LUCAS Copernicus 2018: Earth Observation relevant in-situ data on land cover and use throughout the European Union

Raphaël d'Andrimont[1], Astrid Verhegghen[1], Michele Meroni[1], Guido Lemoine[1], Peter Strobl[1], Beatrice Eiselt[2], Momchil Yordanov[1], Laura Martinez-Sanchez[1], and Marijn van der Velde[1]

[1]European Commission Joint Research Centre (JRC), Ispra, Italy
[2]European Commission, Eurostat (ESTAT), Luxembourg, Luxembourg

Correspondence: Raphaël d'Andrimont (raphael.dandrimont@ec.europa.eu) and Marijn van der Velde (marijn.van-der-velde@ec.europa.eu)

Abstract.

The Land Use/Cover Area frame Survey (LUCAS) is ~~a regular~~ an evenly spaced in-situ land cover and land use ground survey exercise that extends over the whole of the European Union. LUCAS was carried out in 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015, and 2018. A new LUCAS module specifically tailored to Earth Observation (EO) was introduced in 2018: the LUCAS Copernicus module~~, aiming at surveying~~. The module surveys the land cover extent up to 51 meters in four cardinal directions ~~around~~ around a point of observation~~. This paper first~~, offering in-situ data compatible with the spatial resolution of high-resolution sensors. However, the use of the Copernicus module being marginal, the goal of the paper is to facilitate its uptake by the EO community. First, it summarizes the LUCAS Copernicus protocol to collect homogeneous land cover on a surface area of up to a 0.52 ha. Secondly, it proposes a methodology to create a ready-to-use dataset for Earth Observation land cover and land use applications with high resolution satellite imagery. As a result, a total of 63 364 LUCAS points distributed over 26 level-2 land cover classes were surveyed on the ground. Using homogeneous extent information in the four cardinal ~~direction~~directions, a polygon was delineated for each of ~~such point~~these points. Through geo-spatial analysis and by semantically linking the LUCAS core and Copernicus module land cover observations, 58 428 polygons are provided with a level-3 land cover (66 specific classes including crop type) and land use (38 classes) information as inherited from the LUCAS core observation. The open-access dataset supplied with this manuscript (https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12382667.v3 (d'Andrimont, 2020)) provides a unique opportunity to train and validate decametric sensor-based products such as those obtained from the Copernicus Sentinel-1 and -2 satellites. A follow-up of the LUCAS Copernicus module is already planned for 2022. In 2022, a simplified version of the LUCAS Copernicus module will be carried out on 150 000 LUCAS points for which in-situ surveying is planned. This guarantees a continuity in the effort to find synergies between statistical in-situ surveying and the need to collect in-situ data relevant for Earth Observation in the European Union.

1 Introduction

The Land Use/Cover Area frame Survey (LUCAS) is ~~a regular~~ an evenly spaced in-situ land cover and land use data collection exercise that extends over the whole of the European Union (EU) (Gallego and Delincé, 2010; Eurostat, 2018c). LUCAS has

been carried out in 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015, and 2018. During these five campaigns, a total of 1 351 293 points at 651 780 unique locations were surveyed and 5.4 million photos were collected. On each of these surveyed points, observations were recorded on up to 109 variables. The combination of the information collected in the five LUCAS surveys has resulted in the most comprehensive in-situ database on land cover and land use in the EU (d'Andrimont et al., 2020).

LUCAS in-situ data collection was designed for EU-wide standardized reporting of land cover and land use area statistics and not for training and validation of remote sensing data algorithms. The LUCAS activity is complementary to the CORINE Land Cover (CLC) inventory that collects land cover data by interpreting satellite images and orthophotos. In addition, in 2018 the Copernicus High Resolution Layers (HRL) have been produced to provide information about different land cover characteristics. Five HRLs describe some of the main land cover characteristics: impervious (sealed) surfaces (e.g. roads and built up areas), forest areas, grasslands, water and wetlands, and small woody features.

In the scientific community, LUCAS has been widely used for soil studies thanks to the topsoil survey module (Orgiazzi et al., 2018). LUCAS data has also already been valuable in the context of land cover and land use research and remote sensing specifically. Esch et al. (2014) used the data for crop type mapping in the North of Germany. Zillmann et al. (2014) provided an accuracy assessment of grasslands mapping in Hungary based on LUCAS. Mack et al. (2017) used Landsat time series along with LUCAS in-situ data to generate a land use and land cover product for Germany. Leinenkugel et al. (2019) assessed the potential of open geodata including LUCAS to generate land use and land cover products from multi-temporal Landsat satellite observations over 3 European sites. Pflugmacher et al. (2019) recently demonstrated the potential of using LUCAS to map pan-European land cover (13 classes) with Landsat data. Close et al. (2018) provided a Sentinel-2 LUCAS-based classification over Southern Belgium in the context of Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry (LULUCF) monitoring. According to Weigand et al. (2020), LUCAS in-situ data is a suitable source for classifying high-resolution Sentinel-2 imagery at a large scale. Weigand et al. (2020) tested the accuracy of different pre-processing approaches of the LUCAS data based on positioning and semantic selection. These studies highlight that there is an interest and value to the remote sensing research community in using LUCAS in-situ data. Nevertheless, the LUCAS core protocol has major limitations in terms of spatial scale and representativeness when it comes to collecting in-situ data for calibration, training, and/or validation of EO products.

