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Abstract

A validation of the 2005 500m MODIS vegetation continuous fields (VCF) tree cover product in the circumpolar taiga-tundra ecotone was performed using high resolution Quickbird imagery. Assessing the VCF's performance near the northern limits of the boreal forest can help quantify the accuracy of the product within this vegetation transition area. The circumpolar region was divided into 7 longitudinal zones and validation sites were selected in areas of varying tree cover where Quickbird imagery is available in Google Earth. Each site was linked to the corresponding VCF pixel and overlaid with a regular dot grid within the VCF pixel's boundary to estimate percent tree crown cover in the area. Percent tree crown cover was estimated using Quickbird imagery for 396 sites throughout the circumpolar region and related to the VCF's estimates of canopy cover for 2000-2005. Regression results of VCF inter-annual comparisons (2000-2005) and VCF-Quickbird image-interpreted estimates indicate that: (1) Pixel-level, inter-annual comparisons of VCF estimates of percent canopy cover were linearly related (mean $R^2 = 0.77$) and exhibited an average root mean square error (RMSE) of 10.1% and an average root mean square difference (RMSD) of 7.3%. (2) A comparison of image-interpreted percent tree crown cover estimates based on dot counts on Quickbird color images by two different interpreters were more variable ($R^2 = 0.73$, RMSE = 14.8%,...
RMSD = 18.7%) than VCF inter-annual comparisons. (3) Across the circumpolar boreal region, 2005 VCF-Quickbird comparisons were linearly related, with an $R^2 = 0.57$, a RMSE = 13.4% and a RMSD = 21.3%, with a tendency to over-estimate areas of low percent tree cover and anomalous VCF results in Scandinavia. The relationship of the VCF estimates and ground reference indicate to potential users that the VCF’s tree cover values for individual pixels, particularly those below 20% tree cover, may not be precise enough to monitor 500m pixel-level tree cover in the taiga-tundra transition zone.
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**Introduction**

Over the next century, estimates of global temperature increases range from 1.8°C to 4.0°C, but this warming will not be distributed evenly around the globe (IPCC 2007). The Arctic regions are expected to warm approximately twice as fast, 4°C to 7°C by 2100, and much of that warming may occur in the autumn and winter months (Serreze & Francis 2006; Hassol 2004). Large changes in high-latitude forest structure and extent are possible and, in fact, have already been documented. For example, in the 1980s and 1990s between 40° N and 70° N, increases in photosynthetic activity have been linked to changing spring land surface temperatures (Goetz et al. 2005; Zhou et al. 2003; Randerson et al. 1999; Myneni et al. 1997). There is modeled, remotely-sensed, and field-measured evidence of changes in fire regime, insect infestations, treeline migration, age class structure and species distribution in northern forests (Soja et al. 2007, Kurz et al. 2007, 2008a,b). Trees may respond to a warming environment by moving northward and upslope, however, southward treeline movements are possible as permafrost melts,
soils saturate, and bogs and wetlands replace forests (Crawford et al. 2003; Schuur et al. 2008). As the northern boundaries of the circumpolar boreal forests become less certain, there is a need to develop remote sensing techniques to monitor changes in the transition zone between the taiga and tundra, forest extent and treeline location as forests respond to the changing climate and disturbance regimes (Frey et al. 2007). The taiga-tundra transition zone is the largest ecotone on earth, stretching over 13,400 km.

The MODIS sensor, part of NASA’s Earth Observation System (EOS) onboard the Terra and Aqua satellites, is designed for moderate-resolution global monitoring of the Earth. The Vegetation Continuous Fields (VCF) product is derived from multiple temporal composites and provides a percent canopy cover value for each 500m pixel. This continuous value (0-100%) is related to the amount of skylight obstructed by tree canopies equal to or greater than 5 meters in height. This percent canopy cover term differs from percent tree crown cover (TCC) measured for the Quickbird imagery (see below), where the latter refers to the sum of the canopy cover and the within-crown skylight (Hansen et al. 2003). This continuous value approach to land cover mapping can be used along with more conventional land cover categorical data to more reliably map global land covers. The heterogeneous nature of land cover at ecotone boundaries lends itself to the continuous mapping method of the VCF and there have been other efforts to map tree cover in this manner around the world (Cross et al. 1991; Zhu and Evans 1994; Mayaux and Lambin 1997; Tottrup 2007; Heiskanen and Kivinen 2008).

We validated the accuracy of this product within the taiga-tundra transition zone using validation sites distributed throughout the circumpolar boreal and taiga-tundra transition zone. We addressed how VCF pixels compare inter-annually and the differences in TCC interpretations from high-resolution optical Quickbird satellite
imagery between different interpreters to assess the variation that is inherent in human estimation of TCC from high-resolution imagery. Finally, we examined comparisons of VCF pixels and visual interpretations from Quickbird imagery.

