

# CalCROP21: A Georeferenced multi-spectral dataset of Satellite Imagery and Crop Labels

Rahul Ghosh\*  
ghosh128@umn.edu  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN, USA

Praveen Ravirathinam\*  
pravirat@umn.edu  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN, USA

Xiaowei Jia  
xiaowei@pitt.edu  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Ankush Khandelwal  
khand035@umn.edu  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN, USA

David Mulla  
mulla003@umn.edu  
University of Minnesota  
St. Paul, MN, USA

Vipin Kumar  
kumar001@umn.edu  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN, USA

## ABSTRACT

Mapping and monitoring crops is a key step towards sustainable intensification of agriculture and addressing global food security. A dataset like ImageNet that revolutionized computer vision applications can accelerate development of novel crop mapping techniques. Currently, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) annually releases the Cropland Data Layer (CDL) which contains crop labels at 30m resolution for the entire United States of America. While CDL is state of the art and is widely used for a number of agricultural applications, it has a number of limitations (e.g., pixelated errors, labels carried over from previous errors and absence of input imagery along with class labels). In this work, we create a new semantic segmentation benchmark dataset, which we call CalCROP21, for the diverse crops in the Central Valley region of California at 10m spatial resolution using a Google Earth Engine based robust image processing pipeline and a novel attention based spatio-temporal semantic segmentation algorithm STATT. STATT uses re-sampled (interpolated) CDL labels for training, but is able to generate a better prediction than CDL by leveraging spatial and temporal patterns in Sentinel2 multi-spectral image series to effectively capture phenologic differences amongst crops and uses attention to reduce the impact of clouds and other atmospheric disturbances. We also present a comprehensive evaluation to show that STATT has significantly better results when compared to the resampled CDL labels. We have released the dataset and the processing pipeline code for generating the benchmark dataset.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

With the rise in world's population, food supplies must scale up to keep pace with the growing demand. Hence it is critical to ensure that farm lands are being used efficiently from an environmental perspective. In particular, mapping and monitoring crops is a key step towards forecasting yield, guiding sustainable management practices, measuring the loss of productive cropland due to urbanization and evaluating progress in conservation efforts.

In the United States, the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Cropland Data Layer (CDL) provides a publicly available land-cover classification map annually at 30m resolution which includes major crop commodities for the conterminous United States (CONUS) [5]. CDL product has driven the advancement of research in areas

ranging from agricultural sustainability studies [10, 13], to environmental issues [3, 7], land conversion assessments [21, 25], crop rotations [4, 19], farmer surveys [17] and many more [6]. While CDL is the state-of-the-art spatially explicit identification product for crops, it has a number of limitations [20, 22]. First, the CDL is created using a pixel based classification algorithm and hence contains pixelated errors in crop labels. Second, each pixel is not updated every year and labels for some pixels are borrowed from previous years which sometimes leads to incorrect labels. Third, CDL is known to have low accuracy in classifying many minor crops such as alfalfa, hay, tree crops, and many vegetable crops [15]. Finally, CDL labels are created using Landsat images, which are at 30m resolution, leading to mixed pixels errors. The Sentinel constellation provides images at a finer resolution (10m) and more frequent temporal scale (5days vs 15 days) and thus offers the possibility of creating crop labels at 10m resolution.

The success of deep learning in solving highly complex tasks in the field of computer vision and natural language processing can be attributed to the availability of large datasets such as ImageNet [9] and computational resources. These large datasets are essential for the generalization of such deep learning methods. Indeed advances in Earth observation technologies have led to the collection of vast amount of accurate and reliable remote sensing (RS) data that provide tremendous potential to create similar large scale datasets for mapping crops over large regions. For example, several large-scale remote sensing datasets have been created for similar land cover mapping tasks [2, 8, 14, 16, 18, 23, 24, 27]. However, these datasets cannot be directly used for crop mapping for several reasons. First, existing large-scale RS datasets mostly provide a single view of the earth's surface in time. As highlighted in previous literature [12], the distribution and growth of crops commonly exhibit special spatio-temporal patterns, e.g., the contiguous nature of crop fields and temporal/seasonal patterns due to their unique crop phenology. Hence, these datasets are not designed for effective crop mapping using spatial and temporal data patterns. Moreover, these large scale datasets are either limited [11] in the number of categories (i.e. limited number of classes that do not cover many important crop types) [8] or lack in the spatial resolution (e.g. single label assigned to entire image) [24].

To overcome the limitations of existing RS datasets and to facilitate deep learning research in RS-based crop mapping, this paper presents a new semantic segmentation benchmark dataset for

\*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

crops, CalCROP21. Specifically, the input images were created using a Google Earth Engine based robust image processing pipeline on the multi-spectral temporal images collected by the Sentinel-2 constellation in the Central Valley of California in 2018. A novel spatio-temporal semantic segmentation [12] method was used to generate better quality labels using resampled CDL as initial labels. This efficacy of the methodology relies on several key assumptions. First, the noisy coarse resolution CDL labels are still of good enough quality to be used for training a classifier. Second, a classifier that makes use of space and time is more effective in dealing with the training label noise than one that ignores such information. Third, labels at the geographical farm boundaries can be mixed and their labels at the coarse resolution are not trustworthy, whereas labels at the interior of a region are likely to be more confident.

To summarize, our contributions in this paper are as follows:

- This dataset is a first large scale semantic segmentation dataset that includes both input images as well as labels for a diverse array of crops at 10m resolution. Specifically, each pixel in the image is labeled as one of 21 crop or 7 other classes.
- We improve the quality of the resampled CDL labels for these classes using a novel spatio-temporal deep learning method based on the phenotypic differences among crops with Sentinel images at multiple time steps.
- We validate the quality of the labels via a detailed quantitative and qualitative evaluation.
- We provide the processing pipeline code for further use by the community in collecting images and generating results for a different year and using different temporal frequency.
- With some small edits, this pipeline can be used to produce similar results for any other part of the US or the world (assuming some initial labels are available even at a coarse resolution).

## 2 RELATED WORKS

Several such benchmark datasets are available for land use and land cover (LULC) mapping. They can be divided into multiple categories based on their downstream tasks, a) object recognition [26], b) image classification [2, 14, 18, 24, 27] and c) semantic segmentation [8, 16, 23]. These datasets do not have sufficient granularity to enable scientific advances in crop mapping using deep learning. First, they provide labels that cover a very small number of categories. Second, due to the use of overhead aerial imagery which only captures limited number of bands as compared to satellites which can capture a vast array of bands and thus help in distinguishing between crops. Unlike image classification task which only provides presence of a crop in an image, image segmentation datasets are more relevant from the domain perspective because knowledge of area under different crops provides insights into food supply. While datasets are available for LULC, to the best of our knowledge, no dataset on crop semantic segmentation that includes minor crops is available. For example, in the context of cropland mapping, BigEarthNet [24] is the one most relevant dataset which provides 590,326 image patches from 125 Sentinel-2 tiles and associate each image patch with a subset of 43 Corine Land Cover classes over Europe. However, there are several limitations in this

dataset which make it less ideal for crop monitoring. First, the topology of the classes included do not distinguish between different crops but rather between broad vegetation types (forest, agriculture, grassland, etc). Second, due to the association of labels to entire image patch it captures the presence and not the area of a certain category of land cover. Finally, a single temporal snapshot for an area does not allow identification of different types of crops [12].