While LUCAS survey data had been valuable in providing in-situ observations relevant for remote sensing as highlighted, the LUCAS survey was designed to collect statistics and thus has inherent shortcomings when used in the context of EO. In 2018, a new ~~LUCAS module~~ LUCAS module specifically tailored to Earth Observation (EO) was introduced: the LUCAS Copernicus module. The Copernicus module was designed to improve the value of LUCAS in-situ surveying for EO ~~and to address the three specific EO limitations~~ for three specific reasons described hereafter.

First, in-situ observations recorded with a high precision are needed to ensure a the quality of EO applications and the development of services relying on geo-location. Second, the collection of the in-situ data has to be done through protocols that are compatible with decametric sensors. Specifically, the spatial extent of the observation needs to be designed according to the spatial resolution of common EO sensors. Third, the diversity of land cover and land use in the EU needs to be represented in the thematic diversity of the information collected in-situ. Comprehensive and thematically rich in-situ data can lead to better classifiers and more accurate multi-temporal land surface mapping. Finally, the representative, comprehensive, precisely

geo-located, available over larger areas in-situ data need to be with an open access licence. First, the quality of EO derived

60 products is underpinned by the availability and thematic representativity of precisely geo-located in-situ observations. Such in-situ data is essential to train and validate algorithms applied to EO products. Comprehensive and thematically rich in-situ data can lead to better classifiers and more accurate multi-temporal land surface mapping.

Second, remotely sensed observations of the Earth are increasingly frequent along with finer spatial and spectral detail and, in the case of the observations by the fleet of Sentinel satellites of the EU's Copernicus Earth Observation Program, accessible

65 to everyone. These remote observations need complementary in-situ observations. At the same time, there is an enormous and continuing growth in a variety of services relying on geo-location. In this context, it is fair to say that we are witnessing a renewed recognition of the importance of in-situ data for EO.

Therefore, the third motivation is that the LUCAS Copernicus collected in-situ data should be representative, comprehensive, precisely geo-located, available over larger areas, available across political borders, and with open access. Free and open

70 accessibility is in fact essential for contributing to the creation of common in-situ data-sets and protocols as currently pursued by e.g. the Land Product Validation (LPV) of the Working Group on Calibration and Validation of the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) and by the Joint Experiment for Crop Assessment and Monitoring (JECAM). The availability of such ~~data-set~~ data-sets acquired with transparent protocols is key to assess the quality of EO products resulting from various public and commercial activities. Thus, the Copernicus module gives the opportunity to further integrate the classical LUCAS

75 survey purpose of collecting statistically representative information with the need to collect in-situ data to produce better EO-derived products, specifically for the EU's Copernicus program. The Copernicus module equips the EU with an in-situ dataset specifically fitting EO land applications monitoring allowing to develop consistent land monitoring at EU level.

While data from the Copernicus module has been available since 2019, ~~the Copernicus module~~ it has not been used in EO applications (to the best of our knowledge). This study is reducing the complexity of the data to ease the ~~take up of the~~

80 ~~Copernicus module~~ uptake of LUCAS Copernicus data by the remote sensing community.

This manuscript describes and provides the LUCAS Copernicus data in a ready-to-use format. More specifically, this study (i) describes the LUCAS 2018 Copernicus in-situ survey protocol, (ii) presents a methodology to produce polygons from the surveyed data to be used in EO studies, (iii) proposes a method to inherit more detailed information from the LUCAS core, and (iv) highlights the added value of the survey in order to derive a simplified protocol for the LUCAS Copernicus module

85 that will be integrated in future LUCAS surveys (e.g. in 2022).

2 LUCAS 2018 data

The survey consists of a two phases sampling. In the first phase, 1.1 million geo-referenced points are systematically drawn forming a 2x2 km^2 grid, i.e. one point every 2 km in the EU. The points are then stratified according to land cover classes to allow the second phase sampling. In 2018, this resulted in 337 854 points on which statistical information is collected by

90 surveyors in the field or by photo interpretation in the office. The sampling design methodology used for the LUCAS 2018 survey is described in detail in Scarnò et al. (2018). The grid is static and includes 1 090 863 points stratified according to land

cover class and is available in csv format from Eurostat (2019b). For a detailed description of the grid data see Eurostat (2018a), and for technical details about the stratification see Eurostat (2018b).

95 In 2018, the campaign involved more than 1300 actors including more than 900 surveyors and lasted for 23 months. The actual in-situ data collection occurred between March and September 2018. The raw data have been available online since May 2019 (Eurostat, 2019a) as a downloadable csv table with 97 columns and 337 854 records (Table 4 presents the attribute names of the 97 original fields; a record descriptor is available in Eurostat (2019c); the detailed survey instructions in Eurostat (2018d)). ~~At the basis of the LUCAS sampling methodology is the LUCAS grid containing the theoretical locations of the points. This LUCAS 2x2 km^2 grid (i.e. one point every 2 km in the EU) consists of geo-referenced points in the EU from~~

100 ~~which the sample is selected for each survey. The grid is static and includes 1 090 863 points stratified according to land cover class. The grid is available in csv format from Eurostat (2019b). For a detailed description of the grid data see Eurostat (2018a), and for technical details about the stratification see Eurostat (2018b).~~ Out of the 337 854 points surveyed in 2018, 23% points had been included in three previous surveys (2009, 2012, and 2015), 25% had already been surveyed once or twice before (e.g. in 2009 and 2015), and the remaining 52% of the points were new entries. In the LUCAS 2018 survey, 70.45% of the points

105 were surveyed in-situ, and 29.54% were obtained through the interpretation of detailed ortho-photos (Table 1 and Table A1).