Background

The changing abundance of trees along the taiga-tundra transition zone has been used to monitor shifts in vegetation patterns that may signal a response to human activities and/or climatic changes. Treeline changes occur where temperature changes are most profound and a possible circumpolar trend has been suggested (Esper and Schweingruber 2004). Satellite observations have shown that northern latitudes (Zhou et al. 2003), and specifically the boreal forests (Bunn and Goetz 2006), respond in different ways to changing climate. Because of the variability related to the response of the boreal treeline to climate change, there is a critical need for accurate mapping of land cover and monitoring of changes with consistent monitoring methods (Frey et al. 2007; Esper and Schweingruber 2004). Sun et al. (2004) used a spectral un-mixing method with Landsat data to characterize the transition from taiga to tundra for a forest island in northern Russia. Heiskanen and Kivinen (2008) concluded that the use of multi-angular and –temporal data can increase the accuracy of 1km resolution tree cover estimates of the peak growing season in the taiga-tundra ecotone in northern Scandinavia.

With a nominal 500m spatial resolution, the VCF product incorporates multi-spectral and -temporal data, capturing phenological differences, to estimate the proportion of canopy cover in each pixel. The VCF resolution may also be suitable for studying ecotone dynamics (Stow et al. 2004). This technique allows for heterogeneous areas to be better represented than is possible by discrete land cover classes.
Heterogeneous areas, such as the taiga-tundra transition zone, lend themselves to this type of depiction because groups of percent cover pixels can represent gradients across space. The product is derived from a regression tree that interprets the biophysical relationship between the satellite spectral signals and vegetation cover throughout a season and a linear regression model that helps improve the regression tree's predicted values (Hansen et al. 2002b). The VCF algorithm is kept constant for each year's data, so robust MODIS data processing is a key factor in the year-to-year consistency of the VCF. Furthermore, this method of statistically estimating sub-pixel tree cover at global scales is necessary because individual trees cannot be resolved by the sensors required for regional and global level satellite monitoring (Rees et al. 2002).

MODIS data products have been validated at a sub-regional scale by using previously collected field data or higher resolution image data extending across the study area (Pisek and Chen 2007; White et al. 2005; Hansen et al. 2002a; Hansen et al. 2003). White et al. (2005) used 3954 plots from two independent datasets to test the VCF correlation with ground measurements of tree cover in the southwestern United States. They found an overall negative bias, whereby VCF underestimated tree cover (31% and 24% overall for the two datasets) and the RMSE generally increased with increasing tree cover. The authors advised using the Version 1 VCF with caution in this part of the world. However, as this version has been superseded with subsequent versions, with consequent changes to the algorithm, the relationship of ground data to VCF values for this area should be reassessed using the most current product. Hansen et al. (2002a) performed a validation of an early VCF version in Zambia using high resolution IKONOS and Landsat data. After classifying the higher resolution imagery and scaling up to MODIS resolutions, the RMSE was 5.2%. The two different levels of validation
success revealed by these studies indicate that the VCF’s ability to reliably estimate percent canopy cover may vary greatly depending on factors such as ecoregion and latitude. In northern Finland, Heiskanen (2008) compared the VCF with other global scale map products, finding that the VCF overestimates values in low tree cover and underestimates values in high tree cover. The author also noted the difficulty in mapping tree cover in the taiga-tundra transition zone and the difficulty of obtaining field data.

There have also been validations of MODIS land products at the pixel level. Liu and Mishchenko (2008) compared measurements of aerosol optical thickness from MODIS and MISR for collocated pixels. Morisette et al. (2003) discussed the use of IKONOS and Landsat ETM+ for exploring variation within a MODIS pixel. Salomonson et al. (2006) compared percent snow cover within individual MODIS 500m pixels to the percentage of Landsat ETM+ derived snow cover for corresponding grid cells. Hall et al. (2008) examined MODIS level 2 land surface temperature (LST) pixels in the sinusoidal grid with LST values derived from Landsat ETM+ and ASTER of the same area. The LST values from MODIS pixels were also compared with automatic weather station data at high latitudes (Greenland). The authors found that single weather station point observations of temperature could not be reliably compared with 1km MODIS, 90m ASTER, or 57m ETM+ pixels because the point measurements don’t represent the variation of temperature across the area covered by each pixel. The authors suggested that a local array over areas corresponding to pixels used in the comparison would appropriately characterize the internal heterogeneity of surface temperature within a pixel. The latter two studies used regression to relate the MODIS product values in high latitudes to the ground reference data at the pixel level.
In place of on-site validation, some studies have acquired ground reference from high-resolution imagery displayed in Google Earth (GE). Using the Quickbird imagery in GE, measurements have been made of river channels and oxbow lakes (Constantine and Dunne 2008) as well as irrigated areas (Thenkabail et al. 2008). Luedeling and Buerkert (2008) visually interpreted GE’s high-resolution data in areas randomly distributed across a study area to validate a Landsat-based classification of desert oases in Oman. In this study, we use GE’s archive of Quickbird imagery to validate the MODIS VCF product for northern boreal forests. These Quickbird images in GE cannot be spectrally enhanced nor can band combinations be reconfigured. The imagery is displayed in true-color and the near infrared channel cannot be accessed, which reduces the information content available to image interpreters. There is, however, some basic image information metadata accessible through the “DigitalGlobe Coverage” sub-layer under the pre-packaged “More” layer contained in the GE “Primary Database.” Activating this information reveals an icon at the center point of each Quickbird image that links to a web thumbnail version of the image along with the Catalog ID number, acquisition date, latitude and longitude of the image center, off nadir angle, target azimuth, cloud cover, and environmental quality.

