



(12) **United States Patent**
Rhoads

(10) **Patent No.:** **US 8,085,976 B2**
(45) **Date of Patent:** **Dec. 27, 2011**

(54) **DIGITAL WATERMARKING VIDEO
CAPTURED FROM AIRBORNE PLATFORMS**

5,113,445 A 5/1992 Wang
5,214,757 A 5/1993 Mauney et al.
5,280,537 A 1/1994 Sugiyama et al.

(Continued)

(75) Inventor: **Geoffrey B. Rhoads**, West Linn, OR
(US)

(73) Assignee: **Digimarc Corporation**, Beaverton, OR
(US)

EP 0 947 953 A2 10/1999
(Continued)

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this
patent is extended or adjusted under 35
U.S.C. 154(b) by 0 days.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Notice of Allowance (dated Dec. 17, 2004), Appeal Brief (dated Sep.
20, 2004) and Office Action (dated May 7, 2004) from parent U.S.
Appl. No. 09/800,093.

(21) Appl. No.: **12/687,687**

(Continued)

(22) Filed: **Jan. 14, 2010**

(65) **Prior Publication Data**

US 2010/0226528 A1 Sep. 9, 2010

Primary Examiner — Matthew C Bella
Assistant Examiner — Dennis Rosario

Related U.S. Application Data

(60) Continuation of application No. 11/465,405, filed on
Aug. 17, 2006, now Pat. No. 7,650,008, which is a
continuation of application No. 10/778,762, filed on
Feb. 13, 2004, now Pat. No. 7,099,492, which is a
division of application No. 09/800,093, filed on Mar. 5,
2001, now Pat. No. 7,061,510.

(57) **ABSTRACT**

Digital watermarking technology is used in conjunction with
video captured from airborne platforms (e.g., satellites,
remotely controlled aerial vehicles and aircraft). One claim
recites an airborne platform comprising: a camera for captur-
ing video depicting at least a portion of the earth's surface;
and an electronic processor. The electronic processor is pro-
grammed for: obtaining geographical metadata associated
with captured video; encoding first digital watermarking in
the captured video through alterations to data representing the
captured video, in which the first digital watermarking is
generally imperceptible to a human observer of the captured
video when rendered to the human observer in real time, and
in which the first digital watermarking comprises or links to
the geographical metadata; and controlling transmission of
digital watermarked video to a remotely located receiver on or
in the earth's surface. Another claim recites: that the elec-
tronic processor is further programmed for: hiding second
digital watermarking in data representing the captured video,
the second digital watermarking comprising a plural-bit pay-
load that includes data representing a refinement relative to at
least some of the geographical metadata. Other claims and
combinations are provided too.

(51) **Int. Cl.**
G06K 9/00 (2006.01)

(52) **U.S. Cl.** **382/100**

(58) **Field of Classification Search** 382/100
See application file for complete search history.

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

4,232,313 A * 11/1980 Fleishman 342/36
4,504,910 A 3/1985 Araki et al.
4,631,678 A 12/1986 Angermüller
4,789,962 A 12/1988 Berry et al.
4,805,020 A 2/1989 Greenberg
4,807,031 A 2/1989 Broughton et al.
4,969,041 A 11/1990 O'Grady et al.

