occasional signaling) do not currently use much of the uplink bandwidth [29].

**Generalization of results:** Our evaluation of Earth+ focuses on a specific set of satellite specs and imagery datasets, but it does not show how effective Earth+ would be if it is used on other or future earth-observation satellites. We hope our work will inspire more research to examine Earth+ in other environments.

**Deployment concerns:** Though Earth+ only changes software, there may be complications in implementing Earth+ on existing satellites as Earth+ requires a software update on the satellite’s imagery encoding module onboard the satellite.

Stepping back, we acknowledge that Earth+ does increase the system complexity, especially on the ground stations, including sharing downloaded images across ground stations efficiently. However, we believe Earth+ takes an initial step towards constellation-wide sharing of information, a fundamental capability that has broader applications than image compression.

## 9 CONCLUSION

While satellite imagery is useful for a wide range of applications, most of the imagery observed by the satellites is not downloaded to the ground due to limited downlink capacity. This work presents Earth+, a new onboard satellite imagery compression system to reduce the downlink bandwidth usage. Earth+ is the first to make reference-based compression efficient, by enabling constellation-wide sharing of fresh reference images across satellites. To this end, Earth+ uses several techniques to judiciously select and upload reference images under limited uplink capacity. We show that Earth+ can compress the imagery by 3× without compromising imagery quality on all bands without using more computation and storage resources, all while staying within existing real-world uplink constraints.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Aqua - part of the a-train satellites | nasa. [https://www.nasa.gov/mission\\_pages/aqua/index.html](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/aqua/index.html). (Accessed on 09/11/2023).
- [2] Biomass (satellite) - wikipedia. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biomass\\_\(satellite\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biomass_(satellite)). (Accessed on 08/20/2023).
- [3] Celestrak: Special data request form. <https://celestrak.org/NORAD/archives/request.php>. (Accessed on 01/15/2024).
- [4] Data formats - user guides - sentinel-2 msi - sentinel online - sentinel online. <https://sentinels.copernicus.eu/web/sentinel/user-guides/sentinel-2-msi/data-formats>. (Accessed on 02/02/2024).
- [5] Environmental management, environmental monitoring | satellite imaging corp. <https://www.satimagingcorp.com/applications/environmental-impact-studies/>. (Accessed on 09/08/2023).
- [6] Esa - sentinel-2 operations. [https://www.esa.int/Enabling\\_Support/Operations/Sentinel-2\\_operations](https://www.esa.int/Enabling_Support/Operations/Sentinel-2_operations). (Accessed on 12/04/2023).
- [7] Github - uclouvain/openjpeg: Official repository of the openjpeg project. <https://github.com/uclouvain/openjpeg>. (Accessed on 01/16/2024).
- [8] Global forest area 2020 | statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1292175/global-forest-area/>. (Accessed on 08/20/2023).
- [9] How much do satellites cost? - how satellites work | howstuff-works. <https://science.howstuffworks.com/satellite10.htm#:~:text=A%20typical%20weather%20satellite%20carries,of%20maintaining%20and%20repairing%20satellites>. (Accessed on 12/03/2023).
- [10] How much of the earth is covered by clouds? - geography realm. <https://www.geographyrealm.com/how-much-of-the-earth-is-covered-by-clouds/>. (Accessed on 11/16/2023).
- [11] How much of the ocean has been explored? : Ocean exploration facts: NOAA office of ocean exploration and research. <https://oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/facts/explored.html>. (Accessed on 08/21/2023).
- [12] How satellite imagery is helping precision agriculture grow to new heights | news | eco-business | asia pacific. <https://www.eco-business.com/news/how-satellite-imagery-is-helping-precision-agriculture-grow-to-new-heights/>. (Accessed on 12/03/2023).
- [13] Kakadu software. <https://kakadusoftware.com/>. (Accessed on 09/05/2023).
- [14] leoconn\_2021\_day1\_kiruthika.pdf. [https://leoconn.github.io/slides/leoconn\\_2021\\_day1\\_kiruthika.pdf](https://leoconn.github.io/slides/leoconn_2021_day1_kiruthika.pdf). (Accessed on 09/10/2023).
- [15] Planet | insights - our constellations. <https://www.planet.com/our-constellations/>. (Accessed on 08/30/2023).