## 3 DATA SOURCES

We use freely available multi-spectral satellite images and data products to create our dataset. Specifically, we use Sentinel-2 as the input images and the Cropland Data Layer as initial labels. Here we describe the data sources involved in creating the dataset.

### 3.1 Input Satellite Imagery

In our dataset, we use the multi-spectral images captured by the two polar-orbiting satellites as part of the Sentinel-2 mission operated by the European Space Agency (ESA). Due to its high revisit time of 5 days, phenological characteristics of different crops can be observed compared to using single snapshot (or few snapshots) for the whole season. The multi-spectral images has 13 bands in the visible, near infrared, and short wave infrared part of the spectrum, each having a spatial resolution of 10, 20 or 60m. The captured images are available in the form of tiles, each of which have a unique ID and covers an area of 10,000 sq km.

### 3.2 Crop Labels


The Cropland Data Layer (CDL) is an annual publicly available land cover classification map for the entire US. CDL is generated by a Decision tree based approach using moderate resolution satellite imagery and extensive agricultural ground truth. With over 200 classes, CDL provides land cover maps covering the entire conterminous United States (CONUS) at 30-meter spatial resolution with a high accuracy up to 95% for classifying major crop types (i.e., Corn, Soybean, and Wheat). The CDL data products are free to download from Google Earth Engine [1]. Although CDL is a very useful product that has led to the development of many downstream applications, the product is plagued with noise that arise due to the reasons discussed in Section 1. In particular, it has high accuracy (up to 95%) for classifying major crops (e.g., Corn, Soybean, Wheat), but it is known to have poor accuracy for minor crops (e.g., Alfalfa, Hay and Tree crops) [15].

## 4 PROCESSING PIPELINE

We use Google Earth Engine to build a robust image processing pipeline to create biweekly Sentinel image composites. Using the obtained biweekly composites and CDL labels, we develop a novel spatio-temporal deep learning method to improve upon the original CDL labels. In the following, we describe these steps in details.

### 4.1 Generation of bi-weekly Sentinel-2 multispectral composites


Many land covers, e.g., different types of crops, are indistinguishable at a single time step. In particular, different crops have different seeding time and harvesting time, which is also affected by weather



**Figure 1: Overlay of 11 tiles in Central Valley of California region we used in our study. The colors represent different crops and the mapping (refer to Figure 4) is kept consistent throughout this paper.**

conditions. Hence, different crops show discriminative signatures at different points of time [12]. Correctly identifying crops will require modelling its entire agricultural cycle from sowing to harvesting. Hence, we consider all the images available in a year for this dataset. However, these images often have clouds and other atmospheric disturbances. Here, we generate bi-weekly image composites using a robust Google Earth Engine based pipeline to reduce the impact of these atmospheric disturbances. Specifically, we collect all available images within a 2-week period and score every pixel of each tile using a the quality band (QA60), which presents information as to whether a pixel is cloud-free, dense cloud or cirrus cloud. The quality scores are then thresholded to create cloud masks for each image. Based on the amount of cloud-free pixels the collection of images are sorted and finally the best images merged to create a cloud-free mosaic. Thus we obtain 24 mosaics in a year per tile, each in the projection of the zone (for California crop belt, 8 tiles are in EPSG:32610 - WGS 84 / UTM zone 10N and 3 are in EPSG:32611 - WGS 84 / UTM zone 11N). All the bands are resampled to 10m spatial resolution and then exported from Google Earth Engine. Since some Sentinel tile images may be slightly larger than the area they are supposed to cover, we use GDAL to clip the images and reproject them so that every pixel is of 10m×10m resolution.

This finally produces 24 georeferenced files each of which has a shape of (10980,10980,10) for a tile, with 10 signifying the number of bands (10m and 20m) used. Since our objective is to map the entire crop belt in the Central Valley of California, we found that 11 Sentinel-2 tiles covers this crop belt, namely T10SEH, T10SEJ, T10SFG, T10SFH, T10SFJ, T10SGF, T10SGG, T10TEK, T11SKA, T11SKV,



**Figure 2: Evolution of labels through each preprocessing step are shown for two randomly chosen regions (rows). The first columns shows the raw CDL labels resampled at 10m resolution. The second columns shows a revised set of labels, where similar classes have been combined and untrustworthy classes have been grouped as unknown class (in light purple). The third column shows one level of erosion done classwise at boundaries and also removal of connected components of size less than 4 pixels. We refer to these labels as CDL-combined-eroded, and use these for training our deep learning model.**

and T11SLV, giving a total of 264 tif files. As a preprocessing step we first clip the bottom and top 2%ile of each channel of the satellite images and then apply max-min normalization. Following the preprocessing of the images, we split each tile into 100 grids each of size 10km×10km (1098×1098 pixels). We combine all the 24 composite images corresponding to same grid together to form an array of shape (24,1098,1098,10): 24 timestamps, (1098,1098) pixels and 10 channels. We have 1,100 grid arrays in total, each of which is named as “TILEID\_YEAR\_ROW\_COL\_IMAGE.npy”, e.g., “T11SKA\_2018\_5\_6\_IMAGE.npy” corresponds to the 5th row and 6th column (indexed from 0) of the tile T11SKA in 2018.

## 4.2 Pre-processing of CDL

We use Google Earth Engine to fetch the labels and crop them using each georeferenced Sentinel-2 tile, which produces a label image at 30m resolution for each tile. We then resample the labels to 10m resolution to create 11 label tiles of shape (10980,10980). The overlay of the 11 labels tiles on the California Central Valley crop belt is shown in Fig. 1. CDL provides labels for more than 200 crop classes, many of which are completely absent or rarely present in the California Central Valley region. In our dataset we exclude these absent classes in the California Central Valley region. In addition, CDL provides state-wise validation metrics for their labels using ground-truth labels. We also exclude those classes for which the number of pixels used for CDL validation is too few as their labels cannot be trusted. Specifically, we include a crop class in our dataset if it fulfils the following conditions:

- The crop class has at least 1 million pixels in the study region (in this case the 11 tiles).
- The crop class has at least 100 validation pixels used by CDL.

For non-crop classes we only apply the first condition (e.g., wetlands, grass, forests, hay, urban etc.) as their validation metrics are not provided by CDL. Following these steps we are left with 34 classes: {Corn, Cotton, Rice, Sunflower, Barley, Winter Wheat, Safflower, Dry Beans, Onions, Tomatoes, Cherries, Grapes, Citrus, Almonds, Walnut, Pistachio, Garlic, Olives, Pomegranates, Alfalfa, Hay, Barren, Fallow and Idle, Deciduous Forests, Evergreen forest, Mixed Forests, Clover and wildflower, Shrubland, Grass, Woody wetlands, Herbaceous Wetlands, Water, Urban, Double Crops}. For training and evaluation purposes we combine the different forest classes to a super class “Forest Combined”, wetland classes to “Wetlands Combined”, and combine {Grass, Shrubland, Clover, Wildflower} to “Grass combined”. We also do not use Double Crops in our study and label all those pixels as unknown class. Following the preprocessing of the labels we are left with 21 crop classes and 7 other classes and we refer to this label set as CDL-combined.