Methods

Identifying validation sites in Google Earth

We selected sites throughout the circumpolar boreal forest that included a range of percent TCC for which there was high resolution, true-color Quickbird imagery available in GE. Only images with resolutions that allowed interpreters to identify individual tree crowns were considered in the selection process and the majority of
images were acquired from May-September. To ensure that our sites were well
distributed throughout the circumpolar northern boreal region, we divided Eurasia above
60° N into 4 regions and North America above 55° N into 3 regions and selected
approximately 60 validation sites for each of these seven zones (Figure 1). The
validation sites extended southward to 55 ° N in North America to include the taiga-
tundra transition zone of eastern Canada, where biophysical characteristics in this region
begin to limit tree growth at this latitude. The southern limits of study sites in both
Eurasia and North America were chosen based on information from various
interpretations of treeline, ensuring that these limits allowed us to consider tree cover
within the transition zone from boreal forest to tundra (Timoney et al. 1992, Callaghan et
al. 2002a, Olsen et al. 2001). The seven circumpolar regions include: Scandinavia,
Western Eurasia, Central Eurasia, Eastern Eurasia, Alaska, Central/Western Canada, and
Eastern Canada. In each zone, at least 20 test sites were identified in the boreal forest in
each of three TCC categories: 0-20%, 20-60%, 60-100%. In a given region, we selected
every point based on (1) the availability of high-resolution (2.44m at nadir) Quickbird
imagery in GE, (2) our initial, quick-look, visual assessment/estimate of percent TCC
category (i.e., 0-20%, etc), and (3) on landscape/forest homogeneity surrounding the
location (approximates a 3x3 MODIS 500m pixel window size). This third criterion was
introduced to try to mitigate mis-registration errors between the GE imagery and the
MODIS VCF pixels. The percent canopy cover values of the corresponding local VCF
pixels were not considered during this site selection process.

Sites were located at least 15 km apart to spread the VCF evaluation pixels across
a given zone and to introduce spatial independence into the site selection process. We
selected 431 sites (7 zones x 3 TCC classes x 20 locations + 11 additional unique/unusual sites).

MODIS VCF Mosaics

We obtained the latest VCF data, downloaded by MODIS tile, through the University of Maryland’s Global Land Cover Facility (ftp://ftp.glcf.umiacs.umd.edu/modis/VCF). The Collection 4 version of the data used for this validation was collected for MODIS tile rows 2 and 3. Tile row 1 (above 70° N) was not available at the time of the analysis. Tile mosaics in the native sinusoidal projection for North America and Eurasia were created using the MODIS Reprojection Tool version 4.0 from the Land Processes Distributed Active Archive Center (http://lpdaac.usgs.gov). Horizontal tiles 9-14 were used for North America and tiles 18-26 for Eurasia (Figure 2).

While each MODIS pixel is nominally 500m X 500m, they are in fact 463m on either side in the original sinusoidal projection. This detail is important for generating precise TCC sampling grids.

Matching validation sites, VCF pixels and Google Earth imagery

The comparison of percent TCC estimates from Quickbird imagery in GE to MODIS VCF pixel values of percent canopy cover requires accurately matching the VCF pixels with their corresponding spatial locations in GE to the extent possible given MODIS geo-location error limits. The VCF pixel whose centroid was closest to each location selected in GE was identified and the boundary of each pixel, geo-located according to the four corners, was overlaid on the GE imagery. We then generated regular 10 X 10 dot grids for each VCF pixel such that each dot represented the center of an area that was one-tenth the length and width of the VCF pixel. The boundaries of the
selected pixels for each of the 7 circumpolar zones along with the regular dot grids were then converted to Keyhole Markup Language (KML) files and displayed in GE. Since the MODIS data was in its native sinusoidal (equal area) projection with an accuracy of 50m (1σ) (Wolfe et al. 2002), the VCF pixel boundaries displayed in GE and associated dot grids did not maintain the square shape of a gridded cell, but preserved the areal coverage, location and extent that the pixel represented (see Figure 3). We note that the sinusoidal projection does not increase inaccuracy beyond the geo-location accuracy stated above.

Estimating percent tree cover

Five interpreters systematically viewed a subset of the validation sites, counting the number of dots that lay atop tree crowns. Prior to the image interpretation, interpreters collectively reviewed test sites composed of a range of TCC densities and types at various latitudes and various regions in order to standardize interpretations of tree cover. The interpreters counted dots, for each assigned VCF pixel, lying atop tree crowns to provide an estimate of percent TCC. The following guidelines were used to determine if a dot lay atop a tree crown:

1. The entire dot must intercept a tree crown. As each dot represents an infinitesimally small point on the earth, i.e. it has no area, increasing the scale (zooming in) reveals the placement of the dot in relation to tree crown pixels. Note: Increasing the scale will not alone determine whether a dot intercepts a tree crown, because the context of surrounding pixels is needed to identify features.
The feature beneath a dot had to be distinguished from shrubs. The two central indications of tree crown presence were:

a. the shape of the crown, and

b. the presence of a shadow.

