

Interactive interpretation of 3D surfaces in field-based geosciences using mobile devices - concepts, challenges and applications

Melanie Kröhnert^{a,*}, Christian Kehl^e, Sophie Viseur^b, Simon J. Buckley^{c,d}

^a*Institute for Photogrammetry & Remote Sensing, TU Dresden, Helmholtzstr. 10, 01069 Dresden, Germany*

^b*Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, IRD, CEREGE UM 34, Dept. Sedimentary and Reservoir Systems, 13001 Marseille, France*

^c*Uni Research AS – CIPR, Nygårdsgaten 112, 5008 Bergen, Norway*

^d*Department of Earth Science, University of Bergen, Allégaten 41, 5007 Bergen, Norway*

^e*Danmarks Tekniske Universitet, DTU Compute, Richard Petersens Plads, Building 321/208, 2800 Kongens Lyngby, Denmark*

Abstract

Keywords: discrete geometry, surface reconstruction, volume reconstruction, surface parameterization, digital outcrops

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

1. Introduction

A considerable number of domains within the geosciences rely on digitised natural observations and their interpretation to steer and constrain numerical models. Published (semi-)automatic interpretation methods emerged within the
5 past decade that support the digital documentation of observations and interpretations. These advanced interpretation techniques require increasingly complex computing that is restricted to office-based work environments, which poses a problem for field-based studies. Domains such as hydrology, geology or glaciology hence established multi-stage procedures where observations are taken
10 manually in the field and later digitised in the office. This is disadvantageous

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: melanie.kroehnert@tu-dresden.de (Melanie Kröhnert), chke@dtu.dk (Christian Kehl), viseur@cerege.fr (Sophie Viseur), Simon.Buckley@uni.no (Simon J. Buckley)

and within the referred domains, there is an increasing desire to facilitate digital interpretations in the field at the study location. Mobile computing equipment (e.g. smartphones and tablets) are one technological option to facilitate such digital field-based workflows. These devices are nowadays ubiquitous and can easily be equipped in field-based research. Also, as seen in technical magazines and the general media, the range of available devices continuously increases, which allows to find a "fit-for-purpose" device to each specific situation. New application cases, which are demonstrated and discussed in this article, and commitment within geoscience- and computer technology industry lead to an increasing interest in this cross-disciplinary domain between mobile computing and geoscientific interpretation.

Next to easily available, pocket-format computing devices, the required three-dimensional base data for modern applications also need to be available and being processed in a "mobile-ready" manner. The availability of topographic 3D surface data is steadily increasing due to easy-to-use software and instrumentation for surface generation (e.g. drones, structure from motion (SfM) [?] and multi-view geometry [?], satellite digital elevation models (DEMs)). Furthermore, crowdsourced data and Volunteered Geographic Information (VGI) contribute to the geoscience data inventory, which is acquired by citizen scientists.

Domain-specific mobile software is required in order allow for data interaction on the available mobile devices. Specific challenges such as power consumption, multi-manufacturer support, smart sensor utilisation and device intercommunication distinguish mobile software from common desktop software. This leads to a very different design electronics design of tablets and smartphones in comparison to desktop PCs and laptops, which in turn means that existing approaches for digital data processing and interpretation are not transferable as-is to this new computing domain. Even when considering the fast technological development, there are some challenges within mobile device software development that are rooted in the technology itself: user interfaces need to be specifically designed for mobile devices so to utilise touch screen interfaces, nat-

ural language interfaces and gesture interaction (e.g. "swipe" and "optical lens" motions). global navigation satellite system (GNSS)-based geo-localisation accuracy, as delivered by the integrated-circuit sensor of mobile, is inferior to
45 common user expectations and requirements in geoscientific studies. The modalities of sensor data delivery (be it hardware sensor or software emulation), photo capturing and processing, and the computational capabilities of mobile devices differ significantly between each vendors. Short-comings such as inappropriate data structuring, visual object correlation and registration, increasing
50 data volumes and the unavailability of off-the-shelf program codes further complicate the technological development. Addressing the demonstrated challenges distinguishes the mobile application development and common desktop software development for geoscience purposes. **the same as in line 34?**

This article demonstrates how the above-listed challenges can be addressed
55 to provide, in the end, the desired added value for field-based research. This demonstration addresses the 3D data annotation and interpretation for two use cases within the domains of surface hydrology and (petroleum) geology. The content covered in the article is a detail-driven extension of earlier published research [1], focussing on extensive measurements to verify the reasoning and
60 statements of previous studies.

The sections within this article adhere to the following structure: First, the use cases are presented as opening statements to introduce field-related tasks that are to be addressed with mobile device technology. Secondly, different 3D surface data representations are introduced that employed within this technical
65 research. Thirdly, algorithmic baseline concepts that are key for interpreting 3D data on mobile devices are introduced, summarising project-internal development by the authors as well as referencing key literature on the subject. Fourth, the algorithms are mapped to the specific mobile technologies and components. The technologies and major parameters that impact the target use case applica-
70 tion are highlighted. Finally, we showcase and discuss how available mobile systems are used in application scenarios from hydrology and petroleum geology to improve data analysis and integrate outdoor measurements in digital

workflows. Then, the article is finalized with some concluding remarks and a discussion for future developments in this research trajectory.

75 2. Target case studies

TO-BE-FILLED

3. Representation basis – Geometry and Radiometry

Various representation forms for 3D terrain data are available. While early digital systems used DEMs for their simplicity and compact storage [2, 3], digital
80 surface models (DSMs) and triangulated irregular networks (TINs) are dominating most terrain-based systems for application-specific analysis. An useful example can be seen a [4] for glaciology, where the authors use a triangulated digital surface model to represent a Patagonian glacier front. The same application of ... can be observed for climate studies, as in In this context, it is
85 important to distinguish geometrically valid TINs from polygon soup surfaces. While the latter is often employed in early stages of mesh-based software systems due to its simplicity and ease of implementation, valid TINs are employed in mature stages of the analysis. This is because some automated analysis (e.g. auto-interpretation, volume derivation) require clean surfaces with coherently
90 outward-oriented surface normals.

In geoscience domains such as petroleum geology, texture- and color information are vital for interpretation- and analysis tasks. In these cases, as demonstrated by Buckley et. al [5] and Caumon et. al [6], the TIN is supplemented with photographic information that is projected on the surface as textures. As
95 it is also possible to project textures from outside the visible spectrum as supplementary information on the surface [?], we generalize for the remainder of the article that the model in question consists of its geometric and radiometric information.