20 Claims, 3 Drawing Sheets

Steganographically
hide or embed the
second information in
the media or image



Overlay the first
information

US 8,085,976 B2

Page 2

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

5,329,108	A	7/1994	Lamoure	6,498,984	B2	12/2002	Agnew et al.
5,385,371	A	1/1995	Izawa	6,504,571	B1	1/2003	Narayanaswami et al.
5,410,598	A	4/1995	Shear	6,505,160	B1	1/2003	Levy et al.
5,481,294	A	1/1996	Thomas et al.	6,507,890	B1	1/2003	Morley et al.
5,499,294	A	3/1996	Friedman	6,512,835	B1	1/2003	Numao et al.
5,502,576	A	3/1996	Ramsay et al.	6,512,857	B1 *	1/2003	Hsu et al. 382/294
5,640,193	A	6/1997	Wellner	6,522,770	B1	2/2003	Seder et al.
5,664,018	A	9/1997	Leighton	6,526,155	B1	2/2003	Wang et al.
5,748,362	A	5/1998	Delacourt et al.	6,529,615	B2	3/2003	Hendrickson et al.
5,748,763	A	5/1998	Rhoads	6,532,541	B1	3/2003	Chang et al.
5,761,606	A	6/1998	Wolzien	6,542,927	B2	4/2003	Rhoads
5,764,770	A	6/1998	Schipper et al.	6,556,688	B1	4/2003	Ratnakar
5,799,082	A	8/1998	Murphy et al.	6,611,607	B1	8/2003	Davis et al.
5,809,139	A	9/1998	Girod et al.	6,614,914	B1	9/2003	Rhoads et al.
5,812,962	A	9/1998	Kovac	6,625,297	B1	9/2003	Bradley
5,822,436	A	10/1998	Rhoads	6,636,249	B1	10/2003	Rekimoto
5,825,892	A	10/1998	Braudaway et al.	6,650,761	B1	11/2003	Rodriguez et al.
5,841,978	A	11/1998	Rhoads	6,650,877	B1	11/2003	Tarbouriech et al.
5,848,373	A	12/1998	DeLorme et al.	6,664,976	B2	12/2003	Lofgren et al.
5,861,841	A	1/1999	Gildea et al.	6,674,993	B1	1/2004	Tarbouriech
5,864,623	A	1/1999	Messina et al.	6,675,165	B1	1/2004	Rothschild
5,875,249	A	2/1999	Mintzer et al.	6,694,043	B2	2/2004	Seder et al.
5,889,868	A	3/1999	Moskowitz et al.	6,741,790	B1 *	5/2004	Burgess 386/227
5,889,898	A	3/1999	Koren et al.	6,748,362	B1	6/2004	Meyer et al.
5,901,178	A	5/1999	Lee et al.	6,811,113	B1 *	11/2004	Silansky et al. 244/30
5,909,673	A	6/1999	Gregory	6,829,430	B1	12/2004	Ashizaki et al.
5,919,730	A	7/1999	Gaspar et al.	6,894,794	B1	5/2005	Patton et al.
5,943,422	A	8/1999	Van Wie et al.	6,947,571	B1	9/2005	Rhoads et al.
5,958,051	A	9/1999	Renaud et al.	6,950,519	B2	9/2005	Rhoads
5,964,821	A	10/1999	Brunts et al.	6,961,441	B1 *	11/2005	Hershey et al. 382/100
5,987,136	A	11/1999	Schipper et al.	6,987,862	B2	1/2006	Rhoads
5,990,826	A	11/1999	Mitchell	6,993,152	B2	1/2006	Patterson et al.
5,995,681	A	11/1999	Lee et al.	7,010,144	B1	3/2006	Davis et al.
6,005,501	A	12/1999	Wolosewicz	7,042,470	B2	5/2006	Rhoads et al.
6,005,936	A	12/1999	Shimizu	7,061,510	B2	6/2006	Rhoads
6,031,914	A	2/2000	Tewfik et al.	7,084,903	B2	8/2006	Narayanaswami et al.
6,069,914	A	5/2000	Cox	7,088,843	B2	8/2006	Pelly
6,081,827	A	6/2000	Reber et al.	7,095,871	B2	8/2006	Jones et al.
6,088,394	A	7/2000	Maltby	7,098,931	B2	8/2006	Patterson et al.
6,122,403	A	9/2000	Rhoads	7,099,492	B2	8/2006	Rhoads
6,130,741	A	10/2000	Wen et al.	7,184,572	B2	2/2007	Rhoads et al.
6,148,091	A	11/2000	DiMaria	7,197,160	B2	3/2007	Rhoads et al.
6,175,639	B1	1/2001	Satoh et al.	7,209,571	B2	4/2007	Davis et al.
6,181,802	B1	1/2001	Todd	7,249,257	B2	7/2007	Brundage et al.
6,185,312	B1	2/2001	Nakamura et al.	7,254,249	B2	8/2007	Rhoads et al.
6,199,048	B1	3/2001	Hudetz et al.	7,289,643	B2	10/2007	Brunk et al.
6,205,249	B1	3/2001	Moskowitz	7,321,667	B2	1/2008	Stach
6,243,480	B1	6/2001	Zhao et al.	7,333,957	B2	2/2008	Levy et al.
6,246,777	B1	6/2001	Agarwal et al.	7,349,552	B2	3/2008	Levy et al.
6,249,226	B1	6/2001	Harrison	7,372,976	B2	5/2008	Rhoads et al.
6,263,438	B1	7/2001	Walker et al.	7,437,430	B2	10/2008	Rhoads
6,266,430	B1	7/2001	Rhoads	7,450,734	B2	11/2008	Rodriguez et al.
6,282,362	B1	8/2001	Murphy et al.	7,460,726	B2	12/2008	Levy et al.
6,282,648	B1	8/2001	Walker et al.	7,502,489	B2	3/2009	Rhoads
6,286,036	B1	9/2001	Rhoads	7,502,490	B2	3/2009	Rhoads et al.
6,289,453	B1	9/2001	Walker	7,506,169	B2	3/2009	Brundage et al.
6,301,360	B1	10/2001	Bocionek et al.	7,532,741	B2	5/2009	Stach
6,310,956	B1	10/2001	Morito et al.	7,562,392	B1	7/2009	Rhoads et al.
6,311,214	B1	10/2001	Rhoads	7,590,259	B2	9/2009	Levy et al.
6,320,829	B1	11/2001	Matsumoto et al.	7,650,008	B2 *	1/2010	Rhoads 382/100
6,324,573	B1	11/2001	Rhoads	7,650,010	B2	1/2010	Levy et al.
6,332,149	B1	12/2001	Warmus et al.	7,657,057	B2	2/2010	Davidson et al.
6,332,193	B1	12/2001	Glass et al.	7,702,511	B2	4/2010	Rhoads
6,341,350	B1	1/2002	Miyahara et al.	7,711,564	B2	5/2010	Levy et al.
6,343,138	B1	1/2002	Rhoads	7,792,325	B2	9/2010	Rhoads et al.
6,351,439	B1	2/2002	Miwa et al.	7,930,546	B2	4/2011	Rhoads et al.
6,381,418	B1	4/2002	Spurr et al.	2001/0001854	A1	5/2001	Schena et al.
6,389,151	B1	5/2002	Carr et al.	2001/0019611	A1	9/2001	Hilton
6,401,206	B1	6/2002	Khan et al.	2001/0022667	A1	9/2001	Yoda
6,408,082	B1	6/2002	Rhoads et al.	2001/0023421	A1	9/2001	Messina
6,408,331	B1	6/2002	Rhoads	2001/0026377	A1	10/2001	Ikegami
6,411,725	B1	6/2002	Rhoads	2001/0026616	A1	10/2001	Tanaka
6,418,232	B1	7/2002	Nakano et al.	2001/0026629	A1	10/2001	Oki
6,427,020	B1	7/2002	Rhoads	2001/0030759	A1	10/2001	Hayashi et al.
6,448,979	B1	9/2002	Schena	2001/0031064	A1	10/2001	Donescu et al.
6,463,416	B1	10/2002	Messina	2001/0033674	A1	10/2001	Chen et al.
6,493,514	B1	12/2002	Stocks et al.	2001/0034835	A1	10/2001	Smith
6,496,802	B1	12/2002	van Zoest	2001/0039546	A1	11/2001	Moore et al.
				2001/0046307	A1	11/2001	Wong

