

# Comparison of visible and multi-satellite global inundation datasets at high-spatial resolution

Filipe Aires, Catherine Prigent, Etienne Fluet-Chouinard, Dai Yamazaki,

Fabrice Papa, Bernhard Lehner

### ▶ To cite this version:

Filipe Aires, Catherine Prigent, Etienne Fluet-Chouinard, Dai Yamazaki, Fabrice Papa, et al.. Comparison of visible and multi-satellite global inundation datasets at high-spatial resolution. Remote Sensing of Environment, 2018, 216, pp.427-441. 10.1016/j.rse.2018.06.015 . hal-02376959

## HAL Id: hal-02376959 https://hal.science/hal-02376959

Submitted on 22 Nov 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Comparison of visible and multi-satellite global inundation datasets at high-spatial resolution

Filipe Aires<sup>a,b,c,\*</sup>, Catherine Prigent<sup>a,b,c</sup>, Etienne Fluet-Chouinard<sup>d</sup>, Dai Yamazaki<sup>e</sup>, Fabrice Papa<sup>f,g</sup>, Bernhard Lehner<sup>h</sup>

<sup>a</sup>LERMA / Observatoire de Paris, UPMC, CNRS, Paris France <sup>b</sup>Estellus, Paris, France

<sup>c</sup>Water Center / Columbia University, New York, USA <sup>d</sup>Center for Limnology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA <sup>e</sup>Department of Integrated Climate Change Projection Research, Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Yokohama, 236-0001, Japan <sup>f</sup>LEGOS, Université de Toulouse, CNES, CNRS, IRD, UPS, Toulouse, France <sup>g</sup>Indo-French Cell for Water Sciences, IRD-IISc-NIO-IITM Joint Intern. Lab., IIS, India <sup>h</sup>Department of Geography, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

#### Abstract

Several new satellite-derived and long-term surface water datasets at highspatial resolution have recently become available at the global scale, showing different characteristics and abilities. They are either based on visible imagery from Landsat - the Global 3-second Water Body Map (G3WBM) and the Global Surface Water Explorer (GSWE) - or on the merging of passive/active microwave and visible observations - Global Inundation Extent from Multi-Satellite (GIEMS-D3) - that has been downscaled from a native resolution of 25 km×25 km to the 90 m×90 m resolution. The objective of this paper is to perform a thorough comparison of the different water surface

Preprint submitted to Remote Sensing of Environment

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author

*Email address:* filipe.aires@obspm.fr (Filipe Aires)

URL: https://vm-wordpress-lerma01.obspm.fr/faires/ (Filipe Aires)

estimates in order to identify the advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches and propose a strategy for future developments of high-resolution surface water databases. Results show that due to their very high spatial resolution (30 m) the Landsat-based datasets are well suited to retrieve open water surfaces, even at very small size. GIEMS-D3 has a better ability to detect water under vegetation and during the cloudy season, and it shows larger seasonal dynamics. However, its current version overestimates surface water extent on water-saturated soils, and due to its low original (i.e. before downscaling) spatial resolution, it is under-performing at detecting small water bodies. The permanent waters for G3WBM, GSWE, GIEMS-D3 and GLWD represent respectively: 2.76, 2.05, 3.28, and 3.04 million km<sup>2</sup>. The transitory waters shows larger discrepancies: 0.48, 3.72, 10.39 and 8.81 million km<sup>2</sup>.

Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) data (from ENVIronment SATellite (EN-VISAT), Sentinel and soon the Surface Water Ocean Topography (SWOT)) would be a good complementary information because they have a high nominal spatial resolution and are less sensitive to clouds than visible measurements. However, global SAR datasets are still not available due to difficulties in developing a retrieval scheme adequate at the global scale. In order to improve our estimates of global wetland extents at high resolution and over long-term records, three interim lines of action are proposed: (1) extend the temporal record of GIEMS-D3 to exploit the full time series of microwave observations (from 1978 to present), (2) develop an approach to fuse the GSWE and GIEMS-D3 datasets leveraging the strengths of both, and (3) prepare for the release of SAR global datasets. *Keywords:* Wetlands and Inundation, Remote sensing, Landsat, Passive microwaves

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

#### 1 1. Introduction

The distribution and dynamics of surface water, i.e. permanently and 2 temporarily inundated areas including lakes, rivers, and wetlands, are impor-3 tant because of their interaction with climate, ecology and human wellbeing. 4 For instance, nearly 30% of global methane emissions (Bousquet et al., 2006) 5 originate from wetland areas, risk management responds to inundation patterns (Winsemius et al., 2015), and food security and rice paddy cultivation 7 relies, in certain regions of the world, on surface waters. In return, surface 8 water ecosystems are affected by human activity, land use, hydrologic al-9 terations, and climate change. The complex feedback mechanisms between 10 surface water and climate are difficult to assess and can potentially exacer-11 bate the sensitivity and vulnerability of these regions to changes in precip-12 itation, evapotranspiration, and flow regimes (Gleick, 1989; Chahine, 1992) 13 putting lakes, rivers, and wetlands at risk of rapid deterioration in quantity 14 and quality. Among the many topics about wetlands and climate change, sea 15 level rise and carbon sequestration are major issues. But wetlands are also 16 threatened by land use change and invasive species. 17

Global distribution and dynamics of surface waters at high-spatial resolution (around 100 m) are still not available, in particular over densely vegetated areas, to satisfy all the needs of the large community of potential users including hydrologists, water and disaster managers, or climate scientists. Indeed, the global, long-term, frequent, and high-resolution characterisation of all surface water types is beyond the capabilities of current
satellite observations.

Visible satellite observations are a primary candidate for the detection of 25 surface waters from space. Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer 26 (MODIS) observations have been used to derive global products every two 27 days (http://oas.gsfc.nasa.gov/floodmap/) but visible/infrared observations 28 suffer from the presence of clouds (about 70% of Earth surface at any time) 29 (Wilson and Jetz, 2016) and vegetation. Despite the limitations from veg-30 etation canopy and cloud cover, this type of data is of great value to the 31 community to detect open water. Yamazaki et al. (2015) introduced the 32 Global 3 arc-second Water Body Map (G3WBM) at a pixel resolution of 3 33 arc-seconds (approximately 90 m at the equator) based on Landsat imagery. 34 This dataset exploits multi-temporal acquisitions in order to distinguish per-35 manent from temporal open water areas. However, no full dynamics of the 36 wetland map are provided. Other datasets have been built from Landsat 37 imagery: (Feng et al., 2014) is global for the year 2000, (Mueller et al., 2016) 38 focused on Australia, (Tulbure et al., 2016) created a three decade dataset 39 over a semi-arid region, and (Verpoorter et al., 2014) mapped an inventory 40 of global lakes. Pekel et al. (2016) recently produced a new Global Surface 41 Water Explorer (GSWE) dataset also from Landsat imagery but using the 42 full 32-year record, allowing for a better description of the trends of surface 43 waters and their occurrence. 44

<sup>45</sup> Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) data has the potential to retrieve surface <sup>46</sup> waters at high-spatial resolution ( $\simeq 10$  m) as well as capture sub-canopy inun-

dation (L-band) as demonstrated by Santoro et al. (2010) using ENVISAT-47 ASAR, or more recently using the Sentinel 1 mission (Pham-Duc et al., 48 2017). Although existing SAR retrievals from a number of sensors cover 49 a large extent of the globe, their use for mapping surface inundation has 50 been protracted due to the local calibration needed for accuracy. The past 51 or current availability of the data has not yet allowed for producing a full 52 global high-spatial resolution surface water dataset from SAR data, although 53 such initiatives have been suggested in the past, e.g. (Westerhoff et al., 2013). 54 There is clearly a need to invest more time in retrieval algorithms and po-55 tentially perform data fusion in order to obtain a global, long-term, reliable, 56 and high-resolution dataset of water extent from this type of observations. 57

The NASA/CNES Surface Water and Ocean Topography (SWOT) mis-58 sion, planned for launch in 2021, is specifically designed to provide high-59 spatial resolution ( $\simeq 10$  m) and good temporal sampling (22 days repeat) 60 of the extent (and altitude) of continental surface waters (Prigent et al., 61 2016; Biancamaria et al., 2016) thanks to an interferometric Ka-band radar 62 (Rodriguez, 2015). Although the SWOT data is expected to deliver a new 63 generation of global water surface extents at unprecedented quality and reso-64 lution, the availability of this product is still years in the future. Meanwhile, 65 alternative efforts should be pursued to provide the community with the best 66 possible information about the spatial and temporal variations of global sur-67 face water extents. Such efforts would also allow for the extension of the 68 SWOT temporal record backward in time, with existing past imagery; this 69 will be a crucial step in assembling multi-decadal measurements of surface 70 water variation. 71

