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Abstract.
Accurately assessing landform evolution and quantifying rapid environmental changes are gaining importance in the context of monitoring techniques in alpine environments. In the European Alps, glaciers and rock glaciers are among the most characteristic cryospheric components bearing the most prolonged monitoring periods. This study introduces a rigorous procedure to quantify rock glacier kinematics and their associated uncertainty derived from sequential unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) surveys. High-resolution digital elevation models (DEMs) and orthomosaics are derived from UAV image series combined with structure from motion (SfM) photogrammetry techniques. Multitemporal datasets are employed for measuring spatially continuous rock glacier kinematics using image matching algorithms. This procedure is tested on seven consecutive (from 2016 to 2019) UAV surveys of Tsarmine rock glacier, Valais Alps, Switzerland. The evaluation of superficial displacements was performed with simultaneous in-situ differential global navigation satellite system (GNSS) measurements. During the study period, the rock glacier doubled its overall frontal velocity, from around 5 m yr⁻¹ between October 2016 and June 2017 to more than 10 m yr⁻¹ between June and September 2019. Using the adequate UAV survey acquisition, processing, and validation steps, we almost achieved the same accuracy as the GNSS-derived velocities. Nevertheless, the proposed monitoring method provides accurate surface velocity fields values, which allow an enhanced description of the current rock glacier dynamics and its surface expression.

1 Introduction
Rock glaciers represent one of the most iconic and abundant landforms inside the mountain permafrost realm (Barsch, 1996; Jones et al., 2018). As conspicuous periglacial landforms, they have been regarded as useful indicators of past and present permafrost conditions in different mountain chains (Kellerer-Pirklbauer et al., 2008; Konrad et al., 1999; Sorg et al., 2015; Winkler and Lambiel, 2018). Rock glacier analogues have even been discovered on extra-terrestrial planetary bodies such as Mars (Hubbard et al., 2014), where ground ice is most likely abundant (Clifford et al., 2003). The dynamics of rock glaciers includes not only the acting forces on the creeping body but also the 3D changes over time (Kääb, 2005). Whereas the former cannot be directly measured by remote sensing techniques but from modelling approaches (e.g. Müller et al., 2016), the latter
(i.e. kinematics) can be monitored by different remote sensing and in-situ measurements (Haeberli et al., 2006). As such, superficial displacements are expected to reflect mainly the creep of the permafrost body inside the rock glacier (Arenson et al., 2002). This creeping process is dominated by the high deformation rate at the shear horizon, which accommodates a large portion of the observable surface displacement (60%–90%) and it is usually located at a depth of 10 to 30 m from the top (Arenson et al., 2002; Cicoira et al., 2020; Haeberli et al., 2006; Krainer et al., 2015; Wagner, 1992).

Rock glacier kinematics are commonly derived from consecutive acquisition epochs, forming different time series of seasonal, annual, and decadal observation periods (Delaloye et al., 2010; Kääb et al., 2007). The most extended kinematic monitoring effort goes back to the summer of 1938, and since the early 1950s at regular periods, at the Outer Hochebenkar in the Ötztal Alps of Western Austria (Hartl et al., 2016; Schneider and Schneider, 2001). Subsequently, systematic kinematic monitoring programs were initiated in 1979 at the Laurichard rock glacier in the French Alps (Bodin et al., 2009; Francou and Reynaud, 1992); and in 1995 at the Dösen rock glacier in the Hohe Tauern Range of the central Austrian Alps (Kaufmann, 2016; Kellerer-Pirklbauer et al., 2017). In the Swiss Alps, and under the coordination of the Swiss Permafrost Monitoring Network (PERMOS) continuous long-term kinematics data series are obtained for several rock glaciers, since early as 1994 at the Gemmi/Furggentälti rock glacier (PERMOS, 2019a). These time series consist mainly of data from annual surveys, providing a full and updated picture of the overall state of rock glacier kinematics. The wealth of such systematic observations have revealed strong correlations of relative velocities changes on an interannual basis for a majority of rock glaciers, and consequently, their association with changes in the thermal state of permafrost (Delaloye et al., 2008; Kellerer-Pirklbauer et al., 2018; Roer et al., 2005).