2001/0051964	A1	12/2001	Warmus et al.
2002/0001395	A1	1/2002	Davis et al.
2002/0002679	A1	1/2002	Murakami et al.
2002/0006212	A1	1/2002	Rhoads et al.
2002/0009209	A1	1/2002	Inoue et al.
2002/0044690	A1	4/2002	Burgess
2002/0046178	A1	4/2002	Morito et al.
2002/0057340	A1	5/2002	Fernandez
2002/0059520	A1	5/2002	Murakami et al.
2002/0065844	A1	5/2002	Robinson
2002/0069370	A1	6/2002	Mack
2002/0075298	A1	6/2002	Schena et al.
2002/0080396	A1	6/2002	Silverbrook et al.
2002/0095586	A1	7/2002	Doyle et al.
2002/0095601	A1	7/2002	Hind et al.
2002/0106105	A1	8/2002	Pelly et al.
2002/0122564	A1	9/2002	Rhoads et al.
2002/0124171	A1	9/2002	Rhoads
2002/0124173	A1	9/2002	Stone
2002/0126869	A1	9/2002	Wang et al.
2002/0135600	A1	9/2002	Rhoads et al.
2002/0136531	A1	9/2002	Harradine
2002/0147910	A1	10/2002	Brundage et al.
2002/0159765	A1	10/2002	Maruyama et al.
2002/0168069	A1	11/2002	Tehranchi et al.
2002/0191810	A1	12/2002	Fudge et al.
2003/0011684	A1	1/2003	Narayanaswami et al.
2003/0012562	A1	1/2003	Lawandy et al.
2003/0032033	A1	2/2003	Anglin et al.
2003/0040326	A1	2/2003	Levy et al.
2003/0048908	A1	3/2003	Hamilton
2003/0053654	A1	3/2003	Patterson et al.
2003/0063319	A1	4/2003	Umeda et al.
2003/0069693	A1	4/2003	Snapp et al.
2003/0074556	A1	4/2003	Chapman et al.
2003/0083098	A1	5/2003	Yamazaki et al.
2003/0090690	A1	5/2003	Katayama et al.
2003/0120940	A1	6/2003	Vatija
2003/0215110	A1	11/2003	Rhoads et al.
2004/0005078	A1	1/2004	Tillotson
2004/0046774	A1	3/2004	Rhoads et al.
2004/0162981	A1	8/2004	Wong
2004/0201676	A1	10/2004	Needham
2004/0221244	A1	11/2004	Baldino
2004/0223626	A1	11/2004	Honsinger et al.
2005/0025335	A1	2/2005	Bloom et al.
2005/0030588	A1	2/2005	Reese et al.
2005/0086585	A1	4/2005	Walmsley et al.
2005/0154924	A1	7/2005	Scheidt et al.
2005/0276440	A1	12/2005	Rhoads et al.
2006/0026140	A1	2/2006	King et al.
2007/0052730	A1	3/2007	Patterson et al.
2007/0116325	A1	5/2007	Rhoads et al.
2008/0025561	A1	1/2008	Rhoads et al.
2008/0080737	A1	4/2008	Rhoads et al.
2010/0067734	A1	3/2010	Rhoads
2010/0205445	A1	8/2010	Anglin et al.

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

EP	0 953 938	A2	11/1999
EP	935 872		11/2001
EP	1220152		7/2002
GB	2371934		8/2002
JP	2000 41144	A	2/2000
WO	WO99/17537		4/1999
WO	WO 2000/56058	A1 *	9/2000
WO	WO 01/05075		1/2001
WO	WO01/24113		4/2001
WO	WO01/39121		5/2001

WO	WO01/76253	10/2001
WO	WO02/03328	1/2002
WO	WO02/33650	4/2002

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Notice of Allowance (dated Dec. 17, 2004), Appeal Brief (dated Sep. 20, 2004) and Office Action (dated May 14, 2004) from assignee's patent U.S. Appl. No. 10/002,954.

Apr. 27, 2006 Appeal Brief and Nov. 25, 2005 final Office Action, each from assignee's U.S. Appl. No. 09/833,013.

Aug. 30, 2006 Amendment and Aug. 23, 2006 Office Action, each from Assignee's U.S. Appl. No. 10/423,489 (published as US 2004-0046774 A1).

Jan. 5, 2007 Amendment and Oct. 6, 2006 Office Action, each from Assignee's U.S. Appl. No. 10/371,995 (published as US 2003-0215110 A1).

Bender et al., "Techniques for Data Hiding," SPIE vol. 2420, Jan. 1995, pp. 164-173.

Berger, et al., "Watermarking in JPEG Bitstream," in Security, Steganography, and Watermarking of Multimedia Contents VII, edited by Edward J. Delp III, Ping Wah Wong, Proceeding of SPIE-IS&T Electronic Imaging, SPIE vol. 5681, pp. 539-548, 2005.

Caronni, "Assuring Ownership Rights for Digital Images," Published in the Proceedings of 'Reliable IT Systems,' VIS '95, HH. Brüggemann and W. Gerhardt-Häckl (Ed.), Vieweg Publishing Company, Germany, 1995, Jun. 14, 1994, 10 pages.

Carp, "Seven wonders of the imaging world", International Contact, Oct./Nov. 2000, pp. 36/I-36/IV.

"Digital Watermarking, The Unseen Advantage," Geo Informatics, Jun. 2001 (3 pages).

Friedman, "The Trustworthy Digital Camera: Restoring Credibility to the Photographic Image," IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics, vol. 39, No. 4, Nov. 1993, pp. 905-910.

<http://web.archive.org/web/20010305033241/http://www.kodak.com/country/US/en/corp/researchDevelopment/>

[technologyFeatures/digitalWatermarking.shtml](http://web.archive.org/web/20010305033241/http://www.kodak.com/country/US/en/corp/researchDevelopment/technologyFeatures/digitalWatermarking.shtml), "Invisible Watermarking", archive date of Mar. 5, 2001 (4 pages, including Internet Archive Wayback Machine cover page).

Jauregui et al., "A procedure for map updating using digital monoplottting and DTMs," IAPRS, vol. 32, Part 4 "GIS-Between Visions and Application," Stuttgart, 1998.