Eurostat has carried out LUCAS surveys every three years with the survey design ever evolving, however the LUCAS *core* component (i.e. the identification of the point, and the surveying of specific variables on different aspects of land cover, land use, and land and water management Eurostat (2018d)), has remained comparable for all five surveys. At each LUCAS point, standard variables are collected including land cover, land use, environmental parameters, and landscape photos. Additionally

110 to the *core* variables collected, other specific *modules* were carried out on demand such as (i) the transect of 250 m to assess transitions of land cover and existing linear features (2009, 2012, 2015), (ii) the topsoil module (2009, 2012 (partly), 2015 and 2018), (iii) the grassland (2018), and (iv) the Copernicus module (2018).

Out of the 337 854 LUCAS points sampled in 2018 (combining in-situ and photo-interpreted points, Table A1), the sample of the Copernicus module was ~~programmed~~ a third-phase sampling nested in the two-phase sampling scheme. The Copernicus

115 module was planned for 90 620 points and actually executed for 63 364 points (Table 1). For 27 256 (30.08%) planned points, the surveyors did not manage to reach the point to make the observation, for example due to natural or human-made obstacles. Therefore, the Copernicus module was carried out in-situ for a total of 63 364 points, corresponding thus to ~~69.02~~69.92% of the planned Copernicus points.

Table 1. LUCAS 2018 points totaling ~~337 854~~ 337 854 points. The points ~~could be~~ were either surveyed In-situ (238 014, 70.45%), ~~Office~~ Photo-Interpreted in the office (99 803, 29.54%) or ~~Others~~ not surveyed (i.e. "In situ PI not possible", "Out of national territory" or "Out of EU28"). ~~Within the in-situ class, the observation~~ The Copernicus module was ~~done on~~ collected for a subset of the ~~point following~~ in-situ points in addition to the LUCAS core protocol ~~and for a subset of locations also~~ collected for ~~the Copernicus module.~~ any in-situ point

	LUCAS Core Points	LUCAS Core and Copernicus	Total
In situ	147 394 + 27 256*	63 364	238 014
Office Photo-Interpreted	99 803	-	99 803
Others	37	-	37
Total	274 490	63 364	337 854

* Planned in the Copernicus module, but the Copernicus survey was not possible and thus solely surveyed as a point

3 LUCAS 2018 Copernicus Protocol

120   In the ~~LUCAS core~~ LUCAS core protocol, the surveyor aims to get as close as possible to the theoretical point. The surveyor then provides the so-called LUCAS *core* observations for the ~~LUCAS theoretical~~ LUCAS theoretical grid point from the location that the surveyor was actually able to reach. Thus, although typically close to each other, the nominal geolocation of a LUCAS point may not exactly coincide with the actual observation location, that is not recorded for LUCAS core points. As an illustrative example, the observation is made from an unknown location and assigned to the LUCAS nominal point in

125   red on Figure 1. The exact geolocation of the surveyor observation is recorded only in the corresponding LUCAS-Copernicus entry (green point in Figure 1). The ~~LUCAS theoretical grid~~ LUCAS theoretical grid point observation is representative for a circle of 1.5 meter radius. In some specific cases, the window of observation is extended to a 20 meter radius whenever the land cover at the point is heterogeneous (Eurostat, 2018d). This occurs in areas such as permanent crops (B7X, B8X, except nurseries B83) where the parcels of permanent crops contain trees or other plants along with ~~with~~ bare soils and/or grassland

130   or another crop, in woodland (CXX), shrub land (DXX) where a mix of e.g. shrubs and trees might occur, in grassland (EXX) where land features may alternate (e.g. grassland with trees), in bare land (FXX) and in wetland (HXX). Given the mentioned protocol, two main drawbacks of the LUCAS core observations are apparent for their use in the context of EO applications.

     The first limitation is that the observation corresponds to a ~~subfraction~~ fraction (7%) of a Sentinel(-1 and -2) pixel (the circle with 1.5 m radius, representing thus an area of $7.07\,\mathrm{m}^2$) and is thus not directly usable with such decametric sensors. Indeed,

135   the 10-m pixel (i.e. $100\,\mathrm{m}^2$) could be covered by different land covers while the LUCAS observation only captures one. This jeopardizes the use of LUCAS core observations for training and validation when building EO derived products. The second limitation refers to GPS geo-location survey inaccuracies that is comparable to the representative area, making the information unsuitable. ~~On the contrary to~~ To address these limitations, the LUCAS Copernicus module collected the exact geolocation of the observation as well as information on the spatial extent and homogeneous continuity of the Land Cover (LC) observed

140   around the point, making it suitable for use in EO applications.