- [16] Planet\_fusion\_specification\_v1.0.0. [https://assets.planet.com/docs/Fusion-Tech-Spec\\_v1.0.0.pdf](https://assets.planet.com/docs/Fusion-Tech-Spec_v1.0.0.pdf). (Accessed on 11/09/2023).
- [17] Planetscope - high-resolution satellite imagery source | pacgeo.com. <https://pacgeo.com/satellite/planetscope/>. (Accessed on 02/02/2024).
- [18] Planetscope2 imagery available in the planet platform. <https://www.planet.com/pulse/planetscope2-imagery-available-in-the-planet-platform/>. (Accessed on 02/02/2024).
- [19] Precision agriculture imaging with planet satellite solutions | planet. <https://www.planet.com/markets/monitoring-for-precision-agriculture/>. (Accessed on 09/08/2023).
- [20] Precision agriculture imaging with planet satellite solutions | planet. <https://www.planet.com/markets/monitoring-for-precision-agriculture/>. (Accessed on 12/03/2023).
- [21] Satellite imagery road segmentation | by nithish | medium. <https://medium.com/@nithishmailme/satellite-imagery-road-segmentation-ad2964dc3812>. (Accessed on 09/08/2023).
- [22] Satellite images, satellite map | satellite imaging corp. <https://www.satimagingcorp.com/gallery/high-resolution/>. (Accessed on 12/06/2023).
- [23] Sentinel 2 bands and combinations - gis geography. <https://gisgeography.com/sentinel-2-bands-combinations/>. (Accessed on 12/06/2023).
- [24] User guides - sentinel-2 msi - resolutions - sentinel online - sentinel online. <https://sentinels.copernicus.eu/web/sentinel/user-guides/sentinel-2-msi/resolutions>. (Accessed on 09/09/2023).
- [25] Masud Ibn Afjal, Md Al Mamun, and Md Palash Uddin. Band reordering heuristics for lossless satellite image compression with 3d-calic and ccSDs. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, 59:514–526, 2019.
- [26] Masud Ibn Afjal, Palash Uddin, Al Mamun, and Abu Marjan. An efficient lossless compression technique for remote sensing images using segmentation based band reordering heuristics. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 42(2):756–781, 2021.
- [27] Bruno Aiuzzi, Luciano Alparone, Stefano Baronti, and Cinzia Lastris. Crisp and fuzzy adaptive spectral predictions for lossless and near-lossless compression of hyperspectral imagery. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 4(4):532–536, 2007.
- [28] Vinicius Alves de Oliveira, Marie Chabert, Thomas Oberlin, Charly Poulliat, Mickael Bruno, Christophe Latry, Mikael Carlavan, Simon Henrot, Frederic Falzon, and Roberto Camarero. Reduced-complexity end-to-end variational autoencoder for on board satellite image compression. *Remote Sensing*, 13(3):447, 2021.
- [29] Xueliang Bai, Xiaofeng Wu, and IEEE Member. 1-bit processing based model predictive control for fractionated satellite missions. *Acta Astronautica*, 95:37–50, 2014.
- [30] Johannes Ballé, David Minnen, Saurabh Singh, Sung Jin Hwang, and Nick Johnston. Variational image compression with a scale hyperprior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.01436*, 2018.
- [31] Jim Bankoski, Paul Wilkins, and Yaowu Xu. Technical overview of VP8, an open source video codec for the web. In *2011 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2011.
- [32] Marco Cagnazzo, Sara Parrilli, Giovanni Poggi, and Luisa Verdoliva. Costs and advantages of object-based image coding with shape-adaptive wavelet transform. *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing*, 2007:1–13, 2007.
- [33] Shkelzen Cakaj, Bexhet Kamo, Algenti Lala, and Alban Rakipi. The coverage analysis for low earth orbiting satellites at low elevation. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 5(6), 2014.
- [34] Tiffany Yu-Han Chen, Lenin Ravindranath, Shuo Deng, Paramvir Bahl, and Hari Balakrishnan. Glimpse: Continuous, real-time object recognition on mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*, pages 155–168, 2015.
- [35] Yang Cunjian, Wang Siyuan, Zhang Zengxiang, Huang Shifeng, et al. Extracting the flood extent from satellite SAR image with the support of topographic data. In *2001 International Conferences on Info-Tech and Info-Net. Proceedings (Cat. No. 01EX479)*, volume 1, pages 87–92. Ieee, 2001.
- [36] Vinicius Alves de Oliveira, Marie Chabert, Thomas Oberlin, Charly Poulliat, Mickael Bruno, Christophe Latry, Mikael Carlavan, Simon Henrot, Frederic Falzon, and Roberto Camarero. Satellite image compression and denoising with neural networks. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 19:1–5, 2022.
- [37] Bradley Denby, Krishna Chintalapudi, Ranveer Chandra, Brandon Lucia, and Shadi Nohhabi. Kodan: Addressing the computational bottleneck in space. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International*

- Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 3*, pages 392–403, 2023.
- [38] Bradley Denby and Brandon Lucia. Orbital edge computing: Nanosatellite constellations as a new class of computer system. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 939–954, 2020.
- [39] Kiruthika Devaraj, Ryan Kingsbury, Matt Ligon, Joseph Breu, Vivek Vittaldev, Bryan Klofas, Patrick Yeon, and Kyle Colton. Dove high speed downlink system. 2017.
- [40] Matthias Drusch, Umberto Del Bello, Sébastien Carlier, Olivier Colin, Veronica Fernandez, Ferran Gascon, Bianca Hoersch, Claudia Isola, Paolo Laberinti, Philippe Martimort, et al. Sentinel-2: Esa’s optical high-resolution mission for gmes operational services. *Remote sensing of Environment*, 120:25–36, 2012.
- [41] Lilian N Faria, Leila MG Fonseca, and Max HM Costa. Performance evaluation of data compression systems applied to satellite imagery. *Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering*, 2012:18–18, 2012.
- [42] Sajid Ghuffar. Dem generation from multi satellite planetscope imagery. *Remote Sensing*, 10(9):1462, 2018.
- [43] KS Gunasheela and HS Prasantha. Satellite image compression-detailed survey of the algorithms. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Cognition and Recognition: ICCR 2016*, pages 187–198. Springer, 2018.
- [44] Tobias B Hank, Katja Berger, Heike Bach, Jan GPW Clevers, Anatoly Gitelson, Pablo Zarco-Tejada, and Wolfram Mauser. Spaceborne imaging spectroscopy for sustainable agriculture: Contributions and challenges. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 40(3):515–551, 2019.
- [45] A Indradjad, Ali Syahputra Nasution, Hidayat Gunawan, and Ayom Widipaminto. A comparison of satellite image compression methods in the wavelet domain. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, volume 280, page 012031. IOP Publishing, 2019.
- [46] Sushil K Jain and Donald A Adjeroh. Edge-based prediction for lossless compression of hyperspectral images. In *2007 Data Compression Conference (DCC’07)*, pages 153–162. IEEE, 2007.
- [47] George Kopsiaftis and Konstantinos Karantzalos. Vehicle detection and traffic density monitoring from very high resolution satellite video data. In *2015 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, pages 1881–1884. IEEE, 2015.
- [48] F Li, V Lukin, G Proskura, I Vasilyeva, and G Chernova. Image classification accuracy analysis for three-channel remote sensing data. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Intelligent Information Technologies & Systems of Information Security (IntellTISIS 2022), Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine*, pages 505–519, 2022.
- [49] Yuanqi Li, Arthi Padmanabhan, Pengzhan Zhao, Yufei Wang, Guoqing Harry Xu, and Ravi Netravali. Reducto: On-camera filtering for resource-efficient real-time video analytics. In *Proceedings of the Annual conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication on the applications, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communication*, pages 359–376, 2020.
- [50] Guo Lu, Wanli Ouyang, Dong Xu, Xiaoyun Zhang, Chunlei Cai, and Zhiyong Gao. Dvc: An end-to-end deep video compression framework. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11006–11015, 2019.
- [51] Guo Lu, Xiaoyun Zhang, Wanli Ouyang, Li Chen, Zhiyong Gao, and Dong Xu. An end-to-end learning framework for video compression. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 43(10):3292–3308, 2021.
- [52] Enrico Magli, Gabriella Olmo, and Emanuele Quacchio. Optimized onboard lossless and near-lossless compression of hyperspectral data using calic. *IEEE Geoscience and remote sensing letters*, 1(1):21–25, 2004.
- [53] Salvatore Manfreda, Matthew F McCabe, Pauline E Miller, Richard Lucas, Victor Pajuelo Madrigal, Giorgos Mallinis, Eyal Ben Dor, David Helman, Lyndon Estes, Giuseppe Ciruolo, et al. On the use of unmanned aerial systems for environmental monitoring. *Remote sensing*, 10(4):641, 2018.