A possible approach in this direction it to use the synergy from multiple 72 satellite observations. Following this idea, the Global Inundation Extent from 73 Multi-Satellites (GIEMS) database has been developed through a retrieval 74 scheme that combines satellite observations in the visible, near-infrared, and 75 passive/active microwaves (Prigent et al., 2007, 2012; Papa et al., 2010). 76 GIEMS provides a monthly-mean water surface extent at a low spatial resolu-77 tion  $(0.25^{\circ} \times 0.25^{\circ}$  equal-area grid) over a 15-year period (1993-2007). In or-78 der to obtain global inundation estimate at high resolution, downscaling tech-79 niques have been developed on GIEMS (Aires et al., 2013, 2014). In partic-80 ular, Fluet-Chouinard et al. (2015) exploited topographic and hydrographic 81 information derived from the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) 82 and trained on a global land cover map to produce a 15 arc-second ( $\sim 500 \text{ m}$ ) 83 resolution map of the minimum and maximum inundation extents at global 84 scale (GIEMS-D15) (http://www.estellus.fr/index.php?static13/giems-d15). 85 In (Aires et al., 2017), an evolution of this downscaling methodology was 86 proposed to obtain a global and dynamic inundation dataset GIEMS-D3, at 87 even higher spatial resolution of 3 arc-second ( $\sim 90$  m), over 15 years with a 88 monthly time step. 89

Given the variety of remote sensing approaches, a cross comparison of existing products is needed to explore differences and combined uses of the resulting data. The objective of this paper is to compare and contrast two Landsat-based products (G3WBM and GSWE) and one multi-satellite-based product (GIEMS-D3). Section 2 presents the databases used in this work. A global-scale comparison of the three inundation datasets is performed in section 3, and section 4 presents regional comparisons. To evaluate inherent <sup>97</sup> uncertainties, we contrast the differences among surface water databases with
tree and cloud cover data. The advantages and disadvantages of each type
of data are then investigated. Finally, section 5 summarises the conclusions
of this comparative study. We discuss ways forward to improve estimates
of global, high-spatial resolution extents and long-term dynamics of surface
waters of multiple types.

As the descriptions of original data sources are not always using identical 103 vocabulary, this paper explicitly defines the following terminology: The ex-104 pression "inundation" refers to all surfaces that are detected as water pixels 105 in the original datasets, including lakes, rivers, temporarily inundated land, 106 but also (by error or not) saturated soils. The expression "transient" is used 107 throughout this paper for non-permanent inundation, including temporal, 108 seasonal, intermittent, and ephemeral inundation, as well as spatio-temporal 109 transitions such as moving river meanders or newly constructed reservoirs. 110 The expression "wetland" is used only in descriptive terms without specific 111 definition and may include all types of inundated areas (such as lakes, reser-112 voirs, and rivers) but also wet soils or non-inundated areas such as peatlands. 113

#### 114 2. Datasets

#### 115 2.1. G3WBM

The Global 3 arc-second Water Body Map (G3WBM) uses an automated algorithm to process multi-temporal Landsat images from the Global Land Survey (GLS) database (Yamazaki et al., 2015). Over 33,000 scenes were used from four GLS snapshots at 5-year intervals between 1990 and 2010 in order to delineate a seamless water body map, without cloud and ice/snow gaps.

Permanent water bodies were distinguished from transitory water-covered 121 areas by calculating the frequency of water body existence from overlapping, 122 multi-temporal Landsat scenes. By analysing the frequency of water body 123 existence at 3 arc-second resolution, the G3WBM separates river channels 124 and floodplains (http://hydro.iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp/ yamadai/G3WBM/). De-125 spite distinguishing between permanent and transitory water surfaces, only 126 permanent waterbodies are believed to be comprehensively mapped, while 127 not all transitory waterbodies are captured by the four used used scenes (Ya-128 mazaki et al., 2015). The seven different G3WBM surface types are described 129 in Tab. 1 and classes 1-4 represent transitory types. 130

#### 131 2.2. GSWE

The Global Surface Water Occurrence (GSWE) dataset (Pekel et al., 132 2016) uses three million Landsat satellite images to quantify inundation over 133 32 years (from 1984 to 2015) at a 30 m spatial resolution. The GSWE dataset 134 is freely available at: https://global-surface-water.appspot.com/. Each Land-135 sat pixel has been classified as open water, land, or non-valid observation 136 using an expert system. Open water is defined as any feature of water larger 137 than  $30 \text{ m} \times 30 \text{ m}$  open to the sky, including fresh and saltwater. Validation 138 against Google Earth images (i.e. from satellite datasets covering mostly 139 the last three years from visible instruments such as Landsat) and labelling 140 from experts shows that the classifier produces less than 1% of false water 141 detections, and misses less than 5% of water. About 52% of the maximum 142 inundation extent (over the 32 years) is found above 44°N. In 2015, perma-143 nent bodies of water represented about 2.78 million  $\mathrm{km}^2$ , with 86% of that 144 area present throughout the 32-year period (Pekel et al., 2016). A rigorous 145

	G3WBM	GLWD
Class	(Yamazaki et al., 2015)	(Lehner and Döll, 2004)
1	Snow	Lake
2	Wet Soil, Wet Vegetation, Lava	Reservoir
3	Salt Marsh	River
4	Temporally Flooded Area	Freshwater Marsh, Floodplain
5	Permanent Water	Swamp Forest, Flooded Forest
6	Permanent Water (from SWBD)	Coastal Wetland
7	Ocean (external land/sea mask)	Pan, Brackish/Saline Wetland
8		Bog, Fen Mire (Peatland)
9		Intermittent Wetland/Lake
10		50-100% Wetland
11		25-50% Wetland
12		0-25% Wetland

Table 1: The seven surface classes of the G3WBM dataset, and the twelve classes of GLWD (classes 1-3 corresponds to open water, 4-12 to wetlands).

validation has been performed based on over 40,000 Landsat-derived control 146 points spanning all three Landsats operational life spans dating back to 1985. 147 When using visible observations, instantaneous estimates can be contam-148 inated by error, for instance due to the presence of clouds (only clear pixels 149 are used to compute the occurrence, but this cloud detection can be erro-150 neous). Other potential errors and issues need also to be covered, i.e. omis-151 sion errors, algorithmic issues, and permanent water that was not present at 152 all times during the 32-year period, such as newly built reservoirs or river 153 meanders that have moved. Therefore, a threshold in occurrence of inun-154 dation is needed in order to distinguish permanent from transitory pixels. 155 The GSWO (Global Surface Water Occurence) product provides the surface 156 open water occurrence "O(surface water)" over the 32-year Landsat record. 157 This occurrence was obtained using only cloud-free pixels. This clear-sky 158 sampling aliasing increases the importance of the dry seasons and decrease 159 that of the wet seasons. To alleviate this difficult, the occurrence in GSWE 160 was normalised by month of the year. Note that the sampling during the day 161 should still exclude boreal winter in the GSWO occurrence. In the following, 162 we will refer to GSWO for the occurence product of the GSWE dataset. 163

For the purpose of conducting baseline comparisons as conducted in this paper, we use:

166

• The threshold of O(surface water)  $\geq 90\%$  for permanent waters.

and O(surface water) < 90% to identify transitory waters over the full</li>
 32-year record in order to accommodate some uncertainties.

<sup>169</sup> This definition of permanency differs significantly from (Pekel et al., 2016)

who produced permanent water estimates only for shorter time periods (per-170 manent waters are defined at the yearly scale, not at the 32-year scale). 171 The 0.9 threshold appears as a good pragmatic compromise: With a too 172 low threshold, seasonal waters would be classified as permanent, and with 173 a too high threshold, erroneous classifications would suppress truly perma-174 nent pixels. Erroneous classifications can be related for instance to omission 175 errors, vegetation and algorithmic issues, and to include permanent water 176 that was not present at all times during the 32 year periods, such as newly 177 built reservoirs or river meanders that have moved. Note that by using a 178 90% threshold on the occurrence, if a dam is constructed for less time than 179 the 10% of the full record, it will not be a permanent water body but a 180 transitory. If we had chosen a 100% threshold, then even less such structures 181 would be kept as permanent waters. It should be noted however that the 182 selection of this threshold, which only represents our best guess in the ab-183 sence of conclusive and consistent evidence, will affect the results presented 184 in this study. However, the maximum water extent (permanent plus transi-185 tory) is independent of this threshold. Other threshold or no threshold could 186 be considered instead. 187