[EXAMPLE PHOTO FROM LIME]

100 In other geoscience domains, such as hydrology and free surface flow man-
 agement, on the one hand georeferenced laser scanner point clouds, and on the
 other one colored point data streams provided by terrestrial photogrammetry
 for small- or unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) for large-scale use cases, both pro-
 cessed by application of SfM, are used for several tasks like coastal monitoring
 105 [7, 8], soil erosion and rain-induced landslide observation or even monitoring
 river’s topography [9]. Nevertheless, new approaches for low-cost and on-the-fly
 river monitoring [10] and simulation [11] arise due to globally increasing flash
 flood events after heavy rainfalls [12] that are further addressed in section. Since
 SfM became state of the art in geosciences, the acquisition of (true-)colored
 110 ”point cloud“ models is not that difficult and commonly employed because of
 their rapid processing (compared to conventional approaches like terrestrial laser
 scanning (TLS)). Regarding 3D annotation, nearest neighbour analysis provide
 an opportunity whereby surface triangulation can be avoided.

The stated base concepts of geometric and radiometric model information
 115 and their representations are also valid for mobile device software. Because of
 the limited processing speed of mobile chipsets, a tendency for employing point
 cloud models on mobile devices (e.g. Garcia et. al [13]) can be observed. A
 drawback of point cloud models is their sparse nature, which prohibits continu-
 ous analysis of field data. Therefore, DEMs have seen a revival in the mobile
 120 computing domain because they provide dense, closed geometric models that
 can be rendered and processed very effectively. Furthermore, with the inferior
 memory capacity of mobile devices in comparison to laptops and workstations,
 it is advantageous to be able to aggressively compress the data for mobile use,
 which is facilitated both by point clouds and DEMs. Base mapping applica-
 125 tions such as Open Street Maps and Google Maps use ... as their main 3D data
 representation. Other systems within the geosciences processing 3D data on mo-
 bile devices, such as ”Outcrop“ and Geological Registration and Interpretation
 Toolset (GRIT), employ genuine textured triangulated DSM.

The form of model representation chosen significantly impacts the algorithms
 130 and analytical capabilities employed on the mobile device. Although all al-

gorithms presented in this article work on either form of representation, some of the algorithms favor the treatment of triangulated surfaces (e.g. image-to-geometry registration, guided interpretation), while others clearly favour point-based representations (e.g. SfM and rendering).

135 4. Algorithms

This section demonstrates novel- as well as existing algorithms and methods on mobile devices that are used for solving analysis tasks in the geoscience use cases laid out in section ?? . As mentioned before, the effectiveness of each algorithm depends on the applied model representation.

140 4.1. Image-to-geometry registration

- ~~short description what it does~~
- ~~how is it generally employed~~
- ~~relation to mobile devices~~
- ~~approaches and implementation known on mobile devices~~
- 145 • integration to the above-mentioned use cases

Image-to-geometry algorithms aim at registering a 2D image to a given 3D surface, providing a transformation from 2D coordinate system to 3D coordinate system as follows:

$$P' = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ w \end{pmatrix} = [R_{3,3}|T_{1,3}] \cdot P \quad (1)$$

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

$$P' \in \mathbb{R}^2 = \frac{P'}{w} \quad (3)$$

Using this coordinate system transformation on combination with a known
 150 interior camera orientation, it is possible to projectively map entire images on
 the surface just as surface texturing does. It is also possible to map specific
 objects on the image, such as image-based interpretations, on the surface. In
 the geosciences, these algorithms are employed to create a direct correlation
 between 3D model and the screen- or image space on which annotations and
 155 interpretations are based on [14]. The technique is also employed to provide
 texture mappings for multi-layer images, such as hyperspectral data or domain-
 specific thematic maps.

- feature-based registration: detect prominent points or edges in the input
 2D images and a rendered representation of the 3D model
- 160 • different concept for registration:
 - for mesh models, 2D feature locations are raycasted using camera
 projection and the 3D model in background; 3D feature location
 determined upon ray-plane intersection
 - for point-based models, raycasting doesn't directly work as point
 165 cannot be intersected; prominent solution is employing a smart ren-
 dering technique that expands the point into an area, and generate
 a depth map; after depth map generation, the 3D coordinate of a 2D
 feature map can be read directly from the depth map; drawback of
 the method / offset for speed: accuracy limitation of depth maps;
 170 high-resolution depthmaps (above 512^2) cost a lot of performance
- registration then has source- and target 2D-3D point pairs (in a normalized
 manner) that are put into a least-squares optimization system (give math
 here)
- optimization system usually non-linear, usually employing Levenberg-
 175 Marquardt optimization schemes [15]

- largest challenges for feature-based registration: (a) reliable feature correlation and (b) optimization stability; useful constraints can be employed in both cases – such as horizon information, building edges, object outlines – to increase the registration reliability and accuracy
- 180 • employing constraints is highly application-dependent
- feature-based registration techniques most prevalent on mobile devices due to execution speed, implementation ease and so forth
- examples of mobile implementation: [16? , 17?]
- 185 • drawback of feature-based methods: reliability and instability to imaging variances (discussed later in this article)
- a contrasting technique commonly achieving more accurate results: mutual information
- idea: pixel-wise comparison between 2D input image and 2D rendering of 3D scene; if both images match (meaning: $\operatorname{argmin} \delta(I_{2D}, I'_{3D})$), then registration is completed
- 190 • mutual information [18] use notion of self-information and entropy to measure $\delta(I_{2D}, I'_{3D})$
- challenge: optimization of 7 degree-of-freedom system over such over-determined system (i.e. each image pixel results in 2 equations for the optimization scheme) unstable and prone to local minima
- 195 • only optimization known to provide stable results is NEWUOA (i.e. Powell's method) [19];
- has recently been employed in an earth science case for light detection and range (lidar) registration [?]
- 200 • not available for mobile devices until now

- in terms of usability on mobile devices (why should we want to have that on mobile devices), projection of image-based information is vital on mobile devices
- because of interaction difficulty, image-based interpretations on 3D surface data is preferable
- it is potentially advantageous, in terms of power consumption, to implement data interaction in 2D rather than 3D; a hypothesis proven by experiment in this article
- as it directly relates to the interactive component of the geoscience app, it has to be executed in real-time on the device instead of an offline process

4.2. Data presentation and rendering

- ~~short description what it does~~
- ~~how is it generally employed~~
- ~~relation to mobile devices~~
- ~~approaches and implementation known on mobile devices~~
- integration to the above-mentioned use cases
- rendering the 3D model in this context refers to generation of image generation of 3D model by projective rasterization of model data to 2D imaging plane of a virtual camera
- rendering is performed to view the 3D model on the mobile device
- also employed to generate a reference image used in the image-to-geometry registration and the annotation and interpretation of the data
- major concepts: mesh-based rendering and Point-based Rendering (PBR)
- technical details on how this is done covered in the technology section ??

