This is the author's version (accepted manuscript) of the work that was accepted for publication in IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing.

The Version of Record is available online at https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2022.3147490.

IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON GEOSCIENCE AND REMOTE SENSING

Retrieval of Wind- and Total Surface Current Vectors Using Experimental Bidirectional Along-Track Interferometric TanDEM-X Data

Nina Caldarella, Paco Lopez-Dekker, *Member, IEEE*, Pau Prats-Iraola, *Member, IEEE*, Frédéric Nouguier, Bertrand Chapron, Mariantonietta Zonno, Marc Rodriguez-Cassola, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract-Observations of wind- and ocean surface velocity vectors by Along-Track Interferometry (ATI) with the Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) are not only important for direct applications, but also to increase understandings of ocean upper-layer mixing, air-ocean interactions, and mapping submesoscale (1-10 km) structures. Experimental Bidirectional(BiDi) ATI acquisition mode of TanDEM-X observes with two squinted beams separated by an angle of approximately 13.2 degree in azimuth on the ground. The baseline is very short, and the ATI phase of the ocean surface in line-of-sight direction of the beams can be interpreted as a total Doppler velocity. The 2-dimensional Doppler velocity field will thus include wind wave detected motions. In this paper, Doppler velocity fields acquired from this experimental acquisition mode are presented. The sequential retrieval of wind- and total surface current vectors is demonstrated on the bidirectional TanDEM-X data. The retrieval algorithm builds on existing Geophysical Model Functions (GMF) of NRCS and Doppler velocity. XMOD2 and a GMF based on the Elfouhaily Ocean Wave Spectrum coupled with a Kirchhoff Approximation (EOWS&KA) are used respectively. The retrieved wind fields are generally consistent with ECMWF ERA-5. Where the ATI phase errors are small, the retrieved TSCV field looks promising. Acquisitions were located at sea over the tip of the Novaya Zemlya in Russia and over an area near Tromsø, Norway.

Index Terms—ocean surface current vectors, wind vectors, along-track interferometry, bidirectional synthetic aperture radar, TanDEM-X.

I. INTRODUCTION

E XPERIMENTAL along-track interferometric acquisitions in bidirectional mode with TanDEM-X[1] provide opportunities to demonstrate retrieval of 2-dimensional high resolution surface current fields of the ocean[2]. These data have been long desired to help study small scale upper ocean processes, that play key roles in upper ocean mixing [3] and air-ocean interactions.

The observation of ocean surface currents with Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) Along-Track (AT) Interferometry (ATI) was demonstrated a long time ago[4]. The along-track interferometric phase (ATI phase) is the along-track phase difference between two SAR images acquired under nearly identical geometry and with a short time lag τ in between. The ATI phase is shifted proportional to the line-of-sight velocity of the moving target. However, for ocean scenes, this velocity cannot be directly interpreted as a surface current.

It was illustrated using ENVISAT ASAR data that microwave Doppler velocity data encompass high resolution

information about surface currents as well as winds[5]. Traditionally, Normalised Radar Cross Section data from broadside-pointing SAR have been exploited to generate high resolution wind fields. In combination with bidirectional ATI phase derived Doppler velocity data, it may be possible to obtain both high resolution wind- and surface current fields. The Doppler velocity measured by microwave systems is the sum of the Doppler velocity measured without current plus the ocean surface current. In the absence of current, wind induced ocean surface wave motions produce substantial Doppler velocities that are hereafter referred to as wind-wave induced artifact surface velocity (WASV)[6][7]. Wind-generated gravity waves are the dominant drivers of the WASV, with sea state development and swell playing smaller but non-negligible roles. Ocean surface wind and waves also generate net displacements of water through phenomena like Ekman drift and Stokes drift that are components of ocean surface currents, but are not part of the WASV.

1

The Normalized Radar Cross Section (NRCS) can be described by a Geophysical Model Function (GMF) as a function of the wind ten meters above the ocean surface[8]. The wind waves that influence the NRCS also influence the Doppler velocity. Similarly, the Doppler velocity can be described by a Geophysical Model Function[9]. A similar inversion algorithm is presented by Martin et al.[7] for X-band SAR measurements. Note, a large number of theoretical Geophysical Model Functions (GMF) have been developed (e.g. [10],[11],[12]). Only a few of them have been validated against observations, and this study will help assess the applicability of the model[12].

The bidirectional ATI SAR concept was first proposed by Frasier and Camps[13]. It combines two interferometric pairs to generate two separate images in 'Fore' and 'Aft' direction. Later the concept was demonstrated by Toporkov et al. [14] in an airborne campaign. A bidirectional ATI SAR has further been used in the airborne Wavemill proof-of-concept experiment that aimed at estimating the wind-wave induced surface velocity for X-band SAR[6].

TanDEM-X and TerraSAR-X are so far the only satellites capable of formation flying with near-optimum ATI baselines, providing sensitivity and coherent imaging of the ATI phase on the ocean[15]. For these unique data TanDEM-X and TerraSAR-X antennas are squinted in azimuth to the maximum possible angle supported by the antenna[1].

Manuscript received August 9, 2021; revised December 20, 2021.

The retrieval of the Total Surface Current Vectors (TSCV)

© 2022 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/ republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.



Fig. 1: Data flowchart also indicating the structure of this paper. TanDEM-X BiDi ATI data and ECMWF ERA-5 wind direction data are inputs to the process flow. TSCV and the wind vector are the outputs. ECMWF wind direction is only used to constrain the sign of the solution of the wind vector.

from these data makes a good pilot study for satellite missions using a similar geometry for the observation of ocean surface winds and currents.

Interferometric processing of the data has been done in the German Aerospace Center (DLR) in Oberpfaffenhofen. The available acquisitions with a suitable observation geometry are located over the tip of the Novaya Zemlya in Russia and of an area at the coast near Tromsø. The presence of a land area is necessary for phase calibration.

Figure 1 provides an overview of the research. Section II describes the specificities of the experimental satellite data and of the ATI processing of the phase and NRCS. In Section III, a wind- and TSCV retrieval algorithm for bidirectional ATI TanDEM-X data is presented. Results are presented in Section IV and the paper closes with the final conclusions in Section V.

II. TANDEM-X BIDIRECTIONAL ALONG-TRACK INTERFEROMETRY

A. Concept

Bidirectional imaging mode with the TerraSAR-X and TanDEM-X synthetic aperture radar simultaneously images in two directions with one antenna. In this way two beams are formed, squinted apart as far as possible to an approximate value of 2.2° in Fore and Aft direction from the nominal range direction.