#### 188 2.3. GIEMS and GIEMS-D3 databases

To minimise limitations and uncertainties related to measurements by individual instruments, a multi-sensor technique has been developed to estimate surface water extent and dynamics at global scale (Prigent et al., 2007, 2012; Papa et al., 2010). The method exploits the complementary sensitivities of different satellite observations to surface characteristics (e.g., water, vegetation, soil). Passive microwave observations are particularly sensitive

to the presence of surface water, even under vegetation canopy. However, 195 additional observations have to be used to subtract the contribution of con-196 founding factors such as vegetation from the signal and to avoid confusion 197 with other surface types such as dry sand. The following satellite observa-198 tions were used to generate GIEMS: (1) passive microwaves from the Special 199 Sensor Microwave/Imager (SSM/I) measurements between 19 and 85 GHz; 200 (2) active microwave backscattering coefficients at 5.25 GHz from scatterom-201 eters; and (3) visible and near-infrared reflectances and the derived NDVI 202 (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index). The methodology is described in 203 details in (Prigent et al., 2001). The use of multiple satellite sources is a 204 true challenge, e.g. it is required to obtain a well calibrated dataset for each 205 individual source. But it was shown that the GIEMS approach is able to 206 benefit from the synergy of these satellite sources to obtain a general algo-207 rithm able to perform well in most environments. GIEMS data have been 208 used for modelling of surface water dynamics and biogeochemical fluxes and 200 have been thoroughly evaluated. Note that GIEMS estimates include all 210 surface waters such as rivers, floodplains or lakes indiscriminately. The in-211 undation is expressed as the fractional inundation within each  $773 \text{ km}^2$  pixel 212 of an equal-area grid with  $0.25^{\circ}$  resolution at the equator. Regional qual-213 ity assessments of the GIEMS database using SAR data indicate that the 214 approach captures realistically complex wetlands. However, it can underesti-215 mate small surface waters comprising less than 10% fractional coverage of a 216 grid cell ( $\leq 80 \text{ km}^2$ ) due to its coarse spatial resolution and it can also overes-217 timate large surface waters comprising more than 90% of fractional coverage 218 due to water-saturated soils (Prigent et al., 2012). GIEMS is available at 219

<sup>220</sup> (http://lerma.obspm.fr/spip.php?article91lang=en).

Downscaling methods have recently been developed to reduce the spatial 221 resolution of GIEMS estimates from 25 km to 500 m (15 arc-second, GIEMS-222 D15) (Fluet-Chouinard et al., 2015) (http://www.estellus.fr/index.php?static13/giems-223 d15) and 90 m (3 arc-second, GIEMS-D3) (Aires et al., 2017). The method-224 ology uses a floodability index which is predicted for each pixel based on 225 topography and hydrography information from the HydroSHEDS database 226 (Lehner et al., 2008). This floodability index at high-spatial resolution is 227 used to distribute the water fraction from coarse resolution into the high-228 resolution pixels. A smoothing procedure is applied during the downscaling 229 to reduce transition artefacts at the edges of the low-resolution boxes from 230 GIEMS. GIEMS-D3 has been assessed by analysing its spatial and tempo-231 ral variability, and evaluated by comparisons to other independent satellite 232 observations (Aires et al., 2017). Topographic information is useful in pre-233 dicting natural inundation where hydrology is controlled by elevation, but 234 is more limited in human-modified areas (e.g. artificial reservoirs or rice 235 paddies). The probability of surface water "P(surface water)" is defined in 236 GIEMS-D3 as the temporal recurrence (in percent per high-resolution pixel) 237 of observed water in the available monthly time series (1993-2007). 238

### 239 2.4. Auxiliary datasets

#### 240 2.4.1. GLWD

The Global Lakes and Wetlands Database (GLWD) represents a comprehensive dataset of global surface water area, including small and large lakes, reservoirs, rivers, and wetlands (Lehner and Döll, 2004). GLWD was generated through a compilation and assimilation of existing analog and digital maps and cartographic products, and due to the historic perspective of the majority of data included, it is assumed to represent maximum open water and wetland extents. In comparison to water and wetland extents from land cover maps, it is the most extensive water mask of its kind (Nakaegawa, 249 2012). The "level 3" dataset of GLWD that is used here provides a global 30 arc-second resolution grid describing twelve different surface water types (see Tab. 1). GLWD is static and offers little information on seasonality.

#### 252 2.4.2. Tree density

In order to assess the surface water retrieval from visible observations 253 when vegetation is present, the global percent tree cover map by (Hansen 254 et al., 2009) is used. The MODIS vegetation continuous fields algorithm 255 and a supervised regression algorithm were applied to estimate the percent 256 tree cover over 500 m pixels. Results show that MODIS data yield greater 257 spatial detail in characterising the tree cover compared to past efforts using 258 for instance AVHRR data. Furthermore, validation efforts have shown a 259 reasonable agreement between the MODIS-estimated and the observed tree 260 cover over validation sites. 261

#### 262 2.4.3. Cloud fraction

A cloud fraction dataset can be used over land to investigate where visible observations (from Landsat) can actually retrieve surface parameters or not. Cloud cover dynamics are captured over a large extent yet at fine spatial grain twice-daily by the MODIS satellite images. A near-global, fineresolution ( $\simeq 1$  km) monthly cloud frequency dataset is presented in (Wilson and Jetz, 2016) (http://www.earthenv.org/cloud), spanning a temporal <sup>269</sup> range over 15 years.

Note that the tree density and the cloud fraction datasets are derived from the same instrument, MODIS, but their processing are independent from each other.

#### 273 3. Global comparison

#### 274 3.1. Surface water extents and probabilities

Fig. 1 presents a comparison of the G3WBM and GSWE Landsat-derived datasets, along with the GIEMS-D3 multi-satellite estimate, at the global scale at 90 m spatial resolution. The three estimates share the major hydrological structures, with large surface water extents in Canada, Bangladesh, or Eastern Argentina.

The two Landsat-derived products provide similar results over the boreal 280 region with permanent surface water in large areas in Canada, over Scan-281 dinavia and in Siberia. The surface water occurrence (for GSWO) and sur-282 face water probability (GIEMS-D3) (as defined in the data section) in these 283 regions is generally lower with GIEMS-D3. The differences can be partly 284 related to the reference time periods to calculate the inundation statistics. 285 Landsat only provides information under daylight conditions. As explained in 286 the data section, the GSWO dataset provides statistics done at the monthly 287 level so each month has the same weight in the overall statistics, indepen-288 dent of the number of valid observations in each month. However, during 289 the boreal winter, no observation is available in the Landsat products due 290 to lack of daylight which does not allow for the calculation of inundation 291 occurrence. On the other hand, the GIEMS-D3 product is essentially based 292

on microwave observations that are available regardless of light conditions. The reference time period for the inundation probability includes the winter months when snow and ice cover the boreal region (this is not considered to be inundated in GIEMS-D3). As a consequence, the surface water probability is systematically lower with GIEMS-D3 than the GSWO occurrence in these regions.

Compared to the GIEMS-D3 estimates, the Landsat-derived water esti-290 mates are more uniformly spread, with small surface water detected in most 300 environments all over the globe. The GIEMS-D3 data is based on the low 301 spatial resolution GIEMS product which has known difficulties in detecting 302 water surfaces that cover less than 10% of the original  $0.25^{\circ} \times 0.25^{\circ}$  pix-303 els. The downscaling methodology partly compensates for these omissions 304 through fusion with GLWD data (Aires et al., 2017), yet in general these 305 omissions are propagated into the higher resolution version. 306

In contrast, GIEMS-D3 detects larger areas of surface water than the Landsat estimates in equatorial forests, e.g. around the Amazon or the Congo Rivers. The microwave observations used to derive the GIEMS product can partly penetrate through the dense canopy whereas the Landsat measurements are blocked by the vegetation.

In Australia and in South Africa, significant differences are observed between the similar Landsat products and GIEMS-D3. More inundation is detected in South Africa with Landsat than with GIEMS-D3, while in the north of the Western Territories in Australia the opposite prevails with larger inundation detected by GIEMS-D3. Significant differences are also observed between the G3WBM and the GSWO products around Lake Mackay. This is <sup>318</sup> likely related to the difference in the processing record for these two products

(32 years for GSWO and only four observations for G3WBM).