Since the CDL is originally at 30m resolution, which we resample to 10m (to match with the resolution of input images), the boundary pixels are mixed and thus they could contain regions of multiple classes. Given the uncertainty of labels at spatial boundaries between any two classes, we perform 1 pixel erosion for each class and replace these eroded pixels with unknown class and remove connected components of a class that are less than or equal to size 4. These labels are called CDL-combined-eroded. Fig 2 shows the progression of the labels through these preprocessing steps. Similar to the image data, post erosion we segment and store the label in arrays of shape (1098,1098) and have the naming convention as TILEID\_YEAR\_ROW\_COL\_PREPROCESSED\_CD\_L\_LABEL.npy.


### 4.3 Grid curation

As described earlier, in our dataset we have 1,100 grids of 1098×1098 pixels in size covering the entire crop belt in California’s Central Valley. Many of these grids are predominantly covered by non-crop classes, and hence are removed from the dataset resulting in 367 acceptable grids. Specifically, a grid is included if it follows both of the following conditions:

- Grid has at least 50% pixels that are not unknown
- Out of the valid pixels, Grid G has at least 50% pixels that belong to crop classes

### 4.4 Label Improvement using STATT

As described earlier, CDL based labels cannot be used directly as reference labels. To improve the quality of CDL labels, we used the STATT model proposed by the authors in [12] which uses spatial as well as temporal information to effectively model the phenology of crops and reduce the effects of clouds and other atmospheric disturbances. Specifically STATT uses a UNET style architecture to extract spatial features and a bidirectional Long-Short Term Memory (biLSTM) to model temporal progression of the crop specific growing and harvesting patterns. Further it uses attention networks to aggregate the hidden representations for each time-step based on their contribution to the classification performance. Finally, using these attention scores, the spatial features by the convolutional encoders at multiple resolutions are aggregated and passed using skip connections to the convolutional decoder to generate segmentation maps. A comparison of STATT with alternative approaches that




**Figure 3: Distribution of Train/Val/Test grids. Green, light blue, and red represent the regions used for training, validation and testing, respectively. The purple regions denote the non-agricultural land and are not used in our experiments.**

model either the spatial or temporal information, or both (but not as effectively as STATT) is available in [12].


To demonstrate the efficacy of this method in improving the quality of CDL labels, we divided the grids into train, validation and test set. The crop distribution is not similar throughout the California Central Valley crop belt. For example, Rice is grown mainly in the northern part of the California Central Valley crop belt and is rarely found in the southern parts. To make sure we create a training set that is balanced amongst classes and is also spread uniformly across space, we adopt a gridwise count based data splitting strategy. For each class, we sort the grids based on the number of pixels present of that particular class in the grid. We take intersection of the common grids amongst all classes such that the total number of grids comes out to around 60% of the total grids we have. Following this first step we were able to filter 210 grids for training (approximately 57%). Now after removing these training grids we again sort grid intersections classwise to create validation set such that around 20% more is used, then the remaining are used for testing. With this approach we created a training set of 210 grids, validation set of 84 grids and test set of 73 grids. The color coded final distribution of the sets can be seen in the Fig. 3.

Following the approach as outlined in [12], STATT extracts patches of size 32×32 pixels from the training grids. Using this input patch of size 32×32, we output labels for a patch of size 16×16. For this task, we use three convolutional blocks in our encoder each having two convolutional layers. Thus there are six convolutional layers having 64,64,128,128,256,256 channels and filters of size 3×3. To downsample the output of the convolutional blocks STATT uses





**Figure 4: Argmax predictions vs Region Growing predictions on certain patches in test area which demonstrate the advantage of Region Growing over Argmax. For example in the first row, the region growing strategy has removed many speckles of winter wheat (brown) misclassified by CDL. Moreover, majority of the pixels converted to “unknown” by region growing lie in the boundary where the pixels due to being mixed, are more likely to be misclassified. (Arrows represent places of improvement by Region growing over Argmax)**



**Figure 5: Flowchart of the entire pipeline used in our study.**


max-pooling of size  $2 \times 2$  after the first and second convolutional blocks. In the decoder, STATT has two convolutional blocks each of which consists of two convolutional layers. The four convolutional layers of the decoder have 128, 128, 64, 64 channels respectively. To upsample the output we add transposed-convolutional layers before the first and second convolutional block of the decoder having 128, 64 channels respectively and kernel size of  $2 \times 2$ . Finally, STATT has a fully-connected layer with input dimension of 64 and output dimension equal to the number of classes i.e. 28. The model was trained using the training dataset for 50 epochs and the validation performance was used as the model selection criteria.

The output of the model are softmax probabilities over the classes for each pixel thus having shape of  $(16, 16, 34)$ . By combining all the patches within a grid, we create probability grids of shape  $(16, 16, 34)$ . Usually for multi-class classification the decision is made by predicting the class for which the model gives the highest probability. We refer to it as the *argmax* prediction. In a multi-class classification setting, confusion between classes can easily occur when dealing with a large number of classes. Furthermore, class confusion also happens at the geographical boundary of different classes (e.g. fields with different crops or roads around field).

We use a region growing strategy to post-process the pixel-wise probability outputs instead of directly taking *argmax* outputs. Specifically, for each class, the pixels that have highest probability value greater than 0.9 are considered as confident anchor pixels. Starting from these anchor pixels, we include all the pixels in their neighborhood which have at least 0.3 probability of belonging to the same class as the anchor pixels. Since the region growing strategy produces class-wise prediction maps, clashes between two or more class at certain pixels are bound to happen, in which case we assign unknown values to those pixels. We observe that majority of such clashes occur near the boundaries which is expected due to the reasons that were described above. As illustrated in Fig 4, this method is very effective in removing noise within fields and also removing confusion at boundaries by replacing them with "unknown". We store the STATT labels in arrays of shape  $(1098, 1098)$  and have the naming convention as `TILEID_YEAR_ROW_COL_PREPROCESSED_STATT_LABEL.npy`.

## 4.5 Final Dataset

In summary, our dataset covers the entire California Central Valley Crop Belt using the 367 grids of cloud filtered multi-spectral images (each in  $(1098, 1098, 10)$ ), and we call these image grids. For each image grid, we also provide both the raw and preprocessed CDL grid as well as STATT grid of size  $(1098, 1098)$ . The diagrammatic flowchart of the entire pipeline can be found in Figure 5. STATT



**Figure 6: The classwise count of labels produced by STATT across all the acceptable grids in the form of a bar chart. The red bar represents the overall count of that class across the entire acceptable set, the green bar represents the count in the northern region and the blue bar represents the count in the southern region. The northern region is given by the tiles T10SEH, T10SEJ, T10SFG, T10SFH, T10SFJ, T10SGG and T10TEK whereas the southern region is given by the tiles T10SGF, T11SKA, T11SKV, and T11SLV. through this bar chart one can observe that there is rich crop variety in our dataset. One can also observe that some classes lie predominately in the north, such as Rice, some lie predominately in the south, such as Pistachio, and some have a good mix in both regions, such as Almonds**

labels are provided for a total of 442,456,668 pixels ( $\tilde{44},000$  sq. km) covering 29 classes, of which 249,946,750 pixels ( $\tilde{25},000$  sq. km) belong to one of the 21 crop classes and the remaining 192,509,918 pixels ( $\tilde{19},000$  sq. km) belong to other 8 classes including unknown. The distribution of the 29 classes in the form of a bar chart is given in Figure 6. Figure 6 also shows the distributions class wise in the north vs south of the region, with The northern region given by the tiles T10SEH, T10SEJ, T10SFG, T10SFH, T10SFJ, T10SGG and T10TEK and the southern region given by the tiles T10SGF, T11SKA, T11SKV, and T11SLV.