Koch et al., "Digital Copyright Labeling: Providing Evidence of Misuse and Tracking Unauthorized Distribution of Copyrighted Materials," OASIS Magazine, Dec. 1995, 3 pages.

Manjunath, "Image Processing in the Alexandria Digital Library Project," Proc. IEEE Int. Form on Research and Tech. Advances in Digital Libraries—ADL '98, pp. 180-187.

Seybold Seminars: Keynote: Digital Imaging Day, comments from panel including Daniel Carp, panel discussion occurring on Aug. 28, 2000 (8 pages).

Yeung et al., "Digital Watermarks: Shedding Light on the Invisible," Nov.-Dec. 1998, IEEE Micro vol. 18, No. 6, pp. 32-41.

Zhao et al., "Embedding Robust Labels Into Images for Copyright Protection," Proc. of the International Congress on Intellectual Property Rights for Specialized Information, Knowledge and New Technologies (Vienna, Austria) Aug. 21-25, 1995, 10 pages.

Zhao, "Digital Watermark Mobile Agents," Proc. of NISSC'99, Arlington, VA, Oct. 18-21, 1999, pp. 138-146.

Zhao, "A WWW Service to Embed and Prove Digital Copyright Watermarks," In Proc. of the European Conf. on Multimedia Applications, Services and Techniques, Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium, May 1996, 15 pages.

* cited by examiner




FIG. 1




FIG. 2




FIG. 3




FIG. 4




FIG. 5

DIGITAL WATERMARKING VIDEO CAPTURED FROM AIRBORNE PLATFORMS

RELATED APPLICATION DATA

This application is a continuation of U.S. patent application Ser. No. 11/465,405, filed Aug. 17, 2006 (now U.S. Pat. No. 7,650,008) which is a continuation of U.S. patent application Ser. No. 10/778,762, filed Feb. 13, 2004 (now U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,492). The Ser. No. 10/778,762 application is a division of U.S. patent application Ser. No. 09/800,093, filed Mar. 5, 2001 (now U.S. Pat. No. 7,061,510). The above U.S. Patent documents are hereby incorporated by reference.

FIELD OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates to image management and processing, and is particularly illustrated in the context of near real-time management of satellite and other aerial imagery, and automatic revision of map data based on such imagery.

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Acquisition of aerial imagery traces its history back to the Wright brothers, and is now commonly performed from satellite and space shuttle platforms in addition to aircraft.

While the earliest aerial imagery relied on conventional film technology, a variety of electronic sensors are now more commonly used. Some collect image data corresponding to specific visible, UV or IR frequency spectra (e.g., the Multi-Spectral Scanner and Thematic Mapper used by the Landsat satellites). Others use wide band sensors. Still others use radar or laser systems (sometimes stereo) to sense topological features in 3 dimensions.

The quality of the imagery has also constantly improved. Some satellite systems are now capable of acquiring image and topological data having a resolution of less than a meter. Aircraft imagery, collected from lower altitudes, provides still greater resolution.

For expository convenience, the present invention is particularly illustrated in the context of a Digital Elevation Model (DEM). A DEM, essentially, is an "elevation map" of the earth (or part thereof). One popular DEM is maintained by the U.S. Geological Survey and details terrain elevations at regularly spaced intervals over most of the U.S. More sophisticated DEM databases are maintained for more demanding applications, and can consider details such as the earth's pseudo pear shape, in addition to more localized features. Resolution of sophisticated DEMs can get well below one meter cross-wise, and down to centimeters or less in actual elevation. DEMs—with their elevation data—are sometimes supplemented by albedo maps (sometimes termed texture maps, or reflectance maps) that detail, e.g., a grey scale value for each pixel in the image, conveying a photographic-like representation of an area.

There is a large body of patent literature that illustrates DEM systems and technology. For example:

U.S. Pat. No. 5,608,405 details a method of generating a Digital Elevation Model from the interference pattern resulting from two co-registered synthetic aperture radar images.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,926,581 discloses a technique for generating a Digital Elevation Model from two images of ground terrain, by reference to common features in the two images, and registration mapping functions that relate the images to a ground plane reference system.

U.S. Pat. Nos. 5,974,423, 6,023,278 and 6,177,943 disclose techniques by which a Digital Elevation Model can be transformed into polygonal models, thereby reducing storage requirements, and facilitating display in certain graphics display systems.

U.S. Pat. Nos. 5,995,681 and 5,550,937 detail methods for real-time updating of a Digital Elevation Model (or a reference image based thereon), and are particularly suited for applications in which the terrain being mapped is not static but is subject, e.g., to movement or destruction of mapped features. The disclosed arrangement iteratively cross-correlates new image data with the reference image, automatically adjusting the geometry model associated with the image sensor, thereby accurately co-registering the new image relative to the reference image. Areas of discrepancy can be quickly identified, and the DEM/reference image can be updated accordingly.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,150,972 details how interferometric synthetic aperture radar data can be used to generate a Digital Elevation Model.

From systems such as the foregoing, and others, a huge quantity of aerial imagery is constantly being collected. Management and coordination of the resulting large data sets is a growing problem.

In accordance with one aspect of the present invention, digital watermarking technology is employed to help track such imagery, and can also provide audit trail, serialization, anti-copying, and other benefits.

In accordance with another aspect of the invention, incoming imagery is automatically geo-referenced and combined with previously-collected data sets so as to facilitate generation of up-to-date DEMs and maps.

The foregoing and additional features and advantages of the present invention will be more readily apparent from the following detailed description.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

FIG. 1 shows a flow chart of steganographically embedding auxiliary data in imagery.

FIG. 2 shows a flow chart of steganographically hiding information in media.

FIG. 3 shows a flow chart of steganographically hiding or embedding information in an image or media, including an act of decoding first information hidden or embedded in the media or image.

FIG. 4 shows a flow chart of steganographically hiding or embedding second information in media or an image, including overlaying the first information.

