

Transition to the Community Sensor Model Standard for the Generation of Planetary Digital Terrain Models

T. M. Hare ¹, R. L. Kirk ¹, M. T. Bland ¹, D. M. Galuszka ¹, J. T. Laura ¹, D. P. Mayer ¹, B. L. Redding ¹ and B. H. Wheeler ¹

¹ U.S. Geological Survey, Astrogeology Science Center, 2255 N. Gemini Dr., Flagstaff, AZ, 86001, USA

* Correspondence: to Trent Hare 2255 North Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001, USA thare@usgs.gov 928-556-7126

Abstract: The United States Geological Survey, Astrogeology Science Center, continues to transition supported planetary sensor models to the Community Sensor Model (CSM) standard. This paper describes the current state for the use of this photogrammetric standard, supported sensor model types, and focuses on one of the targeted applications, SOCET GXP (® BAE Systems). Rigorous sensor models are a fundamental requirement for deriving the geospatial properties of planetary image observations and are widely used across mapping or cartographic applications. The creation of accurate elevation models (topography) and the creation of orthorectified planetary images are critical for a large variety of geospatial activities, including production of digital orthomosaics, digital terrain models from stereo imagery, change detection, landing site analysis, geologic mapping, rover traverse planning, and spectral analysis. Our transition to the CSM standard will ensure an uninterrupted capability to make these valuable products.

Keywords: Community Sensor Model; sensor model; stereo photogrammetry; Moon; Mars; image processing; digital elevation model; DEM; digital terrain model; DTM; open source

This draft manuscript is distributed solely for purposes of scientific peer review. Its content is deliberative and pre-decisional, so it must not be disclosed or released by reviewers. Because the manuscript has not yet been approved for publication by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), it does not represent any official USGS finding or policy.

Highlights

- This paper describes Astrogeology's transition from ® BAE's SOCET SET to BAE's SOCET GXP for targeted Digital Terrain Model (DTM) creation from stereo images.
- Use of the Community Sensor Model (CSM) standard continues to evolve for planetary research with recent updates for radar and initial in-situ capabilities.

1. Introduction

In this paper we describe the USGS Astrogeology Science Center's (ASC) multi-year adoption of the Community Sensor Model (CSM Working Group, 2007) standard to support a transition from BAE Systems' stereo photogrammetric application SOCET SET ® to its successor SOCET GXP ®. SOCET SET has allowed ASC and other institutions to generate foundational digital terrain models (DTMs) used for general planetary research (e.g., Kirk et al., 2008, Henriksen et al., 2017, Bland et al., 2021, Sutton et al., 2021) and for critical data sets to evaluate safe landing sites for several Mars rover missions (e.g., Golombek et al., 2017, Ferguson et al., 2020, Cheng et al., 2021).

1.1. Overview of Photogrammetric Efforts at the Astrogeology Science Center

As described in Laura and Beyer (2021), there are three classes of geospatial foundational planetary data products which include geodetic coordinate reference frames, topography, and orthoimages. Creation of these data requires software and an instrument's sensor model. A sensor model defines the mathematical transformation between an image (line, sample) and the target body or ground coordinates (longitude, latitude, elevation). ASC supports dozens of instrument sensor models across NASA's planetary missions, including instruments onboard the orbital-based missions Mars Global Survey (MGS), the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter (MRO) and the Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter (LRO) among others (Table 1). These sensor models were originally developed for use within ASC's Planetary Image Cartographic System (PICS) and then its successor called the Integrated Software for Imagers and Spectrometers (ISIS, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7644616>). Within ISIS, the use of these sensor models has enabled the orthorectification of single images, photogrammetrically bundle adjusted multi-image mosaics, and globally controlled image networks used to define the shape of a target body and to make regional or global controlled orthomosaics. Since the mid-1990s, in collaboration with BAE Systems, ASC has also adapted several of these sensor models for use within BAE's SOCET SET stereo photogrammetry software suite (Walker and Pietrzak, 2015, Zhang et al., 2007). NASA Ames Stereo Pipeline (ASP; Beyer et al., 2018) also adopted these ISIS-based sensor models and now more recently also the CSM-based sensor models.

1.2. Brief History with SOCET SET

BAE's SOCET SET has been used by ASC and others in the planetary community for more than two decades (Kirk et al., 1999, 2008). While other photogrammetric applications exist, SOCET SET (and now SOCET GXP) provide the end-user the ability to validate and manually edit DTMs using a heads-up stereo-based display. Over a thousand elevation models and paired orthoimages have been release by the planetary community using SOCET SET from stereo images of Mars, the Moon, Venus, Europa, Titan, asteroids, and terrestrial analogs of Earth. Beyond its use by ASC, there have been several other groups across the planetary community who have also relied on SOCET SET for the creation of elevation data and ortho-images from stereo images. The most prolific teams include the University of Arizona's HiRISE Team (and their collaborators) having released products for more than a thousand individual sites (Kirk et al., 2008; Sutton et al., 2021; McEwen et al., 2023, <https://www.uahirise.org/dtm/>) and the Arizona State University's LROC Team (and their collaborators) releasing data for more than 600 sites (Henriksen et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2010, https://wms.lroc.asu.edu/lroc/rdr_product_select). All these products are openly archived and made freely available by NASA's Planetary Data System (PDS; HiRISE DOI: [10.17189/1520227](https://doi.org/10.17189/1520227) and LROC DOI: [10.17189/1520341](https://doi.org/10.17189/1520341)).

1.3. SOCET GXP and the CSM Standard

SOCET GXP (by BAE Systems) is the successor to their SOCET SET (Walker and Pietrzak, 2015). While there are many updates to SOCET GXP, described more in section 3, the most impactful update for ASC was the transition to the CSM standard to support external third-party sensor models. The CSM is a standardized Application Programming Interface (API) developed by the U.S. Air Force and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) and now supported by the CSM Working Group (Laura et al., 2020). The CSM API functions as a C++ plug-in library that is dynamically loaded at run-time when a compliant Sensor Exploitation Tool (SET) such as SOCET GXP is started. While SOCET GXP is indeed build for the Microsoft Windows operating system, a CSM-based library can be built for most all operating systems.

1.4. Goals

The goal of this paper is to describe the effort and software ASC has implemented to transition to SOCET GXP using the CSM API for DTM production. Section 2 describes the steps and software needed to begin this transition. Section 3 provides a qualitative review comparing SOCET SET and SOCET GXP. Lastly, Section 4 describes how one can use and take advantage of the *usgscsm* library for SOCET GXP and other CSM-compatible tools.