### 320 3.2. Permanent and transitory surface water

For further comparisons, Fig. 2 shows only the permanent water bodies 321 for G3WBM, GSWO (O(surface water) > 0.9), and GIEMS-D3 (P(surface 322 water) = 1), along with the difference between GSWO and GIEMS-D3. To 323 improve the visual interpretation, the fraction of permanent inundation is 324 aggregated into each  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  pixel. Furthermore, the same HydroSHEDS 325 land/sea mask has been applied to all datasets to avoid discrepancies along 326 the marine coastlines and to exclude the Caspian Sea from all calculations. 327 Overall, the three maps show generally good spatial agreement, with a total 328 permanent surface water extent of 2.76 million km<sup>2</sup> for G3WBM, 2.05 mil-329 lion km<sup>2</sup> for GSWO, and 3.28 million km<sup>2</sup> for GIEMS-D3 (Tab. 2). The 330 estimate of GSWO increases to  $2.78 \text{ million } \text{km}^2$  when using a single vear 331 (i.e. 2015) and an O-threshold of 100% instead of the 32-year record with 332 an O-threshold of 90%. All results are reasonably close to the reference data 333 of GLWD (3.04 million  $\text{km}^2$ ). It can be seen in the difference map (D) that 334 in the tropical regions, GIEMS has higher water surfaces (blue colour) prob-335 ably because it has the ability to better detect water through the presence 336 of clouds or vegetation. Conversely, in higher latitudes, GSWO tends to 337 show more water surfaces (red colour), probably due to spatial resolution 338 limitations in GIEMS-D3. These hypotheses will be further discussed in the 339 following. It should be noted, however, that the interpretation of permanent 340 water is not identical in the three datasets as GIEMS-D3 includes inundation 341 that is not visible from the sky (i.e. beneath vegetation). 342



Figure 1: (a) G3WBM classification into permanent and transitory inundation (0-1), (b) the GSWO inundation occurrence (0-100%), and (c) the GIEMS-D3 inundation probability (0-100%). The rendering of this figure is difficult at very high spatial resolution (90 m), the maximum water extents are respectively: 3.74, 5.77 and 13.67 million km<sup>2</sup> (Tab. 2).





		G3WBM	U	SWE	GIEMS-D3	GLWD
Reference		(Yamazaki et al., 2015)	(Pekel e	et al., 2016)	(Aires et al., 2017)	(Lehner and Döll, 2004)
Observations		Landsat	La	andsat	downscaled /	compiled maps
					multi-sensor	& charts
Period		1990, 1995, 2000, 2001	1984-2015	2015	1993-2007	Pre-1990s
Resolution		3 arc-sec	1	arc-sec	3 arc-sec	30 arc-sec
Detect		Open water bodies	Open w	ater bodies	All surface	Waterbodies &
					inundation	natural wetlands
Product(s)		Surface type	Occurence, v	water occurrence	Inundation probability,	Surface type
		(see Tab. 1)	change inten	isity, seasonality,	15-years time record of	(see Tab. 1)
			annual wa	ter recurrence,	monthly binary	
			water t	transitions,	inundation state	
			maximum	water extent		
Validation		Visual quality control	40,000 La	indsat control	Comparison to other inst.	Against
		Comparison to National	points datin	ng back to 1985	(SAR, MODIS, Landsat)	documented
		Hydrography Dataset	for the	3 Landsats	& other products (River	databases
					height, river discharge)	
Permanent	Open-water	2.76	2.05	2.78	3.28	3.04
	Inundation					
	Open-water	0.48	3.72	0.81		
Transitory	Natural wetlands				10.39	8.81
	Inundation (w. rice)					
Total		3.24	5.77		13.67	11.85

waters) and for 2015 only (using O = 100%). Permanent water of GLWD is derived from classes 1-3 only (see Tab. 1). Some Table 2: Estimates of permanent and transitory water extents (in million km<sup>2</sup>) according to the three investigated datasets, and GLWD for reference. For GSWE, results are provided for the full 32-year record (using O > 90% as threshold for permanent numbers are different from the original papers due to inland-water/ocean classification or because of the effects of the threshold selected here. Areas

Fig. 3 presents the transitory water bodies: classes 1-4 from G3WBM, 343 O(surface water)<0.9 for GSWO, and P(surface water)<1 for GIEMS-D3. 344 Here, much larger differences can be observed between the three products. 345 The total transitory surface water is  $0.48 \text{ million } \text{km}^2$  for G3WBM, 3.72 mil-346 lion km<sup>2</sup> for GSWO, and 10.39 million km<sup>2</sup> for GIEMS-D3, compared to 347  $8.81 \text{ million } \text{km}^2$  for GLWD (Tab. 2). Despite the common use of Landsat 348 imagery, G3WBM detects much less transitory surface water than GSWO, 349 which can be attributed both to differences in the observation period and 350 the detection algorithms. The more extensive temporal coverage of GSWO 351 is more likely to capture seasonal variations than the fewer composite snap-352 shots used for G3WBM. 353

Disagreements between GSWO and GIEMS-D3 transitory water bodies 354 have different origins, depending on the environment. First, all over the 355 globe, small transitory water bodies are detected by GSWO and are likely 356 missed by GIEMS-D3 due to the low detection limit of the original GIEMS 357 data. Second, in Asia, GSWO detects much less transitory water surfaces 358 than GIEMS-D3. Local analyses in the Ganges-Brahmaputra region (Papa 350 et al., 2015) or in the Mekong Delta (see estimates from Sakamoto et al. 360 (2007)) show that GIEMS tends to over-estimate the surface water in areas 361 with saturated soils and irrigated rice culture. However, in these regions, vis-362 ible and near-infrared observations can also have difficulties in detecting and 363 correctly classifying mixed surfaces with some vegetation coverage (Sakamoto 364 et al., 2007; Crétaux et al., 2016). Hence in the GSWO dataset, some inun-365 dated pixels that are partly covered by vegetation may not be detected. In 366 addition, these regions are under very persistent cloud cover, especially dur-367





ing the wet season. Landsat observations cannot be used efficiently in these 368 conditions to detect the presence of water, limiting drastically the possible 369 detection of transitory surface water. Third, around extensive hydrological 370 land-water systems (e.g., the Mississippi, Orinoco or Amazon Rivers and 371 floodplains, or the Pantanal wetlands), the GSWO transitory water bodies 372 occupy less area than in GIEMS-D3. With Landsat observations hampered 373 by vegetation and clouds, an underestimation of the transitory water bodies 374 can be expected in particular for densely vegetated areas prone to large cloud 375 cover. Finally, at high latitudes, differences between GSWO and GIEMS-D3 376 likely result from the combination of two factors: the lack of spatial reso-377 lution in the original GIEMS data to detect very small lake fractions and 378 the difference in the reference period to calculate the temporal statistics of 379 surface water (with or without the boreal winter). 380

The longitudinal and latitudinal distribution of surface water extents are 381 illustrated in Fig. 4 for permanent and transitory surface waters of all three 382 estimates (G3WBM, GSWO, and GIEMS-D3). The agreement of the per-383 manent surface water extents is reasonable, with slightly higher values for 384 GSWO in the tropical regions, especially in South America. The slight under-385 estimation around the equator of Landsat estimates with respect to GIEMS-386 D3 is expected to be related to the rain forest or clouds that block the visible 387 and near infrared observations. Transitory water bodies, on the other hand, 388 show much weaker agreement among sources, with substantially more transi-389 tory water surfaces from GIEMS-D3 in comparison to G3WBM and GSWO, 390 especially over higher latitudes in North America and Eurasia. These spa-391 tial differences can also be observed in Figs. 2(D) and 3(D). More detailed 392

<sup>393</sup> explanations on these differences will be given in the following sections.

Fig. 5 presents histograms of the probability distribution function for per-394 manent and transitory surface water extents over  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  pixels, at differ-395 ent latitudinal bands. G3WBM and GSWO estimates reveal strong agree-396 ment for permanent water bodies, regardless of the environment. GIEMS-D3 397 shows slightly less pixels with a smaller percentage of permanent water cover-398 age (below 5%), across all latitudinal sections, yet slightly more with a higher 399 percentage (above 10%). The increase in the probability for the surface wa-400 ter percentage close to 100% for all products is due to water bodies (mostly 401 lakes) larger than the  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  grid used for the calculation. For the tran-402 sitory water surfaces, the pattern of under-detected small water fractions 403 and exceeding large water fractions by GIEMS-D3 compared to the other 404 products is more prominent. 405

A  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  pixel-to-pixel comparison of the GSWO and GIEMS-D3 406 datasets (from Fig.s 2 and 3) is provided in Fig. 6. The first row represents 407 the GSWO/GIEMS-D3 confusion matrices for permanent (left) and tran-408 sitory (right) water extents (in percentage between 0 and 1). The colorbar 409 represents the logarithm of the number of  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  samples in each  $0.1 \times 0.1$ 410 bin of the plot. We observe that for permanent water surfaces, this matrix is 411 quite diagonal. This means that there is no notable difference between the 412 two datasets, except for the differences that can result from random errors 413 in both datasets. For the transitory pixels, GSWO has a reduced range of 414 water extent percentages (x-axis), whereas GIEMS-D3 shows a much broader 415 range and increasing frequencies of high water surface percentages. This can 416 be explained by the fact that vegetated fractions in the  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  pixels can 417



Figure 4: Averaged longitudinal (A and B) and latitudinal (C and D) surface water extents (in  $10^4 \text{ km}^2 \text{ per } 1^\circ \text{ bin}$ ), for G3WBM, GSWO, and GIEMS-D3 estimates. Distributions are plotted for permanent and transitory surface water extents, and for their sum.