225 *4.2.1. Mesh-based rendering*

- well-known concept
- mesh is transferred as vertex set and primitive set (i.e. triangles or polygons, depending on employing TIN or polygonal soup geometry) to graphics processor
- virtual camera is set up as projective view matrix
- primitives are positions in 3D scene via model transformation matrix
- rasterizer projects information to camera plane and transforms continuous data into discrete pixel-based representation
- in-time decompression can be optionally employed (see [20])
- texturing is employed to map image information on the surface; correlation between surface patches and texture images established explicitly beforehand or implicitly defined by geographic coordinate systems (e.g. WGS84 or UTM) for georeferenced surface

235 *4.3. A novel approach to mobile point-based rendering*

240 In comparison to mesh-based rendering, simple point projection seems to be a nice alternative saving computational resources and efforts for post-processing concerning outlier removal due to falsely surface reconstruction (e.g. blobs due to critic point normals). Up to this we enhanced the approach, described by Meierhold, et al. (2010), to project georeferenced object points onto image plane

245 using central projection [?]. For deeper information of the following content and formulas, see Szeliski (2010) [?]. Using

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ c_c \end{pmatrix} = \vec{X}_c = R_{xyz} \left(\vec{X}_W - \vec{X}_0 \right) \quad (4)$$

we can describe three-dimensional object points \vec{X}_W in camera reference frame \vec{X}_c after global rotation applying R_{xyz} rotation matrix and translation by camera's projection center \vec{X}_0 in homogeneous camera coordinates $\vec{X}_c = (u, v, c_c)^T$ with (u, v) for camera coordinates and focal lengths f_x and f_y leading to camera constant in camera's sensor coordinate system c_c . For simplicity, we assume quadratic pixels and define

$$c_c[mm] = f_x[px] \cdot pixel_pitch_x = f_y[px] \cdot pixel_pitch_y$$

In order to transform the prevailing homogeneous coordinates to two-dimensional inhomogeneous image coordinates, we have to homogenize image coordinates by camera constant c_c and projection center-to-object distance z_c . [GRAFIK EINFÜGEN!]

$$\begin{pmatrix} u/c_c \\ v/c_c \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_c/z_c \\ y_c/z_c \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x_c}{z_c} \cdot c_c \\ \frac{y_c}{z_c} \cdot c_c \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

Finally we have to define the image coordinate system with its origin in the upper left corner (u_0, v_0) and adjust metrics. At this point, (u, v) are still in units of the world reference frame. In our case, we must transform UTM metrics [m] in pixel space. Thus, for alignment of world and image units we introduce scaling factor p_s , defined with meter per pixel in distance of one meter from projection center with (c, r) for image columns and rows.

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x_c}{z_c} \cdot c_c - u_0 \\ \frac{y_c}{z_c} \cdot c_c - v_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} c \\ r \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{p_s} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

TO BE FILLED BY MELANIE

265 *4.4. Interpretation and annotation*

- short description what it does
- how is it generally employed
- relation to mobile devices
- approaches and implementation known on mobile devices
- 270 • integration to the above-mentioned use cases

5. Technology

5.1. Sensors

5.1.1. Localization

- references: ...

275 *5.1.2. Orientation*

- stability IMU (see 3D-NO)
- precision IMU

5.1.3. Parameter sensitivity

5.2. Graphics

- 280
- as explained above, rendering 3D data is a key part for conducting annotations on 3D data, either based on 3D geometry itself or correlated images in camera space
 - for mobile devices, this can technologically be realized two-fold, depending on the usage constraints
 - 285 • generally, rendering stages (image-plane projection, rasterization, tessellation & lighting, see [21]) can be realised by means of software or by hardware support

- here, compute operations (gaussian smoothing, derivative computations, vertex projection) are implemented on the mobile device CPU by available operations and libraries using the Android SDK (Java) and Android NDK (C++) on Google's Android system and Swift and Objective-C on Apple's iOS platform
- software-based rendering is more flexible in how operations are carried out as they do not need to account for hardware-specific processing pipelines; in the realm of mobile devices, non-standard software-based rendering operations are supported by a wider range of devices
- drawback of software-based rendering is performance as it makes suboptimal use newer computing capabilities and graphics-specific chipset operations
- example is the novel rendering approach for point-based rendering introduced in section ??, which requires implementation flexibility
- most 3D rendering is done, even on mobile devices, with hardware-based rendering to varying degrees
- even when implementing specific rasterization algorithms (see section ??), operations such as vertex projections and tessellation & lighting are performed on the GPU
- hardware-based rendering on mobile devices is facilitated by Khronos' graphics library for embedded systems (GL ES) [22] on specialised mobile device graphics chips (e.g. Qualcomm Adreno, ARM Mali, NVIDIA Tegra)
- in comparison to software-based rendering, hardware acceleration provides improved performance
- drawbacks of hardware implementations are considerably longer development cycles, because the programming principles of GPUs differ consid-

erably from common "App programming, and reduced flexibility on what can be realised

- for geoscientists and domain experts in the field, the distinction is good to be aware of as accelerated graphical apps for solving domain-specific tasks are usually offered as paid services to offset the increased development costs
- external circumstances and project constraints may govern implementation details for graphical systems
- major constraint imposed in this context is internet availability
- applications that are expected to operate in an urban setting or in well-developed infrastructure environments can make use of internet access
- this allows the externalisation of rendering tasks for 3D models and data to a network-oriented client-server architecture as in Ponchio et al. [20]
- field experts that use apps and require 3D-rendered information can submit rendering requests to a remote server that takes over the image generation of the 3D data
- technically, the app then only transmits metadata about storage location of the 3D data and receives the final, rasterised image, which allow energy-efficient operability
- furthermore, the process is agnostic to the specific mobile device generating the request, so this way of implementation works in the exact same manner for all mobile device regardless of the system manufacturer (e.g. Google, Apple, Microsoft)
- the reduced process load by externalising the rendering tasks allows using advanced algorithms for sensor tracking [] for improved localisation and orientation or augmented reality [] for information overlays and multimedia content