2. Steps Required to Support the CSM and SOCET GXP

Initially, the CSM standard and SOCET GXP were not completely planetary body agnostic, making it difficult for ASC, which focuses on non-terrestrial bodies, to transition away from SOCET SET. However, with the needed updates made in 2018 to the CSM API, ASC released the CSM-based *usgscsm* library specifically to support planetary sensor models within SOCET GXP, but also for ASP, ISIS, and a stand-alone Python environment. In short, the *usgscsm* software library provides CSM-compliant sensor models created and/or maintained by ASC (Laura et al., 2020). The *usgscsm* library currently contains four different types of sensor models including a framing, push-broom, push-frame, and a synthetic-aperture radar (SAR) sensor model. The remainder of this section describes the software modifications and development that were needed to make the transition to SOCET GXP for planetary mapping possible.

2.1. Community Sensor Model API Updates

During our initial assessment for the CSM API (version 3.0.2), ASC noted an unfortunate lock-in to the Earth-based World Geodetic System (WGS84) reference ellipsoid. This meant that there was no valid method to redefine the size of the target body's semi-major and semi-minor radii without breaking the existing API. In 2016, during a CSM Working Group meeting, ASC presented our planetary use-case for the CSM standard. Over the next year, several members of the working group implemented a simple *set* and *get* ellipsoid functions to allow the API to support variable radii. If these two functions are not used, the size of the body still defaults to the WGS84 reference ellipsoid which allows the API to maintain backwards compatibility. In 2018, the CSM API version 3.0.3, with the new settable radii functions, was released by the CSM Working Group and soon after implemented by BAE within SOCET GXP. This capability was also immediately updated within ASC's *usgscsm* library. Note that while some planetary bodies are defined as a tri-axial (3 defined radii), the CSM API allows at most an elliptical definition (semi-major and semi-minor radii). Fortunately, for bodies defined as a triaxial body, it is typical to use the best-fit mean radius as a reference sphere. A list of planetary body parameters, including any defined best-fit mean radius, are recommended and maintained by the International Astronomical Union Working Group on Cartographic Coordinates and Rotational Elements (Archinal et al., 2018).

2.2. CSM for Planetary Sensors

Currently, ASC's *usgscsm* library contains four types of sensor model implementations which in turn has supported dozens of flown instruments (Table 1). These types include a (1) generic framing sensor model, (2) a generic push-broom (line scan) sensor model, (3) a generic push-frame sensor model, and (4) a recently added synthetic-aperture radar (SAR) sensor model. For a full discussion on the generic framing and push-broom sensor models see Laura et al. (2020). ASC, in collaboration with NASA Ames Research Center, has also started testing stereo capabilities for non-orbital sensors found on rovers and landers using an adaptation of the frame sensor model. This is essentially an implementation of a CAVHOR sensor model (Di and Li, 2004). CAVHOR has been widely used in NASA's Mars rover missions and is described in Xu et al. (2020).

It is important to emphasize the constrained role that the *usgscsm* library plays within a larger software ecosystem. Alone, it cannot process data; its capabilities only become

available when it is paired with a SET. SETs wrap the CSM API and the defined sensor model to provide fundamental photogrammetry capabilities. Examples of planetary-capable SETs are ISIS, NASA Ames Stereo Pipeline (ASP; Beyer et al., 2018), SOCET SET and SOCET GXP. The revolutionary aspect for implementing the CSM API is that it allows disparate SETs the ability to share the same sensor model implementation. If a new sensor is added or updates are provided, all applications which support the CSM API benefit. Moreover, this API can allow these diverse SETs to interoperate. For example, a collection of SOCET GXP bundle-adjusted images can now be shared with ISIS or ASP. This capability is built into the CSM API using a method to export what is call “camera state” and allows one to easily share optimized camera model parameters, including any updates to pointing, from one SET to another. In the past, we have used complicated and often indirect methods to achieve this by sharing tie and ground-control points. While ASC currently targets the listed 3 SETs (ISIS, ASP, and SOCET GXP), we are eager to see other CSM-capable open source and commercially available SETs to include support for the *usgscsm* library.

Mini-RF Radar

Although ASC uses a “generic” tag for its SAR sensor model implementation, most SAR sensor model implementations will be very tied to the specific instrument and how the data and metadata are formatted. ASC chose the Mini-RF instrument as an initial SAR sensor model to implement within the *usgscsm* library because it was previously implemented for topographic production and those data were released in a usable and comparatively simple form (Kirk et al., 2016). Versions of the Mini-RF instrument were flown on both the Indian Space Research Organization’s (ISRO’s) Chandrayaan-1 spacecraft (Spudis et al., 2009) and on NASA’s Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter (LRO; Nozette et al., 2010). Both missions utilized the radar capabilities to help globally map the Moon, but the images were specifically useful for mapping the persistently shadowed regions at the lunar poles. Using radar data for topographic generation is usually called stereo-radargrammetry and is analogous to typical stereo-photogrammetry but taking account of the principles by which radar images are formed as described in Kirk et al. (2016).

ASC has also used stereo-radargrammetric methods for other SAR instruments to help map Venus, as well as Saturn’s moon Titan, NASA’s Magellan mission to Venus began in the 1990s and NASA-ESA’s Cassini-Huygens mission to Saturn began in 2005. While there are eventual plans to implement them, neither the Magellan nor Cassini SAR instruments have been implemented in the *usgscsm* library, as these data and metadata provided are more complicated. For more detailed information about these sensor model implementations see Kirk and Howington-Kraus (2008).

2.3. The ALE and Knoten Libraries

To support the CSM-based *usgscsm* library, two additional libraries were also created by ASC. The first library is called the Abstraction Layer for Ephemerides (ALE), and the second library is a test suite called *knoten* which ties together ALE and the *usgscsm* library. While the *usgscsm* library is meant to be a generic implementation for specific sensor types (e.g., framing, push broom), the ALE library was created to instantiate the unique parameters for individual instruments. ALE merges two CSM-required information streams into a single detached file called the Image Support Data (ISD, Laura et al., 2020). The first stream defines the instrument metadata (interior orientation parameters or intrinsics) and the second consists of the spacecraft position and pointing data (exterior orientation or extrinsics). Detaching this information from the image is beneficial because it allows alternative formats (beyond the ISIS cube format) to be used. Note that for Earth, it is common to see the ISD and image combined into the National Imagery Transmission Format (NITF). While NITF was researched for the *usgscsm* library and planetary data, it was quickly discovered that most applications which supported the NTIF format assume an

Earth-based WGS84 reference ellipsoid. Depending on the instrument, *ALE* can independently query the image's spacecraft pointing information from available mission data (kernels), or it can also load the same information directly from an ISIS cube, if the cube has been initialized using the ISIS *spiceinit* application.