- [54] Jonathan C McDowell. The low earth orbit satellite population and impacts of the spacex starlink constellation. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 892(2):L36, 2020.
- [55] Debargha Mukherjee, Jim Bankoski, Adrian Grange, Jingning Han, John Koleszar, Paul Wilkins, Yaowu Xu, and Ronald Bultje. The latest open-source video codec vp9-an overview and preliminary results. In *2013 Picture Coding Symposium (PCS)*, pages 390–393. IEEE, 2013.
- [56] David J Mulla. Twenty five years of remote sensing in precision agriculture: Key advances and remaining knowledge gaps. *Biosystems engineering*, 114(4):358–371, 2013.
- [57] Thanh Tam Nguyen, Thanh Dat Hoang, Minh Tam Pham, Tuyet Trinh Vu, Thanh Hung Nguyen, Quyet-Thang Huynh, and Jun Jo. Monitoring agriculture areas with satellite images and deep learning. *Applied Soft Computing*, 95:106565, 2020.
- [58] Planet Labs PBC. Planet application program interface: In space for life on earth, 2018–.
- [59] Barbara Penna, Tammam Tillo, Enrico Magli, and Gabriella Olmo. Progressive 3-d coding of hyperspectral images based on jpeg 2000. *IEEE Geoscience and remote sensing letters*, 3(1):125–129, 2006.
- [60] Francesco Rizzo, Bruno Carpentieri, Giovanni Motta, and James A Storer. Low-complexity lossless compression of hyperspectral imagery via linear prediction. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 12(2):138–141, 2005.
- [61] Christofer Schwartz, Ingo Sander, Fredrik Bruhn, Mathias Persson, Joakim Ekblad, and Christer Fuglesang. Satellite image compression guided by regions of interest. *Sensors*, 23(2):730, 2023.
- [62] Halah Saadon Shihab, Suhaidi Shafie, Abdul Rahman Ramli, and Fauzan Ahmad. Enhancement of satellite image compression using a hybrid (dwt–dct) algorithm. *Sensing and Imaging*, 18:1–30, 2017.
- [63] Gary J Sullivan, Jens-Rainer Ohm, Woo-Jin Han, and Thomas Wiegand. Overview of the high efficiency video coding (hevc) standard. *IEEE Transactions on circuits and systems for video technology*, 22(12):1649–1668, 2012.
- [64] Bill Tao, Om Chabra, Ishani Janveja, Indranil Gupta, and Deepak Vasisht. Known knowns and unknowns: Near-realtime earth observation via query bifurcation in serval.
- [65] Siva Priya Thiagarajah, Shamini Pillay, Shalini Darमारaju, Rajamani Subramanian, and Michelle Foo May Fung. The effect of rain attenuation on s-band terrestrial links. In *2013 IEEE Symposium on Wireless Technology & Applications (ISWTA)*, pages 192–197. IEEE, 2013.
- [66] David M Tralli, Ronald G Blom, Victor Zlotnicki, Andrea Donnellan, and Diane L Evans. Satellite remote sensing of earthquake, volcano, flood, landslide and coastal inundation hazards. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 59(4):185–198, 2005.
- [67] Compton J Tucker and John RG Townshend. Strategies for monitoring tropical deforestation using satellite data. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 21(6-7):1461–1471, 2000.
- [68] Adam Van Etten, Dave Lindenbaum, and Todd M Bacastow. Spacenet: A remote sensing dataset and challenge series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01232*, 2018.
- [69] Xu Wang, Ruimin Hu, Zhongyuan Wang, and Jing Xiao. Virtual background reference frame based satellite video coding. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 25(10):1445–1449, 2018.
- [70] Thomas Wiegand, Gary J Sullivan, Gisle Bjontegaard, and Ajay Luthra. Overview of the h. 264/avc video coding standard. *IEEE Transactions on circuits and systems for video technology*, 13(7):560–576, 2003.
- [71] Ren Yang, Fabian Mentzer, Luc Van Gool, and Radu Timofte. Learning for video compression with hierarchical quality and recurrent enhancement. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6628–6637, 2020.