- in other geoscientific settings, such as field geology [] and environmental monitoring [] of remote areas, internet access is either restricted or expensive to establish
- 345 • subscription to satellite network with the required data rate costs around 70 euro per month \$ (see www.skydsl.eu, skyDSL2+ flatrate with 30 MBit/s download); data rate needed as high-resolution images with real-time rendering rates (uncompressed 1920x1080 pixels resolution at 30 frames/s amounts to 1.39 GBit/s) requires highest data rates even when
350 employing advanced compression techniques
- thus, for geoscience applications that operate in remote areas, web-based rendering is not an option
- in these cases, rendering needs to be done on the device
- for on-device rendering, the 3D data need to reside in the device memory
355 and image generation needs to be done with performance-restricted hardware
- as is shown in section ??, on-device rendering has considerable impact on the energy consumption
- on-device rendering that processes realistic field data requires considerable
360 implementation efforts, as demonstrated by apps such as OpenWaterLevel [], GRIT [23] and Outcrop [24]
- principle scientific advances in mobile device rendering have demonstrated considerable progress over the years [13, 15, 25]
- scaling up smaller laboratory results with mobile graphics to realistic
365 geoscience data, in terms of image quality and resolution as well as 3D base data, is a persisting challenge
- although technical development continuously provides more powerful devices, mobile devices need to sacrifice capabilities such as sensor availability as well as physical size and weight in order to provide larger memory

370 space and higher-performance processors; examples for this trade-off manufacturing can be seen in special-purpose and high-performance tablets such as NVIDIA Shield¹, Project Tango resp. ARCore² and Google Pixel C³

- an specific problem for geoscientists and domain experts in on-device rendering settings: trade-off between app response time, image quality, hardware utilization and cross-device operability
- in interviews amongst field geologists at the department of earth science at university of Bergen, a major demand from the target user base of such mobile app is interoperability between Android, Microsoft and Apple devices; demand originates from platform-agnostic working of common geoscience software on desktop computers for Apple and Windows
- on the other hand, app responsiveness and high image quality are amongst the next common priorities behind interoperability; user base asks for improved quality when operating advanced equipment (e.g. special-pirpose tablets, novel- and high-performance tablets)
- both demands are conflicting, as making use of specialised hardware (e.g. 64-bit, streaming SIMD extensions (SSE) and vectorisation, parallel processing and graphics processing unit (GPU) Computing such as CUDA⁴ for image processing [26, 27], texture compression [28]) in turn means reducing the range of devices being able to operate the software
- these technologies are key as they provide technical solutions available right now to achieve the required responsiveness and image quality

¹NVIDIA Shield - <https://developer.nvidia.com/develop4shield>

²Google Augmented Reality - <https://developers.google.com/ar/>

³Google Pixel C- <https://www.android.com/tablets/pixel-c/>

⁴CUDA - <https://developer.nvidia.com/cuda-zone>

5.3. Power consumption

- power consumption is a metric of major importance for mobile field applications
395
- metric governs the operation time of an app outdoors for specific studies; in application domains such as field geology, the target operation time is in the range of four to eight hours without recharging at an electricity plug
- for the use cases of waterline detection and field interpretation, we measured the energy consumption of the apps "OpenWaterLevel" and "GRIT" and its relation to technical indicators, such as central processing unit (CPU)- and GPU utilisation, memory consumption and environment measures that influence chip operations, namely the processor temperature
400
405
- the following measures for both apps were obtained on a Google Nexus 5 smartphone with 4-core ARM Cortex CPU and Qualcomm Adreno GPU; furthermore, OpenWaterLevels and its CPU-related measures were validated on a Samsung S8 smartphone with an 8-core ARM Cortex CPU of newer generation
410
- currently, the only app available on Android that allows measuring metrics on an app-specific level (i.e. logging the power consumption related to just one specific external app) is the Trepro Profiler ⁵
- while this profiling app runs on all Android devices, the metrics that can be recorded (e.g. GPU load, processor temperature) vary between devices, so that GPU load measurements are not available for the Samsung S8 smartphone
415

⁵Trepro Profiler -

- 420

 • also the reason why measurements have been carried out on Google smart-phones instead of other tablets; general insight on processor-power consumption behaviour are possible to be extrapolated to other devices
- in the first test, we compare the power consumption in relation to CPU- and GPU utilisation
- 425

 • our initial expectation is the a higher GPU load results in an increased power consumption compared to CPU-dominated operations, because mobile GPUs draw more power than CPUs to realise the increased graphics performance
- the results are shown for GRIT during 6.5 minutes of operations in fig. ?? (split in GPU and CPU contribution) and for OpenWaterLevel during 3.5 minutes of operations in fig. ??
- 430

 • observable in both apps: a clear dependency with CPU load and power consumption; shows that apps enter a state of conservative energy consumption if being inactive
- 435

 • furthermore, when comparing CPU-dependent and GPU-dependent energy graphs, we observe that peak energy consumption strongly relates to GPU activity
- 440

 • for measurements in "GRIT", we also have to distinguish between two operation modes

 • actions such as image-to-geometry registration [] and 3D outcrop viewing employ 3D data processing and GPU computations in a major scale, while the image-based interpretation of an outcrop uses 2D image operations within Android-optimized data structures
- fig. ?? and ?? depict the 2D use case, whereas fig. ?? and ?? show the energy consumption in 3D operations

- as clearly observable in fig. ?? in comparison to fig. ??, the 3D operations
445 result in a drastic energy cost, raising the average power consumption by
XYZ mA
- in contrast to novice expectation, the CPU load also increases in a 3D
data processing setting
- that is because the CPU of the mobile processor needs to deliver the
450 geometric- and texture data to the GPU; also, the CPU needs to decom-
press the texture image files, resulting in a higher processing load
- conclusions from the measurements are manifold
- on the level of assessing the profiled apps "OpenWaterLevel" for hydrolo-
gical studies and "GRIT" for field geology studies, we obtained benchmark
455 measures for their power consumption
- for OpenWaterLevels, the app can be operated with an average of XYZ mA
per minute (XYZ mA/h), allowing a theoretical operability on a Google
Nexus 5 smartphone of XYZ hours
- for GRIT, we distinguish between 2D- and 3D operability
- in 2D operation mode, only conducting image-based interpretations, GRIT
460 consumes XYZ mA per minute (XYZ) per hours, allow XYZ hours of
operation
- on the other hand, if being operated consistently in 3D-mode, the same app
consumes XYZ mA per minute (XYZ) per hours, allow only 0.something
465 hours of operation
- more generally speaking, the study shows that it is important for
geoscience users to be aware of the which data they are working with
on the mobile device
- even though 3D may be readily available for a given study, it is not ad-
470 visable to access them on the mobile device over stretched periods, as the

drastically increased power consumption results in an operation time of XYZ hours with two external power packs in the field bag

- considering the CPU load behaviour in 3D-mode, we can also hypothesize about the positive impact of utilising hardware-specific operations such as GPU texture decompression on energy consumption: while using the GPU requires generally more power, it is also more efficient in operations such as texture decompression, therefore potentially having a positive affect on the overall power consumption of mobile field apps

6. Applications and Requirements

Due to the increasing usability of mobile devices for in the field annotations, several use cases concerning geosciences has become apparent. In the following, two essential

6.1. Derivation of hydrological parameters: Water level gauging

The last decade is characterized by a continued increase of globally devastating flash floods after heavy rainfalls. Even smallest creeks turned into hazardous streams causing flooding and landslides. Conventional gauging stations provide precise information about water levels measured over a short time period. State of the art techniques for administrative observation comprise water pressure sensors, floating gauges and conventional tide gauges. They are characterised by long-term stability and outdoor robustness providing accuracies of several millimeters up to one centimeter [29]. Averaged over defined time intervals, it is advisable to remain caution regarding these accuracies may be too optimistic [30].