The *knoten* library is Python-based and provided as a sensor model testing environment. Given the image, the *ALE*-generated ISD, and the *usgscsm* library, *knoten* can run various tests looping over the core CSM functions “image to ground” and “ground to image”. *Knoten* also has ties into the original ISIS sensor model implementations and can compare the ISIS calculations against the new CSM-based calculations. This has been critical to test new CSM implementations in contrast to well-established and trusted ISIS-based sensor model implementations.

Table 1. USGS ASC currently supported instruments with the *usgscsm* and *ALE* libraries.

Mission	Instrument name	Sensor type
Cassini Orbiter	ISS-NAC (Narrow Angle Camera)	Framing Camera
Cassini Orbiter	ISS-WAC (Wide Angle Camera)	Framing Camera
Chandrayaan 1	Miniature Radio-Frequency instrument (Mini-RF)	SAR
Clementine	Ultraviolet/Visible Camera (UVVIS)	Framing Camera
Dawn	Framing Camera (FC) Instrument	Framing Camera
ExoMars Trace Gas Orbiter	Colour & Stereo Surface Imaging System (CaSSIS)	Framing Camera
Galileo	Solid State Imaging System (SSI)	Framing Camera
Hayabusa 2	Telescopic Camera (AMICA)	Framing Camera
Hayabusa 2	Near Infrared Spectrometer (NIRS)	Framing Camera
Juno	JunoCam	Line Scan Sensor
Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter	LROC-NAC (Narrow Angle Camera)	Line Scan Sensors
Mariner 10	VIDICON_A/B	Framing Camera
Mars Express	High Resolution Stereo Camera (HRSC)	Line Scan Sensors
Mars Global Surveyor	MOC-NAC (Narrow Angle Camera)	Line Scan Sensors
Mars Global Surveyor	MOC-WAC (Wide Angle Camera)	Line Scan Sensor
Mars Odyssey	Thermal Emission Imaging System (THEMIS-IR)	Line Scan Sensors
Mars Odyssey	Thermal Emission Imaging System (THEMIS-VIS)	Push Frame Sensor
Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter	Context Camera (CTX)	Line Scan Sensor
Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter	High Resolution Imaging Science Experiment (HiRISE)	Line Scan Sensor
Mars Science Laboratory	Mast Camera (left, right)	CAHVOR / Framing
Messenger	MDIS-NAC (Narrow Angle Camera)	Framing Camera
Messenger	MDIS-WAC (Wide Angle Camera)	Framing Camera
Near Earth Asteroid Rendezvous	Multispectral Imager (MI)	Framing Camera
New Horizons	Long Range Reconnaissance Imager (LORRI)	Framing Camera

New Horizons	Multispectral Visible Imaging Camera (MVIC)	Framing Camera
New Horizons	Linear Etalon Imaging Spectral Array (LEISA)	Line Scan Sensor
Osiris-Rex	PolyCam, MapCam, SamCam (OCAMS)	Framing Camera
Selenological & Eng. Explorer	Kaguya Terrain Camera (TC)	Line Scan Sensors
Selenological & Eng. Explorer	Multiband Imager (Mi)	Line Scan Sensor
Viking Orbiter 1/2	Visual Imaging Subsystem Camera A/B	Framing Camera
Voyager 1/2	ISS-NAC (Narrow Angle Camera)	Framing Camera
Voyager 1/2	ISS-WAC (Wide Angle Camera)	Framing Camera

Cassini ISS (Porco et al., 2004), Mini-RF (Nozette et al., 2010), UVVIS (Kordas et al., 1995), Dawn FC (Sierks et al., 2011), CaSSIS (Thomas et al., 2017), Galileo SSI (Belton et al., 1992), AMICA/NIRS (Ishiguro et al., 2010), JunoCam (Orton et al., 2017), LROC (Robinson et al., 2010), VIDICON_A/B (Murray et al., 1974), HRSC (Jaumann et al., 2007), MOC (Malin et al., 2010), THEMIS (Christensen et al., 2004), CTX (Malin et al., 2007), HiRISE (McEwen et al., 2023), Mast Camera (Bell et al., 2017), MDIS (Hawkins et al., 2007), NEAR MI (Murchie et al., 2002), LORRI/MVIC/LEISA (Weaver et al., 2008), OCAMS (Rizk et al., 2018), Kaguya TC/Mi (Haruyama et al., 2008), Viking (Flinn 1997), Voyager ISS-NAC/WAC (Smith et al., 1977). Supported instruments are usable in any CSM-supported application or Sensor Exploitation Tool (SET).

2.4. TIN Editing Enhancement

The ability not only to visualize stereo images in 3D, but also to manually edit collected DTMs is an immense benefit of both SOCET SET and SOCET GXP. This allows operators to validate the alignment of DTMs and stereo images and manually update the tie and control points of a network and posts of a DTM or the vertices of a Triangulated Irregular Network (TIN). These capabilities have been critical to support detailed elevation models for research and validating terrain models for Mars landing sites. Low-contrast areas (e.g., dark dune fields or ice) or shadowed areas often do not correlate well during the topographic collection and require manual intervention to remediate the blunders or flaws in the initial DTM. Editing methods allow for single point editing, break-line edits for changes in slope, or manually digitized area-edits to filter over poorly correlated surfaces. It is worth noting that any area manually updated by an operator will be tagged within GXP's Figure of Merit (FOM) file. A FOM file stores a value for every pixel (or TIN vertex) which defines the original calculated correlation strength or whether it was manually updated by a human operator.

While SOCET GXP contains very similar editing capabilities as SOCET SET, including many new tools, it was missing an important method which was critical to ASC personnel. This method allowed editors to modify small regions of post-based DTMs using the more powerful set of tools provided for editing TINs. In particular, TIN-based tools allow the user to quickly modify large regions, a capability that is useful for shadowed regions or low-contrast features like dark dunes, which are generally poorly matched. TIN editing was a vital part of the ASC workflow, and its absence hindered our ability to transition to GXP. In 2021, ASC contracted BAE to support the creation of the tool called "Grid as TIN" within GXP (Figure 1). The addition of this tool restores the capability to convert portions of a post- or pixel-based DTM to a TIN, edit it using TIN-based tools, and then convert it back to posts. The tool has been made available in SOCET GXP since 2022.