Figure 5: Histograms of the permanent (top row) and transitory (bottom row) surface water percentage over  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  pixels, for GIEMS-D3 (red), G3WBM (blue), and GSWO (green). From left to right: for  $-90^{\circ}/-45^{\circ}$ ,  $-45^{\circ}/-15^{\circ}$ ,  $-15^{\circ}/+15^{\circ}$ ,  $+15^{\circ}/+45^{\circ}$ , and  $+45^{\circ}/+90^{\circ}$  latitudinal bands. The number of  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  pixels for each dataset is also indicated.



Figure 6: Pixel-to-pixel  $(0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ})$  comparison of the GSWO and GIEMS-D3 datasets, for permanent (left) and transitory (right) surface waters. First row: GSWO/GIEMS-D3 confusion matrices for permanent (left) and transitory (right) water extents (in percentage between 0 and 1). The colorbar represents the logarithm of the number of  $0.1^{\circ} \times 0.1^{\circ}$  samples in each  $0.1 \times 0.1$  bin of the plot. Second row: corresponding histogram of differences between the GSWO and GIEMS-D3 water extent estimates (percentages are expressed with the 0-1 range.

be detected in GIEMS-D3, but not in GSWO. This will be examined in more 418 detail in the following sections. The lower row represents the corresponding 419 histograms of differences between the GSWO and GIEMS-D3 water extent 420 estimates. For the permanent waters, this distribution is centred around zero, 421 and the distribution is symmetric meaning that no dataset is over-estimating 422 the water extent compared to the other. For the transitory water extents, the 423 distribution is skewed with a long tail to the left meaning that GIEMS-D3 424 has more pixels with high transitory water extents. 425

#### 426 4. Regional evaluation

In order to investigate the advantages and disadvantages of the various inundation datasets, a regional analysis is performed in this section over several contrasted environments.

#### 430 4.1. The Amazon River in a tropical forest environment

Fig. 7 presents a comparison between Landsat estimates from G3WBM 431 and GSWO, the GIEMS-D3 probabilities, and the GLWD classification, over 432 the Amazon Basin. Tree cover density is also shown to support interpre-433 tation. Overall, this figure supports the general findings of the global-scale 434 comparison (Fig. 1). The spatial structure of the inundation pattern is quite 435 similar for all three satellite datasets and they exhibit very realistic distri-436 butions of major rivers and tributaries (Amazon, Solimoes, Negro, Tapajos, 437 Tocantins) as well as major associated inundated areas and wetlands. This 438 finding aligns with several previous studies where GIEMS was intensively 430 evaluated over the Amazon Basin (Papa et al., 2008, 2013; Frappart et al., 440

<sup>441</sup> 2012; Getirana et al., 2012). Nevertheless, on a finer spatial scale, clear dif-<sup>442</sup> ferences can be observed in the morphological patterns, especially over the <sup>443</sup> flooded zones of the Rio Negro Basin (2°S-2°N; 64°W-61°W), the Madeira <sup>444</sup> Basin (15°S-7°S; 69°W-62°W), or the floodplains adjacent to the main chan-<sup>445</sup> nel of the Amazon River. These regions are characterised by extensive sa-<sup>446</sup> vanna or forest floodplains with dense vegetation canopies that are inundated <sup>447</sup> for four to six months each year (Fig. 7e).

To better illustrate the correlation between Landsat retrieval and vegeta-448 tion, Fig. 8 compares the GSWO and GIEMS-D3 inundation probabilities for 449 ten tree density ranges (0-10% to 90-100%), over a  $5^{\circ} \times 5^{\circ}$  cell in the Amazon 450 region ( $5^{\circ}S-0^{\circ}S$ ;  $70^{\circ}W-65^{\circ}W$ ). The fraction of pixels classified as inundated 451 is estimated for each tree density bin. It can be seen in Fig. 7e that the 452 tree density fall generally within the 90-100% or the 0-10% bins; however 453 enough points (several thousand) are present in each intermediate tree den-454 sity bin so that the inundation probabilities are robust and reliable, which 455 is also corroborated by the fact that the lines in Fig 8 are smooth rather 456 than randomly spiking through the transition zone. The sum of permanent 457 and transitory inundation probability for low vegetation (0-10% bin) is high 458 for both GIEMS-D3 and GSWO datasets, at 97% and 89%, respectively. 459 However, the distribution of permanent and transitory inundation is quite 460 different: 82% permanent and 15% transitory for GIEMS-D3, and 40% per-461 manent and 49% transitory for GSWO. For the GSWO dataset, permanently 462 inundated pixels can be found only in the 0-10% bin while transitory pixels 463 decrease linearly from 50% to 0% with increasing tree cover. This behaviour 464 may, at least in part, be influenced by the thicker forest density in upland 465



30 Figure 7: Comparison of the different surface water dataset over the Amazon: G3WBM (A), GSWO (B), GIEMS-D3 (C), GLWD (D), tree density from MODIS for interpretation (E), and indication of the two commented basins and four rivers (F). See Tab. 1 for the definition of the G3WBM and GLWD classes.

<sup>466</sup> areas compounded with the limitations of Landsat detection.

For GIEMS-D3, the transitory inundation probability in tree density bins
is fairly constant from 10 to 90%, then experiences a steep decline in the 90100% bin. A peak occurs at 80-90% which might be related to the overestimation of transitory inundation for water-saturated soils. With GIEMS-D3,
still 13% of transitory inundation is observed for the highest tree density bin,
confirming that flooding can be detected by GIEMS-D3 even under densely
vegetated areas.



Figure 8: Probability of inundation for ten tree density ranges (0-10% to 90-100%), over a  $5^{\circ} \times 5^{\circ}$  cell in the Amazon region ( $5^{\circ}$ S-0°S; 70°W-65°W). The probability of being inundated (permanently in continuous lines, or transitory in dashed lines) is estimated for each tree density bin, for GIEMS-D3 (blue) and GSWO (green).

473

#### 474 4.2. Small water bodies at higher latitudes

Fig. 9 illustrates the surface water estimates of the G3WBM, GSWO, 475 GIEMS-D3, and GLWD datasets over a high-latitude area (56°N-60°N; 105W°-476 100°W) in Canada and supports that the larger hydrological features are very 477 similar from one dataset to another. The reference data of GLWD shows an 478 extensive homogeneous area of a wetland complex (classified as "25-50% wet-470 land"), likely representing a generalised peatland region. This "biome class" 480 is not replicated in the other datasets that convey a water classification in-481 formation. Landsat estimates (G3WBM and GSWO) show no transitory 482 surface waters but only permanent ones. This pattern is likely related to 483 an inundation definition issue or a time sampling problem causing confusion 484 with snow/ice cover, as inundation variation occurs during snowmelt periods 485 at these latitudes. Another possible explanation is also the presence of veg-486 etation since Landsat cannot sense water beneath vegetation. On the other 487 hand, GIEMS-D3 shows a gradient of inundation probability, from the center 488 of the hydrological objects to the borders influenced likely by some confusion 480 with snow/ice cover and the limited ability to capture small lake features in 490 the landscape. The problem may be amplified by the downscaling scheme 491 relying on global-scale topographic and hydrographic information that is too 492 uncertain to adequately represent small variations in elevation within flat 493 regions. This regional case study over the northern latitudes highlights the 494 sampling issues in Landsat, and the difficulty for GIEMS-D3 to retrieve small 495 water bodies. 496



Figure 9: Inundation estimates from G3WBM (a), GSWO (b), GIEMS-D3 (c) and GLWD (d), over a 5  $^{\circ}\times$  5 $^{\circ}$  cell in Canada. See Tab. 1 for the definition of the G3WBM and GLWD classes.