The entire dataset including Image Grids, CDL grids, preprocessed CDL grids and STATT grids for the acceptable grids as well as the Image grids and CDL grids for the rest of the entire region can be found in the link given below<sup>1</sup>.

## 5 EVALUATION

In this section we present the quantitative analysis of the results of our approach on the test regions. Using the STATT and CDL labels we get the confusion matrix as shown in Table 1 for the pixels where both STATT and CDL are not unknown. We observe that out of the total 57,795,199 pixels, SAATT and CDL labels differ in 9,785,767 pixels (16.93%). Focusing only on pixels that are labeled as crop, disagreement drops to 6.97%. Table 2 shows precision, recall, and F1-scores for all classes while treating pre-processed CDL labels as ground truth. We notice that F1-score is usually high for classes that have high support (see left half of Table 2) and usually low for classes that have low support (right half of Table 2). As we discuss in the following, STATT labels are generally more accurate than those provided by CDL.

Fig. 7 shows a comparison of the segmentation maps of STATT and the corresponding patch from the CDL layer. In all four triplets, We notice that STATT generally performs much better in detecting boundaries and removing noise. In the first triplet of the first

column, we can see how a noisy field is replaced with a smooth prediction of fallow land. In the second we can see how a fallow prediction by CDL is replaced with cotton by STATT and it can be verified in the third image of the triplet, an image in July, that the field cannot be fallow as there is a crop present. In the first triplet of the second column, one can observe removal of erroneous cotton speckles present in the CDL map, and in the final triplet we can see smoothing of multiple fields by the STATT map over the region.

Further, we analyze the pixels where our map does not match with CDL. We have noticed errors in the CDL layer at numerous locations throughout the crop belt which are mainly of two types:

- incorrect labeling of complete (or large parts of) fields
- spatially discontinuous label prediction (i.e., label of a pixel differs from its surrounding pixels that all belong to a different class)

In the next few paragraphs we systemically discuss and analyze these cases on some of the fields within California Crop belt. First, we visually analyze and show the results of a sample of patches by looking at the satellite images over the entire year. Next, we provide visual analysis of a sample of NDVI time series. We assume that the NDVI time series of pixels where STATT and CDL agree are correct and we show that on pixels where STATT disagrees with CDL, the NDVI time series are similar to those pixels that have the same label as provided by STATT and where STATT and CDL agree. Finally, we provide a comprehensive (qualitative) analysis of all pixels where STATT and CDL disagree by quantifying the number of pixels that have NDVI series closer to the agreement NDVI series for each set of labels.

### 5.1 Visual analysis of a sample of patches

The first way to compare our dataset and CDL is to visually inspect images over time, check the growing time, rate of greenness and harvest time to assign a label to the field, and then check whether CDL or STATT is correct. Although this method cannot be scaled to every field due to substantial manual effort and expertise needed

<sup>1</sup>[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1EnXXRHNoTylbM-\\_5p-P9pH4zH3xyTqBp?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1EnXXRHNoTylbM-_5p-P9pH4zH3xyTqBp?usp=sharing)


**Table 1: Confusion matrix between STATT labels and CDL labels on test grids. X axis (column data) represents the STATT predictions and Y axis (row data) represents CDL predictions.**

Crop Data Layer	STAT																												
	Class	Corn	Cotton	Rice	Sunflower	Barley	Winter Wheat	Safflower	Dry Beans	Onions	Tomatoes	Cherries	Grapes	Citrus	Almonds	Walnut	Pistachio	Garlic	Olives	Pomegranates	Alfalfa	Hay	Barren	Fallowidle	ForestsCb	GrassCb	WetlandsCb	Water	Urban
Corn	607390	3178	4282	164	17	3285	73	413	326	10341	338	12767	3	8373	726	85	0	26	2	13656	19615	0	16406	0	2938	773	946	10778	
Cotton	5629	3277971	272	0	0	112	28	1824	22	59832	9	10382	0	9657	1157	283	28	0	1	1777	92	1	6252	0	357	250	14	6490	
Rice	5416	0	6879520	269	0	0	62	5	0	5946	25	6351	0	395	637	9	0	33	0	1126	891	0	13152	0	22	53	1281	4948	
Sunflower	7841	1	1466	221533	0	36	2413	35	0	7755	0	2321	0	1813	4063	17	0	6	0	192	66	0	9210	0	65	189	218	2023	
Barley	286	213	0	0	15238	31066	222	0	6	13	0	59	0	8821	0	525	0	3	0	49	8979	8	96979	0	849	0	0	1063	
Winter Wheat	35205	356	9	0	15	1145627	6270	4886	23840	3049	1051	3189	0	4996	313	267	2472	20	143	7324	28273	0	569444	0	85098	50	204	5277	
Safflower	40897	21	351	2139	0	617	383917	15	87569	48333	6	5438	0	596	616	56	12049	4	0	16077	525	0	64979	0	16257	13	23	2227	
Dry Beans	1529	2009	38	7	0	13148	2	94384	90	572	71	1350	0	400	33	1	888	0	0	2744	3380	0	4315	0	55	81	1	972	
Onions	9514	50	0	0	2	1001	8001	0	201520	16235	0	305	0	15	0	1	3979	0	0	555	16	0	18561	0	24	0	0	945	
Tomatoes	36578	30306	446	639	0	655	1598	345	19816	2421624	76	3568	0	8861	172	166	323	0	2	4824	384	0	42105	0	600	60	8	5831	
Cherries	12	155	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	45387	22724	26	5012	4857	2124	0	0	324	60	0	0	15426	0	5259	0	0	769	
Grapes	14290	12029	0	0	0	1184	31	23	1956	18507	1977	255800	14	126264	4362	14492	0	2255	6647	8998	851	0	64457	0	11970	1	11	8969	
Citrus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1967	0	739	145307	620	434	9	3	4063	9	371	0	0	17482	0	931	0	0	1426	
Almonds	9401	5609	25	231	0	16234	1287	3807	14	2206	3129	113893	1560	7592014	85562	29228	2715	6785	3114	34172	427	3	285501	0	99096	138	31	40524	
Walnut	6270	2281	2811	3124	0	508	4707	110	0	72	3787	269005	0	91716	2792583	43332	0	399	694	44839	1568	4	141135	0	13121	5735	686	40591	
Pistachio	332	290	0	0	0	73	1	17	8	7	2365	14843	14	48152	4853	2273489	1	210	8372	2236	0	0	235936	0	63432	0	11	11139	
Garlic	1063	23	0	0	0	8566	91	464	6964	604	11	65	6	48	0	8	302008	0	0	131	0	0	11529	0	102	43	0	913	
Olives	429	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7524	10259	11251	1201	923	0	149718	0	516	12	6	24853	0	3977	0	0	4003	
Pomegranates	2	4611	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2130	3140	12175	7	30375	56	17403	5	123	94072	361	0	0	50850	0	705	87	54	2382	
Hay	31847	1599	322	23	0	11704	4852	7	6590	6543	860	27857	191	31837	5306	1852	1237	1087	130	1372785	14676	0	0	31217	0	8036	2733	271	12958
Barren	13640	158	417	1407	0	26405	217	404	92	501	641	39422	624	25357	6998	1070	0	4805	6	144939	152060	1	9765	0	107317	171	120	20725	
Fallowidle	0	150	51	0	12	0	0	0	0	14	1	278	0	359	144	75	0	40	1	42	4	20040	0	97624	0	106082	633	8816	38194
ForestsCb	11712	17863	164556	986	44	34016	13008	7834	2990	71154	805	81176	76	125921	84253	89519	1102	7941	1363	32032	17392	1351	6817036	0	573836	7230	21056	262682	
GrassCb	6761	0	4135	0	0	3	153	0	0	0	1721	7832	10142	2422	451	0	115216	0	39529	15	2	20653	0	257	731	48	1281		
WetlandsCb	12258	348	1042	0	823	11029	620	6	0	113	3004	81509	640	92248	17723	19635	0	26063	179	92681	409	1307273	0	4677219	11878	2201	79275		
Water	29639	614	32684	0	0	21	3	0	0	48	478	24263	0	811	7426	1226	0	31	2	8927	187	44	83276	0	76186	103289	19880	7644	
Urban	271	0	1658	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	130	0	9	51	0	0	6	0	215	3	958	4940	0	2620	1748	920775	2100	
Urban	2469	9142	21946	574	0	3466	675	144	621	7711	384	28072	907	48990	22374	12213	971	4083	172	18503	2053	3045	201794	0	177117	2542	13400	2747186	
	Fallowidle - Fallow and Idle land; ForestsCb - Forests Combined; GrassCb - Grass Combined; WetlandsCb - Wetlands Combined																												