Figure 1. A screenshot of a multi-port viewer in SOCET GXP showing an anaglyph view for a HiRISE image stereo-pair within the floor of Jezero crater (77.69°E, 18.41°N). Using the newly added tool “Grid as TIN”, the user defines a small region as shown by the yellow box, where the original raster-based DTM was converted to a temporary triangular irregular network (TIN) for vertex editing. Once the user completes their updates to the TIN, the tool will then convert the allocated region back to a raster-based pixel grid for further pixel-based editing.

2.5. Ready for the Transition to SOCET GXP

BAE started the transition from their SOCET SET application to SOCET GXP in 2008 (Walker and Pietrzak, 2015). The final release of SOCET SET (v 5.6) was in 2011. While still available even in 2024, SOCET SET no longer receives updates. Reliance on software that has been unsupported for more than a decade is clearly unacceptable. Fortunately, with the efforts described in Sections 2.1 through 2.4 completed, the needed transition could begin.

SOCET SET and the updated SOCET GXP as stereo photogrammetric applications have very similar capabilities including support for rigorous sensor models, terrain extraction and editing, multi-sensor triangulation, orthorectification, and visualization of stereo images using stereo monitors (Figure 2). These attributes are what the planetary community largely relies on for its derived data creation needs. GXP also adds new functions like LiDAR visualization and exploration, video exploitation, and feature extraction that we have yet to utilize.




Figure 2. A screenshot of a SOCET GXP Multiport showing an anaglyph view for a HiRISE image stereo-pair (ESP_037330_1990, ESP_037818_1990, red channels) within the floor of Jezero crater (77.69°E, 18.41°N). 4-meter interval contours are shown to highlight a visual representation for the stereo-derived DTM. While editing can be performed in this anaglyph mode, most workstations, specifically configured for DTM editing, will have a high-end Graphics Processing Unit (GPU) driving two Liquid Crystal Displays (LCDs) mounted on a specially designed stand. A passive polarized mirror bisects the two monitors allowing the user, who is wearing polarized eyeglasses, to view the left and right monitors separately. The SOCET GXP application, using the available rigorous camera model, provides dynamic adjustments to the left and right images, resulting in the perception of depth. This is how a user can visually verify the quality of the DTMs point-by-point and manually edit any mismatched points (also called blunders).

3. Comparison of HiRISE-Derived Stereo Results for SOCET GXP and SOCET SET

SOCET GXP is not a simple reimplement of its predecessor SOCET SET. SOCET GXP includes many advancements including support for a CSM plug-in environment, updated matching algorithms, and advanced support for hardware acceleration using modern graphics processing units (GPUs) to name a few. But because the transition is a complete overhaul for our sensor model implementation and processing environment, we have performed tests to verify that SOCET GXP can not only replace our current SOCET SET workflow but also accurately replicate the results when used in an equivalent way. For SOCET SET, we used our typical “USGS-based” workflow (Kirk et al, 2021) which uses Next Generation Automatic Terrain Extraction (NGATE) and then a single pass of the area-based Adaptive Automatic Terrain Extraction (AATE, Zhang et al., 1997) algorithm. The NGATE algorithm combines area- and feature-based correlators and can feature

match over all combinations of overlapping imagery. Within a single stereopair NGATE will match both left image to right image and vice versa calculating all match types at every image pixel (Zhang et al., 2007, Kirk et al., 2008). The addition of a final AATE step was added to reduce the appearance of blocky artifacts. However, as described in Kirk et al., 2021, the AATE pass is fundamentally equivalent to a lowpass filter (5×5 mean kernel). Thus, for this comparison, within SOCET GXP we still ran NGATE, but for the smoothing step we replaced the AATE single pass with the same lowpass filter. Lastly, we purposely did not exercise the newer Automatic Spatial Modeler matcher (ASM; Zhang, 2019) which is only available in SOCET GXP.

Fortunately, within SOCET GXP, while the interface has been renovated, the overall processing workflow is very similar to SOCET SET including initial data ingestion, image registration, tie point editing, triangulation, and eventual DTM extraction. For SOCET SET, this process is well described by Kirk et al., (2008) and Sutton et al., (2022). To stage the comparison, we loaded the same stereo-images and defined the same adjustable line-scanner parameters during image triangulation including cross-track, in-track, and radial positional and velocity biases and mounting angle bias. Because the line-scanner sensor model implementations are distinct, we cannot use the same metadata file (or ISD). During the NGATE extraction, both applications used the same custom “strategy” file called *ngate_HIRISE.strategy*, which is largely based on the built-in *ngate_urban.strategy* file, but optimized for HiRISE images. Strategy files allow for dozens of adjustable parameters (e.g., window sizes or slope constraints) which can be updated by the user (Zhang et al., 2007). In practice, this file only defines the initial parameter values, and the application will adapt the parameters based on the input images. Finally, DTMs were collected at the same grid spacing of 1 meter in both systems and using similar smoothing methods as described above. No manual or operator editing was attempted on either DTM.

The main difference in the HiRISE workflows is that before DTM creation within SOCET SET, the user must export intermediate epipolar rectified images. The impact of this step is a forced single rectification transformation across the entire left/right image pair (and an extra resampling). We have never fully understood the need to do this in SOCET SET, but it has been required for HiRISE images prior to DTM extraction. Fortunately, in SOCET GXP, this intermediate step is not required. During DTM extraction in SOCET GXP, new rectification coefficients are automatically updated when they change significantly across the image.

In this paper, we only present a qualitative comparison of DTMs produced in the two systems, focusing on properties such as apparent sharpness, noise level, and artifacts. Overall, the DTMs were found to be very similar, which is not surprising since the same matching method and stereo-model parametrization were used in both applications. Interpreting the small quantitative differences between DTMs would be difficult, because we lack a reference dataset of superior precision and accuracy against which to evaluate the models. A possible objective for future research would be to make DTMs in the two systems from images of lower resolution and evaluate each against a DTM made from full-resolution HiRISE images. Such an approach, described in Kirk et al., (2021), can be used to quantify both the horizontal resolution and vertical error of each product. The low-resolution stereopair to be evaluated could come from a different camera such as the MRO Context Camera (CTX; Malin et al., 2007) or could be simulated by down-sampling HiRISE images (Kirk et al. 2022).

3.1. Comparison HiRISE Pair 1

Figure 3 shows the first DTM stereo-image extraction comparing SOCET SET and SOCET GXP. The HiRISE stereo images, located in the floor of Jezero crater, Mars (77.69°E , 18.41°N), were ESP_037330_1990 and ESP_037818_1990 (red channels). The colorized hillshade and zoomed-in grayscale hillshades are derived from a 1 meter/pixel SOCET SET-generated DTM (left) and a SOCET GXP-generated DTM (right). These images were selected to show a relatively flat area.