In figure 2 the geometry of the squinted angles is depicted. On the ground the along-track beam separation is around 40 km, depending on the angle of incidence of the acquisition. The incidence is steep for the available acquisitions, ranging from 16° upto 23° . In bistatic StripMap mode the two satellites image the ocean surface continuously over a period of time to generate the image of a 30 km wide strip. One satellite operates in transmit and receive mode, while the other satellite only receives. The first satellite in orbit acquires the master image.

The TerraSAR-X and TanDEM-X orbits are positioned such that the along-track baseline B_{AT} is small enough to provide a coherent image of the ocean surface. We avoid observing in the vertical dimension by minimizing the height sensitivity of interferometry. Height sensitivity of SAR interferometry is commonly described with the height of ambiguity. This is the height in meters for which one phase cycle occurs in the interferogram and it is inversely proportional to the sensitivity. Only data is selected with a large height of ambiguity of 1000 meters or above.

The amount of measured phase cycles corresponds to a distance over the period of the interferometric time lag

$$\tau = \frac{B_{\rm AT}}{2 \cdot v_{\rm orb}},\tag{1}$$

where B_{AT} is the along-track baseline and v_{orb} is the platform velocity in m/s. The interferometric phase can then be related to a velocity in line-of-sight of the beam

$$\phi_{ATI} = -2\pi \frac{B_{\rm AT}}{\lambda} \frac{v_{\rm LoS}}{v_{\rm orb}},\tag{2}$$

where ϕ_{ATI} is the interferometric phase of the ATI images in cycles, λ is the radar wavelength (approximately 0.032 meters for X-band radar), v_{LoS} is the velocity in radar line-of-sight in m/s. For each squinted beam an average of the sea surface motion (v_{LoS}) is projected on the line-of-sight of the sensor. The phase velocity provides an estimate of the first moment of the Doppler spectrum.

With Equations 1 and 2 we can compute the velocity in beam line-of-sight

$$v_{\rm LoS} = \frac{\phi_{\rm ATI}}{4\pi} \frac{\lambda}{\tau}.$$
 (3)

By using a dual beam configuration, with beams in different directions, along-track and across-track components of the Doppler velocity measured in beam line-of-sight can be found using the following geometric relations:

$$v_{at} = \frac{v_{\text{fore}} - v_{\text{aft}}}{2\sin(\psi_s)} \tag{4}$$

and

$$v_r = \frac{v_{\text{fore}} + v_{\text{aft}}}{2\cos(\psi_s)},\tag{5}$$

where v_{at} and v_r are the components of Doppler velocity in along-track and across-track (line-of-sight) direction, respectively. ψ_s is the radar squint angle. This is basically a scaling of the beam line-of-sight velocities for the along-track component, and an average of the beam line-of-sight velocities for the across-track line-of-sight component. The uncertainty of the across-track line-of-sight component is of a factor $\tan(\psi_s)$ smaller than the along-track component (0.04 in this specific case).



Fig. 2: Schematic overview of the concept and geometry. TanDEM-X and TerraSAR-X have short along-track baselines of around 50 m. The antenna is squinted in two directions where ψ_{fore} and ψ_{aft} may differ slightly and have an approximate value of 2.2°. The angle of incidence θ for the data used in this study ranges from 17° to 22°. The two satellites image a strip on the ocean surface with a width of 30 km in StripMap acquisition mode.

If instead of the line-of-sight component, we are interested in the horizontal motion, v_r needs to be scaled with $\sin(\theta)$, where θ is the angle of incidence. As a consequence, the sensitivity in the horizontal plane needs to be scaled with an additional term of $1/\sin(\theta)$. The sensitivity then becomes the following

$$\frac{\delta v_{xt}}{\delta v_{at}} = \frac{\tan(\psi_s)}{\sin(\theta)},\tag{6}$$

where v_{xt} is the Doppler velocity component in horizontal across-track direction and the other parameters have not changed with respect to their earlier definition.

In the bidirectional imaging mode the azimuth antenna pattern has two main-lobes pointing into different directions[1]. The resulting Doppler azimuth spectrum has a large bandwidth. The two components can be separated in the Doppler frequency domain. Each beam has a non-zero Doppler Centroid, as a consequence errors in coregistration will lead to larger phase errors than for the nominal range direction. The NESZ of bidirectional imaging mode is affected by the splitting of the beams, as intensity of the antenna pattern of each squinted beam is approximately half the intensity of the antenna pattern for a single beam.

A phase ramp is present in the range direction. This becomes a phase offset in the interferogram [16]. Due to a difference in Doppler rate introduced by the physical Doppler, there will thus be an additional azimuth shift in the data. This would need to be corrected in the SAR focusing process.

B. Data and calibration

1) Location and conditions: The data has been selected based on the requirements of small baselines and the absence of sea ice. There are two over Novaya Zemlya (Russia) and one located near Tromsø (Norway) that meet these requirements. Table I gives the acquisition parameters of the data. TABLE I: Relevant acquisition parameters and conditions Of data set A the Doppler field has been analyzed. Of data set B wind- and TSCV have been analyzed. Of data set C wind has been analyzed. All the acquisitions have an ascending orbit.

	A	В	С
Location	Novaya Zemlya	Novaya Zemlya	Tromsø
Date	13.09.13	22.08.13	04.09.13
Incidence	15.6-18.6°	15.6-18.6°	19.5-23.2°
angle			
Squint angle	2.20, -2.24°	2.20, -2.24°	2.20, -2.24°
Time lag	0.004 s	0.006 s	0.003 s
PRF	1475 Hz	5900 Hz	5810 Hz
Polarization	VV	VV	VV
Resolution	4.5 x 19.2 m	4.5 x 19.2 m	6.8 x 19.5 m
(rg x az)			
Height of	1191 m	1182 m	2307 m
ambiguity			
ECMWF mean	4.7 m/s	5.5 m/s	2.1 m/s
wind speed			
ECMWF mean	-142.1°	9.7°	2.2°
wind direction			
(w.r.t. north)			
ECMWF mean	-59.4°	89.1°	90.2°
wind direction			
(w.r.t. range)			

The location of the Novaya Zemlya data sets is displayed in figure 3. Data set A, that was acquired in this location (table I) was preliminary processed by [17], but radiometric calibration was not performed. Due to the missing calibration, data set A remains unused for retrieval. Data set B (table I) was calibrated. ECMWF ERA-5 wind data with a temporal resolution of 3 hours and spatial resolution of 30 km was analyzed for the same acquisition time and locations.

The predominant current at the Barents Sea is the extension of the northward Norwegian Current, which has velocity values ranging from 0.15 upto 0.4 m/s [18]. In the Novaya Zemlya acquisition strip the water mixes with Arctic Ocean water and is therefore colder than the Norwegian Current and consequently currents are weaker. In surface current



Fig. 3: Bidirectional ATI acquisition over the Barents sea and Kara sea, with the tip of Novaya Zemlya. The latitudes of the image vary between 75.5° and 78.2° North and the longitudes of the image between 63.5° and 70.9° East. The width of the strip is 30 km.