Fallowidle - Fallow and Idle land; ForestsCb - Forests Combined; GrassCb - Grass Combined; WetlandsCb - Wetlands Combined

**Table 2: Precision, Recall, and F1-Score of STATT labels in the test region with CDL as groundtruth. We also mention support(in pixels), that is the count classwise of CDL labels used during evaluation (10000 pixels equals 1 sq.km).**

STATT									
CLASS	Precision	Recall	F1-score	Support	CLASS	Precision	Recall	F1-score	Support
Fallow and Idle	0.6587	0.8069	0.7253	8448934	Safflower	0.8965	0.5623	0.6911	682725
Almonds	0.9172	0.9107	0.9139	8336706	Hay	0.3869	0.2360	0.2932	644262
Rice	0.9668	0.9941	0.9803	6920141	Wetlands Combined	0.7462	0.2604	0.386	396679
Grass Combined	0.7742	0.7109	0.7412	6579739	Garlic	0.9214	0.9079	0.9146	332639
Walnut	0.9167	0.8050	0.8572	3469078	Barren	0.7746	0.0735	0.1343	272560
Cotton	0.9730	0.9691	0.9710	3382440	Sunflower	0.9586	0.8479	0.8999	261263
Urban	0.8265	0.8248	0.8257	3330554	Onions	0.5718	0.7729	0.6573	260724
Grapes	0.7663	0.8952	0.8258	2855088	Pomegranates	0.8164	0.4295	0.5628	219041
Pistachio	0.9065	0.8528	0.8788	2665781	Olives	0.4636	0.6974	0.557	214675
Tomatoes	0.9018	0.9383	0.9197	2580987	Forests Combined	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	211352
Winter Wheat	0.8753	0.5944	0.7080	1927378	Citrus	0.8559	0.8382	0.8469	173361
Alfalfa	0.7422	0.8708	0.8013	1576520	Barley	0.9435	0.0886	0.162	172028
Water	0.9300	0.9843	0.9564	935492	Dry Beans	0.8227	0.7487	0.7839	126070
Corn	0.6819	0.8472	0.7557	716901	Cherries	0.6550	0.4440	0.5293	102081
OVERALL	Precision	Recall	F1-score	Support	CROPS ONLY	Precision	Recall	F1-score	Support
MEAN	0.7732	0.6754	0.6885	57795199	MEAN:	0.8067	0.7262	0.7386	37,619,889
Weighted MEAN	0.834	0.8307	0.8251	57795199	Weighted MEAN	0.8882	0.8699	0.8731	37,619,889
ACCURACY:			0.8307		ACCURACY			0.9303	

**Figure 7: Segmentation map comparisons on some patches from CDL and STATT in the test regions, Each triplet shown depicts a situation where STATT produces better labels. For description on each triplet please refer to Section 5**

regarding crop growing patterns, we can still use this approach to

verify disagreement between CDL and STATT where one predicts



**Figure 8: Visual Analysis of Grid T10SGF\_2018\_5\_4.** One can observe from the visual images that many fields in this region are fallow throughout the year but CDL labels them as Winter Wheat (such as the field next to the triangular Cotton (red) field). However STATT does not make these mistakes and correctly labels the region as Fallow land.

fallow and idle land and the other predicts a crop. Since no crop is grown year around in a fallow or idle land, it should be easy to verify the correct prediction. We observed numerous cases in the California Central Valley crop belt where CDL predicted a crop and STATT predicted fallow land. On further investigation as to why so much confusion has happened, we observed in the CDL that some classes, such as almonds, grapes, and barley, are just carried over from the year before without new analysis. This is mainly a problem when the farmer decides not to plant a crop in that area that year or a drought occurs in that area that year and so in reality the pixel is fallow land but CDL will label it as a crop. In such cases even though STATT may label the pixel as Fallow land it will be taken as an error with respect to CDL. In particular, 2018 was a dry year for the California Central Valley and many farmers were not able to irrigate fields in 2018 that were wet and productive in 2017. We found this to be the main reason as to why the F1 score for Fallow and Idle land is low in the table in spite of a high count. An example of what was just described can be seen in Fig. 8. In this grid, We can observe numerous fields as fallow throughout the year (such as the one next to the triangle shaped cotton field) but CDL labels them as crop (the field next to the triangle cotton field is labelled as winter wheat by CDL). Through this first method of visual analysis, we were able to verify many cases of fallow vs crop disagreement, in which the STATT prediction of fallow seems appropriate.

## 5.2 Visual analysis of a sample of NDVI time series

Here we resolve the disagreement between STATT and CDL labels by analyzing the NDVI time series of the field in question (i.e. a continuous region where STATT and CDL differs. In each disagreement there are two classes in analysis, the CDL prediction class and the STATT prediction class. If the NDVI series of field lies closer to the characteristic NDVI series of the STATT prediction class than the CDL prediction class then we can say that the field is actually the STATT prediction class and vice versa. Now the question arises, how do we obtain this characteristic NDVI series of different classes in our dataset? To get the characteristic NDVI series we take the

median (timestamp wise) of the NDVI series for pixels agreeing with the class of interest in the grid where the field of interest is located. What we mean by pixels of agreement are those pixels where CDL and STATT agree, i.e predict the same class at that pixel. we use only agreement pixels within the grid of the field because we found that across grids crops have different NDVI series due to local farmer practices, weather conditions and cloud cover patterns. We also use median to get the characteristic NDVI series due to the fact that it is better at handling outliers when compared to other strategies such as mean or mode.