More specifically, the following additional data are collected on the LUCAS Copernicus surveyed points: (i) the ~~exact~~ measured location of the observation, and (ii) the land cover (level 2) extent up to 51 m from the point in the four cardinal directions (N, W, S, E), as well as the neighboring LC. Note that the surveyor records 51 m to indicate that the land cover is homogeneous for more than 50 m. However, as the exact extent is not reported, we conservatively set it to the minimum extent of 51 m. Figure 1 illustrates the Copernicus protocol for one point and the respective collected data is shown in Table 2. On the basis of these LUCAS Copernicus observations, a quadrilateral polygon with homogeneous LC can be constructed. As part of the Copernicus module, the surveyor collects 13 additional variables and three types of observations (Table 2): the level-2 LC (one variable); the extent of the Copernicus land cover (LUCAS LC classification at level 2) registered at the point reached in the field (four variables); the next land cover (up to 50 m) (four variables) and the breadth of the next land cover (four variables). The breadth corresponds to the % of the width of the land cover in this sector, as visible on the landscape photo (i.e. landscape photos taken in each cardinal direction : N, E, S, W). This means that the breadth is 100% if the next LC is seen all over the photo from one side to the other. If the next land cover is not visible on the photo because it is completely behind a linear feature (e.g. hedge) or because it is completely hidden by the terrain, then the next land cover is to be recorded but the breadth is 0%. For more information about the breadth and the next land cover, see Eurostat (2018d).

Table 2. Example of information collected by the Copernicus protocol (for point with ID 45223358). The Copernicus protocol collects observations on 13 variables: land cover (LC) at LUCAS legend level 2 (here B3 is "Non-permanent industrial crops"), the extension of the LC in the four cardinal directions (up to 50 m, 51 means more than 50 m), the breadth of the next LC in the four cardinal directions (%) and the next LC in the four directions (here, E2 means "Grassland without tree/shrub cover" in the N and W). Figure 1 shows how this information is used to build the geometries of the Copernicus polygon with homogeneous LC. The radial distance "d" is measured between the Copernicus point and the next LC, with "888" and "8" meaning "not relevant".

Copernicus LC: B3			
	Extension (d) of Copernicus LC in cardinal directions in m	**Breadth of next LC in (%), if d <= 50m**	**Next LC, if d <= 50m**
N	30	15	E2
E	51	888	8
S	51	888	8
W	45	50	E2

The following sections describe how the LUCAS Copernicus data are prepared and cleaned to obtain ~~a~~ the ready to use data set provided with this manuscript. The following workflow was done in R (Code and Data availability, see Section 8).

3.1 Adding an explicit LUCAS land cover and land use legend

The LUCAS land cover classification is hierarchical and contains four levels briefly described hereafter (for a detailed description, see the Technical reference document C3 Classification (Eurostat, 2018e)). The land cover classification system is

Figure 1. Building the Copernicus polygon geometry (example for POINT ID 45223358). The collected Copernicus variables (Table 2) are used to build the geometry of the Copernicus polygon. As the LUCAS theoretical point is inside in the Copernicus polygon, the LC legend of the LUCAS theoretical observation (here B32 - Rape and turnip rape) could be inherited to the Copernicus polygon (B3 - Non-permanent industrial crops) as described in Section 4. The background RGB imagery is obtained from "Map data ©2019 Google".

160   subdivided into eight main level-1 land cover categories: Artificial Land, Cropland, Woodland, Shrubland, Grassland, Bare Land, Water and Wetlands. The legend level-2 contains 26 classes (e.g. 8 under level-1 B Cropland) and level-3 comprises 73 classes (e.g. 9 under level-2 B1 Cereals). Only a limited number of observations has a level-4 land cover information distributed into 205 classes ("LC1_SPEC" field in the data). Similarly, the Land Use comprises 40 subclasses.

    To facilitate the usability of the data, in addition to the code describing the land use or land cover (e.g. B21 or U112), an
165   explicit legend label was added to the dataset provided with this manuscript. This was done by adding nine Label explicit fields (Table 4) to the data for the LC and LU legend.

    In the results section, details on the hierarchical legend structure classes are also provided (Table 3 on legend level-2, Figure 5 on legend level-3 ("LC1" field in the data), and the 40 Land Use sub classes as shown by the level-3 distribution of the Copernicus polygons in Table A2), "LU1" in the data).

3.2 Constructing the LUCAS Copernicus polygon

On the basis of the LUCAS Copernicus observations, a polygon with homogeneous LC can be constructed. In order to generate the LUCAS Copernicus polygon, the Copernicus point (i.e the effective location of the surveyor, i.e. "GPS_LAT" and "GPS_LONG") is defined as the centre to build a quadrilateral for each point. The location of this point is first projected in the Lambert Azimuthal Equal-Area projection coordinate reference system (ETRS89-LAEA). Second, the 4 distances (N, W, S, E) measured by the surveyor are added to the point in the four respective cardinal directions resulting in 63 364 irregular quadrilaterals (Table 1). The quadrilateral diagonals can measure up to 102 m, but are smaller if the surveyor found a field boundary within 51 m of the LUCAS-Copernicus point.