Fig. 4: Bidirectional ATI acquisition at the coast near Tromsø. The latitudes of the image vary between 68.9° and 70.3° North and the longitudes of the image between 17.7° and 18.6° East. The width of the strip is 30 km.

simulations of the Kara Sea[19] it is seen that during spring/summer there is a very weak anticyclonic circulation and significant inflow from the Barents Sea, while in autumn currents become stronger and are predominantly along the coast of Novaya Zemlya. Tidal amplitudes are relatively low [20]. Therefore, tidal currents are expected to be weak: no more than 20 cm/s and generally below 2 cm/s[19].

Figure 4 shows the location of the acquisition over Tromsø. Table I gives the acquisition parameters for data set C from Tromsø. This data set was calibrated and ECMWF wind was analyzed.

2) Level-2 product data: Interferometric processing of the data with the experimental SAR processor (TAXI)[21] in the German Aerospace Center outputs the level 2 products of

Novaya Zemlya as displayed in figure 5. The product includes amplitude data, coherence data and an interferogram. The high phase values left of the land appear to be ambiguities originating from the mountains near the coast.

The difference between fore- and aft look of the NRCS in decibel scale is given in figure 5b. After smoothing geophysical features are found in the image of the NRCS diversity. The mean diversity at sea is 0.2 dB. Notice how the values lie around zero. Consider a GMF, as for example XMOD2[8]. This value is typical for cross-wind conditions, when the nominal range direction is at 90 degrees with the wind. Notice also how the NRCS diversity, which is assumed to correlate with the wind, shows very similar features as the interferogram in figure 5.

The mean absolute difference between the interferogram of the fore beam and the aft beam, averaged over sea gives a value of 0.41 radians. Following equation 2 we find a value of 0.164 m/s for the mean absolute Doppler velocity diversity at sea.

In the Tromsø data set in figure 6, the NRCS values also turn out very low and there is a phase offset between the fore- and aft beam. Topographic features can be seen on the land areas causing layover, which should be avoided in phase calibration. The layover effect is a radar imaging effect that makes tall features appear distorted towards the near range. Low reflection at sea is seen where there are no waves. In this image the NRCS average over the land area is -16.59 dB, while the NRCS over sea is -15.78 dB. Backscatter ratio between land and sea is close to unity. The small difference between signal on land and at sea indicates that chances to see contributions on the land areas originating from scatterers at sea are high. This would cause errors in the phase calibration.

3) Radiometric calibration: The amplitudes of BiDi ATI data have been radiometrically calibrated in TAXI with the relation $\beta_0 = k_s \cdot |DN|^2$ where DN are digital numbers and k_s is the calibration factor[22]. σ_0 is derived from β_0 by means of projection to the ground range with

$$\sigma_0 = (\beta_0 - \text{NEBN})\sin(\theta_{\text{loc}}) \tag{7}$$

where NEBN is the Noise Equivalent Beta Naught. When multiplied with the sine of the local incidence angle θ_{loc} this becomes the Noise Equivalent Sigma Zero (NESZ).

The signal to noise ratio of bidirectional TanDEM-X is 3.7 dB lower than the SNR of nominal StripMap images[1], therefore NESZ is 3.7 dB higher than for nominal TanDEM-X. Nominal TanDEM-X typically has NESZ of around -20 dB [22]. The NESZ for Bidirectional TanDEM-X then follows from SNR = NRCS – NESZ, when all three quantities are expressed in decibels and this gives us an NESZ value of -17 dB. The lower SNR is the result of splitting the antenna into two beams. Data set C of Tromsø has a mean NRCS of -15.2 dB on land. Whereas nominal TanDEM-X images with a similar acquisition geometry and time show a mean NRCS of -9 dB. There appears to be an offset of roughly between 6 dB and 7 dB. By forward modelling the NRCS using the ECMWF wind data for data set C of Tromsø at sea and XMOD2, a similar offset between measured NRCS and XMOD2 output



(a) Level-2 products. In far range the low coherence is a result of a lower SNR due to roll-off of the antenna pattern. Low coherence on land is due to ice melt. The high phase values left of the land are azimuth ambiguities.



(b) Difference between fore- and aft look of the NRCS in decibel scale smoothed with a window length of 91 samples to about 2 km azimuth resolution.

Fig. 5: Data set B. The intensity is calibrated, corrected with 6 dB offset and expressed in NRCS (m^2/m^2) in decibel scale.

values is found. This calibration offset is corrected by adding a constant value between 6 dB and 7 dB.

4) Phase calibration: Before the phase offset between the beams was calibrated for data set B, residual topography had to be removed from the interferograms using the DEM included in the data product multiplied with the interferometric height sensitivity. Data set A did not have residual topography to correct. We do this because our calibration routine calculates an average offset from zero. Thus non-zero phase due to topography is unwanted in the calibration.

The offset in the ATI phase between the fore and aft beam originates from the sum of errors from residual topography, radar noise and from coregistration errors. Assuming these errors account for a constant offset between the beams, a methodology is adopted to correct for a phase offset. Given that the ATI phase should be zero on land, the correction is conducted by means of estimating the offset from 0 on land for each beam weighting each point with the coherence to avoid including areas of noisy phase to the estimation. The offset is computed as follows

$$i_{\text{offset},b} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} W_j \cdot i_{\text{land},b,j},\tag{8}$$

where b is the beam number (1 for fore, 2 for aft), $i_{\text{offset},b}$ the phase offset in the fore- or aft beam, W_j a weight given to each pixel, $i_{\text{land},b,j}$ the interferometric phase of points on land in complex notation. Areas with layover are excluded.

The differences between mean and modal offsets for each



Fig. 6: Level-2 products of the aft look of data set C near Tromsø. The land consists of high fjords. Lay-over effect can be seen in the intensity image on the mountains. In the fjords the coherence is low and intensity is low, where the water is most likely without any wind waves.

beam for Novaya Zemlya do not exceed 0.5° , which implies that the distribution of phase offset is close to normal. This justifies the assumption of a correction with a constant bias estimated from a normal distribution. Considering the offset between mean and modal phase offset as the calibration error, one finds a Doppler velocity error of about 0.01 m/s.

However for the case of Tromsø the difference between mean and modal phase offset is 3.9° and 8.9° in the fore and aft beam respectively. These values are much higher than the values seen for Novaya Zemlya. Since the distribution of phase offsets is not Gaussian, the calibration method is unsuitable for this data set. Therefore, of data set C the Doppler velocity is not further analyzed. This decision can also be explained by interpreting the difference between mean and modal phase offset as phase errors that are propagated to the Doppler velocity for each beam when scaled with $\lambda/(\pi\tau)$ following from equation 3. The resulting velocity error in fore and aft beam are 0.26 m/s and 0.55 m/s respectively. The resulting across-track line-of-sight Doppler error is 0.39 m/s following from equation 5 and the along-track Doppler error is 3.51 m/s following from equation 6.