Panel A shows the SOCET SET colorized hillshade and panel F shows the SOCET GXP colorized hillshade (the scalebar for A and F is at the top right of the figure). At this scale, both A and F colorized hillshades appear to be identical, highlighting the consistency between the applications. Panels B–E and G–H cover the two zoom-in locations shown by the red outlined boxes. These two zoomed-in regions were selected to contrast the matching results in a very flat dune field and a steep mesa-like feature. All six zoom-in panels are shown at the same scale (the scalebar for all 6 panels is at the bottom right of figure). Panels B and G show the first zoom-in of the hillshaded DTMs for SOCET SET and SOCET GXP, respectively. Panels C and H show the second zoom-in of the hillshaded DTMs for SOCET SET and SOCET GXP, respectively. Lastly, Panel D is the orthoimage of the same area as B and G and panel E is the orthoimage of the same area as C and H showing the SOCET GXP-created orthorectified ESP_037818_1990 image. The resulting orthorectified images, as generated from SOCET GXP and SOCET SET, were nearly identical, so they are not compared here.

Within the SOCET SET extraction, the hillshade does contain several distinct undesirable linear artifacts as shown in panel C (45-degree angle across the lower part of the hillshade). We are uncertain about the cause of these artifacts, but they likely indicate necessary intermediate epipolar rectification or that the updated CSM-based sensor model has mitigated a potential “pixel-locking” issue.




Figure 3. HiRISE DTM comparison visualized as hillshades of SOCET SET (left, panels A–C) and SOCET GXP (right, panels F–H) models from the same stereopair in Jezero crater, Mars. Orthoimages from GXP are in panels D and E. See Section 3.1 for a detailed description.

3.2. Comparison HiRISE Pair 2

Figure 4 shows the second stereo-extraction comparison using HiRISE images ESP_011969_1425, ESP_047190_1425 (red channels) from the rim of Triolet crater, Mars (191.98°E, 37.09°S). The colorized hillshade and zoomed-in grayscale hillshades are derived from a 1 meter/pixel SOCET SET-generated DTM (left) and a SOCET GXP-generated DTM (right). These images were selected to show an extremely steep area.

Panel A shows the SOCET SET colorized hillshade and panel F shows the SOCET GXP colorized hillshade (the scalebar for A and F is at the top right of the figure). As in Figure 3, the colorized hillshades A and F are almost indistinguishable. Panels B–E and G–H cover the two zoom-in locations shown by the red outlined boxes. All six zoom-in panels are shown at the same scale (the scalebar for all 6 panels is at the bottom right of figure). Panels B and G show the first zoom-in of the hillshaded DTMs for SOCET SET and SOCET GXP, respectively and cover a section of the Triolet crater rim. Panels C and H show the second zoom-in of the hillshaded DTMs for SOCET SET and SOCET GXP, respectively and highlight a V-shaped gully-like feature. Lastly, Panel D is the orthoimage of the same area as B and G, and panel E is the orthoimage of the same area as C and H showing the SOCET GXP created orthorectified ESP_011969_1425 image.

In SOCET SET panel B, shown are one undesirable vertical and one horizontal linear artifacts. SOCET SET panel C also shows another more subtle horizontal linear artifact. In the top middle of SOCET GXP panel G we do find subtle flat polygonal or “faceted” artifacts. This is common for very bland areas and is seen in DTMs from both SOCET GXP and SOCET SET. Filtering, as applied to both DTMs, has helped to mitigate these artifacts here.




Figure 4. HiRISE DTM extract comparison as hillshades from SOCET SET (left, panels A–C) and SOCET GXP (right, panels F–H) of Triolet crater, Mars. Orthoimages from GXP are in panels D and E. See Section 3.2 for a detailed description.

3.3. Comparison Summary

Figures 3 and 4 highlight the resulting DTM extraction across SOCET SET and SOCET GXP are very similar, which is one of the main goals of this paper. While not shown, and due to the similarity of the DTMs, the derived orthoimages were also nearly indistinguishable. The subtle differences in the DTM could be attributed to either advances in the SOCET GXP application itself (e.g., being able to dynamically epi-polar rectify the images during matching) or actual updates to the CSM-based line-scanner sensor model implementation (Laura et al., 2020).

Although we realize more testing is needed across other instruments (e.g., LROC, CTX), we have shown that the development described herein (addition of a settable reference ellipsoid radii to the CSM API, successful transition of ASC's sensor models to the *usgscsm* library, and updated editing capabilities), and the unique capabilities available in SOCET SET, can now be accomplished by SOCET GXP. This will allow ASC, and others in the planetary community, to transition to SOCET GXP, a move necessitated by the deprecation of BAE's support for SOCET SET. While not discussed, it is worth noting that SOCET GXP offers much faster DTM extractions and image orthorectifications due to the use of multi-threading and/or GPU acceleration.

4. Access to the ASC Community Sensor Model *usgscsm* Library

The transition to the CSM API-based *usgscsm* library was ultimately based on the need to transition away from SOCET SET to SOCET GXP. This library, again while originally created for SOCET GXP, can now function as a standalone library or as a plug-in for NASA Ames Stereo Pipeline (ASP) and the ISIS software suite. Any application that conforms to the CSM API, including the ability to set custom radii using the API, can also take advantage of the photogrammetric capabilities the *usgscsm* library offers.

As part of our NASA-supported community efforts, the source code for the *usgscsm* library can be found at the USGS GitHub repository (<https://github.com/DOI-USGS/usgscsm>). ASC has also released the related *ALE* and *knoten* libraries (<https://github.com/DOI-USGS/ALE>, <https://github.com/DOI-USGS/knoten>). All three libraries are in the public domain with a Creative Commons Zero (CC0 1.0) license, unless stated otherwise, and each site has their own GitHub issue and community discussion boards. Documentation, as linked from each site, is also available. Linked from the *usgscsm* wiki, sample data sets for testing in SOCET GXP, ASP and the Python-based *knoten* environment have been made available (<https://github.com/DOI-USGS/usgscsm/wiki>). Lastly, pre-built binaries for the *usgscsm*, *ALE*, and *knoten* libraries are also offered, including installation instructions.

As part of our Astrogeology Photogrammetry and Processing Lab (APPL), we have prepared a standard operating procedure (SOP) manual that describes how a user can process their own data in SOCET GXP. The use of the *usgscsm* library is already well described in ASP's documentation (Beyer et al., 2018). Detailed workflow steps have been provided in the SOP and posted to the *usgscsm* GitHub wiki. For the most recent version of the SOP, please contact the lead author.