FIG. 5 shows a flow chart of steganographically hiding or embedding second information in media or an image, including overwriting the first information.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

(For expository convenience, the following specification focuses on satellite "imagery" to illustrate the principles of the invention. The principles of the invention, however, are equally applicable to other forms of aerial surveillance data and other topographic/mapping information. Accordingly, the term "image" should be used to encompass all such other data sets, and the term "pixel" should be construed to encompass component data from such other data sets.)

When new aerial imagery is received, it is generally necessary to identify the precise piece of earth to which it corresponds. This operation, termed "georeferencing" or "geocoding," can be a convoluted art and science.

In many systems, the georeferencing begins with a master reference system (e.g., latitude and longitude) that takes into account the earth's known deformities from a sphere. Onto this reference system the position of the depicted region is inferred, e.g., by consideration of the satellite's position and orientation (ephemeris data), optical attributes of the satellite's imaging system, and models of the dispersion/refraction introduced by the earth's atmosphere.

In applications where precise accuracy is required, the foregoing, "ephemeris," position determination is refined by comparing features in the image with the placement of known features on the earth's surface (e.g., buildings and other man-placed objects, geological features, etc.) and compensating the georeference determination accordingly. Thus, for example, if the actual latitude and longitude of a building is known (e.g., by measurement from a ground survey—"ground truth"), and the corresponding latitude and longitude of that building as indicated in the georeferenced satellite imagery is different, the reference system applied to the satellite data can be altered to achieve a match. (Commonly, three or more such ground truth points are used so as to assure accurate correction.)

Ground-truthing is a tedious undertaking. While computer methods can be used to facilitate the process, the best ground truth correction of imagery generally requires some human involvement. This is impractical for many applications.

Let us consider the basic principle of cost/meter as a useful metric, and imagine that various applications for exploiting satellite data are willing to pay different amounts in order to achieve given levels of geocoding accuracy. The following disclosure hypothesizes that there are ways (possibly novel, alluding to the idea that the author lacks detailed knowledge of the state of the art, and presumes no novelty nor lack thereof) to utilize all collected satellite data, properly identified and stored as a huge intercorrelated reference system—itsself anchored by ground truth data—as a means to automatically geocode incoming raw pixels to the massive overall data set. The accuracy of this automated geocoding would hopefully be higher than that obtainable from ephemeris-type systems alone, but would probably be less accurate than "manually instigated" precision geocoding based directly on ground truth. The hope and goal would be that a lower core cost/meter geocoding accuracy could be achieved.

Such a system may involve the following elemental components:

- 1) An ideal sphere with an arbitrary time origin (as the starting point for the DEM model)
- 2) A time-evolving DEM
- 3) A time-evolving master-correlate albedo texture map
 - 3A) A finite layered index map, organizing current raw data contributors to map
- 4) Ground Truth Data
- 5) Nominal ephemeris data per contiguous datastream

The ongoing automation process includes:

- 1) Creating initial sphere, DEM, and texture map using existing ground truth
- 2) Creating a layered index map
- 3) Each newly acquired datastream is cloud-masked, DEM-projection-and refraction-corrected
- 4) The masked-corrected data—using nominal ephemeris data as a starting point—is correlated to a master DEM/albedo map, itself projected along nominal ephemeris
- 5) The quality of the new data is evaluated, and incrementally added to the master albedo map and index map if it is deemed acceptable

5A) a pseudo infinite impulse response (based on time and quality of data) in coming up with current albedo map pixel value (omnidirectional pixel value)

At the core of building the albedo-map (and also the DEM) is the need to always track its inputs for several reasons:

- redundant checking for accuracy and veracity of inputs;
- indexing of what data is contributing to the master albedo map;
- coordination of data from similar or even vastly different sources, all contributing to either the master maps or to existing relational databases.

As detailed below, watermarking can play an important role in the achieving these objects.

The foregoing will be clearer from the following.

Consider an illustrative DEM system with a 10 meter horizontal resolution, and featuring continual refresh and georeferencing. At two bytes per pixel, and a model size of 4M by 2M pixels, the model comprises 16 Terabytes of data. The albedo map is on the same order of resolution, with the same data storage requirements. The database storing this information desirably is arranged to easily graph necessary correlation scenes.

Presume an existing master DEM and albedo map. These may have been formed by a dozen or more redundant component data sets (e.g., aerial images, ground surveys), acquired over the previous days, months or years, that have been composited together to yield the final DEM/map ("model").

Now imagine a new satellite image is acquired corresponding to part of the region represented by the master model. The particular terrain depicted by the satellite image can be inferred from ephemeris and other factors, as noted above. By such techniques, the location of the depicted image on the earth's surface (e.g., the latitude and longitude of a point at the center of the image) may be determined within an error of, say 5-500 meters. This is a gross geo-referencing operation.

Next a fine geo-referencing operation is automatically performed, as follows. An excerpt of the master model is retrieved from the database—large enough to encompass the new image and its possible placement error (e.g., an area centered on the same latitude/longitude, but extending 250 meters further at each edge). A projective image is formed from this master DEM/map excerpt, considering, e.g., the satellite's position and atmospheric effects, thereby simulating how the master model would look to the satellite, taking into account—where possible—the particular data represented by the satellite image, e.g., the frequency bands imaged, etc. (The albedo map may be back-projected on the 3D DEM data in some arrangements to augment the realism of the projective image.)

The projective image formed from the master DEM/map excerpt differs somewhat from the image actually acquired by the satellite. This difference is due, in part, to the error in the gross geo-referencing. (Other differences may arise, e.g., by physical changes in the region depicted since the master DEM/map was compiled.)

The projective image is next automatically correlated with the satellite image. A variety of known mathematical techniques can be utilized in this operation, including dot product computation, transforming to spatial frequency domain, convolution, etc. In a lay sense, the correlation can be imagined as sliding one map over the other until the best registration between the two images is obtained.

From the correlation operation, the center-to-center offset between the excerpt of the master DEM/map, and the satellite image, is determined. The satellite image can thereby be accurately placed in the context of the master model. Depend-

ing on system parameters, a fine placement accuracy of, e.g., between 5 cm and 5 meters (i.e., sub-pixel accuracy) may be achieved.