Reported rock glacier superficial velocities have ranged from a few centimetres to some metres per year (Barsch, 1996; Delaloye et al., 2010; Janke et al., 2013), but, for very fast rock glaciers, the velocities can reach several metres per year (Hartl et al., 2016; Valenzuela, 2004) or more (Delaloye et al., 2013; Eriksen et al., 2018). In the more spectacular cases, evidence of anomalous velocities or surface disturbances (e.g. cracks, crevasses and scarps) have been identified as evident signs of landform destabilisation (Roer et al. 2008; Delaloye et al., 2013; Marcer et al., 2019, 2020; Vivero and Lambiel, 2019). In this context, the main factors of rock glacier acceleration and destabilisation have been attributed to permafrost degradation due to increased atmospheric warming (Bodin et al., 2017; Deline et al., 2015; Roer et al., 2005, 2008), and by related feedback mechanisms such as increasing water content (Buchli et al., 2018; Cicoira et al., 2019; Ikeda et al., 2008; Wirz et al., 2016). Likewise, mechanical overload caused by rockfalls deposits (Delaloye et al., 2013; Scotti et al., 2017) or artificial overload by mining waste deposits (Valenzuela, 2004) have also been identified as triggers of rock glacier destabilisation.

The quantification of rock glacier movement has been traditionally measured by ground surveying techniques such as theodolite or total station instruments (Francou and Reynaud, 1992; Koning and Smith, 1999), and more recently using differential GPS (Berthling et al., 1998), differential real-time kinematic (RTK) GPS (Lambiel and Delaloye, 2004) and...
permanent GPS stations (Buchli et al., 2018; Wirz et al., 2016). Nevertheless, remote sensing techniques such as photogrammetry, high-resolution optical satellite imagery, satellite radar interferometry (InSAR) and airborne laser scanning (ALS) have become more broadly employed in recent years, mainly due to their ability to monitor vast and remote regions (Blöthe et al., 2020; Bollmann et al., 2015; Groh and Blöthe, 2019; Necsoiu et al., 2016; Rignot et al., 2002; Strozzi et al., 2020). Since the earliest examples of permafrost creep measurements extracted from analogue photogrammetry (e.g. Messerli and Zurbuchen, 1968), the quality and availability of remote sensing datasets have allowed a substantial evolution to be achieved in rock glacier research (Kääb, 2005; Kääb et al., 1997; Kääb and Vollmer, 2000).

The rapid development of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) systems has opened up significant new applications in the field of remote sensing due to their comparably lower prices and high customised settings (Carbonneau and Dietrich, 2017; Cook, 2017; Nex and Remondino, 2014). Alongside, new developments in the domain of image processing and photogrammetric techniques, such as Structure-for-motion (SfM), have burgeoned during the last years (James and Robson, 2012; Smith et al., 2016; Westoby et al., 2012). As such, the so-called UAV-SfM workflows have been used in different domains, such as the monitoring of landslide kinematics (Clapuyt et al., 2017; Lucieer et al., 2013) and for studying glacial (Benoit et al., 2019; Rossini et al., 2018; Ryan et al., 2015) and periglacial processes (Eichel et al., 2020; Hendrickx et al., 2020), among other applications. Until now, only a few study cases analyses the benefits of UAV-SfM techniques for rock glacier monitoring (Dall’Asta et al., 2017; Fey and Krainer, 2020; Vivero and Lambiel, 2019). However, as UAV systems are continuously changing and improving, there is still scope for validation and protocol optimisation using different UAV configurations in high and challenging terrain.