In cases of continuous dense tree cover, where shadows and shape did not help identify individual trees, the broader spatial context and texture of the forest patch and local landscape patterns helped to determine whether a dot intercepted a tree crown or a shrub.

The VCF product measures percent canopy cover, where canopy cover is defined as the component of TCC that obstructs skylight (Hansen et al. 2003). Percent TCC was interpreted, rather than percent canopy cover, because our validation approach relied on Quickbird imagery where canopy cover and within-crown gaps could not be distinguished. From an interpreter's perspective, TCC is the metric that can be visually estimated.

Each site was attributed a value based on an interpreter’s count/estimate of tree/no tree for each of the 100 dots regularly arranged within a VCF pixel’s boundary. Each site’s value was then associated with the corresponding values of VCF pixels for years 2000-2005. This data set allowed us to examine the consistency of the VCF from one year to the next. Furthermore, 58 of the 396 sites were systematically selected for replicate image-interpretations by two of the five image-interpreters. This re-examination of 15% of the sample allowed us to investigate the variability among the five image interpreters. Interpretations of percent TCC were made for 424 of the 431 sites because seven sites were judged, after examining the imagery, to be too difficult to confidently discern trees from shrubs, i.e., the images were either too dark or too blurry.
to permit accurate estimation of TCC. Quickbird – VCF regressions were based on 396 sites since there were no Collection 4 VCF values for 28 sites above 70° N. Sites for which multiple interpretations of tree cover differed by more than 30 percentage points were examined to investigate and resolve the differences in the tree cover estimates. In these instances, the interpreters involved discussed the scene, and interpretations were redone to better standardize image-interpreted estimates. A reduced major axis (RMA) regression was used to compare a later VCF year’s data with an earlier year’s, and one interpreter’s TCC estimates to another’s. The RMA regression is appropriate for comparing 2 year’s of VCF data and 2 interpreter’s estimates of TCC because there are similar amounts of error in data on both axis, i.e., in both X and Y (Curran and Hay 1986).

Results

Inter-Annual Comparisons

Figure 4 reports the slopes of the simple linear regression lines relating Quickbird estimates to VCF estimates for each zone for 2000-2005. While there are differences between longitudinal zones, most slopes (64%) are between 0.4 and 0.6 and all slopes for all zones were less than 1 reflecting the varying relationship of Quickbird image-interpreted estimates and VCF values at the low and high ends of the canopy cover range. This relationship is examined in subsequent figures. Results for Scandinavia report regressions with low slope values throughout the study time period. Visual examination of the data in this region reveals what may be some systematic processing bias in that VCF canopy cover values show an abrupt change in northern Scandinavia that are not indicative of natural patterns or land use.
We compared the VCF canopy cover values with the Quickbird TCC interpretations at the 396 validation sites. Figure 5 shows the distribution of each Collection 4 VCF dataset from 2000-2005 with the validation site estimates using an amalgam of cloud-free data (2002-2008) from the Quickbird satellite. This provides information on the variability of the VCF from 2000-2005, as the appearance of each frequency distribution plot helps to explain the consistency of the VCF and where there may be systematic differences from ground-truth validation. To generate Figure 5, each of the yearly VCF estimates and the image-interpreted estimates of percent TCC were assigned to a 10% bin (e.g., 0-10%, 11-20%,... 91-100%) and a count made. The majority of VCF pixels at the 396 sites report canopy cover values between 20 and 60%. While the difference between iterations of the VCF is minimal in this range, they are distinctly higher than the image-interpreted estimates of percent TCC. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for two independent samples was performed to compare the distributions of the earliest and latest (2000 and 2005) VCF data and confirmed that the differences in these yearly VCF distributions are in fact not significantly different (p = 0.939). The distributions of the image-interpreted estimates and the 2005 VCF data were tested in the same manner, confirming a significant statistical difference (p < 0.001). The frequency distributions of each yearly VCF estimate suggest that the VCF tends to underestimate canopy cover in areas where Quickbird reports TCC < 20% and overestimates in areas where Quickbird reports TCC > 20%. In addition, this figure shows that there are no VCF values above 80% canopy cover (discussed in a subsequent section).

We also examined VCF inter-annual variability with regression in order to characterize the precision of the VCF product. Figure 6 shows the inter-annual variation on a pixel-by-pixel basis for 403 circumpolar ground sites for each combination of VCF
years (2000-2005). This set of regressions explains the relationship of all VCF estimates available to date for 403 sites. In interpreting the regressions in Figure 6, we assume that from 2000-2005 actual canopy cover changes little at the each site, though certainly forest disturbances, such as fire, could alter the canopy cover in this time period. Simple t-tests indicate that most slopes are not significantly different from 1.0 and most intercepts are not significantly different from zero (Table 1). At the pixel level, the inter-annual scatter, 2004 to 2005, amounted to RMSE < 10% and RMSD = 7%, though the greatest range discrepancy across all sites was 38% (61% in 2005 with 23% in 2004 and 47% in 2005 with 9% in 2004). The inter-annual scatter for all combinations of years ranged from a RMSE = 9.5 to 10.8% and a RMSD = 6.8 to 7.8%.