Because of high costs in purchase and maintenance, gauging stations with complex sensing devices must be sparsely installed. A prime example here is the hydrological network in Saxony, Germany. Here, 184 gauging stations are installed for permanent observation on 154 of 259 rivers rising from small, medium and large catchments [31, 32]. Thus, around a third is not monitored

neither during flood events when the most protection is required. Recently,
 500 commercial smartphone applications arose to enable crowd-sourcing based water
 level estimation for, among other things, such cases [33, 34]. But all of them have
 one thing in common: the water level is entered manually by engaged citizen
 scientists finding and photographing tide gauges close to rivers that makes - on
 the one hand a potential danger to themselves (f.e. by sudden landslides), and
 505 still limits on the other the approaches to open and visible gauges.

Improvements in this sense can be achieved through *image-2-geometry in-*
tersection and 3D annotation for automatic water level determination without
 reference gauges for almost every situation regarding running waters. for this,
 the smartphone application *Open Water Level* that bases on the freely available
 510 open source camera framework *Open Camera* [35]. *Open Water Level* allows
 for free stationing water line detection using short hand held time-lapse image
 sequences (for details please refer to [?]). To interpret these, image measure-
 ments must be transformed into object space. Thus, exterior information needs
 to be provided by smartphone sensors for orientation and positioning.

515 6.1.1.1. Requirements applying to the sensors

To solve the task of autonomous water level determination on running rivers
 f.e. emergency cases using *image-2-geometry intersection*, citizen scientists po-
 sition and orientation must be know. As figured out in 5, smartphone sensors
 accuracies for orientation and location are highly dependent on user’s envi-
 520 ronment. Especially the strong correlation of heading and disturbing magnetic
 sources may be a issue must be solved specifically related to running rivers where
 metal railings usually exists. Similar effects can also be noted using high-end
 IMU systems for instance autonomous car navigation. But the magnetic influ-
 ences inside cars are almost stable and can be calibrated during the drive (ad-
 525 vanced navigation manual). For smartphone orientation, the magnetic strengths
 attaching the phone may change substantially in short time. A typical scenario
 would be: a citizen scientist walks along street, taking his phone inside the bag-
 gage close to metallic keys. While walking he passes several street lamps, signs,

etc. Finally, he arrives at a bridge over a urban river, takes out the phone, looks
530 down to the river and records the time lapse image sequence a few centimetres
above a metallic railing. Meanwhile, several cars passing the same bridge. In
this simple use case, the magnetic field around the smartphone changes count-
less times due to several unpredictable disturbances (`table'mag'disturb`) [36].
The heading angle has the highest influence compared to pitch and roll regard-
535 ing 2D image and 3D object data registration. For this, a so-called synthetic
image is rendered from colored 3D reference point clouds using scientist's loc-
ation and orientation to define a situation-dependent bounding box of points
to be projected onto image plane with respect to depth and indentations (see
[37]). Thereby the heading defines the rotation of the depth direction, as a false
540 angle gives a false viewing direction resulting in a synthetic image that has no
similarity or only a little with the time lapse sequence. However, in case of
no similarity and thus no possible solution for *image-2-geometry intersection*,
simply no water level can be calculated. But in case of slight overlapping, there
might be image matches but with very bad distribution that impedes a correct
545 positioning (`fig'heading'test`) and may lead to even worse results of false water
levels.

It is obvious that a second source for destructive results exists: the absolute
geo-positioning using smartphones currently installed GNSS receivers. In urban
scenes with several shadow effects due to high-rise buildings, errors of several
550 meters in latitude and up to more than 30 meters in height are highly possible
where even the weather has impact [38, 36, 39]. It is likely that, in the near fu-
ture, smartphone's GNSS modules will be improved solving lateral accuracies
of 50 centimetres [40].

For now, possible relief might come including other sources for positioning like
555 digital elevation models for simple height correction or invoke map services that
allows the user for position refinement. For this, some APIs are already provided
by Google (`quellen`) but they are rather cost-expensive by extensive accessing.
Another upcoming option is including barometers in sensor fusion, altitude can
be measured within three meters [41] but for now, they are not a standard.

- 560 • (table, observation heading during water line detection outside → check magnetic strengthens and there changes over short times)
- (figure/table, sensitivity analysis → heading changed in terms of 10 degrees, what does it make for)

6.1.2. Requirements applying to the scenario

- 565 • *online processing and position refinement: need online connection*
- *image quality for water line detection: influence of image resolution, lighting, ...)*
- available approach to address the task

6.2. Field Geology

570 The goal of geological fieldtrips is to gather insight in the rock record and the structural- and sedimentary rock architecture of a given location. Rock architecture can be studied within subsurface seismic records, but this approach suffers from inferior imaging resolutions and physical limitations of the surveying technique. Therefore, surface outcrops are used for the study. Outcrops can be scanned with modern equipment (e.g. lidar [5, 42], drones [43] and SfM [44]) to 575 generate digital surface representations. The most common representations of digital outcrops are coloured point clouds and textured TINs.

The geological aspect is introduced by interpreting the outcrop models. In this case, interpretations refer to (i) line marks for separating stratigraphic 580 layers, (ii) surface-projected polygons to highlight structural- and sedimentary facies or specific architectural elements and (iii) minor ticks (e.g. lines, points, patterns) to indicate depositional attributes such as deposition orientation or grain geometry. The interpretations was until recently performed in a two-step process: sketches are drawn by hand in the field to document the field 585 geologist's observation of the architecture. After the fieldtrip, the observations are digitalised in the office by transferring the sketched architecture on the available digital outcrop. From there on, further study goals (e.g. geomodelling)

are pursued. As recently published, this workflow is currently being transformed into an integrated digital workflow in the field using mobile devices (see [45] for further details).