Due to the squinted geometry there will be an additional baseline in line-of-sight direction. This baseline introduces a deterministic error to the 2-D velocity field. Expressed in the radial velocity, the additional error can be calculated with the following expression:

$$\Delta v_r \approx v_r \frac{2 \cdot \psi_s \Delta R_0}{B_{AT}},\tag{9}$$

where ΔR_0 is the slant range difference in zero-Doppler. The effect of this additional baseline is an apparent amplification of the across-track velocity with an even component of true Doppler, that is caused by across-track currents and wind. This effect causes an amplification of the along-track velocity with an odd component of true Doppler. The effect has been corrected in the processing by adding an extra temporal baseline term (equation 10).

Using the values of data set B (table I) and a ΔR_0 of 742.6 m, a value of $\Delta v_r = 1.39v_r$ is found. This bias is corrected for by adding an extra temporal baseline term of the form:

$$\tau_e = \frac{\Delta R_0 \tan(\psi_{s,fore})}{2 \cdot v_s} \tag{10}$$

where v_s is the satellite velocity.

5) Doppler field: The Doppler field is retrieved from the calibrated ATI phase using the relations described with Equations 3, 4 and 5. The images have been smoothed to a resolution of 1059 m in azimuth and 973 m in range to mitigate the impact of swell. Swell waves can be seen as ripples in the top plot of figure 5.

From the ATI phase of the Novaya Zemlya acquisition of August 22nd (figure 5) the Doppler field was retrieved with high accuracy. The uniformity of the Doppler field direction (figure 7b) is indeed very similar to that of the ECMWF wind field (figure 13), again an indication of the presence of WASV. High values of Doppler velocity left of the coast are azimuth ambiguities originating from the mountains near the coast of about 900 meters altitude. Another argument supporting the identification of these ambiguities is that for data set A (figure 7a), acquired at the same geometry and of the same area, but with a different PRF, no ambiguities are found.

III. WIND- AND TOTAL SURFACE CURRENT VECTOR RETRIEVAL

Provided there are GMF's for the NRCS and the WASV as a function of the wind vector, the wind vector will first be inverted. Then the WASV will be modelled and removed from the Doppler components. The NRCS is a function of the azimuth look direction with respect to the wind direction

$$\sigma_0 = \text{GMF}(U_{10}, \phi_a - \phi_0, \theta), \qquad (11)$$

where σ_0 the NRCS, U_{10} is the wind speed magnitude 10 meters above the sea-surface, ϕ_a is the azimuth look direction and ϕ_0 the wind direction, for which the north is taken as the reference (figure 8).

XMOD2[8] was used as the GMF for σ_0 in equation 11. For up-wind and down-wind directions XMOD2 generates



(b) Data set B. The high values of Doppler seen left from the land are azimuth ambiguities. The radar is looking cross-wind. Notice the similarity with the ECMWF winds in figure 13.

Fig. 7: 2-D Doppler velocity fields over Novaya Zemlya. Using the interferogram data from the two beams and equations 2, 5 and 4 these vector fields were retrieved. If we only consider the first harmonic of the Doppler GMF, in the absence of current the Doppler fields would be aligned with the wind. When the wind is aligned with radar line-of-sight of the beam we would see a maximum or minimum value for the Doppler and when it is at ninety degrees with radar line-of-sight of the beam, we would see a value of zero for the Doppler.

the highest values of backscattered radar intensity, whereas cross-winds give the lowest values. Increasing wind speeds go with larger values of intensities. The maximum possible diversity of the NRCS occurs when the nominal range is at -125, -45, 45 or 125° angle with the wind vector. Thus there are four possible solutions for the wind direction.

The WASV is a signed quantity and a function of the same parameters[7]. The fore- and aft beam receive echoes from different scattering surfaces for a given patch of ocean. An expression for the geophysical model function may be defined as

$$v_{\text{WASV}} = \text{GMF}(U_{10}, \phi_a - \phi_0, \theta).$$
(12)

Figure 8 gives the geometry of the wind vector, Doppler vectors and the sign convention. The Elfouhaily wave spectrum coupled with a Kirchhoff Approximation (EOWS&KA)[11] is used as a Doppler GMF to calculate v_{WASV} . The Doppler GMF in equation 12 is zero when the wind is at 90° with the radar line-of-sight and has a maximum or minimum when it is aligned with radar-line-of sight. This is if you consider the first moment of the Doppler in the absence of currents. The Kirchhoff approximation is polarization insensitive, while wave scattering is polarization sensitive. It is therefore expected that the Kirchhoff approximation model for VV data lacks accuracy due to polarization insensitivity[11] except in crosswind direction, where the Doppler is zero.

Another way to look at the Doppler is by considering small squint angles. Then the along-track velocity (equation 5) can be rewritten as

$$v_{at} \approx \left. \frac{\partial v_r}{\partial \psi_s} \right|_{\psi_s = 0}$$
$$= \left. \frac{\partial v_r}{\partial \phi_a} \cdot \frac{d\phi_a}{d\psi_s} \right|_{\phi_a = 0} = \left. \frac{1}{\sin(\theta)} \cdot \frac{\partial v_r}{\partial \phi_a} \right|_{\phi_a = 0}.$$
(13)

It can be seen that an azimuth angle dependence of $\cos(\phi_a - \phi)$ will lead to a Doppler-velocity change in the along-track velocity of the form $\sin(\phi)$. This effect can be seen in figure 7a and 7b, that show the imprint of a wind field in the retrieved Doppler fields.

The expected diversity modelled with XMOD2 (equation 11) for the mean wind conditions of data set B given in table I, an azimuth beam separation on the ground of 15° and an incidence angle of 17° is -0.04 dB. This is lower than the value of 0.2 dB observed NRCS diversity (section IV-A2). In this case it is cross-wind, which implies a lower diversity with respect to other wind directions when you consider the sensitivity to directionality of the GMF. Radiometric calibration errors will affect the wind retrievals. To find the right solution for the wind direction among the ambiguities a constraint is needed.

The expected Doppler velocity diversity modelled with EOWS&KA (equation 12) using the same parameters as in the previous paragraph is 0.160 m/s. This is very close to the observed mean absolute Doppler velocity diversity of 0.164 m/s (section IV-A2). Indeed the Doppler velocity measurements are more sensitive than the NRCS. Discrepancies come from calibration errors and are estimated



Fig. 8: Sign convention and geometry of the Doppler- and wind vectors according to equations 4, 5 and 11. "at" indicates the along-track axis and "xt" the across-track axis.

to be of the order 0.01 m/s. Other discrepancies may be attributed to GMF uncertainty.