#### 497 4.3. The Ganges-Brahmaputra region and related cloud issues

Characterising the distribution and variability of surface freshwater at 498 high resolution is critical for the Indian sub-continent and surrounding areas 499 where the availability of water resources is highly influenced by anthropogenic 500 pressure. Fig. 10 compares, over the Ganges-Brahmaputra River system 501 and the Bengal Delta, the various datasets. To support the interpretations, 502 Fig. 10 also shows tree density (E), the mean climatological cloud fraction 503 from MODIS in August over the region (F), the seasonality of the cloud cover 504 (G), and the number of months in which water is present during 2014 from 505 GSWO (H). 506

For reference, the GLWD map coarsely depicts three larger homogeneous 507 wetland areas classified as freshwater marsh and floodplains (C4), coastal 508 wetlands (C6), and 0-25% wetlands (C12). The three satellite-derived prod-509 ucts agree in their representation of the permanent major rivers (Ganges-510 Brahmaputra-Meghna River systems) and their large tributaries, as well as 511 some of the associated large inundated areas or wetlands of the Meghna River 512 and the Bengal Delta. However, this region is characterised by the presence 513 of complex areas with extensive transitory and seasonal flooding, which are 514 better captured by the more complete temporal coverage of GSWO com-515 pared to G3WBM. For instance, the flooding region along the confluence 516 of the Ganges and the Kosi River in India as well as the floodplain of the 517 Meghna River are captured in GSWO, yet they are not visible in G3WBM. 518 The overall low coverage of surface water in both Landsat estimates is in high 519 contrast to GIEMS-D3 estimates, which are characterised by extensive and 520 in some cases overestimated flooded areas. The issue of overestimation in 521

the original GIEMS data over the Indian subcontinent has been discussed in 522 several publications (Papa et al., 2006, 2008, 2015; Salameh et al., 2017) and 523 while GIEMS is broadly able to capture the distributions and variations of 524 surface freshwater in the Ganges-Brahmaputra Basin, some analysis suggests 525 that the method encounters difficulties in accurately discriminating between 526 very saturated/moist soil and standing open water which can lead to poten-527 tial overestimations of actual surface water extents, especially for saturated 528 soil in pixels with high flood coverage such as the delta region (Papa et al., 529 2010). 530

Unlike in the Amazon Basin, low surface water detection in GSWO and 531 G3WBM over the Ganges-Brahmaputra region are not associated with dense 532 tree cover, see Fig. 10(E). On the other hand, Fig. 10(F) reveals that in 533 August the entire region is covered by clouds, in particular the areas around 534 the lower Ganges-Brahmaputra and delta which are covered by clouds for 535 90% of the month. August is also the month when excessive rainfall caused 536 by the South-West Indian monsoon produces maximum river discharge in the 537 Ganges-Brahmaputra system (Papa et al., 2012) along with associated large 538 flooding in the basin and in the lower delta. The persistent presence of cloud 539 cover during the monsoon season from May to September, see Fig. 10(G), 540 suggests that GSWO and G3WBM might encounter difficulties to properly 541 retrieve the maximum extent of inundation and seasonal surface water bodies 542 during their peak season. This might explain why GSWO detects most of 543 the surface water in April-May or October-December as shown in Fig. 10(G). 544 545



Figure 10: Comparison of surface water datasets for the Ganges-Brahmaputra region: G3WBM (A), GSWO (B), GIEMS-D3 (C), and GLWD (D). Tree density from MODIS (E), cloud fraction in August (F), seasonal cloud fraction (G) and GSWO season duration (in months) (H) are also represented for interpretation purposes. See Tab. 1 for the definition of G3WBM and GLWD classes.

#### 5. Conclusion and perspectives 546

#### 5.1. Conclusion 547

570

A comparison of Landsat-based (G3WBM and GSWO) and multi-satellite 548 (GIEMS-D3) datasets was conducted at global and regional scales to iden-549 tify advantages and disadvantages in terms of detecting water surface areas 550 for both types of approaches. Overall, good agreement in permanent water 551 bodies was found for all datasets. Due to differences in observation methods, 552 discrepancies are apparent in particular for transitory (i.e. not permanently 553 inundated) zones. Landsat-based datasets have a very high nominal spatial 554 resolution and can detect even small water bodies at high accuracy, such as 555 those ubiquitous in northern latitudes. However, Landsat observations are 556 affected by cloud cover, snow/ice and vegetation. As a result, Landsat prod-557 ucts are most apt at detecting open water bodies and variation within them, 558 but provide incomplete representation of seasonal wetlands or inundation 550 areas where the spectral signature is confounded by vegetation. 560

The multiple sensors behind GIEMS-D3 can penetrate vegetation and 561 clouds and are thus capable of retrieving non-open water wetland types and 562 of detecting temporal dynamics even if seasonal cloud cover is prevalent dur-563 ing the periods of the year when inundation occurs. Current implementations 564 of the GIEMS-D3 downscaling method, however, have used topographic in-565 formation which does not provide spatial accuracy comparable to direct ob-566 servations from Landsat sensors. Furthermore, the current version of GIEMS 567 probably over-estimates inundation over water-saturated soils, and due to its 568 low nominal spatial resolution, it is not able to retrieve small water bodies. 560 SAR data (from ENVISAT, Sentinel and soon SWOT) would be a good

37

<sup>571</sup> supplement because they warrant high-spatial resolution and are less sensi-<sup>572</sup> tive to clouds than the visible observations. However, long-term and global <sup>573</sup> mapping of surface waters has remained challenging due to localised param-<sup>574</sup> eterisation necessary for obtaining locally accurate maps. Regardless, SAR <sup>575</sup> remains among the most promising approaches for global baseline mapping of <sup>576</sup> inundation in vegetated areas, even if it cannot provide a long-term historic <sup>577</sup> time record such as available from GIEMS or Landsat.

In summary, the data sources compared possess complimentary strengths which could be leveraged through assimilation and combination. The extensive archive of Landsat imagery provides reliable estimates of open water bodies and variation, while downscaled GIEMS maps such as GIEMS-D3 provide a more complete, if less locally accurate, extent of inundation under canopy and cloud cover.

#### 584 5.2. Perspectives

In order to obtain the best estimate of global wetland extents at high spatial resolution and with a long-term record, several ways forward should be investigated which are listed in the following.

588

Improvement of GIEMS and GIEMS-D3 - It was shown that GIEMS and GIEMS-D3 have some good complementary information to Landsat observations. However, GIEMS and GIEMS-D3 also need to be further enhanced. Three main ways are suggested to improve the original GIEMS dataset: (1) The retrieval algorithm could be corrected to reduce the over-estimation of inundated areas over saturated soils. (2) The temporal resolution could be increased, from the monthly to a 10-day scale. (3) Most importantly, the time

record of GIEMS (currently 1993-2007) could be extended on both ends. The 596 time period covered by GIEMS is limited by auxiliary information (e.g. tem-597 porally coherent surface temperatures, cloud flags) required for the GIEMS 598 retrievals, whereas the microwave observations are available for a longer pe-599 riod (1972-present). This information was obtained form the ISCCP (In-600 ternational Satellite Cloud Climatology Project) (Rossow and Schiffer, 1999). 601 Alternative ways could be investigated to perform the retrieval without these 602 auxiliary information, which would allow for building a GIEMS dataset from 603 1978 to present (about 40 years). 604

GIEMS-D3 could also be improved in several ways, for instance by using 605 a better downscaling scheme: (1) The floodability index used in the down-606 scaling could be trained on Landsat data instead of GLWD. (2) A floodability 607 index could be developed with regional tuning adapted to different wetland 608 types (currently, the same model is used for arid, tropical, temperate or po-609 lar areas) (Aires et al., 2017). (3) Other Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) 610 could be used instead of, or in combination with, SRTM/HydroSHEDS. For 611 instance, the newer version of SRTM at 30 m resolution could be tested. 612 New DEMs (Yamazaki et al., 2017) could also correct some artefacts such as 613 vegetation noise or tree height contamination (e.g., (Simard et al., 2011)). 614 615

<sup>616</sup> Data fusion of several sources of information - Since both Landsat-based <sup>617</sup> data and GIEMS-D3 carry complementary information, it would be valuable <sup>618</sup> to combine them to obtain a better inundation product. There are several <sup>619</sup> avenues to achieve this: (1) The permanent water body area from Landsat <sup>620</sup> could be used to correct the minimum values of GIEMS-D3 which currently

tend to be underestimated due to the limited retrieval capability of GIEMS 621 in areas of low water fractions. (2) The Landsat occurrence could also replace 622 the topography-based floodability index that is used to perform the downscal-623 ing of GIEMS-D3. In this way, an updated version of GIEMS-D3 would be 624 more compatible to Landsat products because it would follow similar spatial 625 patterns. The difficulty with of this approach is that the maximum GIEMS 626 inundation estimate is higher than that from Landsat, hence a Landsat-based 627 probability map is not covering the required extent. This shortcoming could 628 be solved by fusing the Landsat-based and topography-based probability in-629 dices. 630

Aside from water and inundation masks, categorising surface water types could benefit from developments of databases specific to discriminated waterbody types. For instance, lakes and reservoirs (HydroLAKES) (Messager et al., 2016) or the Global River Widths from Landsat (GRWL) (Allen and Pavelsky, 2015) could be used to improve downscaling of GIEMS or for posthoc classification efforts.

637

Combination with SAR data - Although global SAR coverage may eventually 638 provide the most comprehensive estimates of surface waters on its own, steps 639 improving global SAR retrieval would benefit from the use of GIEMS or 640 Landsat datasets. For instance, the GIEMS/Landsat estimates could help 641 in the development of a global SAR retrieval algorithm by serving either as 642 an a priori mask or as a first guess. GIEMS/Landsat combination would 643 also be a good tool to select the sites of validation campaigns for the SWOT 644 mission that will be launched in 2021 (Rodriguez, 2015; Prigent et al., 2016). 645

<sup>646</sup> Finally, it could help in assessing the sensitivity of hydrological models to
<sup>647</sup> this kind of high resolution data (e.g. assimilation experiments to estimate
<sup>648</sup> river discharges), feed the SWOT simulator, or measure signal-to-noise ratio
<sup>649</sup> constraints.