Geological interpretations can be documented on various scales, but from observations of the author most interpretations are conducted on medium-range. This results in an average observation distance for architectural interpretations of between 100m to 500m to document individual depositional elements and further distances of around 400m to 1400m to document the overall stratigraphic framework of an outcrop. Therefore, as a result of perspective observations, the required lateral localisation accuracy is in the range of $\leq 2.5m$ for the individual element setting and $\leq 8m$ for the wide-angle stratigraphic setting. While achieving the former resolution can still be challenging with mobile sensors (see section ??), the latter resolution is almost guaranteed for GPS localisation. The more important problem is in the vertical resolution: the vertical observation position has, especially in close-distance observations, a drastic impact on the view perspective. Even more important, a vertical localisation error of $\geq 1.5m$ may result in positioning the mobile device "under ground", making any image-based registration impossible. It is this vertical accuracy that is crucial for mobile device interpretation systems to work. Several improvements, such as DEMs and barometric altitude [46], have been proposed to reduce the vertical positioning error while there is still room for novel research proposals to provide more accurate vertical positioning or ground-based constraints on the altitude estimation.

One of the dominant challenges for digital field geology is the free availability of 3D surface models. Currently, research groups in the domain (e.g. from the University of Manchester, Durham University, University of Aberdeen, University of Bergen and UniResearch CIPR) are building their own digital outcrop databases. Due to the strong industry involvement, these and other databases (see SAFARI [47] and FAKTS [48]) are excluded from public access. Recent developments aim at providing digital outcrops in an open-access manner [49] to resolve the issue. Furthermore, due to the vertical positioning problem above,

easy access to high- and medium resolution DEMs is important. As demon-
620 strated by recent measurement, the usage of DEMs has a significant influence
on the projection accuracy of image-based interpretation on mobile device to-
wards 3D surface models [46].

One particular challenge in digital field geology is the treatment of envir-
onmental changes. Digital outcrops are infrequently collected and the textured
625 models are used for field study all across the year. Therefore, in image registra-
tion terms, there is a drastic difference in local illumination, moisture content
as well as fog and snow between acquired 3D surface models and the outcrop
images collected during field trips. The issue has been previously discussed in
terms of illumination differences [17], but drastic changes in terms of fog and
630 moisture are still problematic to treat. Therefore, it is advisable to collect di-
gital outcrop models for prominent locations in different seasonal conditions to
allow for variety in model selection when planning field trips.

Currently available systems that provide digital outcrop interpretation cap-
abilities on mobile devices in 3D include GRIT [23] and Outcrop [24], though
635 earlier prototypes have been demonstrated [50]. Outcrop, developed by Centre
Européen de Recherche et d’Enseignement des Géosciences de l’Environnement
(CEREGE) at Aix-Marseille Université, is a mobile device app for Android
devices that is able to load and process various forms of numerical outcrops. Its
major focus is the documentation of structural features (e.g. fault areas, frac-
640 tures and rock deformations) on outcrops using line interpretations. Furthmore,
it is possible to pin extended note annotations to the model. GRIT, developed
as a collaboration between UniResearch AS CIPR, University of Bergen, Univer-
sity of Aberdeen and CEREGE, is a mobile device app for Android devices that
can handle large-area digital outcrops of tens of kilometres in surface length in
645 3D. Its major focus is the documentation of the sedimentary- and stratigraphic
architecture (e.g. strata boundaries, depositional object envelopes, facies areas)
on outcrops via lines, polygons and brushes. The interpretations are mapped in
a 2D-3D interplay between outcrop surface and field photograph.

[comparison photo: GRIT and Outcrop]

- 650 • ~~recap: task to be solved~~
- ~~main requirements for (location- and orientation) sensor accuracy and~~
geometric accuracy
- ~~specific requirements to this use case: data availability; illumination; net-~~
work inavailability
- 655 • ~~available approach to address the task~~

6.3. *Virtual Field Trips*

- recap: task to be solved
- main requirements for (location- and orientation) sensor accuracy and
geometric accuracy
- 660 • specific requirements to this use case: data availability; illumination; net-
- work inavailability
- available approach to address the task

7. Conclusions

This article assessed the possibility of interactive interpretation and annota-
 665 tion of 3D outcrops on mobile devices in multiple geoscientific domains. Due
 to the research effort in recent years, novel mobile applications such as Open-
 WaterLevels for surface hydrology and GRIT for field geology were introduced
 to the community to bridge the gap between lab assessment and outdoor field
 work for data interpretation. This article also showed further application areas
 670 that build upon mobile device technology and the interactive annotation of 3D
 surface data for geoscientific problem solving.

McCaffery et al. proposed the use of mobile devices for field interpretation
 in geology in 2005 [3]. The technological specifics of mobile device app develop-
 ment hampered the progress on this goal for years. Only recent advancements in
 675 efficient treatment of 3D data [?], algorithmic proposals for image-to-geometry

registration (see [16, 46]) and on-device 3D rendering (as presented in [25] and in this article for point-based surface) specifically designed for mobile devices make the actual use for geoscientific applications in the field possible. The utilisation of crowdsourced VGI and introduction of mobile devices as low-cost measuring
680 devices for real-world problems [51] contribute to the acceptance of this mobile device technological development within the geoscientific community. Computer Vision challenges such as image registration under changing illumination conditions and with reduced image resolution can be viewed as "sufficiently solved" to make photogrammetric- and vision-based algorithms applicable to real-world
685 outdoor settings, while still leaving space for improvement and quality and performance.

The measurements found in this article as well as its related studies suggest that localisation and orientation of mobile device sensors with respect to the application-specific accuracy requirements is a persisting challenge. The sensors
690 employed by low-cost devices have accuracy limitations. Sensor filtering- and fusion techniques are required to even moderately consider the use of such sensor data. Environmental effects such as device-internal heating processes and the system-internal handling of sensor initialisation further complicate the calibration of such sensors without user involvement.

Furthermore, this study gives a representative overview about the energy
695 consumption of mobile apps employing 3D surfaces, computer vision and computer graphics procedures. It was shown that the distinction between 2D- and 3D data used by mobile apps significantly drives the power consumption, and therefore the operation time of the mobile field apps during a study. Means of
700 reducing the power consumption in the future have, next to extended periods of app use by domain experts, beneficial secondary effects: power-reduced main functions of the mobile app allow energy-expensive simultaneous localisation and mapping (SLAM) techniques to be used for sensor data augmentation.

Lastly, the treatment of vegetation within scanned- and photographed data
705 during mobile field studies remains a challenge in the context of interactive interpretation. 3D reference data are obtained less frequent than they are used

in a given outdoor setting. Vegetation itself is visually dynamic content that complicates image registration to existing 3D data, which complicates interpretations in common outdoor settings. While current procedures of data processing try to segment- and remove vegetation data from scans [], it leaves the mobile device app less information to work with when registering photos. Therefore, proposing means of 3D topographic data processing that homogenizes vegetation in 3D scans and photos without removing the related data will have an impact on accurate outdoor photo registration on 3D base data.