We now plot the characteristic NDVI series for both the CDL prediction class and the STATT prediction class on the same graph. We then plot the median NDVI series timestamp wise of all the pixels in the field of interest on the same graph and check which characteristic NDVI series it lies closer to. If the NDVI series of the field is closer to the characteristic series of the class labeled by STATT compared to the characteristics series of the class labeled by CDL, then we can say that STATT label was correct, and vice versa. We found that in a vast majority of cases, whenever there is a field of disagreement, the NDVI series of the field lies closer to the STATT prediction class signature than the CDL prediction class signature. Fig. 9 shows 8 triplets for some fields where we conducted this method of analysis. The first image in the triplet is the CDL prediction and the second image is the STATT prediction, and in each of these images there is a red boundary denoting the field of interest. One can observe that in all the triplets, the predicted class within the field of interest (i.e the red boundary) differs between the CDL image and the STATT image. The third image is the NDVI plot of the three timeseries described before, i.e the CDL prediction class characteristic NDVI series (denoted by the plot in the color of the CDL prediction class), the STATT prediction class characteristic NDVI series (denoted by the plot in the color of the STATT prediction class) and the NDVI series of the field of interest (denoted by the signature in the green color).

To give a better understanding let us look at the top leftmost triplet of Fig. 9 in detail. This triplet shows a field which has been labelled as winter wheat by CDL but as fallow land by STATT. In the third image we can see the NDVI series signature of winter






Figure 9: Comparison of NDVI for some fields with disagreement between CDL labels and STATT labels. Each triplet denotes a case where the labels produced by STATT are better than CDL, as the series of the field (represented in Green) lies closer to the series of the class denoted by STATT.

wheat in dark brown and that of fallow land in light brown (note that the colors of the lines are the same colors of the fields in the images). We can also see the green line plot in the image which denotes that of the field's NDVI series. It can clearly be seen that the green plot lies much closer to the light brown plot (fallow land) and so we can say the STATT prediction of this field as fallow land is correct. Similarly the top rightmost triplet shows a field with pistachio (CDL prediction) vs Almond (STATT prediction) and from the plot we can see that the green line lies closer to the greenish blue line (Almond) than when compared to the light blue line (Pistachio) showing that the STATT prediction in this field is correct. All other examples in Figure 9 similarly show that the green line lies closer to the STATT class NDVI line. The top two triplets of the right column show cases where CDL predicts a crop class and STATT predicts fallow land. The bottom next triplet of the right column show cases where CDL predicts fallow land but STATT predicts a non fallow class (Cotton). The last triplet in this column shows winter wheat vs corn. The top two triplets of the left column showcase confusion of almonds and pistachio in both ways between the two tree crops which are of high importance in the California region. The next triplet shows walnut vs alfalfa and the final triplet shows alfalfa vs hay.


### 5.3 Comprehensive analysis of all pixels where STATT and CDL disagree

The previous two methods prove to be very useful while doing field analysis and using a combination of the two we can show for

Table 3: Area under the curves (in Fig. 10) for each class along with number of agreement pixels and F1 score of class with CDL as groundtruth.

Class	AREA UNDER THE CURVE			Count	
	CDL	STATT	Difference	Agreement	F1-Score
Garlic	0.4899	<b>0.7409</b>	0.2510	173908	0.9146
Citrus	0.5097	<b>0.7555</b>	0.2458	26018	0.8469
Dry Beans	0.4388	<b>0.6803</b>	0.2415	59647	0.7839
Tomatoes	0.4708	<b>0.6927</b>	0.2218	1344877	0.9197
Olives	0.5745	<b>0.7741</b>	0.1995	52639	0.5570
Corn	0.4850	<b>0.6177</b>	0.1327	68350	0.7557
Almonds	0.5959	<b>0.7072</b>	0.1112	2867928	0.9139
Alfalfa	0.6933	<b>0.8000</b>	0.1067	477421	0.8013
Pomegranates	0.7310	<b>0.8114</b>	0.0804	71381	0.5628
Onions	0.7007	<b>0.7628</b>	0.0621	146608	0.6573
Grass Combined	0.8334	<b>0.8910</b>	0.0576	1336303	0.7412
Barren	0.7997	<b>0.8550</b>	0.0552	8902	0.1343
Fallow and Idle	0.8396	<b>0.8825</b>	0.0429	2451705	0.7253
Rice	0.5055	<b>0.5481</b>	0.0426	501687	0.9803
Cherries	0.4864	<b>0.5277</b>	0.0413	28185	0.5293
Walnut	0.8223	<b>0.8519</b>	0.0296	369057	0.8572
Grapes	0.7197	<b>0.7465</b>	0.0269	435258	0.8258
Pistachio	0.7559	<b>0.7816</b>	0.0257	1106181	0.8788
Cotton	0.6727	<b>0.6918</b>	0.0192	2481209	0.9710
Winter Wheat	0.6292	<b>0.6403</b>	0.0111	372512	0.7080
Hay	<b>0.7887</b>	0.7879	-0.0009	28640	0.2932
Safflower	<b>0.7749</b>	0.7638	-0.0112	125555	0.6911
Barley	<b>0.3051</b>	0.2474	-0.0577	424	0.1620
Sunflower	<b>0.6578</b>	0.4333	-0.2246	3842	0.8999
MEAN	0.6440	<b>0.7195</b>			

each field who is correct. However, neither of these methods give a global perspective nor do they quantify how much better STATT's predictions are when compared to those of CDL's predictions. To address this issue, we use a third method of analysis in which we



**Figure 10: Class wise Area under the curve plots. The x axis represents the NMSE and the y axis represents the  $Score(\cdot)$  value for the corresponding NMSE from x axis. The red and blue curves represent CDL and STATT, respectively. In each plot we also mention the F1-Score of that class as a measure of agreement between CDL and STATT. We can see that in classes with high F1 such as Garlic, where agreement is high, and in those with low F1 such as Olives, where agreement is low, STATT has a better curve than CDL.**

devise a function to measure closeness of pixels to ground reality, and after plotting the function, use area under the curve to establish which strategy, i.e. CDL or STATT, is better.

After obtaining the map for STATT and CDL, we calculate the characteristic NDVI series gridwise for each class using the agreement pixels as described in the previous section. Now we consider a characteristic series to be valid only if there are at least  $T$  pixels in agreement in the grid, and  $T$  is set to 100 in this work. Now for each pixel of disagreement for each class we calculate the Normalised Mean Square Error (NMSE) with the characteristic NDVI series and the NDVI series of the pixel of disagreement. For each strategy (CDL or STATT), we first sort all the disagreement pixels according to their NMSE. Then we compute  $Score(E)$  for each strategy, which

is defined to be the proportion of disagreement pixels with NMSE less than a particular error  $E$  over all the disagreement pixels, i.e.,  $Score(\cdot)$ , for a particular error ( $E$ ) as follows:

$$Score(E) = \frac{\# \text{disagreement pixels in strategy with NMSE less than } E}{\text{Total No. of pixels of disagreement in strategy}} \quad (1)$$

where *strategy* represents either CDL or STATT.