3.3 Quality check

While the Copernicus protocol was implementable for 63 364 ~~points~~polygons, several surveyed ~~point~~ polygon locations (i.e. LUCAS Copernicus ~~point~~ polygon as defined by "GPS_LAT" and "GPS_LONG") were either missing or wrong. The missing locations could be flagged for 67 ~~points~~ polygons ("GPS_PREC"=8888 or "GPS_LAT"=0 or "GPS_LONG"=0). In addition to these, 10 ~~points~~ polygons were discarded because the surveyor geolocation ("GPS_LAT", "GPS_LONG") was far away from the nominal location ("TH_LAT" , "TH_LONG")), i.e. difference larger than 0.1 degree (i.e. about ~~11.1 km~~7.1 km in the center of the EU). In addition to the missing GPS measured locations, some macro errors were flagged and removed by selecting ~~points~~ polygons for which the longitude and latitude differences between the GPS measured location and theoretical location ("TH_LAT" , "TH_LONG") is larger than 0.1 degree. This allows to flag and remove 10 polygons which are all wrongly located because of the "GPS_EW" field (i.e. GPS Observation East/West). This location quality check permits to flag and remove a total of 75 polygons resulting in a final total of 63 287 polygons.

3.4 Resulting LUCAS Copernicus Data

The 63 287 Copernicus polygons surveyed are published along with this paper. They are distributed among 26 level-2 LC classes (Table 3) in eight level-1 LC classes (see map in Figure 3).

The homogeneous area of the 63 287 polygons range between 0.005 ha to 0.52 ha with an average of ~~0.32~~0.33 ha (Figure 2) corresponding to 32 10-m pixels. Half of the polygons are larger than 0.33 ha. Also, the third quartile corresponds to the maximum area of 0.52 ha, which is the maximum area possible for a rhombus with diagonals of 102 m (51 m + 51 m). Among the 63 287, it is worth mentioning that 21 657 polygons (i.e. 34.2%) have an area greater than 0.5 Ha, i.e. corresponding thus to ~~more than~~almost 50 10-m pixels depending on the orientation. These characteristics make the obtained spatial data well suited for training and validation of products based on decametric (i.e. 0,01 ha) and even subdecametric remote sensing sensors.

Table 3. Distribution of level-2 land cover classes of the resulting ~~LUCAS Copernicus polygons~~ LUCAS Copernicus polygons (N=63 287).

Class	Label	# LUCAS Copernicus polygons
Roofed build-up areas	A1	12
Artificial non-built up areas	A2	374
Other artificial areas	A3	21
Cereals	B1	12 774
Root crops	B2	877
Non-permanent industrial crops	B3	2435
Dry pulses, vegetables and flowers	B4	767
Fodder crops	B5	2757
Permanent crops: fruit trees	B7	817
Other permanent crops	B8	1148
Broadleaved woodland	C1	8481
Coniferous woodland	C2	5996
Mixed woodland	C3	4484
Shrubland with sparse tree cover	D1	1308
Shrubland without tree cover	D2	1546
Grassland with sparse tree/shrub cover	E1	2078
Grassland without tree/shrub cover	E2	13 053
Spontaneously re-vegetated surfaces	E3	2608
Rocks and stones	F1	35
Sand	F2	30
Lichens and moss	F3	3
Other bare soil	F4	1503
Inland water bodies	G1	1
Inland running water	G2	9
Inland wetlands	H1	164
Coastal wetlands	H2	6
	TOTAL	63 287

Figure 2. Distribution of the area of the LUCAS Copernicus polygons in Ha (N=63 287). On average, the polygon covers an area of ~~0.32~~ 0.33 Ha.

Figure 3. Map of LUCAS Copernicus polygons (N=63 287) surveyed in 2018 per level-1 land cover class over the EU28.

4   Linking LUCAS core data to Copernicus polygons

A set of rules was defined to link LUCAS core and LUCAS Copernicus data and thus enrich the LUCAS Copernicus set of
information. The rationale is that if the LUCAS theoretical point location falls within the LUCAS polygon, the LUCAS core
surveyed attributes at the theoretical point could be inherited to the LUCAS Copernicus polygon. This condition is satisfied by
the vast majority of the polygons (60 134 points, i.e. 95.02%). In addition, to filter out suspicious data points where the LUCAS
core and Copernicus information were not in agreement despite being spatially consistent, we retained only those points where
the reported Copernicus level-2 land cover observed is the same as the one reported for the LUCAS theoretical point (50 417
points, i.e. 95.47%). This happens when a surveyor can observe the LUCAS theoretical point from a distance, but makes the
Copernicus observation on the actual point that was reached. On this Copernicus point, the land cover does not correspond to the
land cover of the LUCAS theoretical point. Among the 63 287 Copernicus polygons available with this paper, 58 428 polygons
(i.e. 92.23%) fulfill both requirements (Condition "CPRN_LC_SAME_LC1" and condition "LUCAS_CORE_INTERSECT"
in the provided dataset) and are thus flagged as "COPERNICUS_CLEANED" in the data. For these polygons, the more detailed
level-3 land cover class of LUCAS core can be inherited to the LUCAS Copernicus polygon ("COPERNICUS_CLEANED"
is "TRUE"). Figure 4 illustrates the variety in shapes of the constructed quadrilateral Copernicus polygons as projected on top
of satellite imagery for different land cover types. The resulting polygons are distributed over 66 specific LC classes as shown
in Figure 5. Similarly, the level-3 Land Use (LU) is also available distributed in 38 classes organised in four main classes (see
Table A2).