8. Discussion

- porting existing desktop algorithms on mobile devices [quick and fast]
- pre-processing of geodata for mobile use

References

- [1] M. Kröhnert, C. Kehl, H. Litschke, S. J. Buckley, Image-to-geometry registration on mobile devices - concepts, challenges and applications, in: L. Paul, G. Stanke, M. Pochanke (Eds.), 3D-NordOst, volume 20, Gesellschaft zur Förderung angewandter Informatik, 2017, pp. 99–108.
- [2] I. Trinks, P. Clegg, K. McCaffrey, R. Jones, R. Hobbs, B. Holdsworth, N. Holliman, J. Imber, S. Waggott, R. Wilson, Mapping and analysing virtual outcrops, *Visual Geosciences* 10 (2005) 13–19.
- [3] K. McCaffrey, R. Jones, R. Holdsworth, R. Wilson, P. Clegg, J. Imber, N. Holliman, I. Trinks, Unlocking the spatial dimension: digital technologies and the future of geoscience fieldwork, *Journal of the Geological Society* 162 (2005) 927–938.
- [4] E. Schwalbe, H.-G. Maas, The determination of high-resolution spatiotemporal glacier motion fields from time-lapse sequences, *Earth Surface Dynamics* 5 (2017) 861–879.

- [5] S. J. Buckley, J. A. Howell, H. D. Enge, T. H. Kurz, Terrestrial laser scanning in geology: data acquisition, processing and accuracy considerations, *Journal of the Geological Society* 165 (2008) 625–638.
- [6] G. Caumon, G. Gray, C. Antoine, M. O. Titeux, Three-dimensional implicit stratigraphic model building from remote sensing data on tetrahedral meshes: Theory and application to a regional model of la popa basin, ne mexico, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 51 (2013) 1613–1621.
- [7] P. Letortu, M. Jaud, P. Grandjean, J. Ammann, S. Costa, O. Maquaire, R. Davidson, N. L. Dantec, C. Delacourt, Examining high-resolution survey methods for monitoring cliff erosion at an operational scale, *GIScience & Remote Sensing* (2017) 1–20.
- [8] M. Medjkane, O. Maquaire, S. Costa, T. Roulland, P. Letortu, C. Fauchard, R. Antoine, R. Davidson, High-resolution monitoring of complex coastal morphology changes: cross-efficiency of SfM and TLS-based survey (vaches-noires cliffs, normandy, france), *Landslides* (2018).
- [9] Y. Watanabe, Y. Kawahara, UAV photogrammetry for monitoring changes in river topography and vegetation, *Procedia Engineering* 154 (2016) 317–325.
- [10] M. Kröhnert, R. Meichsner, Segmentation of environmental time lapse image sequences for the determination of shore lines captured by handheld smartphone cameras, *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences IV-2/W4* (2017) 1–8.
- [11] J. G. Leskens, C. Kehl, T. Tutenel, T. Kol, G. de Haan, G. Stelling, E. Eise-mann, An interactive simulation and visualization tool for flood analysis usable for practitioners, *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* (2015) 1–18.

- [12] E. N. Mueller, A. Pfister, Increasing occurrence of high-intensity rainstorm events relevant for the generation of soil erosion in a temperate lowland region in central europe, *Journal of Hydrology* 411 (2011) 266 – 278.
- [13] S. García, R. Pagés, D. Berjón, F. Morán, Textured splat-based point clouds for rendering in handheld devices, in: *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on 3D Web Technology, Web3D '15*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2015, pp. 227–230. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2775292.2782779>.
- [14] C. Kehl, S. Buckley, R. Gawthorpe, I. Viola, J. Howell, DIRECT IMAGE-TO-GEOMETRY REGISTRATION USING MOBILE SENSOR DATA, *ISPRS Annals of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing & Spatial Information Sciences* 3 (2016) 121–128.
- [15] C. Kehl, S. J. Buckley, J. A. Howell, Image-to-Geometry Registration on Mobile Devices - An Algorithmic Assessment, in: *Proceedings of the 3D-NordOst workshop*, volume 18, GFaI, 2015, pp. 17–26. ISBN 978-3-942709-14-9.
- [16] S. Gauglitz, C. Sweeney, J. Ventura, M. Turk, T. Hollerer, Model estimation and selection towards unconstrained real-time tracking and mapping, *Visualization and Computer Graphics*, *IEEE Transactions on* 20 (2014) 825–838.
- [17] C. Kehl, S. J. Buckley, S. Viseur, R. L. Gawthorpe, J. A. Howell, Automatic illumination-invariant image-to-geometry registration in outdoor environments, *The Photogrammetric Record* 32 (2017) 93–118.
- [18] P. Viola, W. M. Wells, Alignment by maximization of mutual information, *International journal of computer vision* 24 (1997) 137–154.
- [19] M. Corsini, M. Dellepiane, F. Ganovelli, R. Gherardi, A. Fusiello, R. Scopigno, Fully Automatic Registration of Image Sets on Approximate Geometry, *International journal of computer vision* 102 (2013) 91–111.

- [20] F. Ponchio, M. Dellepiane, Multiresolution and fast decompression for optimal web-based rendering, *Graphical Models* 88 (2016) 1 – 11.
- 790 [21] J. Kessenich, G. Sellers, D. Shreiner, *OpenGL Programming Guide: The Official Guide to Learning OpenGL, Version 4.5 with SPIR-V*, OpenGL, Pearson Education, 2016. URL: <https://books.google.fr/books?id=vUK1DAAAQBAJ>.
- [22] P. Mehta, *Learn OpenGL ES: For Mobile Game and Graphics Development*, Apress, 2013. URL: <https://books.google.dk/books?id=Ra09AAAAQBAJ>.
795
- [23] C. Kehl, J. R. Mullins, S. J. Buckley, R. L. Gawthorpe, J. A. Howell, I. Viola, S. Viseur, Geological Registration and Interpretation Toolbox (GRIT): A Visual and Interactive Approach for Geological Interpretation in the Field, in: *Proceedings of 2nd Virtual Geoscience Conference*, 2016, pp. 59–60.
800
- [24] S. Viseur, R. Roudaut, R. Bertozzi, M. Castelli, J.-L. Mari, 3d interactive geological interpretations on digital outcrops using a touch pad, in: *Vertical Geology Conference (VGC)*, 2014.
- 805 [25] M. Agus, E. Gobbetti, F. Marton, G. Pintore, P.-P. Vázquez, Mobile Graphics, in: A. Bousseau, D. Gutierrez (Eds.), *EuroGraphics 2017 - Tutorials*, The Eurographics Association, 2017. doi:10.2312/egt.20171032.
- [26] S. Heymann, K. Müller, A. Smolic, B. Froehlich, T. Wiegand, Sift implementation and optimization for general-purpose gpu, *Winter School of Computer Graphics (WSCG)* (2007).
810
- [27] M. A. Hudelist, C. Cobârzan, K. Schoeffmann, Opencv performance measurements on mobile devices, in: *Proceedings of International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval, ICMR '14*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2014, pp. 479:479–479:482. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2578726.2578798>. doi:10.1145/2578726.2578798.
815

