23rd Conference and 7th Meeting of the Region F ICCWG

Ljubljana, Slovenia – 29 March - 1 April 2022.

MBSHC / CHMMN

The Potential of Artificial Intelligence in Phase-Measuring Bathymetric Sonar Data Processing











Contents

MBES vs PMBS

Al model

Results

IHO

Conclusions

Further Work



- 0

X



agreed with GEOACOUSTICS LTD in writing. Any authorised reproduction in whole or in part, must include this legend. © 2022 GeoAcoustics Ltd. – All rights reserved.



MBHSC23 (2022) International Hydrographic Organization GEOACOUSTICS LTD PROPRIETARY: This document contains GEOACOUSTICS LTD information which is proprietary and confidential. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use is prohibited if not otherwise explicitly

MBES vs PMBS

IHO





MBES vs PMBS









MBES vs PMBS





IHO

International

Hydrographic

Organization

GEOACOUSTICS LTD PROPRIETARY: This document contains GEOACOUSTICS LTD information which is proprietary and confidential. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use is prohibited if not otherwise explicitly agreed with GEOACOUSTICS LTD in writing. Any authorised reproduction in whole or in part, must include this legend. © 2022 GeoAcoustics Ltd. – All rights reserved.



UK

Problem outline



- Wide swath bathymetry data can be collected using either Phase-Measuring Bathymetric Sonars (PMBS) or a Multibeam Echosounders (MBES).
- Because PMBS is a high-resolution multi-stave side scan, PMBS produces an order of magnitude more bathymetry data points than MBES for bathymetry (*).
- This introduces challenges for data processing:
 - Typically this requires manually configuring a set of filters for outlier removal.
 - For best results this requires an **experienced trained user**.
 - Highlighted further within real-time operation.
 - The quality of results produced is therefore very much correlated to the users experience.

(*) That is not true when MBES water column data is collected.

MBHSC23 (2022)





Problem outline



Could an **automated approach using Artificial Intelligence (AI)** maintain or **improve outlier identification in real-time** over a more standard post-survey approach?

Could it alleviate user-induced discrepancies and save time and money as well?

Would it be accepted by the experts???







AI Model



General requirements:

Real-time, hands-free, & equivalent (or improved), outlier identification.

Proposed methodology:

- Develop an unsupervised Al outlier identificatory
- In partnership with AI specialists (University of East Anglia)

Funding:

via Innovate UK (two-year KTP project).







AI Filtering – Example









AI Filtering – Results



GeoSwath 4: 500 kHz – Training Dataset

Depth range: ca. 20m Survey line spacing 40m Swath coverage set to 80m



Summary:

Survey Accuracy: IHO Special Order (Bc10,Bd8) a = 0.250, b = 0.0075 Compliant Bins 98.74%

















Shallow Survey Common Dataset 2015



University of East Anglia













GeoSwath 4: 250 kHz Shallow Survey Common Dataset 2015 Depth range: ca. 30m









Hands-free

llow Survey Common Dataset 2015 th range: ca. 30m

GEOACOUSTICS LTD PROPRIETARY: This document contains GEOACOUSTICS LTD information which is proprietary and confidential. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use is prohibited if not otherwise explicitly agreed with GEOACOUSTICS LTD in writing. Any authorised reproduction in whole or in part, must include this legend. © 2022 GeoAcoustics Ltd. – All rights reserved.

International

Hydrographic

Organization

IHO

Innovate UK

University of East Anglia



Manual cleaning











y Innovate UK University of East Anglia

AI Filtering – Real-time performance



- With improved real-time outlier identification, sonar-dependent IHO conformance can also be displayed in real-time.
- Allows users to check data collection likely meets the required spec and adjust survey accordingly.
- Saves time and costs.

MBHSC23 (2022)

IHO

International

Hydrographic

Organizatio

-1	0.0 -5	.0 0	.0 5	.0 10	.0
-2.0	· · · ·		~ 14	x water depth	
0.0		Ca. ~1.5 m	viewin	g angle > 163 o	leg)
2.0	. No de Alexandre angle ang	Charles Street Anno 199		e nanometrikasin yahi en bin tantariketin (histo	elegiherren i
·			2	20 m	

Summary:

Survey Accuracy: IHO Exclusive Order (Bc10,Bd8) a = 0.150, b = 0.0075 Compliant Bins 98.28%

Real-time IHO conformance



GeoSwath 4 USV: 500 kHz



Examples – NOC OB 2021



Innovate

University of East Anglia

UK

ŔĨ



GeoSwath 4 USV 500 kHz



- \odot



Examples – NOC OB 2021





GeoSwath 4 USV 500 kHz





Examples – Alpine lake







IHO

International Hydrographic

Organization





Examples – Alpine lake

IHO

International Hydrographic

Organization





GeoSwath 4R 250 kHz



Conclusions



- Developed an unsupervised AI solution.
- Provides equivalent performance to the standard filters in real-time.
- No user input required.
- General requirements met:

Real-time ✓, hands-free ✓, human expert-equivalent ✓











Acknowledgements









University of East Anglia







Innovate UK







GeoAcoustics





Innovate

University of East Anglia

UK







Further work



The results prove that this real-time cleaning approach can meet IHO standards and produce virtually clean data in real-time, but...



Internationa

Hydrographic

Organizatio

MBHSC23 (2022)

HO

would PMBS data processed in this way be widely accepted by the experts??? under which circumstances???





www.geoacoustics.com



sales@geoacoustics.com

.....

+44 (0)1493 600666



Shuttleworth Close, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, NR31 ONQ, United Kingdom





GEOACOUSTICS LTD PROPRIETARY: This document contains GEOACOUSTICS LTD information which is proprietary and confidential. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use is prohibited if not otherwise explicitly agreed with GEOACOUSTICS LTD in writing. Any authorised reproduction in whole or in part, must include this legend. © 2022 GeoAcoustics Ltd. – All rights reserved.

MBHSC23 (2022)

Organization