Variability of Quickbird TCC Interpretations

Figure 7 presents the variation inherent among Quickbird image interpreters. Different pairs of interpreters estimated %TCC on 58 of the 396 validation sites to quantify the variability associated with our image-interpreted tree counts. The VCF product (Figure 6) is less variable, i.e., more stable (average RMSE = 10.1%, average RMSD = 7.3%) than the Quickbird image-interpreted estimates (RMSE = 14.8%, RMSD = 18.7%) which serve as our ground reference data product. There were 15 estimates for which at least a 30 percentage point difference in tree cover interpretation occurred. The majority (12) of these involved shrub/tree confusion by one of the interpreters. These estimates were re-done after interpreters re-calibrated their understanding of tree cover appearance for these sites, to further standardize ground reference.

Percent Tree Crown Cover by Circumpolar Zone
Using the most recent (2005) version of the Collection 4 VCF, we correlated the observed Quickbird percent TCC values with the percent canopy cover estimates of the VCF for each of the 7 zones and for all zones combined (Figure 8). Table 2 summarizes the simple linear regression results for each of the plots in Figure 8. Each zone had a minimum of 45 validation sites. The scatter varies for each zone, with no apparent bias towards any percent TCC interval. Some of the more inconsistent data points were investigated and found in some cases to be at the boundary of an abrupt change in VCF percent canopy cover or in an area where shrub cover had a tone and texture similar to that of nearby stands of trees. Tests confirmed that all slopes were different than 1 and all Y-intercepts were different than 0 (Table 2). The Scandinavian sites had a slope that was significantly different than the slope for all zones combined (p < 0.001).

We note the following in Table 2 and Figure 8: (1) an upper VCF bound of 80% in all graphs in Figure 8 (also apparent in Figure 6), (2) a consistently positive y-intercept significantly different from zero in all zones, and (3) RMSE values ranging from ~10-15% and RMSD values ranging from ~14–23% (with the exception of Scandinavia). The 80% upper VCF limit noted in Figures 6 and 8 in both North America and Eurasia is consistent with other reports on the VCF product (White et al. 2005; Mark Carroll, personal communication). Hansen et al. (2003) explains that this 80% upper VCF limit is due to the relationship between TCC and canopy cover. On average, 80% canopy cover corresponds to complete crown cover. However, we might expect the canopy cover to TCC ratio to vary depending on the different crown cover densities of the dominant tree types across regions.

For low percent TCC values, the y-intercepts show a range from about 11% to nearly 25%, indicating the VCF’s tendency to overestimate crown cover in areas that are
more lightly forested. The consistent, positive y-intercepts may indicate some tendency of the VCF to confuse tall shrubs as trees. Certainly the Quickbird image interpreters had this same problem, and a considerable amount of time was spent by the interpreters trying to discern and define the difference between shrubs and trees in some of the imagery. However, where the 2005 VCF values were less than 20% canopy cover (49 sites), 73% of the Quickbird estimates were also less than 20 (36 sites) and only 7 of the remaining 13 fell outside the RMSE range (14%). This indicates that while the VCF may err in areas where trees are scarce and shrubs are abundant, the Quickbird estimates tend to confirm the VCF low percent canopy cover values.

The entire circumpolar region had an overall RMSE and RMSD of 13.4% and 21.3%, respectively. We view the zonal and circumpolar RMSE and RMSD values reported in Table 2 and Figure 8 as worst-case estimates given that some unknown portion of this error term is due to variation associated with the image-interpretation results. This 13.4% RMSE is lower than the values reported by White et al. (2005) for the southwestern United States (24% and 31%) and higher than the values reported in Hansen et al. (2002a) for Zambia (5.2%).

Limitations and Uncertainties

It is helpful to understand the spatial and temporal context in which our ground reference was gathered and the VCF produced. Limitations to, and uncertainties in, accurately assessing tree cover at a given location may stem from the method of collecting ground reference, satellite data geo-location/gridding, and the timing of satellite data for compiling both the ground reference and the VCF data product.
The variability in Figure 7 indicates the ease with which similar estimates will be repeated and the inherent difficulty of remote satellite and visual estimation of percent canopy cover and TCC. Although standardization protocols were established prior to the validation effort, there were a number of cases in which the five interpreters differed in their interpretation of tree cover. The replicated site interpretations of percent TCC were done by five interpreters, which likely increased the level of disagreement between site interpretations than if sites had been re-interpreted by the same interpreter. Thus, the overall uncertainty in ground reference is not surprising. The similar image tone and texture of trees and shrubs combine with different interpretations of these features by five interpreters to create noisy validation data. The purpose of re-examining those replicated sites that differed by at least 30 points was to minimize differences based on strong interpreter bias where an errant interpretation of tree cover could dramatically effect overall interpreter precision. A lower threshold would have allowed for examination of smaller discrepancies and refinement of a greater number of the replicated estimates, resulting in a higher level of consistency.