Figure 4. Examples of LUCAS Copernicus built polygons. The green point is the theoretical LUCAS point. The red point is the GPS location of the Copernicus surveyor. Polygons are built using distances in N, E, S, W directions collected on the ground. The background RGB imagery is obtained from "Map data ©2019 Google".

Figure 5. Distribution of level-3 land cover (inherited from LUCAS core) for the LUCAS Copernicus polygons (N=58 428).

5 Public data and usage note

6 Discussion

The LUCAS Copernicus polygons and data compiled and presented here can provide valuable information for a variety of topics and applications. The LUCAS Copernicus polygons can provide valuable information to extract land cover specific surface radiometric and temporal signatures as measured by different sensors, in the multispectral, thermal and microwave range, for different land cover types. This is particularly relevant for land covers exhibiting a dynamic signal (e.g. forests, grasslands, crops) that is modulated by climatic and agro-ecologic conditions, which are well sampled in this EU-wide dataset. The dataset can serve various EO-based applications, among many others: train classification algorithms for land cover mapping using existing sensors (e.g. Sentinel 1 and 2, Landsat, Quickbird, ASTER, WorldView...), validate land cover products centred on 2018 (e.g. the Copernicus High Resolution Layers), study land cover specific land surface processes (e.g. phenology), develop algorithms to monitor crop and grassland management practices. Future surveys could consider drones to collect high-resolution NADIR view observations concomitant with the survey date. Such data could then be used a posteriori to collect training data for landscape elements difficult to monitor with decametric sensors and could thus provide training data for future research using very high resolution satellite observations.

With this paper we provide LUCAS Copernicus polygons constructed at 63 287 locations. In addition, we provide a dataset that benefits from inheriting attributes collected on those same points via the LUCAS core protocol. This results in 58 428 Copernicus polygons, discarding a total of 4859 polygons.

The LUCAS Copernicus module is also planned to be carried out during the LUCAS 2022 survey. However, a simplified protocol has been designed for the LUCAS 2022 survey. In this protocol, the observations on the distance of homogeneous LC from the point, and the LC remain, but observations on the neighboring LC and breadth of the neighboring LC have been discarded. Despite this simplification, the coverage of the 2022 LUCAS Copernicus module will be expanded ~~in 2022~~ to 150 000 LUCAS points for which in-situ surveying is planned.

7 Conclusions

For the first time, the LUCAS 2018 survey contained a module that was specifically tailored to the needs of EO. The LUCAS Copernicus module collected homogeneous land cover data over areas with a size relevant to 10-m satellite sensors. A total of 63 364 Copernicus polygons were obtained across the EU representing 66 land cover type classes at LUCAS legend level-2. A follow-up of the LUCAS Copernicus module is planned for 2022. In 2022, a simplified version of the LUCAS Copernicus module ~~will~~ is planned to be carried out on 150 000 LUCAS points~~for which in-situ surveying is planned~~. This guarantees a continuity in the effort to find synergies between statistical in-situ surveying and the need to collect in-situ data relevant for Earth Observation in the European Union.

8   Code and data availability

The data repository https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12382667.v3 (d'Andrimont, 2020) contains the following files:

– *LUCAS_2018_Copernicus_polygons.shp* : Shapefile of polygons with the "POINT_ID" attribute

– *LUCAS_2018_Copernicus_attributes.csv* : CSV file containing the 109 variables including the "POINT_ID"

– *CreateCopernicusPolygonsAll.R* : The open-source R script used to generate the data

– *LUCAS_2018_Copernicus_ReadMe.txt* : short description of the data repository

The LUCAS Copernicus 2018 dataset is provided as a polygon shapefile along with a csv table containing 109 attributes. Among the 109 attributes (list in Table 4), 97 attributes are the original fields as described in Eurostat (2019c), nine attributes are the legend-explicit LC and LU obtained as described in Section 3.1 and three attributes are obtained as described in the previous Section 4.

To use the data, the attribute "POINT_ID" should be used to join the attribute table of the shapefile and the csv table. While the Copernicus related level-2 LC could be used for every polygon, the level-3 LC and LU, along with other LUCAS core information, should be used only for polygons with "COPERNICUS_CLEANED" as "TRUE" as described in the previous section.

Table 4. The LUCAS Copernicus 2018 dataset is provided as a polygon shapefile along with a table with 109 attributes to be joined based on POINT_ID. Among the 109 attributes, 97 attributes are the original as described in Eurostat (2019c), 9 are the legend-explicit LC and LU attribute obtained as described in d'Andrimont et al. (2020) and 3 attributes are obtained as described in Section 8.