The broad range of rock glacier surface velocities (from few centimetres to several metres per year) makes a robust validation of these magnitudes obtained from particular remote sensing techniques necessary. Likewise, systematic ground validation through consecutive periods is required to improve the kinematic data quality and shed light on rock glaciers' kinematic behaviour on great spatial detail. The aims of this study are twofold: (1) to investigate the benefits of high-resolution UAV surveys to study landform-wide kinematics; and (2) to evaluate the quality of this methodological approach employing highly accurate kinematic data obtained from terrestrial geodetic surveys (TGS). To achieve this, we have performed repeated and simultaneous UAV, and global navigation satellite system (GNSS) surveys at the Tsarmine rock glacier (Swiss Alps) since 2016. The workflow presented allows for gaining high-quality rock glacier kinematic data, which helps to understand the current rock glacier dynamic behaviour better. We propose that repeated UAV surveys provide complementary information to improve our understanding of rock glacier kinematics and dynamics, and therefore, a potential technique to be integrated into the mountain permafrost monitoring programs.
2 Material and methods

2.1 Site description

The Tsarmine rock glacier (46°02' N, 7°30' E) is located in the Arolla Valley, Western Swiss Alps (see Lambiel, 2021). The morphology corresponds to a long tongue-shaped form, displaying 550 m long and 120 m wide, and with an altitudinal range between 2470 (terminus) and 2700 (rooting zone) m a.s.l. (Fig 1). This active landform sits close to the regional lower limit of discontinuous permafrost in the area (Deluigi et al., 2017). Furthermore, geoelectrical surveys on the rock glacier and its connecting talus slope indicate that the active layer thickness ranges between 3 to 5 m, whereas the frozen body thickness reaches 15 m at least (Lambiel, 2006).

Sub-metric rocks to metric-sized boulders from an orthogneiss lithology (Arolla series) are abundant on the surface (‘bouldery rock glacier’ sensu Ikeda and Matsuoka, 2006), whereas finer matrix sediments are visible at the steep front (Fig 1). Webcam images indicate that the main shear horizon is about 15 m below the front line edge (Kummert et al., 2018). Due to the absence of compression, the rock glacier surface is devoid of the “classical” ridge and furrow morphology (Frehner et al., 2015), but it displays protruding lateral margins or levees (Fig 1). Based on terrestrial laser scanning (TLS) surveys, Micheletti et al. (2016) indicated that between 2014 and 2015 the rock glacier terminus was providing sediments to the downstream gully in the order of ~ 1500 m³ yr⁻¹. Subsequently, and based on TLS surveys, Kummert and Delaloye (2018) calculated that between 2015 and 2016, the sediment transfer rate was about 3500 m³ yr⁻¹. For the last years, sediment transfer rates have progressively risen to more than 10,000 m³ yr⁻¹ (unpublished data).

Based on the analysis of archival aerial imagery Micheletti et al. (2015) showed an acceleration of this landform from 0.3 to more than 2 m yr⁻¹ between 1967 and 2005. Between the beginning of the TGS measurements in 2004 and until 2012, mean annual surface velocities where around 2 m yr⁻¹ (PERMOS, 2013). More recent TGS reveal a marked acceleration, with velocities of 4 m yr⁻¹ between 2014 and 2016, and with peaks up to 6 m yr⁻¹ in 2016 (PERMOS, 2019a). In 2019/20, annual velocities have overpassed 12 m yr⁻¹ (unpublished data). Additionally, a permanent mono-frequency GNSS station with hourly resolution captured a peak monthly velocity of up to 22 m yr⁻¹ in October 2020 (unpublished data). Such high velocities are a clear sign of rock glacier destabilisation (Delaloye et al., 2010; Roer et al., 2008), and therefore, their development since the early 2010s is no more fitting with the behaviour of the ensemble of rock glaciers velocities in this part of the Swiss Alps (PERMOS, 2019a). Aside from TGS surveys, monitoring activities performed in conjunction between the universities of Fribourg (UNIFR) and Lausanne (UNIL) also include the monitoring of ground surface temperatures, hourly acquisition of images by webcam devices (Kummert et al., 2018) and biannual TLS surveys of the rock glacier terminus and the subjacent gully since 2013 (Kummert and Delaloye, 2018).
2.2 Terrestrial geodetic surveys

The rock glacier kinematics have been measured biannually (early summer and autumn) at around 58 points distributed along sub-parallel lines since 2004 (Fig. 1). Additionally, six fixed points on stable terrain outside the rock glacier are measured during each survey to cross-assess the consistency of the positional error. Their position was surveyed using either a Trimble R10 or a Leica GS10 differential GNSS setups (rover and base). The survey style follows the protocol elaborated by Lambiel and Delaloye (2004), employing differential GNSS devices with RTK technique for rapid measurements over large areas. The positioning error usually lies in the cm range in the horizontal coordinates but may rise to more than 2 cm in the elevation component. Additionally, a Post-Processing Kinematic (PPK) treatment was conducted on the Trimble R10 raw data using Trimble Business Center (TBC) v4 surveying software, linking our base station with the permanent base station in Zermatt from the Automatic GNSS Network for Switzerland (AGNES). This procedure also aided to evaluate the stability of the base station between 2016 and 2019.