5. Summary

We have shown that the *usgscsm* library is ready for DTM production in SOCET GXP with the generic push-broom sensor model using HiRISE images. Because the *usgscsm* library is used in SOCET GXP, ASP, and ISIS, it also greatly facilitates sharing data between these applications. Examples of useful workflows that would exploit such interoperability include creating a DTM in ASP and editing it interactively in SOCET GXP, or sharing orientation data for a set of images controlled in SOCET GXP so that they can be processed in ISIS.

Testing the new capabilities of SOCET GXP, such as the ASM image-matching module, additional editing tools, and enhanced hardware support is a logical and valuable

extension of the work reported here. This would also include utilizing the methodology of Kirk et al. (2021) to quantify the resolution and precision of SOCET GXP DTMs as compared to SOCET SET. The community-supported *usgscsm* GitHub repository (e.g., the GitHub Discussion site and Wiki) is a mechanism to communicate the results of such tests.

Lastly, as new planetary instruments are supported by ASC, we have adopted a policy to first implement a CSM-based sensor model over an ISIS-based sensor model to support the three applications discussed here (SOCET GXP, ASP, and ISIS). We are hopeful that more applications which natively support the CSM API may also implement the *usgscsm* library, broadening planetary data processing across the community, especially as efforts increase with the Artemis missions to the Moon.

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to all the planetary instrument teams, specifically the LROC and HiRISE Teams, who have also been pushing forward in this transition. We are also thankful for support from the CSM Working Group and BAE Systems. Lastly, we would like to especially thank the many dedicated software developers from ASC and NASA Ames Research Center who have brought the *usgscsm* library into existence. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. All input data used for this paper are available via NASA's Planetary Data System. This work has been funded by the NASA-USGS Planetary Spatial Data Infrastructure Interagency Agreement.

List of Acronyms Used

AATE	Adaptive Automatic Terrain Extraction	
ALE	Abstraction Layer for Ephemerides	
API	Application Programming Interface	
APPL	Astrogeology Photogrammetry and Processing Lab	
ASC	Astrogeology Science Center	
ASP	Ames Stereo Pipeline	
ASU	Arizona State University	
ASM	Automatic Spatial Modeler	
AATE	Adaptive Automatic Terrain Extraction	
CCD	Charge-Coupled Device	
CSM	Community Sensor Model	
CTX	Context Camera	
DEM	Digital Elevation Model	
DTM	Digital Terrain Model	
EDR	Experiment Data Record (PDS product)	
ESA	European Space Agency	
FOM	Figure of Merit	
GIS	Geospatial Information System	
GPU	Graphics Processing Unit	
HiRISE	High Resolution Imaging Science Experiment	
HRSC	High Resolution Stereo Camera	
IMG	Image format used by PDS	
IMU	Inertial Measurement Unit	
InSight	Interior Exploration using Seismic Investigations, Geodesy and Heat	
Transport		
ISD	Image Support Data	
ISD	Image Support Data	
ISIS	Integrated Software for Imagers and Spectrometers	
ISRO	Indian Space Research Organization	
JPL	Jet Propulsion Lab	
LCD	Liquid Crystal Display	
LROC	Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter Camera	
MGS	Mars Global Surveyor	

MOLA	Mars Orbiter Laser Altimeter	493
MRO	Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter	494
MSL	Mars Science Laboratory	495
NGATE	Next-Generation Automatic Terrain Extraction	496
NITF	National Imagery Transmission Format	497
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	498
NGA	National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency	499
NGATE	Next Generation Automatic Terrain Extraction	500
NITF	National Imagery Transmission Format	501
PDS	Planetary Data System	502
PICS	Planetary Image Cartographic System	503
PSP	Primary Science Phase	504
RDR	Reduced Data Record (PDS product)	505
RGB	Red-Green-Blue color	506
SAR	Synthetic-Aperture Radar	507
SET	Sensor Exploitation Tool	508
SAR	Synthetic-aperture radar	509
SOCET GXP	SOftCopy Geospatial eXploitation Products	510
SOCET SET	SOftCopy Exploitation Toolkit	511
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure	512
TIN	Triangulated Irregular Network	513
UA	University of Arizona	514
USGS	United States Geological Survey	515
WGS	World Geodetic System	516

References

- Archinal, B.A., Acton, C.H., A'Hearn, M.F., Conrad, A., Consolmagno, G.J., Duxbury, T., Hestroffer, D., Hilton, J.L., Kirk, R.L., Klioner, S.A., McCarthy, D., Meech, K., Oberst, J., Ping, J., Seidelmann, P.K., Tholen, D.J., Thomas, P.C., and Williams, I.P. (2018). Report of the IAU Working Group on Cartographic Coordinates and Rotational Elements: 2015, *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy* 130 (22), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10569-017-9805-5>.
- Bell, J. F., III, Godber, A., McNair, S., Caplinger, M. A., Maki, J. N., Lemmon, M. T., et al. (2017). The Mars Science Laboratory Curiosity rover Mastcam instruments: Preflight and in-flight calibration, validation, and data archiving. *Earth and Space Science*, 4(7), 396–452. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016EA000219>.
- Belton, M.J.S., Klaasen, K.P., Clary, M.C. et al. (1992). The Galileo Solid-State Imaging experiment. *Space Sci Rev* 60, 413–455. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00216864>
- Beyer, R. A., Alexandrov, O., McMichael, S. (2018). The Ames Stereo Pipeline: NASA's Open Source Software for Deriving and Processing Terrain Data. *Earth and Space Science* 5, Issue 9, 537–548.
- Bland, M.T., Kirk, R.L., Galuszka, D.M., Mayer, D.P., Beyer, R.A., Ferguson, R.L., 2021, How Well Do We Know Europa's Topography? An Evaluation of the Variability in Digital Terrain Models of Europa. *Remote Sensing*, 13, 5097.
- Cheng, Y., Ansar, A., and Johnson, A. (2021). Making an onboard reference map from MRO/CTX imagery for Mars 2020 Lander Vision System. *Earth and Space Science*, 8, e2020EA001560. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EA001560>.
- Christensen, P.R., B.M. Jakosky, H.H. Kieffer, M.C. Malin, H.Y. McSween, Jr., K. Neelson, G.L. Mehall, S.H. Silverman, S. Ferry, M. Caplinger, and M. Ravine. (2004). The Thermal Emission Imaging System (THEMIS) for the Mars 2001 Odyssey Mission, *Space Science Reviews*, 110, 85–130.
- Community Sensor Model Working Group (2007). Community Sensor Model (CSM) Technical Requirements Document (TRD): National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.
- Di, K., and Li, R. (2004). CAHVOR camera model and its photogrammetric conversion for planetary applications. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109, E04004. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JE002199>.
- Ferguson, R. L., Hare, T. M., Mayer, D. P., Galuszka, D. M., Redding, B. L., Smith, E. D., Shinaman, J. R., Cheng, Y., Otero, R. E. (2020), Mars 2020 Terrain Relative Navigation Flight Product Generation: Digital Terrain Model and Orthorectified Image Mosaics, 51st Lunar and Planetary Science Conference, DOIs: [10.5066/P9QIDP48](https://doi.org/10.5066/P9QIDP48), [10.5066/P906QQT8](https://doi.org/10.5066/P906QQT8).
- Flinn, E. A. (1997). Scientific results of the Viking Project, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, vol. 82, Sept. 30, 1977. Washington, D.C., American Geophysical Union, 1977. 735 p.
- Golombek, M. P., et al. (2017). Selection of the InSight landing site, *Space Science Reviews* 211, 5–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-016-0321-9>.