A. Wind retrieval algorithm

The retrieval algorithm that was developed for- and demonstrated on TanDEM-X BiDi data is based on the minimization of a cost function (figure 9), where the cost function is defined by the squared difference between the NRCS data and a GMF for the backscattered signal from an ocean surface shaped by wind. The cost function can be written as

$$J_{\sigma_0}(U_{10}, \phi) = \frac{(\sigma_{0, \text{fore}} - \text{GMF}(U_{10}, \phi - \alpha))^2}{\text{Var}\{\sigma_{0, \text{fore}}\}} + \frac{(\sigma_{0, \text{aft}} - \text{GMF}(U_{10}, \phi + \alpha))^2}{\text{Var}\{\sigma_{0, \text{aft}}\}} + \frac{(\phi_{\text{ext}} - D)^2}{W_{\text{ext}}}, \quad (14)$$

where U_{10} is the wind speed parameter in m/s, $\phi = \phi_a - \phi_0$ the wind direction parameter relative to across-track look (figure 8), σ_0 the normalized radar cross section observation, the GMF is provided as a look-up table, α the azimuth separation between the beams, ϕ_{ext} the wind direction observation from external data source (ECMWF) with respect to the nominal range direction. Matrix D is filled with a range of wind direction values from -180° to 180°, repeated along the second dimension and W_{ext} is a tuned weight. W_{ext} is tuned by trial and error to a value of $1 \cdot 10^{20}$. You will find that the first two cost function terms in equation 14 are very large compared to the third term. Thus there is an arbitrarily small bias introduced to the wind vector coming from the a priori wind direction data.

B. Estimation of the Total Surface Current

The Total Surface Current Vector is given by

$$\mathbf{v}_{TSC} = \mathbf{v}_{ATI} - \mathbf{v}_{WASV},\tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{ATI} = [v_{fore}, v_{aft}]$ the Doppler velocity in each beam following from equation 3 and $\mathbf{v}_{WASV} = [v_{WASV,fore}, v_{WASV,aft}]$, the WASV found



Fig. 9: Illustration showing the principle of the cost function minimization. The blue dot shows the location of the minimum of the cost function in 2D. Coordinates of this point (wind speed and azimuth) give the values of wind speed and wind direction.

by evaluating a GMF for the Doppler velocity given in equation 12 with the azimuth angle in the direction of the corresponding beam. v_{TSC} is reconstructed in along-track and across-track direction using equations 4 and 5.

As a GMF for the WASV, the Elfouhaily Ocean Wave Spectrum[23] coupled with an analytical electromagnetic model using a Kirchhoff Approximation[12] (EOWS&KA) was used. The Kirchhoff Approximation is known to be effective for steep incidence angles and insensitive to polarization [12]. For data acquired at incidence angles of 17° and a single VV polarization, polarization effects are expected to be small. Analytical electromagnetic methods were implemented in a software package developed by [12].

The EOWS&KA GMF is evaluated into a look-up table with a resolution of $dU_{10} = 0.1$ m/s, $d\phi = 1^{\circ}$ and $d\theta = 0.1^{\circ}$. The choice of these values is based on the approximate accuracy of reference data. The estimation error of wind vectors is usually limited to 0.1 m/s in magnitude and 1° in direction. [24].

In the EOWS&KA model the Doppler Centroid is expressed as a Doppler frequency. The frequency parameter is converted to velocity using the following expression[25]:

$$f_{Dc} = \frac{2v_r}{\lambda},\tag{16}$$

where f_{Dc} is the Doppler Centroid Frequency (Hz), v_r the velocity line-of-sight and λ the radar wavelength.

IV. RESULTS

The retrieval algorithm presented in Section III is applied to two data sets presented in Section II. The data set of Tromsø has been used for tuning of the wind retrieval algorithm. Finally the Novaya Zemlya data set of August 22nd has been used for the retrieval of the TSCV.



Fig. 10: Wind vector field over the coast near Tromsø resampled to 2 km resolution from the ECMWF ERA-5 Reanalysis model, for the same acquisition time as the BiDi data take of September 4th. This data has an ensemble standard deviation of approximately 0.4 m/s for wind speed magnitude and 33° for wind direction. Mean wind speed is 2.1 m/s, mean wind direction is 90° and thus at cross-wind with the radar.



Fig. 11: Retrieved wind field for the Tromsø data using XMOD2 at 2 km resolution. The mean wind speed is 2.9 m/s, the mean wind direction is 78° .

A. Wind retrieval

1) Tromsø: The results of wind retrieval using XMOD2 (section II-B3) on the Tromsø data set are presented and the ECMWF ERA-5 interpolated wind field is shown. To qualitatively assess the results, the two are compared.

The calibration offset that is corrected with a constant value in section II-B3 gives rise to a calibration uncertainty of roughly 1 dB, that is the same for each beam. This will result in an error of the wind direction and wind speed, depending on the sign and magnitude of the calibration error and the GMF sensitivity.

It is seen that with a sufficiently low weight on the external data term, the solution for wind direction becomes unbiased and only follows the wind direction of ECMWF in a global sense. This is clearly seen by comparing figure 10 with figure 11. The wind fields have similar values for wind speed. Stronger winds are further away from the coast and weaker winds are found near the coast. The wind stream lines curl up for both figures.

ECMWF does not capture local instantaneous effects, as it is an average spatially (low resolution) and temporally (ensemble mean). The retrieved wind in figure 11 displays a dark red patch of high winds that are an instantaneous event of high wind speeds. The direction of the wind is slightly more upward for the retrieved winds, but the difference of 11° between ECMWF- and retrieved direction is less than the accuracy of ECMWF itself (33°). Other observed differences between retrieved winds and ECMWF are due the different resolutions of ECMWF and wind retrieval results. A very small bias in the wind retrievals comes from the dependency on a priori data. This would be resolved by using a different constraint[7] or detecting wind streaks in the SAR image[26]. The limited validity of the GMF also introduces uncertainty to the retrieval results. It does not capture wave-current interactions, bathymetry effects or other local modulations of scattering. Close to the coast local modulations of scattering are more likely to be seen than at open sea. Only the waves that are already developed are captured in the SAR image. Therefore wind fetch is another source of error. Wind retrieval residuals may also be attributed to surface currents. Studies affirm that scatterometry is current-relative[27]. The observed current-relative winds are commonly found to be of an order 10-20% different from the earth-relative winds. Correction of the retrieved wind vector to earth-relative winds or a joint inversion algorithm would improve the results.