Due to the loss of individually marked boulders at the rock glacier front and the inability to measure some markers covered by snow, we procured 35 points regularly measured between October 2016 and June 2019 to validate our close-range remote sensing approach. We also measured four additional permanent ground control points (GCPs) located outside the rock glacier (Fig 1) and several checkpoints (CPs) during nearly each field campaign since 2017 (Table 2). The four permanent GCPs, which were deployed in the field before October 2016, are employed during the UAV imagery processing for improving the SfM results and for a better co-alignment between UAV and GNSS surveys (Forlani et al., 2018). Moreover, the stability of those GCPs was confirmed with repeated measurements in October 2018 and September 2020.

2.3 UAV surveys

The operation of UAV systems is often challenging in steep mountainous terrain. The UAV device must keep an elevation above the ground low enough to have a good high ground sampling density, but safe enough to avoid a potential collision with obstacles. Since October 2016 and simultaneously to the GNSS surveys, seven UAV surveys were deployed using a lightweight SenseFly eBee RTK device (Table 1). This fixed-wing UAV is equipped with a built-in GNSS L1 and L2 signals antenna and with the capability of RTK differential corrections employing either a GNSS base station or a virtual reference station (VRS). Two digital cameras, a Sony WX 4.5 focal length (only available for 2016 survey) and a SenseFly Sensor Optimised for Drone Applications (S.O.D.A.) 20 megapixel 10.5 focal length devices were employed for the ensemble of UAV surveys. Nominal geo-tags using the RTK corrections stored in the image metadata are quote to achieve around 3 cm horizontal and 5 cm vertical accuracy (i.e. camera positions). The UAV camera orientation values (Roll, Pitch, and Yaw angles) recorded by the Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) device have low accuracy. However, independent tests have found that position accuracies are mainly too optimistic, suggesting that some sort of ground or check control should be included during the UAV block orientation (Benassi et al., 2017).
UAV missions were planned and deployed using the SenseFly eMotion 3 software installed on a portable field computer. The flight missions were planned with a longitudinal overlap of 80% and a side overlap of 70%, giving a mean of five overlapping images for every point reconstructed throughout the surveyed area (Hendrickx et al., 2019). The VRS was configured to acquire broadcasted differential corrections from the AGNES service using an RTCM 3.1 protocol. The eBee RTK was hand-launched by the operator, who monitored the flight plan, observed the UAV system, and managed the landing in a small flat area with alpine grass near the rock glacier. Moreover, and due to variable steep mountain terrain, each UAV survey was performed at a constant elevation above the ground with the aid of the SwissALTI3D model digital elevation model (DEM) loaded in eMotion 3 planning step. In our study area, this DEM has a pixel size of 2 m and a vertical accuracy of ± 1–3 m (Swisstopo, 2018).

### 3 Data Processing

#### 3.1 Surface movements from GNSS surveys

Surface movements were calculated from the TGS by measuring the 2D (x and y) component of kinematic points at two sequential surveys. The corresponding horizontal displacements were calculated from the x and y coordinates in terms of the Revised Swiss Reference System (CH1903+ LV95) as

\[
d = \sqrt{\Delta x^2 + \Delta y^2},
\]