13. Haruyama, J., Matsunaga, T., Ohtake, M., Morota, T., Honda, C., Yokota, Y., Torii, M., & Ogawa, Y. (2008). Global lunar-surface mapping experiment using the Lunar Imager/Spectrometer on SELENE. *Earth, Planets and Space*, 60(4), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1186/BF03352788>
14. Hawkins, S. E., Boldt, J. D., Darlington, E. H., Espiritu, R., Gold, R. E., Gotwols, B., Grey, M. P., Hash, C. D., Hayes, J. R., Jaskulek, S. E., Kardian, C. J., Keller, M. R., Malaret, E. R., Murchie, S. L., Murphy, P. K., Peacock, K., Prockter, L. M., Reiter, R. Alan, Robinson, M. S., Schaefer, E. D., Shelton, R. G., Sterner, R. E., Taylor, H. W., Watters, T. R., & Williams, B. D. (2007). The Mercury Dual Imaging System on the MESSENGER spacecraft. *Space Science Reviews*, 131(1), 247–338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-007-9266-3>.
15. Henriksen, M.R., Manheim, M.R., Burns, K.N., Seymour, P., Speyerer, E.J., Deran, A., Boyd, A.K., Howington-Kraus, E., Rosiek, M.R., Archinal, B.A., Robinson, M.S.(2017) Extracting accurate and precise topography from LROC narrow angle camera stereo observations, *Icarus*, Volume 283, Pages 122-137, ISSN 0019-1035, [doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2016.05.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2016.05.012).
16. Ishiguro, M., Nakamura, R., Tholen, D. et al. (2010). The Hayabusa Spacecraft Asteroid Multi-band Imaging Camera (AMICA), *Icarus*, 207, No. 2, 714-731, [doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2009.12.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2009.12.035).
17. Laura, J.R., Adoram-Kershner, L.A., Meyer, D.P., Wheeler, B.H., Bauck, K.H. and Ferguson, R.L. (2023) Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter (MRO) Context Camera (CTX) orthoimage generated using Ames stereo pipeline derived digital terrain models. <https://doi.org/10.5066/P9JKVWR3>.
18. Laura, J. R. and Beyer, R. A. (2021) Knowledge Inventory of Foundational Data Products in Planetary Science, *Planetary Science Journal*, 2 18, [doi:10.3847/PSJ/abcb94](https://doi.org/10.3847/PSJ/abcb94).
19. Laura, J. R., Mapel, J., and Hare, T. M. (2020). Planetary sensor models interoperability using the Community Sensor Model specification. *Earth and Space Science*.7, e2019EA000713, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EA000713>.
20. Jaumann, R., Neukum, G., Behnke, T., et al. (2007). The high-resolution stereo camera (HRSC) experiment on Mars Express: Instrument aspects and experiment conduct from interplanetary cruise through the nominal mission. *Planetary and Space Science* 55, Issue 7-8, 928-952.
21. Kirk, R. L., Howington-Kraus, E., Hare, T., Dorrer, E., Cook, D., Becker, K., Thomas, K., Redding, B., Blue, J., Galuszka, D., Lee, E. M., Gaddis, L. R., Johnson, J. R., Soderblom, L. A., Ward, A. W., Smith, P. H., and Britt D. T. (1999) Digital photogrammetric analysis of the IMP camera images: Mapping the Mars Pathfinder landing site in three dimensions, *J. Geophys. Res.*, v. 104 (E4), p. 8868–8888.
22. Kirk, R. L., Howington-Kraus, E., Rosiek, M. R. et al. (2008). Ultrahigh resolution topographic mapping of Mars with MRO HiRISE stereo images: Meter-scale slopes of candidate Phoenix landing sites. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets* 113(E3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JE003000>.
23. Kirk, R.L and Howington-Kraus, E. (2008). Radargrammetry on three planets, *The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, Volume 37, IssueB4.
24. Kirk, R. L., Barrett, J.M., Wahl, D.E., Erteza, I., Jackowatz, C.V., Yocky, D.A., Paterson, G.W., (2016). A semi-rigorous sensor model for precision geometric processing of Mini-RF bistatic radar images of the Moon, *Int. Arch. Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spatial Inf. Sci.* 41, 425–441.
25. Kirk, R. L., Mayer, D., Redding, B. L., Galuszka, D. M., Ferguson, R. L., Hare, T. M., Gwinner, K. (2021). Further Adventures in Mars DTM Quality: Smoothing Errors, Sharpening Details, *Int. Arch. Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing. Spatial Inf. Sci.*, XLIII-B3-2021, 659–666, <https://doi.org/10.5194/isprs-archives-XLIII-B3-2021-659-2021>.
26. Kordas, J. F., Lewis, I. T., Priest, R. E., White, W. T., Nielsen, D. P., Park, H., Wilson, B. A., Shannon, M. J., Ledebuhr, A. G., Pleasance, L. D. (1995). UV/visible camera for the Clementine mission, in *Space Telescopes and Instruments*, Proc. SPIE Vol. 2478, 175-186, P. Y. Bely and J. B. Breckinridge Eds., [doi:10.1117/12.210943](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.210943).
27. Malin, M. C., Edgett, K. S., Cantor, B. A., Caplinger, M. A., Danielson, G. E., Jensen, E. H., et al. (2010). An overview of the 1985–2006 Mars Orbiter Camera science investigation. *International Journal of Mars Science and Exploration*, 4, 1–60. <https://doi.org/10.1555/mars.2010.0001>.
28. Malin, M. C., Bell III, J. F., Cantor, B. A., Caplinger, M. A., Calvin, W. M., Clancy, R. T., Edgett, K. S., Edwards, L., Haberle, R. M., James, P. B., Lee, S. W., Ravine, M. A., Thomas, P. C., Wolff, M. J. (2007). Context Camera investigation on board the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 112, E05S04. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JE002808>.
29. McEwen, A. S., Byrne, S., Hansen, C., Daubar, I. J., Sutton, S., Dundas, C. M., Bardabelias, M., Baugh, N., Bergstrom, J., Beyer, R., Block, K. M., Bray, V. J., Bridges, J. C., Chojnacki, M., Conway, S. J., Delamere W. A., Ebben, T., Espinosa, A., Fennema, A., Grant, J., Gulick, V. C., Herkenhoff, K. E., Heyd, R., Leis, R., Ojha, L., Papendick, S., Schaller, C., Thomas, N., Tornabene, L. L., Weitz, C., Wilson, S. A. (2023) The High-Resolution Imaging Science Experiment (HiRISE) in the MRO Extended Science Phases (2009–2022), *Icarus*, [10.1016/j.icarus.2023.115795](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2023.115795).
30. Murchie, S., Domingue, D., Robinson, M., Li, H., Prockter, L., et al. (2002). Insight Calibration of the NEAR Multispectral Imager, 2: Results at Eros, *Icarus* 155, 229–243.
31. Murray, B. C., Belton, M. J. S., Danielson, G. E., Davies, J. E., Gault, D. E., Hapke, B., O’Leary, B., Strom, R. G., Suomi, V., Trask, N. (1974). Mercury’s Surface: Preliminary Description and Interpretation from Mariner 10 Pictures, *Science*, 185, 169–179.
32. Nozette, S., Spudis, P., Bussey, B., Jensen, R., Raney, K., Winters, H., Lichtenberg, C. L., Marinelli, W., Crusan, J., Gates, M., Robinson, M. S. (2010). The Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter Miniature Radio Frequency (Mini-RF) Technology Demonstration. *Space Sci Rev* 150, 285–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-009-9607-5>.