(In some embodiments, affine transformations can be applied to the satellite data to further enhance the correlation. E.g., particular geological or other features in the two data sets can be identified, and the satellite data (e.g., map or image) can then be affine-transformed so that these features correctly register.)

With the satellite image thus finely geo-referenced to the master DEM/map, it can be transformed (e.g., resampled) as necessary to correspond to the (typically rectilinear) reference system used in the master model, and then used to refine the data represented in the model. Buildings or other features newly depicted in the satellite image, for example, can be newly represented in the master model. The master model can be similarly updated to account for erosion and other topological changes revealed by the new satellite image.

Part of the finely geo-referenced satellite data may be discarded and not added to the master model, e.g., due to cloud cover or other obscuring phenomena. The remaining data is assessed for its relative quality, and this assessment is used in determining the relative weight that will be given the new satellite data in updating the master model.

In one embodiment, the finely geo-referenced satellite data is segmented into regions, e.g., rectangular patches corresponding to terrain 1000 meters on a side, and each patch is given its own weighting factor, etc. In a system with 10 meter resolution (i.e., a pixel size of 10 m², the patch thus comprises an array of 100×100 pixels. (In some embodiments, the fine geo-referencing is done following the segmentation of the image, with each patch separately correlated with a corresponding area in the master model.) Each patch may take the form of a separate data file.

When the new satellite data is added to update the master model, old data may be discarded so that it no longer influences the model. Consider an area that is imaged monthly by a satellite. Several months' worth of image data may be composited to yield the master model (e.g., so cloud cover that obscured a region in the latest fly-over does not leave part of the model undefined). As each component image data gets older, it may be given less and less weight, until it no longer forms any part of the master model. (Other component data, in contrast, may be retained for much longer periods of time. Map information collected by ground surveys or other forms of "ground truth" information may fall into this category.)

The master model may be physically maintained in different ways. In one exemplary arrangement, a database stores the ten sets of data (e.g., acquired from different sources, or at different times) for each 1000×1000 meter patch. When interrogated to produce a map or other data, the database recalls the 10 data sets for each patch, and combines them on the fly according to associated weighting factors and other criteria (e.g., viewing angle) to yield a net representation for that patch. This composite patch is then combined (e.g., graphically stitched) with other adjoining, similarly-formed composite patches, to yield a data set representing the desired area.

In another embodiment, the component sets of image data are not separately maintained. Rather, each new set of image data is used to update a stored model. If the new image data is of high quality (e.g., good atmospheric seeing conditions, and acquired with a high resolution imaging device), then the new data may be combined with the existing model with a 20/80 weighting (i.e., the existing model is given a weight four-times that of the new data). If the new image data is of low quality, it may be combined with the existing model with a

5/95 weighting. The revised model is then stored, and the new data needn't thereafter be tracked.

(The foregoing examples are gross simplifications, but serve to illustrate a range of approaches.)

The former arrangement—with the component data stored—is preferred for many applications, since the database can be queried to yield different information. For example, the database can be queried to generate a synthesized image of terrain as it would look at a particular time of day, imaged in a specified IR frequency band, from a specified vantage point.

It will be recognized that a key requirement—especially of the former arrangement—is a sophisticated data management system. For each data set representing a component 1000×1000 meter patch stored in the database, a large quantity of ancillary data (meta data) must be tracked. Among this meta data may be a weighting factor (e.g., based on seeing conditions and sensor attributes), an acquisition date and time (from which an age-based weighting factor may be determined), the ID of the sensor/satellite that acquired that data, ephemeris data from the time of acquisition, the frequency band imaged, the geo-referenced position of the patch (e.g., latitude/longitude), etc., etc. (Much of this Data May be Common to all Patches from a Single Image.)

Classically, each component source of data to the system (here referred to as an "image" for expository convenience) is associated with a unique identifier. Tapes and data files, for example, may have headers in which this identifier is stored. The header may also include all of the meta data that is to be associated with that file. Or the identifier can identify a particular database record at which the corresponding meta data is stored. Or hybrid approaches can be used (e.g., the header can include a file identifier that identifies a data base record, but also includes data specifying the date/time of data acquisition).

In the final analysis, any form of very reliable image identification may suffice for use in such a system. The header approach just-discussed is straightforward. Preferable, however, is to embed one or more identifiers directly into the image data itself (i.e., "in band" steganographic encoding using digital watermarking). A well-designed watermarking name-space can in fact become a supra-structure over several essentially independent serial numbering systems already in use across a range of satellite sources. Moreover, rudimentary georeferencing information can actually be embedded within the watermark name-space.

For example, on initial acquisition, an initial watermark can be applied to satellite imagery detailing the ephemeris based gross georeferencing. Once the image has been finely georeferenced, the existing watermark can either be overlaid or overwritten with a new watermark containing the georeferencing information (e.g., "center lat: N34.432-4352, long: W87.2883134; rot from N/S: 3.232; x2.343, y2.340, dx0.123, dy493, etc."). These numbers essentially encode georeferencing info including projective and atmospheric distortions, such that when this image is DEM-projection corrected, high accuracy should be achieved.

Another way to explain the need for watermarking might be the following: Pity the first grade teacher who has a class of young upstarts who demand a lengthy dissertation on why they should simply put their names on their papers. The uses defy even common sense arguments, and it is no different with watermarks . . . sear in a serial number and just keep track of it.

The assignee's U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,403, and pending application Ser. No. 09/503,881, detail suitable digital watermarking techniques in which values of pixels, e.g., in a 100×100

pixel patch, can be slightly altered so as to convey a plural-bit payload, without impairing use of the pixel data for its intended purpose. The payload may be on the order of 50-250 bits, depending on the particular form of encoding (e.g., convolution, turbo, or BCH coding can be employed to provide some error-correcting capability), and the number of bits per pixel. Larger payloads can be conveyed through larger image patches. (Larger payloads can also be conveyed by encoding the information in a less robust fashion, or by making the encoding more relatively visible.)