The Doppler velocity calculated with the retrieved wind and GMF for Doppler Centroid is expected to relate to the wind linearly with

$$V_{D,\text{wind}} = k \cdot U, \tag{17}$$

where v_D is the surface velocity due to intrinsic wind wave motion in m/s, factor k is found to lie around 0.1 and U is the wind speed in m/s. This factor arises from the geophysical model function. Until today there has been no consensus on the value of this factor. A correlation graph of the relation of the WASV and wind vector in along-track and across-track direction of the radar (figure 12) was generated by subtracting the mean from wind data and WASV. The across-track component of the WASV was multiplied with nominal angle of incidence $\sin \theta_{nom}$ to project to the sea surface.

2) Novaya Zemlya: The direction of the ECMWF wind field (figure 13) is very similar to that of the Doppler field (figure 7b), suggesting a high correlation between wind and Doppler.

Reasonable agreement is found between wind direction of ECMWF and the retrieval results (figure 14) with a magnitude of retrieved wind 1.7 m/s higher than ECMWF and general agreement in direction as can be seen by comparing figure 13 and 14. Note that the retrieved wind is instantaneous and ECMWF a 3 hours average, thus the values may be quite different. An overestimation of wind vector magnitude might lead to an overestimation of WASV. The local high velocities seen left of the land in the Doppler field are not seen in the inverted wind field.



Fig. 12: Correlation of the WASV and wind vector in along-track and across-track direction of the radar. The correlation coefficient lies around 0.1. This implies that for EOWS&KA the wind vector is scaled with approximately 0.1 to obtain the WASV. Across-track velocity was scaled with $\sin \theta_{\rm nom}$ to project to the sea surface. The nominal angle of incidence is 20°.

ATI Doppler data in beam line-of-sight was tested as an input for the same retrieval algorithm. Retrieving a wind vector from the Doppler data implies that we are assuming all measured Doppler is a consequence of wind, which is contradictory to earlier assumptions. Wind retrieval using the Doppler data was attempted and the direction of the wind field retrieved from Doppler is 45° different from ECMWF in figure 13. The discrepancy could be of geophysical and/or non-geophysical origin. A geophysical signal could be any of the geophysical components we consider the TSCV to be the sum of: swell waves, Stokes drift, surface current. A possible non-geophysical signal is errors in the phase calibration of the beams with respect to one another.

B. Total Surface Current Vector

The WASV estimated using the retrieved winds for Novaya Zemlya on August 22nd (figure 14) is removed from the Doppler components as described in section III-B. The WASV is lower than the ATI velocity, which can be explained by the presence of a large surface current and a cross-wind, for which polarization effects do not play a role. The result is a velocity component that relates to the surface motion associated with currents and other components of higher order (figure 15). Uncertainty of the resulting TSCV comes from wind retrieval errors, GMF uncertainty, Doppler velocity calibration errors and a factor 0.04 smaller sensitivity of the along-track direction due to the low diversity. A characteristic of a current is either zero velocity at the coast lines or stream lines along the coast. It is interesting that the results show the latter.

Some agreement is found between the direction of geostrophic currents available on the Globcurrent application[28] and the direction of the TSCV. This is a geostrophic surface current of 1/3° spatial resolution and weekly temporal resolution inferred from remote sensing data[29]. Errors in this geostrophic surface current may be large, due to the coastal location and because Ekman components are strong at the surface. Therefore, it is advisable to use a validation data set that includes the Ekman components[30]. Other shortcomings of these validation data are the lack of wind-driven currents at the surface and the different resolutions. The tidal amplitudes in the region are weak[20]. Nevertheless for future work it is recommended that tidal components are also considered using the Tide Model Driver package[31] when attempting this difficult validation of instantaneous surface current measurements in polar areas without oceanic buoys.

Analysis of the divergence of the TSCV and comparison with the divergence of the Doppler velocity field shows a high similarity. Taking the gradient of the phase quantity removes systematic bias from the data. Since the WASV is very smooth relative to the ATI phase small-scale turbulence is independent of it. This indicates that the absolute current value may not be necessary for the identification of small-scale upper ocean dynamical features, at least in the case of a smooth wind field.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Unique experimental TanDEM-X acquisitions in bidirectional mode help assess the performance of along-track interferometry at two locations on the Arctic ocean. The ATI phase calibration was successful at one of the locations and high resolution 2-D velocity fields could be retrieved.

Anticipated, the 2-D velocity field can display a signature very similar to a wind field. To retrieve the ocean surface currents, a method to retrieve the wind vector and TSCV is applied using geophysical model functions: empiricaland based on the Kirchhoff approximation, an ocean wave spectrum and a priori wind direction information.

After applying the necessary corrections to the data, the wind estimated with XMOD2 shows general agreement with atmospheric model data while resolving more local features than the atmospheric model. Shortcomings of the retrievals are calibration errors, limited validity of the GMF, a very small bias due to the use of a priori data and winds that are current-relative.

The inversion of two-dimensional wind- and TSCV is still found promising because the retrieved TSCV stream lines follow the coast and these streamlines generally follow the same direction as the streamlines in the GlobCurrent application. Full validation of these data is challenging and would require necessary co-located oceanographic data, at exact time the ATI images were acquired. More systematic acquisitions, to possibly sample the different tidal phases, would certainly help for future investigations.

More important, while wind- and TSCV retrieval algorithms have obvious limitations, foremost to rely on mean geophysical models, high-resolution ATI phase field can be more directly exploited. Indeed, ATI phase gradients can be more directly used to identify and study small-scale ocean eddies and



Fig. 13: ECMWF ERA-5 wind vectors 10 m above the sea surface interpolated to roughly a 10 km resolution grid. The mean wind speed is 5.5 m/s and the direction is cross-wind relative to the radar.



Fig. 14: Retrieved wind field Novaya Zemlya at roughly 10 km resolution. The wind field shows more local features than ECMWF wind field in figure 13. Mean wind speed magnitude is 7.2 m/s.



Fig. 15: Total Surface Current Velocity field at 250m resolution. Stream lines run along the coast, which is a characteristic of a current. The extremely high TSCV values are SAR ambiguities.

filaments, small compared to atmospheric scales. Moreover, systematic large-scale biases are removed, and one may even omit the geophysical retrieval step.

Note, that due to the squinted observation geometry, an additional azimuth shift is present in the data that still needs to be corrected in the SAR focusing process.

This study provides an experimental base for future investigations in the development of geophysical model functions and the design of satellite missions such as Harmony[32], that aim at attaining the long desired high resolution characteristics of the upper ocean dynamics.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Mittermayer, S. Wollstadt, P. Prats-Iraola, P. Lopez-Dekker, G. Krieger, and A. Moreira, "Bidirectional SAR Imaging Mode," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 601–614, Jan 2013.
- [2] N. Caldarella, "Joint Retrieval of Wind- and Total Surface Current Vectors from TanDEM-X Bidirectional Along-Track Interferometric Data," Master's thesis, Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands, 2018.