We chose this conservative threshold so as not to disguise the true noisy nature of the ground reference. The level of variability in the ground reference makes it difficult to pinpoint the extent to which the VCF estimates of low canopy cover, in the transition zone and throughout the boreal forest, vary from true tree cover. However, the overall RMSE and RMSD (13.4% and 21.3% respectively) are evidence that below 20% VCF canopy cover the ability of the product to provide reliable 500m pixel-level delineation of the circumpolar taiga-tundra transition zone is limited.

The accuracy of the MODIS VCF product may also introduce discrepancies between VCF percent canopy cover values and interpreted percent TCC. MODIS’ sub-
pixel geo-location accuracy (at nadir) may contribute some positional inaccuracies, as will Quickbird's geo-location accuracy (+/- 23m, CE90%), and we also note that the gridding of some observations could also contribute to disagreement between interpretations of percent TCC and VCF values. Heiskanen and Kivenen (2008) indicate that per-pixel comparison of reference data with gridded MODIS Level 1B data is complicated by the fact that some gridded values represent different areas on the ground than do the original satellite observations from which the gridded values were derived. This is due to the MODIS bow-tie effect (Gomez-Landes et al. 2004, Tan et al. 2006) whereby observations further from nadir account for a larger land surface area than those observations at nadir. Tan et al. (2006) also explain that the surface area contributing to a MODIS observation is always larger than the grid cell because of the triangular point-spread function. MODIS Level 3 products, such as the VCF, are multi-temporal composites of the best Level 1B data available for a given location within a time interval. Factors such as proximity to nadir and aerosol contamination contribute to the selection of the data that will best describe ground features. Higher latitudes will have increasingly more nadir and near-nadir pixels available for incorporation into a Level 3 data because of the increasing degree of scan line overlap toward the poles, and more opportunities for larger overlap between satellite observations and the grid cells into which they are mapped (Robert Wolfe, personal communication).

Figure 9 shows a lake outline and one pixel's corners in northern Alaska (68.9N, 151.3W) overlaying both MODIS and Landsat TM from 6/14/2008 and Google Earth basemap data. This example demonstrates that (1) MODIS Level 3 grid cells overlay the correct earth features irrespective of the projection in which they are cast, (2) there is no apparent geo-location degradation at high latitudes, and (3) features maintain their spatial
arrangement when displayed in Google Earth. The regular 10x10 dot grids, constrained
by VCF grid cells, provide a way of estimating TCC in an area with which the boundaries
are presumed to correspond. Each dot is used to represent an area that is 1/10 the area of
a MODIS pixel. The 100 regularly arranged dots within the boundary of each site’s
corresponding pixel provide point-based estimates of areal values of TCC, while the
pixels themselves are geo-located approximations of the actual land surface that provided
the radiance values recorded by the satellite. This method, recommended by Hall et al.
(2008), provides an intuitive and easily replicated means of performing pixel-level
validation, and assessing sub-pixel variability, of MODIS Level 3 geophysical maps.

While our Quickbird TCC interpretations are not the definitive assessment of tree
cover at the 396 sites, they represent our best estimates. We did not examine how the
differences in acquisition time between the Quickbird and MODIS VCF imagery may
have increased variability between the two estimation methods. However (1) the VCF is
a temporal composite designed to minimize sensitivity to a specific time of year, (2) we
gave preference to Quickbird imagery obtained from May to September when ground
features aren’t obscured by long shadows from low sun angles, and (3) the vast majority
of sites were dominated by conifers whose crowns are visible regardless of season.

Cases where forest disturbance occurs between the acquisitions of each data
source could contribute to variability of our ground reference with MODIS estimates.
One case involves a forest disturbance at a validation site after the 2005 MODIS data and
prior to a Quickbird acquisition used for ground reference. For example, a disturbance
after the 2005 VCF dataset but prior to the acquisition of a Quickbird image used to
select a site could affect forest cover that the VCF had already mapped. Depending on
the nature of the disturbance, the ground reference and MODIS estimates could be based
on significantly different forest conditions. Our ground reference sites were chosen in GE with Quickbird imagery where there were relatively homogenous forest conditions and no visual signs of recent disturbances. This site selection method was a screening process, decreasing the likelihood of validating mixed MODIS pixels and changed pixels. A second case may occur if a site selected using a 2002 Quickbird acquisition experienced a subsequent tree cover altering disturbance prior to the 2005 VCF. Such cases will introduce noise into the relationship of the VCF to the ground reference estimates. Regarding the likelihood of a burn at one of our validation sites, Hicke et al. 2003 indicate that 1% of the North American boreal forest biome may burn each year. SPOT-VEGETATION estimates of boreal forest fire indicate that about 1% of the circumpolar boreal burned from 2000-2004 (Bartalev et al. 2007). Similarly, Potapov et al. (2008) estimated that approximately 1% of the area of forest cover loss in the boreal biome was due to wildfire from 2001-2005, while forest cover loss as a percent of year 2000 forest area was 5.63% for North America.