The watermark payload can convey an image identifier, and may convey other meta data as well. In some systems, the component image files are tagged both by digital watermark identifiers and also by conventional out-of-band techniques, such as header data, thereby affording data redundancy.

Watermarking may be performed in stages, at different times. For example, an identifier can be watermarked into an image relatively early in the process, and other information (such as finely geo-referenced latitude/longitude) can be watermarked later. A single watermark can be used, with different payload bits written at different times. (In watermark systems employing pseudo-random data or noise (PN), e.g., to randomize some aspect of the payload's encoding, the same PN data can be used at both times, with different payload bits encoded at the different times.)

Alternatively, different watermarks can be applied to convey different data. The watermarks can be of the same general type (e.g., PN based, but using different PN data). Or different forms of watermark can be used (e.g., one that encodes by adding an overlay signal to a representation of the image in the pixel domain, another that encodes by slightly altering DCT coefficients corresponding to the image in a spatial frequency domain, and another that encodes by slightly altering wavelet coefficients corresponding to the image).

In some multiple-watermarking approaches, a first watermark is applied before the satellite image is segmented into patches. A later watermark can be applied after segmentation. (The former watermark is typically designed so as to be detectable from even small excerpts of the original image.)

A watermark can be applied by the imaging instrument. In some embodiments, the image is acquired through an LCD optical shutter, or other programmable optical device, that imparts an inconspicuous patterning to the image as it is captured. (One particular optical technique for watermark encoding is detailed in U.S. Pat. No. 5,930,369.) Or the watermarking can be effected by systems in the satellite that process the acquired data prior to transmission to a ground station. In some systems, the image data is compressed for transmission—discarding information that is not important. The compression algorithm can discard information in a manner calculated so that the remaining data is thereby encoded with a watermark.

The ground station receiving the satellite transmission can likewise apply a watermark to the image data. So can each subsequent system through which the data passes.

As indicated, the watermark(s) can identify the imaging system, the date/time of data acquisition, satellite ephemeris data, the identity of intervening systems through which the data passed, etc. One or more watermarks can stamp the image with unique identifiers used in subsequent management of the image data, or in management of meta data associated with the image.

A watermark can also serve a function akin to a hyperlink, e.g., as detailed in application Ser. No. 09/571,422. For example, a user terminal can permit an operator to right-click on a region of interest in a displayed image. In response, the system can respond with a menu of options—one of which is

Link Through Watermark(s). If the user selects this option, a watermark detection function is invoked that decodes a watermark payload from the displayed image (or from a portion of the image in which the operator clicked). Using data from the decoded watermark payload, the terminal interrogates a database for a corresponding record. That record can return to the terminal certain stored information relating to the displayed image. For example, the database can present on the terminal screen a listing of hyperlinks leading to other images depicting the same area. By clicking on such a link, the corresponding image is displayed. Or the database can present, on the user terminal screen, the meta-data associated with the image.

In some embodiments, watermarks in component images may carry-through into the master DEM/map representation. If an excerpt of the master DEM/map is displayed, the user may invoke the Link Through Watermark(s) function. Corresponding options may be presented. For example, the user may be given the option of viewing each of the component images/data sets that contributed to the portion of the master model being viewed.

(It will be recognized that a variety of user interface techniques other than right-clicking, and selecting from a menu of options thereby displayed, can be employed. That interface is illustrative only.)

In some embodiments, a watermark can be applied to each DEM/map from the master database as it is retrieved and output to the user. The watermark can indicate (i.e., by direct encoding, or by pointing to a database record) certain data related to the compiled data set, such as the date/time of creation, the ID of the person who queried the database, the component datasets used in preparing the output data, the database used in compiling the output data, etc. Thereafter, if this output data is printed, or stored for later use, the watermark persists, permitting this information to be later ascertained.

Watermarks can be applied to any data set (e.g., a satellite image, or a map generated from the master database) for forensic tracking purposes. This is particularly useful where several copies of the same data set are distributed through different channels (e.g., provided to different users). Each can be “serialized” with a different identifier, and a record can be kept of which numbered data set was provided to which distribution channel. Thereafter, if one of the data sets appears in an unexpected context, it can be tracked back to the distribution channel from which it originated.

Some watermarks used in the foregoing embodiments can be “fragile.” That is, they can be designed to be lost, or to degrade predictably, when the data set into which it is embedded is processed in some manner. Thus, for example, a fragile watermark may be designed so that if an image is JPEG compressed and then decompressed, the watermark is lost. Or if the image is printed, and subsequently scanned back into digital form, the watermark is corrupted in a foreseeable way. (Fragile watermark technology is disclosed, e.g., in application Ser. Nos. 09/234,780, 09/433,104, 09/498,223, 60/198,138, 09/562,516, 09/567,405, 09/625,577, 09/645,779, and 60/232,163.) By such arrangements it is possible to infer how a data set has been processed by the attributes of a fragile watermark embedded in the original data set.

Assuming that early testing proves out that the addition of “watermarking energy” into the normal workflow of satellite imaging systems does not materially disturb the function of most of the output of that system, nevertheless certain “watermark removal” tools can be built to alleviate any problems in cases where unacceptable impact is identified. This can either be a generic tool or one highly specialized to the particular application at hand (perhaps employing secret data associated

with that application). In a second generation system (without too much fanfare) a fairly simple “remove watermark before analyzing this scene” function could be automatically included within analysis software such that 99% of image analysts wouldn’t know or care about the watermarking on/off/on/off functionality as a function of use/transport. 5

As will be apparent, the technology detailed herein may be employed in reconnaissance and remote sensing systems, as well as in applications such as guidance of piloted or remotely piloted vehicles. 10

To provide a comprehensive disclosure without unduly lengthening this specification, applicant incorporates by reference, in their entireties, the disclosures of the above-cited patents and applications.