Arguably the most important reason for a continued improvement of sur-650 face water datasets based on Landsat or multi-sensor products like GIEMS 651 is that they are our most promising tools to preserve the best possible in-652 undation record of the past. Once reliable global SAR estimates become 653 available (from ENVISAT, Sentinel-1 or SWOT), they can be combined with 654 historic GIEMS/Landsat estimates to construct an instantaneous record of 655 inundation areas back to 1978, which then will be carried into the future by 656 the new and advanced SAR measurements. 657

#### 658 6. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank NASA for their support at Columbia Uni-659 versity for the project entitled "Downscaling of flooded fraction derived from 660 low-resolution microwave measurements" (Contract number NNH13CH27C) 661 lead by John Galantowicz at Atmospheric and Environmental Research (AER, 662 Inc.). We would also like to thank the French spatial agency CNES ("Centre 663 National d'Etudes Spatiales"), and in particular Selma Cherchali for funding 664 in 2012/2013 a study related to this work (Aires et al., 2013, 2014), and 665 Nicolas Picot for funding a "Research and Technology" project on the space 666 interpolation of wetland maps in the framework of the SWOT mission. We 667 would like to thank the European Union for funding the Earth2Obs project 668 that allowed us to perform part of the evaluation of the GIEMS-D3 prod-660

uct (Aires et al., 2017). Images from the Global Surface Water Occurrence
(Landsat) are courtesy of the European Commission Joint Research Centre,
and we would like to thank Jean-François Pekel and colleagues for making
them available.

#### 674 References

Aires, F., Miolane, L., Prigent, C., Pham, B., Fluet-Chouinard, E., Lehner,
B., Papa, F., 2017. A Global Dynamic Long-Term Inundation Extent Dataset at High Spatial Resolution Derived through Downscaling
of Satellite Observations. Journal of Hydrometeorology 18, 1305–1325.
URL: http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JHM-D-16-0155.1,
doi:10.1175/JHM-D-16-0155.1.

Aires, F., Papa, F., Prigent, C., 2013. A Long-Term, High-Resolution
Wetland Dataset over the Amazon Basin, Downscaled from a Multiwavelength Retrieval Using SAR Data. Journal of Hydrometeorology 14,
594–607. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_
query?bibcode=2013JHyMe..14..594A&link\_type=EJOURNAL,

doi:10.1175/JHM-D-12-093.1.

Aires, F., Papa, F., Prigent, C., Crétaux, J.F., Bergé-Nguyen, M., 2014.
Characterization and Space-Time Downscaling of the Inundation Extent
over the Inner Niger Delta Using GIEMS and MODIS Data. Journal of
Hydrometeorology 15, 171–192. URL: http://journals.ametsoc.org/
doi/abs/10.1175/JHM-D-13-032.1, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-13-032.1.

Allen, G.H., Pavelsky, T.M., 2015. Patterns of river width and sur face area revealed by the satellite-derived North American River Width
 data set. Geophysical Research Letters 42, 395–402. URL: http://
 onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/2014GL062764/full, doi:10.
 1002/2014GL062764.

Biancamaria, S., Lettenmaier, D.P., Pavelsky, T.M., 2016. The SWOT Mission and Its Capabilities for Land Hydrology. Surveys in Geophysics 37, 307–337. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_
 query?bibcode=2016SGeo...37..307B&link\_type=EJOURNAL,

<sup>701</sup> doi:10.1007/s10712-015-9346-y.

Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Miller, J.B., Dlugokencky, E.J., Hauglustaine, D.A.,
Prigent, C., Van der Werf, G.R., Peylin, P., Brunke, E.G., Carouge, C.,
Langenfelds, R.L., Lathière, J., Papa, F., Ramonet, M., Schmidt, M.,
Steele, L.P., Tyler, S.C., White, J., 2006. Contribution of anthropogenic
and natural sources to atmospheric methane variability. Nature 443, 439–
443. URL: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature05132,
doi:10.1038/nature05132.

<sup>709</sup> Chahine, M.T., 1992. The hydrological cycle and its influence on cli<sup>710</sup> mate. Nature 359, 373-380. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/
<sup>711</sup> cgi-bin/nph-data\_query?bibcode=1992Natur.359..373C&link\_type=
<sup>712</sup> EJOURNAL, doi:10.1038/359373a0.

<sup>713</sup> Crétaux, J.F., Abarca-del Río, R., Berge-Nguyen, M., Arsen, A.,
<sup>714</sup> Drolon, V., Clos, G., Maisongrande, P., 2016. Lake Volume Moni<sup>715</sup> toring from Space. Surveys in Geophysics 37, 269–305. URL: http:

## //adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_query?bibcode=2016SGeo. ...37...269C&link\_type=EJOURNAL, doi:10.1007/s10712-016-9362-6.

Feng, M., Sexton, J.O., Channan, S., Townshend, J.R., 2014. A global,
high-resolution (30-m) inland water body dataset for 2000: first results
of a topographic-spectral classification algorithm. International Journal
of Digital Earth 9, 113–133. URL: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/
full/10.1080/17538947.2015.1026420, doi:10.1080/17538947.2015.
1026420.

Fluet-Chouinard, E., Lehner, B., Rebelo, L.M., Papa, F., Hamilton, S.K.,
2015. Development of a global inundation map at high spatial resolution
from topographic downscaling of coarse-scale remote sensing data. Remote Sensing of Environment 158, 348–361. URL: http://linkinghub.
elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0034425714004258, doi:10.1016/j.rse.
2014.10.015.

Frappart, F., Papa, F., da Silva, J.S., Ramillien, G., Prigent, C.,
Seyler, F., Calmant, S., 2012. Surface freshwater storage and dynamics in the Amazon basin during the 2005 exceptional drought. Environ. Res. Lett. 7. URL: http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/7/i=4/
a=044010?key=crossref.366806a20b43202797338f61d0a23969, doi:10.
1088/1748-9326/7/4/044010.

Getirana, A.C.V., Boone, A., Yamazaki, D., Decharme, B., Papa, F.,
Mognard, N., 2012. The Hydrological Modeling and Analysis Platform
(HyMAP): Evaluation in the Amazon Basin. Journal of Hydrometeorology
13, 1641–1665. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_

query?bibcode=2012JHyMe..13.1641G&link\_type=EJOURNAL,

<sup>741</sup> doi:10.1175/JHM-D-12-021.1.

Gleick, P.H., 1989. Climate change, hydrology, and water resources. Reviews of Geophysics 27, 329–344. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/
 RG027i003p00329, doi:10.1029/RG027i003p00329.

Hansen, M.C., DeFries, R.S., Townshend, J.R.G., Carroll, M., Dim-745 iceli, C., Sohlberg, R.A., Hansen, M.C., DeFries, R.S., Town-746 shend, J.R.G., Carroll, M., Dimiceli, C., Sohlberg, R.A., 2009.747 Global Percent Tree Cover at a Spatial Resolution of 500 Meters: 748 First Results of the MODIS Vegetation Continuous Fields Algo-749 URL: http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/ rithm 7, 1–15. 750 10.1175/1087-3562(2003)007%3C0001%3AGPTCAA%3E2.0.C0%3B2, 751

<sup>752</sup> doi:10.1175/1087-3562(2003)007<0001:GPTCAA>2.0.CO;2.

Lehner, B., Döll, P., 2004. Development and validation of a global database of lakes, reservoirs and wetlands. Journal of Hydrology 296,
1-22. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_query?
bibcode=2004JHyd..296....1L&link\_type=EJOURNAL, doi:10.1016/j.
jhydrol.2004.03.028.

Lehner, B., Verdin, K., Jarvis, A., 2008. New global hydrography derived
from spaceborne elevation data. Eos, Transactions American Geophysical
Union 89, 93–94. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/eost2008E010,
doi:10.1029/eost2008E010.

762 Messager, M.L., Lehner, B., Grill, G., Nedeva, I., Schmitt, O.,

2016. Estimating the volume and age of water stored in global
lakes using a geo-statistical approach. Nature Communications 7,
13603. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_
query?bibcode=2016NatCo...713603M&link\_type=EJOURNAL,

<sup>767</sup> doi:10.1038/ncomms13603.

Mueller, N., Lewis, A., Roberts, D., Ring, S., Melrose, R., Sixsmith,
J., Lymburner, L., McIntyre, A., Tan, P., Curnow, S., Ip, A., 2016.
Water observations from space: Mapping surface water from 25years
of Landsat imagery across Australia. Remote Sensing of Environment
174, 341–352. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.11.003,
doi:10.1016/j.rse.2015.11.003.