33. Orton, G. S., Hansen, C., Caplinger, M., Ravine, M., Atreya, S., Ingersoll, A. P., Jensen, E., Momary, T., Lipkaman, L. (2017). The First Close-up Images of Jupiter's Polar Regions: Results from the Juno Mission JunoCam Instrument. *Geophysical Research Letters*. 44 (10): 4599–4606. doi:10.1002/2016GL072443. 606
34. Rizk, B., Drouet d'Aubigny, C., Golish, D. et al. (2018). OCAMS: The OSIRIS-REx Camera Suite. *Space Sci Rev* 214, 26. 607
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-017-0460-7>. 608
35. Robinson, M. S., Brylow, S. M., Tschimmel, M., Humm, D., Lawrence, S. J., Thomas, P. C., Denevi, B. W., Bowman-Cisneros, E., Zerr, J., Ravine, M. A., Caplinger, M. A., Ghaemi, F. T., Schaffner, J. A., Malin, M. C., Mahanti, P., Bartels, A., Anderson, J., Tran, T. N., Eliason, E. M., McEwen, A. S., Turtle, E., Jolliff, B. L., Hiesinger, H. (2010). Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter Camera (LROC) Instrument Overview. *Space Science Reviews*, 150(1), 81–124. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-010-9634-2>. 609
36. Sierks, H., Keller, H. U., Jaumann, R., Michalik, H., Behnke, T., Bubenhausen, F., Büttner, I., Carsenty, U., Christensen, U., Enge, R., Fiethe, B., Gutiérrez Marqués, P., Hartwig, H., Krüger, H., Kühne, W., Maue, T., Mottola, S., Nathues, A., Reiche, K.-U., Richards, M. L., Roatsch, T., Schröder, S. E., Szemerey, I., Tschentscher, M. (2011). The Dawn Framing Camera. *Space Science Reviews*, 163(1), 263–327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-011-9745-4>. 610
37. Smith, B.A., Briggs, G.A., Danielson, G.E., Cook, A.F., Davies, M.E., Hunt, G.E., Masursky, H., Soderblom, L.A., Owen, T.C., Sagan, C., Suomi, V.E. (1977). Voyager Imaging Experiment, *Space Sci. Rev.*, Vol. 21, p. 103. 611
38. Spudis P. D. et al. (2009) Mini-SAR: An imaging radar experiment for the Chandrayaan-1 mission to the Moon, *Current Science*, Vol. 96, No. 4 (India). 612
39. Sutton, S. S., Chojnacki, M., McEwen, A. S. et al. (2022). Revealing active Mars with HiRISE digital terrain models. *Remote Sensing* 14(10), 2403. 613
40. Thomas, N., Cremonese, G., Ziethe, R. et al. (2017). The Colour and Stereo Surface Imaging System (CaSSIS) for the ExoMars Trace Gas Orbiter. *Space Sci Rev* 212, 1897–1944. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-017-0421-1>. 614
41. Xu X, Liu M, Peng S, Ma Y, Zhao H, Xu A. (2022). An In-Orbit Stereo Navigation Camera Self-Calibration Method for Planetary Rovers with Multiple Constraints. *Remote Sensing*. 2022; 14(2):402. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs14020402> 615
42. Walker, S., and Pietrzak, A. (2015). Remote measurement methods for 3-D modeling purposes using BAE systems' software. *Geodesy and Cartography*, 64, 113–124. 616
43. Weaver, H.A., Gibson, W.C., Tapley, M.B. et al. (2008). Overview of the New Horizons Science Payload. *Space Sci Rev* 140, 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-008-9376-6>. 617
44. Zhang, B. (2019), Automatic Spatial Modeler (ASM): Elevation by Innovation, BAE Systems, Geospatial eXploitation Products, https://www.geospatalexploitationproducts.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/sgxp_automatic-spatial-modeler.pdf 618
45. Zhang, B., Miller, S., Walker, S., Devenecia, K. (2007) Next Generation Automatic Terrain Extraction using Microsoft UltraCam imagery. In *Proceedings of the ASPRS 2007 Annual Conference*, Tampa, FL, USA. 619
46. Zhang, B., Miller, S.B. (1997), Adaptive Automatic Terrain Extraction. In *Proceedings of the SPIE 3072, Integrating Photogrammetric Techniques with Scene Analysis and Machine Vision III*, Orlando, FL, USA, 21–25 April; pp. 27–36. 620

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content. 621