What the function  $Score$  represents is the fraction of total disagreements pixels whose NMSE lies below a set threshold error denoted by  $E$ . The notion behind this function is that, the closer the NMSEs of the disagreement pixels are to zero, the faster  $Score$  rises as  $E$  rises. At the max error, the  $Score$  will be 1, as all NMSEs lie below the threshold. Our hypothesis is that the STATT disagreement pixels have lower errors and so  $Score$  will rise faster for STATT when compared to CDL. As a result, STATT will reach a higher  $Score$  faster and will thus have more area under the plot of  $Score$  until the max error. A plot of this function is constructed for each class with  $E$  starting from 0 and ranging up to maximum NMSE error recorded for that class, which we denote as  $E_{max}$ . Please note that  $E_{max}$  changes from class to class and that  $E_{max}$  could come from either a CDL disagreement pixel or a STATT disagreement pixel. We then calculate Area under the curve as follows:

$$Area_{strategy} = \left( \int_0^{E_{max}} Score(E) dE \right) / E_{max} \quad (2)$$

We divide the area of each plot by  $E_{max}$  to keep it within the range (0,1). The plots of curve for each class can be seen in Fig. 10, with Blue representing STATT and red representing CDL. The areas under these curves for each strategy are summarized in Table 3. We can see that STATT has a higher area when compared to CDL in almost all the classes. STATT has lower area for a small number of classes which have low agreement count. We also see from the figure that in a lot of classes the blue line lies above the red line throughout the plot. This experiment solidifies our claim that STATT labels are closer to the ground reality than when compared to the labels provided by CDL.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper we presented CalCROP21, a georeferenced data set for a diverse array of crops grown in the Central Valley of California. This dataset contains multi spectral Sentinel imagery along with crop labels at 10m resolution for year 2018 that are derived using a novel spatial-temporal deep learning method that makes use of noisy CDL labels available at 30m resolution. Our extensive analysis of this dataset demonstrates the superiority of our dataset over CDL. We have also released our processing pipeline and associated datasets that can be used by the community to generate crop labels for other years and for creating similar data sets for other parts of US. We anticipate this dataset will catalyze the innovation in machine learning research on remote sensing data (e.g., classifying multiple imbalanced classes and modeling heterogeneous data over space), and also enable the use of this information for studying crop distribution and its implications by the agricultural community.

## 7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was funded by the NSF awards 1838159 and 1739191. Rahul Ghosh is supported by UMII MNDrive Graduate Fellowship. Access to computing facilities was provided by the Minnesota Supercomputing Institute.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2021. USDA NASS Cropland Data Layers. [https://developers.google.com/earth-engine/datasets/catalog/USDA\\_NASS\\_CDL](https://developers.google.com/earth-engine/datasets/catalog/USDA_NASS_CDL).
- [2] Saikat Basu, Sangram Ganguly, Supratik Mukhopadhyay, Robert DiBiano, Manohar Karki, and Ramakrishna Nemani. 2015. DeepSat: A Learning Framework for Satellite Imagery. In *Proceedings of the 23rd SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems* (Seattle, Washington) (SIGSPATIAL '15). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 37, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2820783.2820816>
- [3] Jason B Belden, Brittany Rae Hanson, Scott T McMurry, Loren M Smith, and David A Haukos. 2012. Assessment of the effects of farming and conservation programs on pesticide deposition in high plains wetlands. *Environmental science & technology* 46, 6 (2012), 3424–3432.
- [4] Claire Boryan, Zhengwei Yang, and Liping Di. 2012. Deriving 2011 cultivated land cover data sets using usda national agricultural statistics service historic cropland data layers. In *2012 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*. IEEE, 6297–6300.
- [5] Claire Boryan, Zhengwei Yang, Rick Mueller, and Mike Craig. 2011. Monitoring US agriculture: the US Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, Cropland Data Layer Program. *Geocarto International* 26, 5 (2011), 341–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2011.562309>
- [6] CDL 2021. USDA Cropland Data Layer. [https://www.nass.usda.gov/Research\\_and\\_Science/Cropland/docs/MuellerICASVI\\_CDL.pdf](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Research_and_Science/Cropland/docs/MuellerICASVI_CDL.pdf).
- [7] R Cibin, I Chaubey, and B Engel. 2012. Simulated watershed scale impacts of corn stover removal for biofuel on hydrology and water quality. *Hydrological processes* 26, 11 (2012), 1629–1641.
- [8] Ilke Demir, Krzysztof Koperski, David Lindenbaum, Guan Pang, Jing Huang, Saikat Basu, Forest Hughes, Devis Tuia, and Ramesh Raskar. 2018. DeepGlobe 2018: A Challenge to Parse the Earth through Satellite Images. *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)* (Jun 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1109/cvprw.2018.00031>
- [9] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. ImageNet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 248–255. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2009.5206848>
- [10] Timothy Fitzgerald and Grant Zimmerman. 2013. Agriculture in the Tongue River Basin, Output, Water Quality, and Implications. (2013).
- [11] Rahul Ghosh, Xiaowei Jia, and Vipin Kumar. 2021. Land Cover Mapping in Limited Labels Scenario: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.02429* (2021).
- [12] Rahul Ghosh, Praveen Ravirathinam, Xiaowei Jia, Chenxi Lin, Zhenong Jin, and Vipin Kumar. 2021. Attention-augmented Spatio-Temporal Segmentation for Land Cover Mapping. *arXiv:2105.02963* [cs.CV]
- [13] Laura Hartz, Fritz Boettner, and Jason Clingerman. 2011. Greenbrier Valley Local Food: The Possibilities and Potential. *Greenbrier Valley Economic Development Corporation* (2011).
- [14] Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. 2017. EuroSAT: A Novel Dataset and Deep Learning Benchmark for Land Use and Land Cover Classification. *arXiv:1709.00029* [cs.CV]
- [15] Tyler J Lark, Ian H Schelly, and Holly K Gibbs. 2021. Accuracy, Bias, and Improvements in Mapping Crops and Cropland across the United States Using the USDA Cropland Data Layer. *Remote Sensing* 13, 5 (2021), 968.
- [16] Emmanuel Maggiori, Yuliya Tarabalka, Guillaume Charpiat, and Pierre Alliez. 2017. Can semantic labeling methods generalize to any city? the inria aerial image labeling benchmark. In *2017 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*. 3226–3229. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2017.8127684>
- [17] Kathleen Painter, Hilary Donlon, Stephanie Kane, et al. 2013. Results of a 2012 survey of Idaho oilseed producers. *AE Extension Series-Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, University of Idaho* 13-01 (2013).
- [18] Otávio A. B. Penatti, Keiller Nogueira, and Jefersson A. dos Santos. 2015. Do deep features generalize from everyday objects to remote sensing and aerial scenes domains?. In *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*. 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPRW.2015.7301382>
- [19] James D Plourde, Bryan C Pijanowski, and Burak K Pekin. 2013. Evidence for increased monoculture cropping in the Central United States. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment* 165 (2013), 50–59.
- [20] Joshua Pritsolas and Randall Pearson. [n.d.]. A Cautionary Tale: A Recent Paper’s Use of Research Based on the USDA Cropland Data Layer to Assess the Environmental Impacts of Claimed Cropland Expansion. ([n.d.]).
- [21] Benjamin S Rashford, Shannon E Albeke, and David J Lewis. 2013. Modeling grassland conversion: Challenges of using satellite imagery data. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 95, 2 (2013), 404–411.
- [22] Kurtis D Reitsma, David E Clay, Sharon A Clay, Barry H Dunn, and C Reese. 2015. Does the US Cropland Data Layer Provide an Accurate Benchmark for Land-Use Change Estimates? *Agronomy Journal* 108, 108 (2015), 226.
- [23] Michael Schmitt, Lloyd Haydn Hughes, Chunping Qiu, and Xiao Xiang Zhu. 2019. SEN12MS – A Curated Dataset of Georeferenced Multi-Spectral Sentinel-1/2 Imagery for Deep Learning and Data Fusion. *arXiv:1906.07789* [cs.CV]
- [24] Gencer Sumbul, Marcela Charfuelan, Begum Demir, and Volker Markl. 2019. Bigearthnet: A Large-Scale Benchmark Archive for Remote Sensing Image Understanding. *IGARSS 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium* (Jul 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/igarss.2019.8900532>
- [25] Christopher K Wright and Michael C Wimberly. 2013. Recent land use change in the Western Corn Belt threatens grasslands and wetlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 10 (2013), 4134–4139.
- [26] Gui-Song Xia, Xiang Bai, Jian Ding, Zhen Zhu, Serge Belongie, Jiebo Luo, Mihai Datcu, Marcello Pelillo, and Liangpei Zhang. 2018. DOTA: A Large-Scale Dataset for Object Detection in Aerial Images. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 3974–3983. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2018.00418>
- [27] Yi Yang and Shawn Newsam. 2010. Bag-of-Visual-Words and Spatial Extensions for Land-Use Classification. In *Proceedings of the 18th SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems* (San Jose, California) (GIS '10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 270–279. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1869790.1869829>