- [72] Xiajun Yang, CP Lo, et al. Relative radiometric normalization performance for change detection from multi-date satellite images. *Photogrammetric engineering and remote sensing*, 66(8):967–980, 2000.
- [73] Jing Zhang and Guizhong Liu. An efficient reordering prediction-based lossless compression algorithm for hyperspectral images. *IEEE Geoscience and remote sensing letters*, 4(2):283–287, 2007.
- [74] Mingmin Zhao, Peder Olsen, and Ranveer Chandra. Seeing through clouds in satellite images. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2023.
- [75] Lei Zhou, Chunlei Cai, Yue Gao, Sanbao Su, and Junmin Wu. Variational autoencoder for low bit-rate image compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 2617–2620, 2018.
- [76] Lei Zhou, Zhenhong Sun, Xiangji Wu, and Junmin Wu. End-to-end optimized image compression with attention mechanism. In *CVPR workshops*, page 0, 2019.

## A ESTIMATING THE STORAGE OVERHEAD OF EARTH+

We take the technical specification of DOVEs constellation to estimate this overhead. We first estimate the space required for storing captured images. Let the area that the satellite can download during one ground contact be  $a \text{ km}^2$ .

The storage space required to store this  $a \text{ km}^2$  imagery is thus  $0.87a \text{ MB}$ , where the coefficient 0.87 is the megabytes required to encode  $1 \text{ km}^2$  area, estimated by the fact that each image captured by Doves constellation is 300 MB, with a resolution of  $6600 \times 4400$  and a ground sampling distance of 3 m. Thus, the storage space used to store captured imagery is approximately  $2 \times 0.87a \text{ MB}$ , where this  $2 \times$  factor is because the ground keeps the captured imagery for two consecutive ground contacts to make sure the downloading is successful [14]. Earth+ stores the reference images of all locations that each satellite will download, totaling at most  $160a \text{ km}^2$ , since the satellite revisits the same location once every 10-15 days [24] and the maximum amount of ground contact it can have is 240 times, assuming that the satellite can have ground contact during every 90-minute orbit. Since Earth+'s downsampling technique compresses the reference images by  $2601 \times$ . As a result, the total storage space for reference images is at most  $0.08a \text{ MB}$ , 9% of the space for storing captured imagery.