where \(\Delta x\) and \(\Delta y\) are components of the horizontal displacement in easting and northing coordinates, respectively. The resulting displacements were transformed to velocities in metres per year (m yr\(^{-1}\)) based on the time interval between the consecutive surveys (see Table 1). During the PPK treatment of the GNSS data acquired with the Trimble R10 equipment, the standard deviation errors of the x and y coordinates fluctuated between 1–3 cm, whereas errors of the z coordinate fluctuated between 1.5–4 cm. However, technical difficulties hampered PPK treatment of the raw GNSS data acquired during the TGS with the LEICA GS10 equipment. Therefore, the standard deviation errors of the x, y and z coordinates were estimated based on the surveyed positions obtained for the six fixed points (Fig. 1) during each TGS campaign. Thus, the uncertainty of each displacement was calculated using a rigorous estimation of the standard deviation of \(d\) (Savšek-Safic et al., 2006) as provided by

\[
\sigma_d = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta x}{d}\right)^2 \left(\sigma_{x_1}^2 + \sigma_{x_2}^2\right) + \left(\frac{\Delta y}{d}\right)^2 \left(\sigma_{y_1}^2 + \sigma_{y_2}^2\right)},
\]

where \(\sigma_x\) and \(\sigma_y\) are the individual standard deviation of each kinematic point (or their estimated global survey values), and the subscripts 1 and 2 are the time of the GNSS survey acquisition.
3.2 SfM workflow

Recent improvements in photogrammetric processing capabilities, together with advances in computer vision algorithms, have facilitated the emergence of SfM with multi-view stereo (MVS) workflows. These developments have been capitalised by several open source and commercial SfM software packages, such as MicMac, Agisoft Photoscan, 3DF Zephyr and Pix4DMapper, among others (Smith et al., 2016). This study applied the SfM workflow as implemented in the commercial software Pix4DMapper Pro version 4.4 (https://pix4d.com/pix4dmapper-pro/, last access: 3 February 2020). This software provides a straightforward pipeline processing from raw images acquired by UAV devices to point cloud and orthomosaic generation through mainly three steps (Fig 2a).

Primarily, a bundle block orientation of each set of raw images (Table 2) with their corresponding geolocation information (i.e. position and orientation values) was achieved using a GNSS-supported aerial triangulation (GNSS-AT) and camera self-calibration methods (Benassi et al., 2017). The GNSS-AT consisted of using the initial geolocation information and four permanent GCP located outside the rock glacier (Figs 1 and 2) to improve the initial values for the interior and exterior orientation parameters. To compensate the geometric distortion caused by the complementary metal-oxide-semiconductor (CMOS) sensor in the Sony WX 4.5 camera (2016 UAV survey), a rolling shutter camera model was applied during the bundle block adjustment (Vautherin et al., 2016). The camera self-calibration parameters such as principal point, focal length, and radial and tangential distortion were consistent for all surveys using the same camera device. For the UAV surveys between June 2017 and June 2019, an additional set of checkpoints (CP) was employed to independently assess the quality of the bundle block orientation (Table 2). During the second step, the suitable image contrast and texture presented on the rock glacier surface facilitated the tie point extraction by feature matching algorithms with a scale-invariant feature transform (SIFT) operator (Lowe, 2004). A coarse 3-D point cloud is constructed from these tie points, and MVS methods are employed to reconstruct a densified 3-D point cloud (Carrivick et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2016). Average point densities ranged from 201 pts m\(^{-3}\) in June 2017 to 500 pts m\(^{-3}\) in June 2019. During a final step, the densified 3-D point clouds are gridded into seamless DEMs using an Inverse Distance Weighted (IDW) interpolator, whereas the ensemble of oriented images is orthorectified and mosaicked to generate a true-distance colour orthomosaics at 0.1 m pixel size.

3.3 Surface movements from sequential orthomosaics

Image matching using a normalised cross-correlation (NCC) function on CIAS software (Heid and Kääb, 2012; Kääb and Vollmer, 2000) was applied to sequential orthomosaics (obtained from the previous step) covering the Tsarmine rock glacier and its environs. This procedure relies on the heterogeneity produced by the shape and size of the boulders existent at the rock glacier surface, providing high-quality contrasting targets. Basically, the NCC matches homologous points from the rock glacier surface by correlating a window of reference pixel values (8-bit greyscale image) sampled from an initial image at time 1 with a more extensive search window area contained in an overlapping image at time 2. Cross-correlation values are
calculated for potential homologous points of the reference window within the search window. The homologous point that obtains the highest correlation value is established to be the new point location, and therefore the 2-D displacement, from time 1 to time 2 (Kääb and Vollmer, 2000).