- [3] P. Klein and G. Lapeyre, "The oceanic vertical pump induced by mesoscale and submesoscale turbulence," *Annual Review of Marine Science*, vol. 1, pp. 351–375, 2009.
- [4] R. Goldstein, "Interferometric radar measurement of ocean surface currents," *Nature*, vol. 328, p. 707709, August 1987.
- [5] B. Chapron, F. Collard, and F. Ardhuin, "Direct measurements of ocean surface velocity from space: Interpretation and validation," *Journal of Geophysical Research C: Oceans*, vol. 110, no. 7, pp. 1–17, 2005.
- [6] A. Martin, C. Gommenginger, J. Marquez, S. Doody, V. Navarro, and C. Buck, "Wind-Wave induced velocity in ATI SAR Ocean Surface Currents: First experimental evidence from an airborne campaign," *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, pp. n/a–n/a, 02 2016.
- [7] A. C. Martin, C. P. Gommenginger, and Y. Quilfen, "Simultaneous ocean surface current and wind vectors retrieval with squinted SAR interferometry: Geophysical inversion and performance assessment," *Remote Sensing of Environment*, vol. 216, pp. 798 – 808, 2018.
- [8] F. Nirichio and S. Venafra, "XMOD2 An improved geophysical model function to retrieve sea surface wind fields from Cosmo-SkyMed X-band data," *European Journal of Remote Sensing*, vol. 46, 2013.
- [9] A. A. Mouche, F. Collard, B. Chapron, K. F. Dagestad, G. Guitton, J. A. Johannessen, V. Kerbaol, and M. W. Hansen, "On the use of doppler shift for sea surface wind retrieval from SAR," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 50, no. 7 PART 2, pp. 2901–2909, 2012.
- [10] R. Romeiser and D. R. Thompson, "Numerical study on the along-track interferometric radar imaging mechanism of oceanic surface currents," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 38, no. 1,

pp. 446-458, Jan 2000.

- [11] A. A. Mouche, B. Chapron, N. Reul, and F. Collard, "Predicted Doppler shifts induced by ocean surface wave displacements using asymptotic electromagnetic wave scattering theories," *Waves in Random* and Complex Media, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 185–196, 2008.
- [12] F. Nouguier, C. A. Guérin, and G. Soriano, "Analytical techniques for the doppler signature of sea surfaces in the microwave regime-I: Linear surfaces," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 49, no. 12 PART 1, pp. 4856–4864, 2011.
- [13] S. J. Frasier and A. J. Camps, "Dual-beam interferometry for ocean surface current vector mapping," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 401–414, Feb 2001.
- [14] J. Toporkov, D. Perkovic, G. Farquharson, M. Sletten, and S. Frasier, "Sea Surface Velocity Vector Retrieval Using Dual-Beam Interferometry: First Demonstration," *Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, *IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 43, pp. 2494 – 2502, 12 2005.
- [15] R. Romeiser, J. Johannessen, F. Collard, V. Kudryavtsev, H. Runge, and S. Suchandt, *Direct Surface Current Field Imaging from Space by Along-Track InSAR and Conventional SAR*. springer, 07 2010, pp. 73–91.
- [16] M. Bara, R. Scheiber, A. Broquetas, and A. Moreira, "Interferometric sar signal analysis in the presence of squint," *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 38, pp. 2164 – 2178, 10 2000.
- [17] P. Lopez-Dekker, M. Rodriguez-Cassola, P. Prats, F. D. Zan, T. Kraus, S. Sauer, and J. Mittermayer, "Experimental Bidirectional SAR ATI acquisitions of the ocean surface with TanDEM-X," in *EUSAR 2014*; *10th European Conference on Synthetic Aperture Radar*, June 2014, pp. 1–4.
- [18] R. Sætre and R. Ljøen, "The Norwegian Coastal Current," Institute of Marine Research Norway, Tech. Rep., 1972.
- [19] I. Harms and M. Karcher, "Modeling the seasonal variability od hydrography and ciculation in the kara sea," *Journal of Geophysical Research*, vol. 104, no. C6, June 1999.
- [20] B. Gjevik and T. E.Nøst, "Model simulations of the tides in the Barents Sea," *Journal of Geophysical Research*, vol. 99, no. C2, pp. 3337–3350, February 1994.
- [21] P. Prats, M. Rodriguez-Cassola, L. Marotti, M. Naninni, S. Wollstadt, D. Schulze, N. Tous-Ramon, M. Younis, G. Krieger, and A. Reigber, "TAXI: A versatile processing chain for experimental TanDEM-X product evaluation," in 2010 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, July 2010, pp. 4059–4062.
- [22] Radiometric Calibration of TerraSAR-X Data, Infoterra, 88039 Friedrichshafen, Germany, 2008.
- [23] T. Elfouhaily, B. Chapron, and K. Katsaros, "A unified directional spectrum for long and short wind-driven waves," *Journal of Geophysical Research*, vol. 102, no. C7, pp. 15,781–15,796, July 1997.
- [24] W. Tang, W. Liu, and B. Stiles, "Evaluation of high-resolution ocean surface vector winds measured by QuikSCAT scatterometer in coastal regions," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 42, no. 8, pp. 1762–1769, Aug 2004.
- [25] S. Wollstadt, P. López-Dekker, F. De Zan, and M. Younis, "Design Principles and Considerations for Spaceborne ATI SAR-Based Observations of Ocean Surface Velocity Vectors," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 4500–4519, 2017.
- [26] J. Horstmann and W. Koch, "Measurement of ocean surface winds using synthetic aperture radars," *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 508–515, 2005.
- [27] A. M. Plagge, D. Vandemark, and B. Chapron, "Examining the impact of surface currents on satellite scatterometer and altimeter ocean winds," *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, vol. 29, no. 12, pp. 1776–1793, 2012.
- [28] "Globcurrent project." [Online]. Available: http://www.globcurrent.org/
- [29] S. Mulet, M.-H. Rio, A. Mignot, S. Guinehut, and R. Morrow, "A new estimate of the global 3d geostrophic ocean circulation based on satellite data and in-situ measurements," *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, vol. s 7780, p. 7081, 11 2012.
- [30] F. Ardhuin, L. Marié, N. Rascle, P. Forget, and A. Roland, "Observation and estimation of lagrangian, stokes, and Eulerian currents induced by wind and waves at the sea surface," *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 2820–2838, 2009.
- [31] "Tmd matlab toolbox." [Online]. Available: https://www.esr.org/ research/polar-tide-models/tmd-software/
- [32] P. Prats-Iraola, M. Pinheiro, M. Rodriguez-Cassola, R. Scheiber, and P. Lopez-Dekker, "Bistatic SAR image formation and interferometric processing or the STEREOID Earth Explorer 10 candidate mission," 2019.

pp. 2147–2158, 2018.
[34] H. Li, D. Hauser, B. Chapron, F. Nouguier, P. Schippers, B. Zhang, J. Yang, and Y. He, "Up-to-Downwave Asymmetry of the CFOSAT SWIM Fluctuation Spectrum for Wave Direction Ambiguity Removal," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, pp. 1–12, 2021.