Discussion

This validation helps establish the limits of the VCF for mapping the taiga-tundra ecotone on a global scale. The accuracy and precision of global products such as the VCF must be assessed to determine their utility for detecting subtle changes to the taiga-tundra ecotone.

A comparison of VCF-to-VCF variability and interpreter-to-interpreter variability provided an unexpected result. We note the following: (1) each inter-annual VCF percent crown cover RMSE (9.5 – 10.8%) and RMSD value (6.8 – 7.8%) was smaller than the image-interpreters' percent TCC RMSE (14.8%) and RMSD (18.7%) and (2) each inter-annual VCF $R^2$ value (0.74 – 0.80) was higher than the interpreter $R^2$ (0.73). In the
The majority of cases, slopes were not significantly different from 1 and intercepts were not significantly different from zero, however the results, specifically the RMSE and RMSD values, point out the difficulty of working in short-stature, open forests interspersed with shrubs of varying heights, both for image-interpreters and for analysts generating machine-processed standard products. In the ideal case of perfect, completely reproducible estimates of tree canopy cover from Quickbird, then we would expect the VCF-interpreter comparisons to have higher $R^2$ values and smaller RMSE and RMSD values. Interpreters were themselves quite variable, and that variability, which has no bearing on the quality of the VCF estimates, is manifested in the comparison.

Google Earth saved money and time by providing free high-resolution imagery across tens of thousands of kilometers of inhospitable, inaccessible terrain. However, the use of GE imagery comes at a cost. Some key factors that affected the interpretation of tree cover were the inability to manipulate or enhance Quickbird imagery in GE, the combination of view and high-latitude sun angle and the similar appearance of trees and shrubs. The Quickbird data’s near-infrared channel is unavailable in GE, removing a potentially valuable tool for interpreting vegetation on screen. The GE imagery also lacks the ability to perform contrast enhancements. Additionally, in some instances the combination of the arrangement of forest patches and tree shadows with certain sun and view angles may have obscured tree cover, or led to false identification of tree cover. Regional differences in tree and shrub types and appearance may have, in some cases, affected tree cover estimates.

The VCF is a MODIS satellite map of a geophysical variable (tree canopy cover). The pixels of this map have attribute and geo-location information and are intended to be used along with other geographically referenced spatial data. Thus, the pixel locations
are presumed to represent those earth features with matching geo-location. It is for this reason that pixel-level validation is useful, even with the variety of documented uncertainties from the input satellite data, as it provides users, who will relate these pixels to other spatial data, with a fundamental understanding of the accuracy of the product at its finest resolution.

**Implications for Future Work: Mapping Tree Cover Changes at the Taiga-Tundra Ecotone**

Callaghan et al. (2002a) reviewed the global importance of the taiga-tundra boundary. They highlight the difficulties in understanding and representing the location of this transition zone and in how to monitor its fluctuations. Although there are a number of characteristics that aid delineation of this boundary, such as tree growth form, height, age and aggregation, the distribution of trees is probably the most logical way of presenting the regional transition from trees to tundra (Callaghan et al. 2002b). Rees et al. (2002) discussed the importance of spatial resolution on the definition of treeline. Stow et al. (2004) acknowledge the need for multi-scale mapping of vegetation variability in the northern latitudes. Mapping the distribution of trees along the taiga-tundra boundary in the circumpolar Arctic will be mostly at continental to global scales but must also account for finer scale patterns that reveal gradual transitions. Examining the heterogeneity of groups of 500m VCF pixels may help identify forest patches and gaps (i.e., areas of similar tree distribution). Identifying landscape components formed by groups of similar, adjacent pixels at a few scales establishes a foundation on which to apply clear rules and definitions of ecotone location and extent. This process uses the spatial context in which individual pixels exist (the values of surrounding pixels) to
reduce the data volume while advancing understanding of landscape patterns and components. The performance of the VCF at the pixel level is important for understanding the fundamental association of the predicted data with observed data. This pixel-level approach assesses the VCF’s utility for regional tree cover mapping in the taiga-tundra transition zone. The patterns that these pixels reveal can help form the basis of the dataset that can be observed and analyzed for change through time.

McMahon et al. (2004) discussed a robust basis for mapping ecological regions and established a framework for both identifying and mapping ecoregions. This framework involves identifying an extent, a grain/resolution, and a scale for the area being examined and accounts for how the heterogeneity of conditions affects the delineation of a boundary. The forest gaps and patches that form the spatial patterns of the taiga-tundra ecotone represent internal heterogeneity that is difficult to capture on a continental-global scale map. The continuous tree cover mapping provided by the VCF product allows groups of pixels that represent patches and gaps to have attributes representing internal variability that capture the gradual nature of the boundary. The spatial variability, or texture, of the VCF product along with ancillary data may produce maps that replicate forest cover variability in a way that discrete land cover classification cannot, and may facilitate closer monitoring of subtle changes in the ecotone. In fact, according to Hansen et al. (2002b), the VCF was developed because continuous classes can represent the spatial heterogeneity better than fixed land cover classes, particularly in land cover transition zones.