Horizontal surface displacements covering the Tsarmine rock glacier were derived from consecutive orthomosaics resampled to one-tenth of the original pixel size (i.e. 0.01 m). Resampled images allowed achieving displacements at sub-pixel precisions (Debella-Gilo and Kääb, 2011). Surface points for image matching were regularly spaced within the landform boundaries based on a 10 m sampling grid in an Eulerian framework. We also included the 35 points from each TGS with their corresponding initial coordinates as additional points for sequential CIAS calculations. A reference window (initial orthomosaic) of 128 × 128 pixels and a search window (subsequent orthomosaic) of 256 × 256 pixels were found suitable to compute surface displacements from few centimetres up to around thirteen metres. Before applying CIAS, the seasonal snow cover was masked out due to its interference to accurately track surface boulders. Furthermore, a directional filter was used to all computed vectors, considering the primary orientation and the slope gradient on the rock glacier. Nevertheless, the percentage of spurious mismatches were below 5% of the total matches for all periods. An ordinary kriging interpolation was applied to single data voids (i.e. one or two consecutive mismatches) for filling the data gaps in our data.

Despite using the same combination of GCPs for the sequential UAV surveys, a coregistration assessment of orthomosaic pairs was performed using a Helmert similarity transform on stable sectors near Tsarmine rock glacier (Fig 1c). The delineation of the stable ground was based on the previous work done by Kummert and Delaloye (2018), who thoroughly assessed three stable sectors with repeated TLS surveys between 2013 and 2016 (their Fig 2). Nevertheless, TGS measurements revealed that the narrow and elongated southern stable sector had moved at about 0.15 m yr⁻¹ between 2016 and 2019. Therefore, this sector was excluded during the coregistration assessment. Estimates of the directional variance and the systematic (bias) errors were calculated for the consecutive orthomosaic pairs using around 69 stable rock surfaces circumscribed to the reassessed stable sectors (Fig 1c). The Helmert similarity transform included the detection of systematic rotations, translation (x-y-shift vector), and scale differences between the orthomosaics. However, we found neither scale nor rotations differences between the consecutive orthomosaics, thus demonstrating the horizontal positional quality of the SfM-derived products. Removing the systematic x-y-shift vector from the CIAS measurements provided a bias-free overall displacement. Similarly to Eq. (2), the uncertainty of the derived horizontal displacements using CIAS can be calculated, taking into account the coregistration's anisotropy in both the x and y directions (Redpath et al., 2013). Furthermore, as the Δx and Δy have been corrected for the systematic (bias) coregistration errors, the standard deviation for each displacement measured by CIAS is unique and follow:

\[ \sigma_d = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta x}{a}\right)^2 \sigma_x^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta y}{a}\right)^2 \sigma_y^2}, \]  

(3)
where $\sigma_x$ and $\sigma_y$ are standard deviations obtained from coregistration analysis of the stable rock surfaces using the Helmert similarity transform. In this study, we multiplied the results from Eqs. (2) and (3) by a factor of 1.645 (i.e. confidence limit of 90%), and used them to assess the minimum limit of detection (LoD) for each displacement vector.

3.4 DEM assessment and elevation change analyses

The GCPs and CPs root mean square (RMS) errors from the bundle bloc orientation (Table 2) provide the overall sound quality of the UAV-SfM derived products. However, to further test the derived DEMs' elevation component, their accuracy was evaluated by comparing their modelled $z$ coordinate to the measured $z$ coordinate from ca 35 TGS points distributed on the rock glacier surface at the same date. This procedure also allowed to determine the possibility of systematic elevation errors (e.g. doming or dishing), which have been extensively reported for SfM derived datasets (James et al., 2017; Sanz-Ablanedo et al., 2020).

Elevation changes are obtained by computing DEMs of differences (DoD) from different periods, using the Geomorphologic Change Detection (GCD) software (Wheaton et al., 2010). The errors on the DEMs are then propagated during the calculation of the DoD, and positive and negative elevation changes are obtained. A higher confidence interval (i.e. LoD at 95%) allowed distinguishing significant elevation changes between two DEMs (Clapuyt et al., 2017; Wheaton et al., 2010). Using the DoD analysis, mean thickness and volume changes were derived from the difference between the gain and loss of material. The DoD area of examination extends from the frontal position at ~2480 m asl to the upper section at 2615 m asl, which is the same distance as the velocity profiles in Figure 5.

