
DENETHOR: Supplementary Material

1 A Data Availability

2 The dataset is already public and used as part of a competition. Up-to-date links for data access
3 and the competition can be found on the GitHub repository. The test set is not yet public to ensure
4 fairness in the competition but will be released after the competition ends in December. We confirm
5 that we bear responsibility in case of violations of rights.

6 B Additional Results

Table A1: Macro F1 Score of Benchmark Models on DENETHOR test set in the year 2019 by spatial (rows) and temporal encoder (columns). Just like Table 2 in the main paper with a different metric.

Spatial Encoder	Temporal Encoder			
	TempCNN	MSResNet	LSTM	Transformer
ResNet18	30.96%	29.30%	18.44%	14.72%
SqueezeNet	34.73%	25.10%	5.86%	11.19%
MobileNetv3	32.79%	34.17%	19.89%	26.24%
Pixel Average	49.17%	48.64%	23.82%	33.83%
Pixel-Set Encoding + Self-Attention				
PselTae	58.12%			
PseTae	54.50%			
Ablation Scores				
PselTae (2018)	71.76%			
PselTae (Val)	83.23%			

7 C Datasheet for Datasets Documentation

8 C.1 Motivation For Datasheet Creation

9 **Why was the datasheet created?** The dataset was created to address the gap of available daily time
10 series data for crop type mapping in remote sensing. With this, we want to foster methodological
11 development of new algorithms for these kinds of inputs.

12 **Has the dataset been used already?** No, the dataset has not been used apart from our benchmark
13 tests.

14 **What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for?** As we outline in Section 3, crop or field
15 instance segmentation could be other interesting tasks to study. Beyond that, the dataset provides
16 some opportunities for the study of declouding and superresolution as well.

17 **Who funded the creation of the dataset?** The creation of the dataset was supported by the German
18 Ministry of Commerce under the grant DynamicEarthNet (FKZ 50EE2005). The Fusion imagery
19 was provided by Planet to support the development of new algorithms for crop type mapping in the
20 scientific community.

21 C.2 Datasheet Composition

22 **What are the instances?** The instances are crop fields in Germany that are part of a public registry.

23 **How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?** There are about 4,500
24 fields in total

25 **What data does each instance consist of ?** Each instance is a multipolygon in a .geojson, a popular
26 vector file format for geodata. For each instance, a field ID and its crop type are given.

27 **Is any information missing from individual instances?** No, the state registry lists the crop infor-
28 mation for all fields in our area of interest.

29 **Are relationships between individual instances made explicit (e.g., users' movie ratings, social
30 network links)?** Not applicable since the instances are field boundaries.

31 **Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it a sample (not necessarily random) of
32 instances from a larger set?** Our dataset contains all instances of crop fields in our study area.
33 Naturally, however, this is only a subset of crop fields in the country let alone the whole planet. As
34 the distribution of crop types has large spatial dependencies, our sample would, at best, only be
35 representative of a specific climate.

36 There are two challenges that make a global sample of crop fields difficult: First, the existence
37 and availability of ground truth in sufficient quality in a geographic region is anything but random.
38 Second, local crop types and their documentation are not straightforward to integrate across regions
39 and countries. This is why crop type classification datasets currently tend to be primarily from one
40 spatial region and ours is no exception. As access to crop data and satellite imagery becomes more
41 available, we hope that a higher geographic diversity will be within reach in the future.

42 **Are there recommended data splits (e.g., training, development/validation, testing)?** Yes, we
43 present two tiles with one designated to training/validation and the other one for testing. A geographic
44 split of train and test fields is essential to prevent spatial label leakage.

45 **Are there any errors, sources of noise, or redundancies in the dataset?** Not to our knowledge.
46 The information about crop fields and types is considered high-quality data but the possibility of
47 single mistakes there can not be excluded.

48 **Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources (e.g.,
49 websites, tweets, other datasets)?** The dataset is self-contained.

50 C.3 Collection Process

51 **What mechanisms or procedures were used to collect the data** The crop data was already collected
52 and is publicly available.

53 **How was the data associated with each instance acquired?** The crop types are based on self-
54 reports by farmers which are verified by the government in a series of validity checks.

55 **If the dataset is a sample from a larger set, what was the sampling strategy?** Not applicable
56 because we did not sample fields.

57 **Who was involved in the data collection process (e.g., students, crowdworkers, contractors)
58 and how were they compensated (e.g., how much were crowdworkers paid)?** Not applicable
59 since the field data was not collected by us.

60 **Over what timeframe was the data collected?** 2018-2019

61 C.4 Data Preprocessing

62 **Was any preprocessing/cleaning/labeling of the data done (e.g., discretization or bucketing,**
63 **tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, SIFT feature extraction, removal of instances, processing**
64 **of missing values)?** We remove fields below the size of 1000m² but this can be adjusted in the
65 dataloader. So it is rather a parameter than a cleaning process and is left to the user. We therefore
66 skip the rest of the section as suggested by the questionnaire.

67 C.5 Dataset Distribution

68 **How will the dataset be distributed?** The dataset will be distributed via MediaTUM, the dataset
69 sharing platform of the Technical University of Munich. **When will the dataset be released/first**
70 **distributed? What license (if any) is it distributed under?**

71 The dataset will be released in October under a CC-BY license as part of a competition. Evaluations
72 on the test set will be possible via the challenge but the test set itself will only be published after the
73 challenge has concluded in December.

74 **Are there any copyrights on the data?** The crop field information belongs to the German
75 Government © GeoBasis-DE/LGB (2018/19), and is available under the GovData 2.0 licence
76 (<https://www.govdata.de/dl-de/by-2-0>).

77 **Are there any fees or access/export restrictions?** Not to our knowledge.

78 C.6 Dataset Maintenance

79 **Who is supporting/hosting/maintaining the dataset?** The data is hosted and maintained by the
80 chair for Data Science in Earth Observation at the Technical University of Munich.

81 **Will the dataset be updated? If so, how often and by whom?** It is not our intention to update
82 the data itself. If this was necessary, the primary point of contact is xiaoxiang.zhu@dlr.de We will,
83 however, only release the ground truth data for the test set after the end of the competition in early
84 December. The evaluation of predictions for the test set will be done via a public server during the
85 competition where the reference data remains hidden to the participants.

86 **How will updates be communicated? (e.g., mailing list, GitHub)** On the DENETHOR Github
87 Repository

88 **If the dataset becomes obsolete how will this be communicated?** On the DENETHOR Github
89 Repository

90 **Is there a repository to link to any/all papers/systems that use this dataset?** There are no papers
91 that use this dataset yet but we may provide this in the future.

92 **If others want to extend/augment/build on this dataset, is there a mechanism for them to do**
93 **so?** There is no designated mechanism but our dataset could be augmented with additional input data
94 sources or a larger geographic coverage.

95 C.7 Legal and Ethical Considerations

96 **Were any ethical review processes conducted (e.g., by an institutional review board)?** No.

97 **Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential (e.g., data that is protected**
98 **by legal privilege or by doctor/patient confidentiality, data that includes the content of indi-**
99 **viduals non-public communications)?** No the data only contains satellite images and crop field
100 information.

101 **Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening,**
102 **or might otherwise cause anxiety?** No.

103 **Does the dataset relate to people?** No, skipping the rest of the section as suggested by the question-
104 naire.