How the openEO project unifies access to big Earth Observation data processing platforms

Christoph Friedrich, Matthias Mohr, Edzer Pebesma



The idea of openEO Develop an open API that connects various clients to big EO cloud backends in a simple and unified way



Why?

- EO data now too large to download/handle
 → EO processing increasingly cloud-based
- Cloud-based EO solutions pop up like mushrooms
 - DIASs, TEPs, Google Earth Engine, Sentinel Hub, GeoTrellis, Rasdaman, ...

Who knows GDAL?



graphics from http://r-spatial.org/2016/11/29/openeo.html













Why?

- EO data now too large to download/handle
 - \rightarrow EO processing increasingly cloud-based
- Cloud-based EO solutions pop up like mushrooms
 - DIASs, TEPs, Google Earth Engine, Sentinel Hub, GeoTrellis, Rasdaman, ...
- **Combine** different backends
- Extensibility
- Compare/validate results → **reproducibility**
- So far: Google Earth Engine the only feasible offering?
 - It's easy and ready -- but not open.

What we do

- Define a **RESTful API**
- Implement reference implementations
 - 7 backends
 - 3 client libraries
- Define a process catalogue
 - extendable by user-defined functions
- Everything's **open source**: <u>https://github.com/Open-EO/</u>

Live Demo

http://hub.openeo.org/

Standards

- Used existing standards where possible
 - REST, OpenAPI, GeoJSON, OpenID Connect, EPSG codes...
- Processing: not WPS (doesn't support chaining) -- but driver for WCPS!
- Results: Exposing web services possible (WMS, WMTS, WCS, XYZ, ...)
- Compliant to OGC API Commons
- Working on **STAC**

(data discovery)



What we had

- 3 clients
- 7 backends
- 3 use cases
- a handful of processes

Progress over the last year

• New process graph structure

- Parallelised processing
- Callbacks
- Multiple results
- Process graph variables
- Adaption of client libraries and backend drivers
- Compatibility to OGC API Commons
- Full process catalogue with 100+ processes defined
 - Backends can support arbitrary subset
 - Extendable by own definitions
- UDF reference implementations in R and Python

My lessons learned

- Programmers don't read the docs
- Choosing and detailedly describing processes takes time
- Standardising the algorithms is feasible
- But it's quite hard to standardise the data ("Analysis Ready Data")
 - Non-uniform naming (e.g. "SENTINEL-2" vs. "COPERNICUS/S2" etc.)
 - Scientific vs. easy-to-use

Still to come

. . .

- Implementation of processes in backends
- Full compatibility to newest API version
- Fully tested, stable, 1.0-release-ready versions of everything

Challenges (content)

- Uniform **naming** of data collections
- Incorporating everything into one API
 - Dropped the idea of including everything, e.g. user management, settings, payments, ...

• User-defined functions

- reference implementations in Python and R
- Efficient access to big data
 - data cube (raster and vector)
- Validating backends against each other (reproducibility)
 - Master thesis on comparing output

• Cost estimates

• Billing model, but giving a "What would this cost?" quote seems hard

Challenges (project)

- Ensure user adoption (clients and servers)
 - Conferences, workshops, hackathons, social media, science slam ...
- Extend openEO to more backends
 - There are many more than the ones we address -- we can't solve this alone

• Ensure project continuation

- Big players on board (e.g. Google Earth Engine, Sinergise SentinelHub)
- \circ Consortium includes companies that will use openEO in production \rightarrow interest to maintain it
- Community project

Thanks for your attention!

Any questions?



https://openeo.org/ https://github.com/Open-EO https:

https://twitter.com/open_EO