4 Results

4.1 Validation of the UAV-derived velocities

Velocities obtained by in-situ GNSS surveys and UAV-derived data were analysed in detail for five consecutive periods from October 2016 to June 2019. Technical difficulties with the Leica AS10 GNSS base antenna impeded the measurement of all kinematic points during the last UAV survey in September 2019. Therefore, the comparison between GNSS and UAV-derived velocities was not completed for the June–September 2019 period. Using the exact initial position of 35 kinematic points, the whole range of UAV-derived velocities displayed a good agreement with the displacements of these points as measured by GNSS surveys (Fig 3). The correlation values for the consecutive periods were strong and significant, with $R^2$ values ranging between 0.98 and 0.99, indicating high reliability of the methodological approach. Individual outliers are mostly associated with kinematic points marked near the boulder edge. This is mainly because the cross-correlation tends to mismatch homologous points due to substantial changes in the geometry and lighting conditions. On the contrary, kinematics points installed near the boulder centre provide ideal cross-correlation targets for finding homologous points.
The individual LoDs calculated for each period displayed values ranging from 0.08 m (mostly for the 2017.06–2017.09 and 2018.06–2018.09 periods) up to 0.36 m (2016.10–2017.06 period) (Table 3). The largest errors are associated with the first survey (October 2016). They are mainly due to a lower coregistration quality, which may derive from the strong shadows and a thin sheet of snow existing during the UAV flight (Fig 4a). Still, values below LoD were concentrated at the northern and southern margins (levees), where the rock glacier surface is virtually stable (Fig 4).

### 4.2 Horizontal surface velocity fields

Spatially distributed surface velocity fields of the Tsarmine rock glacier between October 2016 and September 2019 are shown in Figure 4. Superficial velocities over 10 m yr⁻¹ were measured during the last period analysed. The landform-wide velocity fields depict lateral shearing margins between the highly active central part and the mostly stagnant northern and southern levees (Fig 4). The velocities of both levees were below the LoD for most periods, but aside between September 2018 and June 2019, where the southern levee displayed mean velocities of 0.21 m yr⁻¹ (Fig 4e) towards the west. Between 2016 and 2019, the broad surface flow field displays a rather persistent direction towards the west in the upper and lower sections, with mean values of 269° and 276°, respectively. A minor circular variance (i.e. how much vector directions deviate from the directional mean) with values approaching zero for each study period also confirms a relatively low variability of this persistent direction on the surface flow fields.

Remarkably, and during the entire period from 2016 to 2019, a sharp discontinuity expressed morphologically by developing a scarp structure indicates the limit between two different kinematic units (indicated as “b” in Fig 5) with different temporal behaviours. The mean values for the horizontal surface velocity fields (excluding the levees zones, see Fig 4) on the lower portion of the rock glacier, that is the portion downstream of the scarp, ranged from 4.92 m yr⁻¹ (2017.09–2018.06) to 8.74 m yr⁻¹ (2019.06–2019.09), whereas upslope they ranged from 2.83 m yr⁻¹ (2017.09–2018.06) to 4.43 m yr⁻¹ (2019.06–2019.09). Moreover, between October 2016 and June 2018, a marked velocity decrease from 3.34 to 2.83 m yr⁻¹ in the upper section contrasts with a marginal decrease of velocities from 5.02 to 4.92 m yr⁻¹ in the lower section (Table 4). On the other hand, the mean surface displacements presented large seasonal differences between the snow cover (October to mid-June) and snow-free (mid-June to late-September) periods. During the snow-free periods, displacement values share nearly a quarter of the yearly component of the surface displacement (Table 4). It is worth to mention that these seasonal variations of rock glacier displacements are in line with those observed by in-situ methods (Delaloye and Staub, 2016).