Nakaegawa, T., 2012. Comparison of Water-Related Land Cover Types in
Six 1-km Global Land Cover Datasets. Journal of Hydrometeorology 13,
649–664. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_
query?bibcode=2012JHyMe..13..649N&link\_type=EJOURNAL,

<sup>778</sup> doi:10.1175/JHM-D-10-05036.1.

Papa, F., Bala, S.K., Pandey, R.K., Durand, F., Gopalakrishna, 779 V.V., Rahman, A., Rossow, W.B., 2012.Ganga-Brahmaputra 780 river discharge from Jason-2 radar altimetry: An update to the 781 long-term satellite-derived estimates of continental freshwater forc-782 ing flux into the Bay of Bengal. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 117, 783 C11021. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_ 784 query?bibcode=2012JGRC..11711021P&link\_type=EJOURNAL, 785 doi:10.1029/2012JC008158. 786

Papa, F., Frappart, F., Güntner, A., Prigent, C., Aires, F., Getirana,
A.C.V., Maurer, R., 2013. Surface freshwater storage and variability in the Amazon basin from multi-satellite observations, 1993–2007.
Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres 118, 11,951–11,965.
URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/2013JD020500/
full, doi:10.1002/2013JD020500.

Papa, F., Frappart, F., Malbeteau, Y., Shamsudduha, M., Vuruputur, V.,
Sekhar, M., Ramillien, G., Prigent, C., Aires, F., Pandey, R.K., Bala, S.,
Calmant, S., 2015. Satellite-derived surface and sub-surface water storage
in the Ganges-Brahmaputra River Basin. Journal of Hydrology: Regional
Studies 4, 15-35. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2015.03.
004, doi:10.1016/j.ejrh.2015.03.004.

Papa, F., Guntner, A., Frappart, F., Prigent, C., Rossow, W.B., 2008. Variations of surface water extent and water storage in large river basins: A comparison of different global data sources. Geophysical Research Letters 35, L11401. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2008GL033857, doi:10.1029/2008GL033857.

- Papa, F., Prigent, C., Aires, F., Jimenez, C., Rossow, W.B., Matthews, E.,
  2010. Interannual variability of surface water extent at the global scale,
  1993–2004. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres (1984–2012)
  115. URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.
- edu/doi/10.1029/2009JD012674/full, doi:10.1029/2009JD012674.

Papa, F., Prigent, C., Rossow, W.B., 2006. Inundated wetland dynamics
over boreal regions from remote sensing: The use of Topex-Poseidon dual-

- frequency radar altimeter observations 27, 4847–4866. URL: http://www.
- tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01431160600675887, doi:10.1080/
   01431160600675887.
- Pekel, J.F., Cottam, A., Gorelick, N., Belward, A.S., 2016. High-resolution
  mapping of global surface water and its long-term changes. Nature 540,
  418–422. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_
  query?bibcode=2016Natur.540..418P&link\_type=EJOURNAL,
  doi:10.1038/nature20584.
- Pham-Duc, B., Prigent, C., Aires, F., 2017. Surface Water Monitoring within
  Cambodia and the Vietnamese Mekong Delta over a Year, with Sentinel1 SAR Observations. Water 9, 366–21. URL: http://www.mdpi.com/
  2073-4441/9/6/366, doi:10.3390/w9060366.
- Prigent, C., Lettenmaier, D.P., Aires, F., Papa, F., 2016. Toward 823 a High-Resolution Monitoring of Continental Surface Water Extent 824 and Dynamics, at Global Scale: from GIEMS (Global Inunda-825 tion Extent from Multi-Satellites) to SWOT (Surface Water Ocean 826 Surveys in Geophysics 37, 339–355. Topography). URL: http: 827 //adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_query?bibcode=2016SGeo. 828 ...37...339P&link\_type=EJOURNAL, doi:10.1007/s10712-015-9339-x. 829
- Prigent, C., Matthews, E., Aires, F., Rossow, W.B., 2001. Remote sensing
  of global wetland dynamics with multiple satellite data sets. Geophysical
  Research Letters 28, 4631-4634. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/
  cgi-bin/nph-data\_query?bibcode=2001GeoRL..28.4631P&link\_type=
  EJOURNAL, doi:10.1029/2001GL013263.

Prigent, C., Papa, F., Aires, F., Jimenez, C., Rossow, W.B., Matthews,
E., 2012. Changes in land surface water dynamics since the 1990s
and relation to population pressure. Geophysical Research Letters 39,
L08403. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_
query?bibcode=2012GeoRL..39.8403P&link\_type=EJOURNAL,

<sup>840</sup> doi:10.1029/2012GL051276.

Prigent, C., Papa, F., Aires, F., Rossow, W.B., Matthews, E., 2007.
Global inundation dynamics inferred from multiple satellite observations,
1993–2000. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres (1984–2012)
112. URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.cul.columbia.
edu/doi/10.1029/2006JD007847/full, doi:10.1029/2006JD007847.

- Rodriguez, E., 2015. Surface Water and Ocean Topography Mission (SWOT).
  Technical Report JPL D-61923. NASA JPL.
- Rossow, W.B., Schiffer, R.A., 1999. Advances in understanding clouds from
  ISCCP. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc. 80, 2261–2287.
- Sakamoto, T., Van Nguyen, N., Kotera, A., Ohno, H., Ishitsuka, N.,
  Yokozawa, M., 2007. Detecting temporal changes in the extent of annual flooding within the Cambodia and the Vietnamese Mekong Delta
  from MODIS time-series imagery. Remote Sensing of Environment
  109, 295–313. URL: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/
  S0034425707000466, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2007.01.011.
- Salameh, E., Frappart, F., Papa, F., Güntner, A., Venugopal, V., Getirana, A., Prigent, C., Aires, F., Labat, D., Laignel, B., 2017. Fifteen

Years (1993-2007) of Surface Freshwater Storage Variability in the GangesBrahmaputra River Basin Using Multi-Satellite Observations. Water 9,
245-19. URL: http://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/9/4/245, doi:10.3390/
w9040245.

Wegmüller, Santoro, М., U., Askne, J.I.H., 2010. Signatures 862 of ERS-Envisat Interferometric SAR Coherence and Phase of 863 An Analysis in the Case of Maize Fields. Short Vegetation: 864 Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing 48, 1702-IEEE 865 1713. URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-data\_ 866 query?bibcode=2010ITGRS..48.1702S&link\_type=EJOURNAL, 867 doi:10.1109/TGRS.2009.2034257. 868

Simard, M., Pinto, N., Fisher, J.B., Baccini, A., 2011. Mapping forest canopy
height globally with spaceborne lidar. J. Geophys. Res. 116, G04021–
12. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/2011JG001708, doi:10.1029/
2011JG001708.

Tulbure, M.G., Broich, M., Stehman, S.V., Kommareddy, A., 2016. Surface
water extent dynamics from three decades of seasonally continuous Landsat
time series at subcontinental scale in a semi-arid region. Remote Sensing
of Environment 178, 142–157. URL: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/
retrieve/pii/S0034425716300621, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.034.

Verpoorter, C., Kutser, T., Seekell, D.A., Tranvik, L.J., 2014. A global inventory of lakes based on high-resolution satellite imagery. Geophys. Res. Lett.
41, 6396-6402. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2014GL060641,
doi:10.1002/2014GL060641.

- Westerhoff, R.S., Kleuskens, M.P.H., Winsemius, H.C., Huizinga, H.J., Brakenridge, G.R., Bishop, C., 2013. Automated global water mapping based
  on wide-swath orbital synthetic-aperture radar. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.
  17, 651–663. URL: http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci.net/17/651/
  2013/, doi:10.5194/hess-17-651-2013.
- Wilson, A.M., Jetz, W., 2016. Remotely Sensed High-Resolution Global
  Cloud Dynamics for Predicting Ecosystem and Biodiversity Distributions.
  PLoS Biol 14, 1–20. URL: http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.
  pbio.1002415, doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002415.
- Winsemius, H., Jongman, B., Veldkamp, T., Hallegatte, S., Bangalore, M.,
  Ward, P., 2015. Disaster risk and poverty: assessing the global exposure
  of the poor to floods and droughts. EGU General Assembly 2015 17, 3225.
  URL: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2015EGUGA..17.3225W.
- Yamazaki, D., Ikeshima, D., Tawatari, R., Yamaguchi, T., O'Loughlin,
  F., Neal, J.C., Sampson, C.C., Kanae, S., Bates, P.D., 2017. A highaccuracy map of global terrain elevations. Geophys. Res. Lett. 44, 5844–
  5853. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/2017GL072874, doi:10.
  1002/2017GL072874.
- Yamazaki, D., Trigg, M.A., Ikeshima, D., 2015. Development of a global
  <sup>~</sup>90m water body map using multi-temporal Landsat images. Remote Sensing of Environment 171, 337-351. URL: http://linkinghub.
  elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0034425715301656, doi:10.1016/j.rse.
  2015.10.014.