Origin of attributes	#	Attribute names
Original fields	97	POINT_ID, NUTS0, NUTS1, NUTS2, NUTS3, TH_LAT, TH_LONG, OFFICE_PI, EX_ANTE, SURVEY_DATE, CAR_LATITUDE, CAR_EW, CAR_LONGITUDE, GPS_PROJ, GPS_PREC, GPS_ALTITUDE, GPS_LAT, GPS_EW, GPS_LONG, OBS_DIST, OBS_DIRECT, OBS_TYPE, LC1, LC1_SPEC, LC1_PERC, LC2, LC2_SPEC, LC2_PERC, LU1, LU1_TYPE, LU1_PERC, LU2, LU2_TYPE, LU2_PERC, PARCEL_AREA_HA, TREE_HEIGHT_SURVEY, TREE_HEIGHT_MATURITY, FEATURE_WIDTH, LNDMNG_PLOUGH, LM_PLOUGH_SLOPE, LM_PLOUGH_DIRECT, LM_STONE_WALLS, CROP_RESIDUES, LM_GRASS_MARGINS, GRAZING, SPECIAL_STATUS, LC_LU_SPECIAL_REMARK, CPRN_CANDO, CPRN_LC, CPRN_LC1N, CPRNC_LC1E, CPRNC_LC1S, CPRNC_LC1W, CPRN_LC1N_BRDTH, CPRN_LC1E_BRDTH, CPRN_LC1S_BRDTH, CPRN_LC1W_BRDTH, CPRN_LC1N_NEXT, CPRN_LC1E_NEXT, CPRN_LC1S_NEXT, CPRN_LC1W_NEXT, CPRN_URBAN, CPRN_IMPERVIOUS_PERC, INSPIRE_PLCC1, INSPIRE_PLCC2, INSPIRE_PLCC3, INSPIRE_PLCC4, INSPIRE_PLCC5, INSPIRE_PLCC6, INSPIRE_PLCC7, INSPIRE_PLCC8, EUNIS_COMPLEX, GRASSLAND_SAMPLE, GRASS_CANDO, WM, WM_SOURCE, WM_TYPE, WM_DELIVERY, EROSION_CANDO, SOIL_STONES_PERC, BIO_SAMPLE, SOIL_BIO_TAKEN, BULK0_10_SAMPLE, SOIL_BLK_0_10_TAKEN, BULK10_20_SAMPLE, SOIL_BLK_10_20_TAKEN, BULK20_30_SAMPLE, SOIL_BLK_20_30_TAKEN, STANDARD_SAMPLE, SOIL_STD_TAKEN, ORGANIC_SAMPLE, SOIL_ORG_DEPTH_CANDO, PHOTO_POINT, PHOTO_NORTH, PHOTO_EAST, PHOTO_SOUTH, PHOTO_WEST
Label explicit fields	9	LC1_LABEL, LC2_LABEL, LC1_SPEC_LABEL, LC2_SPEC_LABEL, LU1_LABEL, LU2_LABEL, LU1_TYPE_LABEL, LU2_TYPE_LABEL, CPRN_LC_LABEL
EO application fields	3	CPRN_LC_SAME_LC1, LUCAS_CORE_INTERSECT, COPERNICUS_CLEANED

References

260   Close, O., Benjamin, B., Petit, S., Fripiat, X., and Hallot, E.: Use of Sentinel-2 and LUCAS Database for the Inventory of Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry in Wallonia, Belgium, Land, 7, 154, 2018.

d'Andrimont, R.: LUCAS 2018 Copernicus Data, https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12382667.v3, 2020.

d'Andrimont, R., Yordanov, M., Martinez-Sanchez, L., Eiselt, B., Palmieri, A., Dominici, P., Gallego, J., Reuter, H. I., Joebges, C., Lemoine, G., et al.: Harmonised LUCAS in-situ data and photos on land cover and use from 5 tri-annual surveys in the European Union, arXiv

265   preprint arXiv:2005.05272, 2020.

Esch, T., Metz, A., Marconcini, M., and Keil, M.: Combined use of multi-seasonal high and medium resolution satellite imagery for parcel-related mapping of cropland and grassland, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 28, 230–237, 2014.

Eurostat: LUCAS Grid Record Descriptor, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/205002/7329820/LUCAS-Grid-Record-Descriptor.pdf, (Accessed on 05/22/2019), 2018a.

270   Eurostat: Technical reference document S1 : Stratification Guidelines, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/205002/7329820/LUCAS2018_S1-StratificationGuidelines_20160523.pdf, (Accessed on 05/22/2019), 2018b.

Eurostat: LUCAS web site, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lucas, (Accessed on 08/30/2018), 2018c.

Eurostat: Technical reference document C-1: Instructions for surveyors, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/205002/8072634/LUCAS2018-C1-Instructions.pdf, (Accessed on 07/30/2019), 2018d.

275   Eurostat: Technical reference document C-3: Classification, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/205002/8072634/LUCAS2018-C3-Classification.pdf, (Accessed on 07/30/2019), 2018e.

Eurostat: LUCAS micro data 2018, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lucas/data/primary-data/2018, (Accessed on 05/24/2019), 2019a.

Eurostat: LUCAS Grid - Eurostat, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lucas/data/lucas-grid, (Accessed on 05/22/2019), 2019b.