NMSE SCATTERPLOT STATISTICS	ALL DISAGREEMENT	CROP DISAGREEMENT
TOTAL POINTS	2681881	2027776
STATT BETTER	1672366	1323883
CDL BETTER	1009515	703893
STATT BETTER MEAN	0.1321	0.1567
CDL BETTER MEAN	0.0857	0.1091

**Table 4: NMSE scatterplots**

## 8 APPENDIX

### 8.1 NMSE analysis

In this section we propose another method of analysis, estimated F1 score analysis method. In this method we try to estimate the actual F1 score of CDL and STATT based on proximity of NDVI series of pixels with respect to the characteristic NDVI series using Normalised mean square error.

Like the AUC analysis we calculate the characteristic NDVI series gridwise for each class using the agreement pixels and consider a characteristic series to be valid only if there are at least 'T' pixels in agreement in the grid. Once again in this experiment, we set 'T' to be 100. Once again for each pixel of disagreement for each class we calculate the mean square error with the characteristic NDVI series and the NDVI series of the the pixel of disagreement and store all these scores and then normalise each after all disagreement pixels series errors have been calculated. We then set a threshold below which the NMSE should be for a pixel so that it can be considered for F1 score calculation. We set this threshold by finding that threshold at which at least 25 to 45 percent of the disagreement pixels have an NMSE score less than that threshold. Note that in this step we are not distinguishing between CDL and STATT pixels, but consider overall all the pixels of disagreement. Now after setting the threshold, we then find out how many of these pixels that cross the threshold are from CDL and how many are from STATT. We also have the number of agreement pixels in that grid as well and also number of disagreement pixels from STATT and CDL for the class and the grid in question. Using these numbers we can calculate the F1 score for CDL and STATT separately using the formula:

$$F1\_Score_{strategy} = \frac{2 \times Precision_{strategy} \times Recall_{strategy}}{Precision_{strategy} + Recall_{strategy}} \quad (3)$$

$$Precision_{strategy} = \frac{count\_thresholded_{strategy} + count\_agreement}{count\_disagree_{strategy} + count\_agreement} \quad (4)$$

$$Recall_{strategy} = \frac{count\_thresholded_{strategy} + count\_agreement}{count\_thresholded_{total} + count\_agreement} \quad (5)$$

where *strategy* represents either CDL or STATT. We conducted this analysis on all classes for which USDA reports statistics and the results can be found in Table. 5. As can be seen from the table STATT has a higher F1 score when compared to CDL on all but 3 classes. The table also verifies our fallow land proposition by a significantly higher f1 score.

### 8.2 NMSE Scatterplot

In this section we present a scatter plot based method to globally show improvement over CDL overall and not class wise. As mentioned before, for each point of disagreement CDL predicts a class, which we call CDL class, and STATT predicts another class, which we call STATT class. Now as mentioned in the previous section, we create the characteristic NDVI series for each class using the agreement pixels for each class. Now for each disagreement pixel, we compare the Normalised Mean Square Error and plot in the form of a scatterplot shown in the left of Fig. 11. The right scatterplot represents a subset of these disagreement points where at least one of the strategies has predicted a crop class.

Since the distinction between the methods is not exactly clear from the scatterplots, the statistics for both the plots are present in 4. From the table we can see that when we look at all the pixels overall STATT is closer to the respective characteristic NDVI class series in 1672366 pixels when compared to where CDL is closer,i.e 1009515 pixels. However, when we look at just the crop confusion pixels we can see STATT is better in almost double the amount of pixels that CDL is better in, thus showing global superiority of STATT when compared to CDL.



Class	Nmse error threshold	<i>Count<sub>agreement</sub></i> threshold	F1 CDL	F1 STATT	F1 USDA(rep)	% pixels
Almonds	0.5	100	0.9513	0.9575	0.9516	0.4104
Rice	0.2	100	0.9615	0.9845	0.9805	0.4616
Alfalfa	0.3	100	0.8185	0.8612	0.8812	0.3162
Pistachio	0.3	100	0.8012	0.9150	0.9632	0.2438
Grapes	0.3	100	0.8945	0.8804	0.9830	0.4293
Fallow and Idle	0.3	100	0.7229	0.8122	0.7183	0.5164
Cotton	0.2	100	0.9532	0.9464	0.9314	0.4212
Walnut	0.2	100	0.8859	0.8930	0.9514	0.5281
Tomatoes	0.2	100	0.8829	0.9650	0.8764	0.3469
Winter Wheat	0.2	100	0.8340	0.8976	0.7000	0.3003
Corn	0.2	100	0.7734	0.8613	0.7530	0.4092
Citrus	0.3	100	0.8407	0.8678	0.7583	0.2891
Sunflower	0.2	100	0.9703	0.8630	0.7956	0.2856
Onions	0.1	100	0.8064	0.8274	0.7553	0.2205
Olives	0.2	100	0.8816	0.9663	0.9255	0.2298
Dry Beans	0.3	100	0.9747	0.9929	0.6503	0.3472
Pomegranates	0.2	100	0.7143	0.7796	0.9448	0.2401
Garlic	0.2	100	0.9191	0.9572	0.8242	0.3481
Cherries	0.4	100	0.9005	0.9240	0.9521	0.2533
Safflower	0.1	100	0.8137	0.8083	0.6899	0.4173
AVG:			0.8650	0.8980	0.8493	

Table 5: NMSE analysis table




Figure 11: NMSE Scatterplot for all disagreement points as well as crop disagreement points