- [28] D. Chait, Using ASTC Texture Compression for Game Assets, whitepaper, NVIDIA Corporation, 2015. URL: <https://developer.nvidia.com/astc-texture-compression-for-game-assets>.
- 820 [29] S. Siedschlag, Wasserstände und Durchflüsse - messen, speichern und übertragen im digitalen Zeitalter, in: *Dresdner Wasserbauliche Mitteilungen*, volume 53 of *Dresdner Wasserbauliche Mitteilungen*, Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Wasserbau und technische Hydromechanik, 2015. URL: <https://henry.baw.de/handle/20.500.11970/103357>.
- 825 [30] I. Horner, B. Renard, J. L. Coz, F. Branger, H. McMillan, G. Pierrefeu, Impact of stage measurement errors on streamflow uncertainty, *Water Resources Research* (2018).
- [31] Saxon Flood Centre, Water levels & flow rates, 2018. URL: <https://www.umwelt.sachsen.de/umwelt/infosysteme/hwims/portal/web/wasserstand-uebersicht>, accessed: 2018-03-05.
- 830 [32] U. Büttner, E. Wolf, Konzeption des gewässerkundlichen pegelnetzes in sachsen, 38. Dresdner Wasserbaukolloquium 2015 Messen und Überwachen im Wasserbau und am Gewässer (2015).
- [33] S. Etter, B. Strobl, Crowdwater, 2018. URL: <http://www.crowdwater.ch/de/home/>, accessed: 2018-03-06.
- 835 [34] Kisters, Einfach smart: App für Pegelmessung auf Knopfdruck, 2014. URL: https://www.kisters.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Wasser/Produkte/WISKI/Produktblaetter/MobileWaterTracker_de_mail.pdf, accessed: 2018-03-06.
- [35] M. Harman, Open Camera - Camera app for Android, 2017. URL: <https://sourceforge.net/projects/opencamera/>, version 1.38.
- 840 [36] J. R. Blum, D. G. Greencorn, J. R. Cooperstock, Smartphone sensor reliability for augmented reality applications, in: K. Zheng, M. Li, H. Jiang

(Eds.), *Mobile and Ubiquitous Systems: Computing, Networking, and Services*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 233 – 248.

- 845 [37] R. Boerner, M. Kröhnert, Brute force matching between camera shots and
synthetic images from point clouds, volume XLI-B5, 2016, pp. 771–777.
doi:doi:10.5194/isprs-archives-XLI-B5-771-2016.
- [38] C. Bauer, On the (in-)accuracy of gps measures of smartphones: A study of
running tracking applications, in: *Proceedings of International Conference*
850 *on Advances in Mobile Computing & Multimedia, MoMM '13*, ACM,
New York, NY, USA, 2013, pp. 335:335–335:341. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2536853.2536893>. doi:10.1145/2536853.2536893.
- [39] P. A. Zandbergen, S. J. Barbeau, Positional accuracy of assisted GPS data
from high-sensitivity GPS-enabled mobile phones, *Journal of Navigation*
855 64 (2011) 381–399.
- [40] S. K. Moore, Superaccurate gps coming to smartphones in 2018, *IEEE*
Spectrum (2017). Accessed: 2018-03-06.
- [41] G. Liu, K. M. A. Hossain, M. Iwai, M. Ito, Y. Tobe, K. Sezaki, D. Matek-
enya, Beyond horizontal location context: measuring elevation using smart-
860 phone’s barometer, in: *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint*
Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing Adjunct Publication,
ACM Press, 2014. doi:10.1145/2638728.2641670.
- [42] S. J. Buckley, E. Schwarz, V. Terlaky, J. A. Howell, R. Arnott, Combining
Aerial Photogrammetry and Terrestrial Lidar for Reservoir Analog Model-
865 ing, *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing* 76 (2010) 953–963.
- [43] T. J. Dewez, J. Leroux, S. Morelli, Uav sensing of coastal cliff topography
for rock fall hazard applications, in: *Journées Aléas Gravitaires JAG 2015*,
2015.
- [44] J. Chandler, S. Buckley, Structure from motion (SFM) photogrammetry vs
870 terrestrial laser scanning, American Geosciences Institute (AGS), 2016.

- [45] C. Kehl, J. R. Mullins, S. J. Buckley, J. A. Howell, R. L. Gawthorpe, Interpretation and mapping of geological features using mobile devices in outcrop geology - a case study of the saltwick formation, north yorkshire, uk, AGU Books - Special Issue (2018 (accepted for publication)).
- 875 [46] C. Kehl, S. J. Buckley, S. Viseur, R. L. Gawthorpe, J. R. Mullins, J. A. Howell, Mapping field photos to textured surface meshes directly on mobile devices, *The Photogrammetric Record* 32 (2017) 398–423.
- [47] T. Dreyer, L.-M. Fält, T. Høy, R. Knarud, J.-L. Cuevas, et al., Sedimentary architecture of field analogues for reservoir information (SAFARI): a case study of the fluvial escanilla formation, spanish pyrenees, in: *The Geological Modeling of Hydrocarbon Reservoirs and Outcrop Analogs*, volume 15, International Association of Sedimentologists – Special Publications, Wiley Online Library, 1993, pp. 57–80.
- 880 [48] L. Colomera, F. Felletti, N. P. Mountney, W. D. McCaffrey, A database approach for constraining stochastic simulations of the sedimentary heterogeneity of fluvial reservoirs, *AAPG bulletin* 96 (2012) 2143–2166.
- 885 [49] A. J. Cawood, C. E. Bond, erock: an online, open-access repository of virtual outcrops and geological samples in 3d, in: *EGU Geophysical Research Abstracts*, volume 20, 2018, p. 18248.
- [50] L. Hama, R. A. Ruddle, D. Paton, 3d mobile visualization techniques in field geology interpretation: Evaluation of modern tablet applications, in: *AAPG Hedberg Research Conference: 3D Structural Geologic Interpretation: Earth, Mind and Machine*, 2013.
- 890 [51] A. Eltner, H. Sardemann, M. Kröhnert, E. Schwalbe, Camera based low-cost system to monitor hydrological parameters in small catchments, in: *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts*, volume 19, 2017, p. 6698.
- 895

Highlights

- point 1
- 900 • point 2
- point 3
- point 4
- point 5