Given the inter-annual scatter noted between individual VCF observations, we suggest that the taiga-tundra ecotone may be more reliably delineated and monitored over time by considering groups of VCF observations rather than individual pixels. In this
scenario, any number of grouping algorithms—clustering processors, decision-tree classifiers, image segmentations—could be used to identify VCF pixels with similar canopy cover attributes. The mean and variance of the grouped pixels might then be used to define a band of canopy cover conditions that represents the taiga-tundra transition zone. Such an approach, one that groups adjacent pixels based on a defined level of similarity, may mitigate spurious canopy cover error caused by VCF variability at the pixel level.

To further improve the VCF product for work in northern regions, we provide the following recommendations for subsequent iterations of the VCF products:

1. The addition of a water mask, which was available in the Collection 3 version, would be useful particularly for northern latitudes where low tree cover and water bodies can be difficult to distinguish without water-coded pixels.

2. Completion of the Collection 4 VCF tiles above 70° N would be helpful for tracking changes at the northern edge of the taiga-tundra transition zone, particularly in the lowlands just north of the Siberian Trappes (Taimyr-Central Siberian tundra ecoregion) in Russia and at the northern tip of Scandinavia (Scandinavian Montane Birch forest and grasslands ecoregion) (UNEP/GRID-Arendal 2007).

3. Continued refinement of the VCF algorithm for low percent canopy cover areas.

Conclusion
Accurate mapping of the taiga-tundra ecotone is important for monitoring subtle changes at the northern limits of the boreal forest. Documenting tree cover in this region using satellite-derived maps provides a means to continually assess changes in the transition between forest and tundra. The results of this study indicate the VCF’s potential utility for the circumpolar taiga-tundra region and limitations inherent in its use, highlighted by its tendency to overestimate percent canopy cover in sparsely forested areas of the circumpolar taiga-tundra transition zone. This overestimation demonstrates to potential users of the VCF maps that this product may not be suitable for detailed mapping and monitoring of tree cover, particularly tree cover below 20%, at the product’s finest (500m pixel) level of detail.
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**Figures & Tables**

**Figure 1** Validation sites by zone in Eurasia and North America.
Figure 2 Areas (in light blue) of MODIS tiles within which Quickbird imagery validation sites were selected.

Figure 3 An example of a VCF validation site in eastern Canada. The marker in the lower right specifies the exact site selected using true-color Quickbird imagery in GE with fixed enhancement. The red box represents the boundary of the corresponding VCF pixel in the sinusoidal projection. The yellow dots mark the location of the 100 points used to estimate %TCC. For this site, interpreters observed 23% TCC (i.e., 23 of 100 yellow dots fall on a tree crown) and the VCF estimated 25% canopy cover. Image
metadata was accessed through the “DigitalGlobe Coverage” layer in GE to provide background information that in some cases aided interpretation of tree cover.

Figure 4 Slopes of the regression line between VCF values and Quickbird estimates of percent TCC for each year of the Collection 4 VCF data. The slopes for Scandinavia may indicate a possible systematic bias in VCF processing for that area.
Figure 5 Frequency distribution of percent TCC from Quickbird or percent canopy cover from the VCF for 396 circumpolar boreal sites. The numbers along the X-axis denote the bin maximum values. The Quickbird estimates report percent tree crown cover while the VCF maps percent tree canopy cover.
Figure 6 Plots of all VCF inter-annual combinations using RMA regression to demonstrate the variability inherent within the VCF. Each observation represents the value of each year’s VCF data at a validation site (n = 403). For each plot, the earlier year is shown on the x-axis, with all subsequent years plotted on the y-axis.
Table 1 Summary of VCF RMA regression results showing Y-intercept (top row), slope (second row), RMSE and RMSD (third row), and $R^2$ values (bottom row) for all VCF inter-annual combinations (2000-2005) at 403 sites. P-values for tests of Y-intercept $\neq 0$ and slope $\neq 1$ are shown in italics adjacent to their corresponding regression coefficients. Significant differences shown in bold ($p<0.05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Y-intercept</th>
<th>slope</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>RMSD</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7 RMA regression showing the relationship of replicated TCC interpretations from Quickbird data by different interpreters for selected sites. The difference between the Y-intercept and 0, and the slope and 1 are not significant ($p = 0.12$ and $p = 0.09$).
Figure 8 Simple linear regression showing the relationship of MODIS 2005 VCF percent canopy cover values with estimated percent TCC values from Quickbird imagery.

Table 2 Summary of simple linear regression values representing the relationship of the 2005 VCF with the observed % TCC values from Quickbird data for each region and all combined regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>RMSD</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>P-value for slope ≠ 1</th>
<th>Y-intercept</th>
<th>P-value for Y-intercept ≠ 0</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/Western Canada</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Canada</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Eurasia</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Eurasia</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Eurasia</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All zones</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9 An example of a feature (a lake) denoted by the red polygon, shown in MODIS Level 3 data and Landsat TM data for 6/14/2008 and in Google Earth. The MODIS (in the sinusoidal grid) is shown in both Landsat TM’s UTM projection and MODIS’s sinusoidal projection. The 4 corners of the lake’s center pixel are show in each image as reference, to show that the geo-location of the pixel with respect to the lake polygon does not change regardless of view projection.