It should be understood that the technology detailed herein can be applied in the applications detailed in the cited DEM patents, as well as in other mapping and image (or audio or video or other content) asset management contexts (Likewise, the technologies detailed in the cited patents can be advantageously used in embodiments according to the present invention.) 15 20

While particular reference was made to Digital Elevation Models and albedo maps, the same principles are likewise applicable to other forms of maps, e.g., vegetative, population, thermal, etc., etc.

While the illustrated embodiment correlated the incoming imagery with a projective image based on the master DEM/map, in other embodiments a reference other than the master DEM/map may be used. For example, a projection based just on part of the historical data from which the DEM/map was compiled can be used (e.g., one or more component data sets that are regarded as having the highest accuracy, such as based directly on ground truths). 25 30

Although not belabored, artisans will understand that the systems described above can be implemented using a variety of hardware and software systems. One embodiment employs a computer or workstation with a large disk library, and capable database software (such as is available from Microsoft, Oracle, etc.). The registration, watermarking, and other operations can be performed in accordance with software instructions stored in the disk library or on other storage media, and executed by a processor in the computer as needed. (Alternatively, dedicated hardware, or programmable logic circuits, can be employed for such operations.) 35 40

Certain of the techniques detailed above find far application beyond the context in which they are illustrated. For example, equipping an imaging instrument with an optical shutter that impart a watermark to an image finds application in digital cinema (e.g., in watermarking a theatrical movie with information indicating the theatre, date, time, and auditorium of screening). 45 50

In view of the wide variety of embodiments to which the principles and features discussed above can be applied, it should be apparent that the detailed embodiments are illustrative only and should not be taken as limiting the scope of the invention. Rather, I claim as my invention all such modifications as may come within the scope and spirit of the following claims and equivalents thereof. (For expository convenience, the term “map” as used in the claim should be construed to encompass terrain models, such as DEMs.) 55 60

What is claimed is:

1. A method of controlling an airborne platform, comprising: 65

controlling capture of video depicting at least a portion of the earth’s surface, wherein the video is captured by a camera on the airborne platform;

obtaining geographical metadata associated with at least captured video;

controlling encoding of first digital watermarking in the video through alterations to data representing the captured video, wherein the first digital watermarking is generally imperceptible to a human observer of the captured video when rendered to the human observer, and wherein the first digital watermarking comprises or links to the geographical metadata;

controlling encoding of second digital watermarking in the video, wherein the second digital watermarking comprises a plural-bit payload that includes data representing a refinement to the geographical metadata; and

controlling transmission of the second digital watermarked video to a remotely located receiver on or in the earth’s surface.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the first digital watermarking comprises a plural-bit payload including at least some of the geographical metadata associated with the captured video.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at least a camera viewing angle.

4. The method of claim 1, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at least camera attributes. 25

5. The method of claim 1, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at least an acquisition date and time.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at least an identifier associated with the airborne platform. 30

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at least a geo-referenced position.

8. The method of claim 7, wherein the geo-referenced position is conveyed in terms of at least latitude and longitude.

9. The method of claim 7, wherein the geo-referenced position corresponds to at least some of the portion of the earth’s surface depicted in the video.

10. The method of claim 1, wherein the geographical metadata comprises a first geolocation and a second geolocation, and wherein the first geolocation and the second geolocation respectively correspond to a first location and a second location depicted in the video.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein the airborne platform comprises a satellite, unmanned aerial vehicle, or aircraft.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein the data representing the captured video comprises data representing compressed captured video.

13. An airborne platform comprising:

a camera configured to capture video depicting at least a portion of the earth’s surface; and

a processor configured to:

obtain geographical metadata associated with captured video;

encode first digital watermarking in the captured video through alterations to data representing the captured video, wherein the first digital watermarking is generally imperceptible to a human observer of the captured video when rendered to the human observer in real time, and wherein the first digital watermarking comprises or links to the geographical metadata;

hide second digital watermarking data representing the captured video, wherein the second digital watermarking comprises a plural-bit payload that includes data representing a refinement relative to at least some of the geographical metadata; and

11

control transmission of the second digital watermarked video to a remotely located receiver on or in the earth's surface.

14. The airborne platform of claim 13, wherein the geographical metadata comprises a first geolocation and a second geolocation, and wherein the first geolocation and the second geolocation respectively correspond to a first location and a second location depicted in the captured video.

15. The airborne platform of claim 13, wherein the airborne platform comprises a satellite, unmanned aerial vehicle, or aircraft.

16. The airborne platform of claim 13, wherein the data representing the captured video comprises data representing compressed captured video.

12

17. The airborne platform of claim 13, wherein the first digital watermarking comprises a plural-hit payload including at least some of the geographical metadata associated with the captured video.

18. The airborne platform of claim 13, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at least camera attributes.

19. The airborne platform of claim 13, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at least an identifier associated with the airborne platform.

20. The airborne platform of claim 13, wherein the geographical metadata comprises at east a geo-referenced position.

* * * * *

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

PATENT NO. : 8,085,976 B2
APPLICATION NO. : 12/687687
DATED : December 27, 2011
INVENTOR(S) : Rhoads

Page 1 of 1

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

In Fig. 5, Sheet 3 of 3, delete “ore image” and insert -- or image --, therefor.

In Column 1, Line 10, delete “Ser. No. 10/778,762 application” and insert -- application Ser. No. 10/778,762 --, therefor.

In Column 6, Line 52, delete “N34.432-4352,” and insert -- N34.4324352, --, therefor.

In Column 9, Line 18, delete “contexts” and insert -- contexts. --, therefor.

In Column 10, Line 63, in Claim 13, delete “data” and insert -- in data --, therefor.

In Column 12, Line 2, in Claim 17, delete “plural-hit” and insert -- plural-bit --, therefor.

In Column 12, Line 11, in Claim 20, delete “at east” and insert -- at least --, therefor.

Signed and Sealed this
Twenty-sixth Day of June, 2012

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David J. Kappos". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "D" and a stylized "K".

David J. Kappos
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office