Eurostat: LUCAS SURVEY2018 WEB CSV Record Descriptor, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/205002/8072634/

280   LUCAS2018-RecordDescriptor-190611.pdf, (Accessed on 8/06/2020), 2019c.

Gallego, J. and Delincé, J.: The European land use and cover area-frame statistical survey, Agricultural survey methods, pp. 149–168, 2010.

Leinenkugel, P., Deck, R., Huth, J., Ottinger, M., and Mack, B.: The potential of open geodata for automated large-scale land use and land cover classification, Remote Sensing, 11, 2249, 2019.

Mack, B., Leinenkugel, P., Kuenzer, C., and Dech, S.: A semi-automated approach for the generation of a new land use and land cover

285   product for Germany based on Landsat time-series and Lucas in-situ data, Remote Sensing Letters, 8, 244–253, 2017.

Orgiazzi, A., Ballabio, C., Panagos, P., Jones, A., and Fernández-Ugalde, O.: LUCAS Soil, the largest expandable soil dataset for Europe: a review, European Journal of Soil Science, 69, 140–153, 2018.

Pflugmacher, D., Rabe, A., Peters, M., and Hostert, P.: Mapping pan-European land cover using Landsat spectral-temporal metrics and the European LUCAS survey, Remote Sensing of Environment, 221, 583–595, 2019.

290   Scarnò, M., Ballin, M., Barcaroli, G., and Masselli, M.: Redesign sample for Land Use/Cover Area frame Survey (LUCAS) 2018, Statistical Working Papers, https://doi.org/10.2785/132365, 2018.

Weigand, M., Staab, J., Wurm, M., and Taubenböck, H.: Spatial and semantic effects of LUCAS samples on fully automated land use/land cover classification in high-resolution Sentinel-2 data, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 88, 102 065, 2020.

295 Zillmann, E., Gonzalez, A., Herrero, E. J. M., van Wolvelaer, J., Esch, T., Keil, M., Weichelt, H., and Garzón, A. M.: Pan-European grassland mapping using seasonal statistics from multisensor image time series, IEEE Journal of selected topics in applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 7, 3461–3472, 2014.

Table A1. Copernicus survey with relation to observation type (OBS_TYPE), observation direction (OBS_DIRECT) and parcel area (PARCEL_AREA_HA).

		CPRN_CANDO			
		Yes	No	Not Relevant	TOTAL
OBS_TYPE					
1	In situ < 100 mt	63364	18924	121673	203961
2	In situ > 100 mt	0	2488	8671	11159
3	In situ PI	0	5844	17050	22894
4	In situ PI not possible	0	2	23	25
5	Out of national territory	0	0	10	10
6	Out of EU28	0	0	2	2
7	In Office PI	0	0	99803	99803
OBS_DIRECT					
1	On the point	63057	23641	237089	323787
2	Look to the North	251	2834	8191	11276
3	Look to the East	56	781	1917	2754
8	Not Relevant	0	2	35	37
PARCEL_AREA_HA					
1	Area < 0.1	855	3526	13965	18346
2	0.1 ≤ area < 0.5	2743	2876	12979	18598
3	0.5 ≤ area < 1	4168	2446	12917	19531
4	1 ≤ area < 10	25733	8434	70371	104538
5	area ≥ 10	29865	9975	136974	176814
8	Not Relevant	0	1	26	27
	TOTAL	63364	27258	247232	337854

Table A2. LUCAS Copernicus level-3 land use distribution.

Class	# LUCAS Copernicus polygons
U111 - Agriculture (excluding fallow land and kitchen gardens)	33 600
U112 - Fallow land	1781
U113 - Kitchen garden	58
U120 - Forestry	15 991
U130 - Aquaculture and fishing	1
U140 - Mining and quarrying	44
U150 - Other primary production	19
U210 - Energy production	13
U221 - Manufacturing of food, beverages and tobacco products	1
U223 - Coal, oil and metal processing	2
U224 - Production of non-metal mineral goods	3
U225 - Chemical and allied industries and manufacturing	1
U226 - Machinery and equipment	1
U227 - Wood based products	4
U311 - Railway transport	12
U312 - Road transport	164
U313 - Water transport	3
U314 - Air transport	12
U315 - Transport via pipelines	1
U316 - Telecommunication	2
U317 - Logistics and storage	17
U318 - Protection infrastructures	16
U319 - Electricity, gas and thermal power distribution	20
U321 - Water supply and treatment	8
U322 - Waste treatment	10
U330 - Construction	32
U341 - Commerce	38
U342 - Financial, professional and information services	2
U350 - Community services	99
U361 - Amenities, museums, leisure	326
U362 - Sport	167
U370 - Residential	378
U411 - Abandoned industrial areas	23
U412 - Abandoned commercial areas	2
U413 - Abandoned transport areas	4
U414 - Abandoned residential areas	30
U415 - Other abandoned areas	459
U420 - Semi-natural and natural areas not in use	5084
Total	58 428

Author contributions. All the authors processed and analyzed the data, wrote the paper, provided comments and suggestions on the manuscript. B. E. and P. S. designed the survey methodology. B.E. and ESTAT are responsible of the LUCAS data collection.

300   *Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Glossary