Nina Caldarella was born in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, in 1992. She received her BSc in civil engineering in 2015 and her MSc in applied earth sciences in 2018 from Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands. Her masters thesis she completed in the geoscience and remote sensing department and as a visiting student to the german aerospace center (DLR) with the SAR Missions Group.



Paco Lopez-Dekker (S98M03SM14) was born in Nijmegen, The Netherlands, in 1972. He received the Ingeniero degree in telecommunication engineering from the Universitat Politcnica de Catalunya (UPC), Barcelona, Spain, in 1997, the M.S. degree in electrical and computer engineering from the University of California, Irvine, CA, USA, in 1998, under the Balsells Fellowship, and the PhD degree from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, USA, in 2003, for his research on clear-air imaging radar systems to study the atmospheric boundary

layer. In 2003, he joined Starlab Barcelona, Barcelona, where he was involved in the development of GNSS-R sensors and techniques. From 2004 to 2006, he was a Visiting Professor with the Department of Telecommunications and Systems Engineering, Universitat Autnoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, where he taught courses on signals and systems, signal processing, communications systems and radiation, and guided waves. From 2009 to 2016, he led the SAR Missions Group, Microwaves and Radar Institute, German Aerospace Center, Wessling, Germany, with a focus on the study of future SAR missions, including the development of novel mission concepts and detailed mission performance analyses. Since 2016, he has been an Associate Professor with the Geoscience and Remote Sensing Department, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands. He has been deeply involved in several radar mission proposals, leading the Sentinel-1 SAR Multistatic Explorer mission proposal, and has co-authored 30 peer-reviewed journal papers and over 100 conference contributions in a broad range of topics related to radar remote sensing. Dr. Lopez-Dekker was a recipient of the Ramon y Cajal Grant to conduct pioneering research on bistatic synthetic aperture radar at the Remote Sensing Laboratory, UPC, in 2006.[33]



Pau Prats-Iraola (S03M06SM13) was born in Madrid, Spain, in 1977. He received the Ingeniero and PhD degrees in telecommunications engineering from the Universitat Politcnica de Catalunya (UPC), Barcelona, Spain, in 2001 and 2006, respectively. In 2001, he was a Research Assistant with the Institute of Geomatics, UPC. In 2002, he was with the Department of Signal Theory and Communications, UPC, where he was involved in airborne repeat-pass interferometry and airborne differential SAR interferometry. From 2002 to 2006,

he was an Assistant Professor with the Department of Telecommunications and Systems Engineering, Universitat Autnoma de Barcelona, Barcelona. In 2006, he joined the Microwaves and Radar Institute, German Aerospace Center, Wessling, Germany, where he has been the Head of the Multimodal Algorithms Group since 2009. His research interests include high-resolution airborne/spaceborne monostatic/bistatic SAR processing, SAR interferometry, advanced interferometric acquisition modes, persistent scatterer interferometry, SAR tomography, and end-to-end SAR simulation. He has co-authored about 50 peer-reviewed journal papers in these fields.[33]



Mariantonietta Zonno was born in Bari, Italy, in 1986. She received the M.S. degree (with Hons.) in telecommunication engineering from the Politecnico di Bari, Bari, in 2011, and the PhD degree jointly from the Scuola Interpolitecnica di Dottorato, Turin, Italy, and the Politecnico di Bari, in 2015. During her PhD studies, she visited the Microwaves and Radar Institute, German Aerospace Center, Wessling, Germany, for eight months. Since 2014, she has been with the SAR Mission Group, Microwaves and Radar Institute, German Aerospace

Center. Her research interests include the study of future SAR missions concepts and analysis of the mission performance.[33]



Marc Rodriguez-Cassola was born in Barcelona, Spain, in 1977. He received the Ingeniero degree in telecommunication engineering from the Universidad Publica de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain, in 2000, the Licenciado (M.Sc.) degree in economics from the Universidad Nacional de Educacin a Distancia, Madrid, Spain, in 2012, and the PhD degree in electrical engineering from the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany, in 2012. From 2000 to 2001, he was a Radar Hardware Engineer with CETP/CNRS,

Saint Maur des Fosses, France. From 2001 to 2003, he was a Software Engineer with Altran Consulting, Munich, Germany. Since 2003, he has been with the Microwaves and Radar Institute, German Aerospace Center, Wessling, Germany, where he is currently leading the SAR Missions Group. His research interests include radar signal processing, SAR end-to-end simulation, SAR processing and calibration algorithms, crisis theory, and radar mission analysis and applications.[33]



Frédéric Nouguier received the Agregation and M.S. degrees in applied physics from the Ecole Normale Superieure de Cachan, France, in 2005, the M.S. degree in physical methods for remote sensing from the University of Paris-Diderot, Paris, France, in 2006, and the Ph.D. degree in physics from the University of Marseille, Marseille, France, in 2009. He is a Research Scientist at the Laboratoire dOcanographie Physique et Spatiale (LOPS), IFREMER, Plouzan, France. He has experience in applied mathematics, physical

oceanography, and electromagnetic wave theory and its application to ocean remote sensing.[34]



Bertrand Chapron received the Ph.D. degree in fluid mechanics from AixMarseille University, Marseille, France, in 1988. He is a Senior Research Scientist with the Lab- oratoire dOcanographie Physique Spatile,Institut Francais de Recherche pour lExploitation de la Mer, Plouzan, France. He has been the Co-Investigator or a Principal Investigator in several ESA (ENVISAT RA2, ASAR, and SMOS), NASA, and CNES (TOPEX and JASON) projects. He contributed to the development of several algorithms for geophysical parameter

retrieval from altimeters, radiometers, or synthetic aperture radar (SAR). He is co-responsible for the ENVISAT ASAR-Wave Mode algorithms and scientific preparation for the ENVISAT and S1 wind, wave, and current. Recently, he collaborated in studies that demonstrated the high potential of radiometers for wind retrieval in extreme conditions and the possibility of doing directional ocean waves spectrum from Sentinel-2. He has authored over 80 publications in refereed journals in applied mathematics, physical oceanography (upper ocean dynamics), and electromagnetic wave theory and its application to ocean surface remote sensing.[34]