### 4.3 High-resolution surface observations

Aside from describing detailed surface velocity fields employing high-resolution orthomosaic pairs, the associated UAV-derived datasets such as DEMs also allow describing some remarkable geomorphic changes on the rock glacier. Frontal line changes between 2016 and 2019 are shown in Figure 6. The mean frontal positions relative to the October 2016 survey fluctuate...
between -0.79 m (September 2017) and +2.42 m (June 2019). These changes reflect the oscillatory position of the rock glacier front at the time of each UAV survey acquisition. Despite the substantial surface displacements during the snow-free periods, the rock glacier front faces net erosion (frontal retreat). Likewise, during the snow cover period, the rock glacier front displays a net advance. This particular behaviour was also described between 2013 and 2016 by Kummert et al. (2018) using time series of in-situ webcam images.

The DoD analyses show a strongly heterogeneous elevation change pattern along the rock glacier (Fig 7). Aggregated over the surveyed area, the net elevation change between October 2016 and September 2019 is -0.21 ± 0.07 m. On the lower rock glacier section, large thickness changes varied between -7 to up to 7.5 m. However, almost non-significant changes are encountered in both levees sector. During the same period, the estimated volume gain is 12360 ± 1784 m³ whereas the volume loss is 22800 ± 2954 m³ of material. The overall net volume change equates to -10526 ± 3451 m³, indicating that wastage of material is considerably larger than the accumulation of material over the same surface. It is important to remark that the upper gully section, where the rock glacier is evacuating sediments from the terminus, is not included in the DoD analyses (for detailed characterization, the reader is referred to Kummert and Delaloye, 2018).

The 3-year development of the scarp structure across the entire width of the rock glacier (Fig 5), which was already existing at the time of the first survey, can be observed from the dynamic visualisation of the hillshade images at the video supplement (V1). At the time of the last UAV survey, the height of the scarp was reaching locally up to 10m (Fig 8). This dynamic visualisation also shows the passive transfer of material and an almost negligible rotational movement of boulders. Additionally, the video depicts the progressive enlargement in the southwestern margin (Fig 6b), which seats in direct contact with the stable southern levee, whereas in its northwestern portion, the rim has not expanded very significantly.

5 Discussions

5.1 UAV monitoring strategies

The close-range remote sensing monitoring approach based on repeated UAV surveys presents some benefits compared to other more classical remote sensing and in-situ techniques. First, as each segment of the remote sensing chain is controlled (Schott, 2007), from image acquisition, processing, and analysis, this approach is highly customisable to different monitoring periods (i.e. temporal resolution) and to the desired level of detail (i.e. spatial resolution). This is not trivial, as the users of classical photogrammetric surveys or satellite imagery cannot directly operate the platform, leaving their management into the hands of commercial or governmental agencies. Furthermore, this may hamper the optimal monitoring period and set prohibitive operational costs for the remote sensing strategy. Second, compared with TGS techniques, the time for data acquisition may be reduced when deploying UAV devices (provided that permanent GCPs are already established). On the field, a routine UAV flight operated from nearby takes less than 30 minutes to cover the rock glacier and its environs, whereas,
a regular TGS may take some hours (depending on the personnel's expertise) to measure the ensemble of kinematic points.

With nearly optimal conditions during image acquisition, the LoD from UAV derived velocities is nearly as good as the one from GNSS measured velocities, but it can be substantially degraded during unfavourable conditions. Besides, the use of UAV helps increase personnel security by avoiding the terrestrial surveys on unstable sectors. This is especially the case in Tsarmine, where many boulders have become unstable and where the frontal area is always prone to rockfalls due to the strong rock glacier acceleration.

With operational fixed low costs and high spatial resolution, UAV surveys are well suited for studying medium-sized landforms (i.e. up to few hectares) at high monitoring rates (Rodriguez et al., 2020) but restricted to the snow-free period and the suitable environmental conditions for flying. For our study area, that means about four months a year (from mid-June to early October). Likewise, strong winds, fog, rain, ambient light, and suitable landing strips can further constrain or impede the operation of fixed-wing UAVs, particularly in high mountain terrain. National or international UAV regulations may pose additional restrictions or even prohibiting operating some UAV models on specific areas. In Switzerland, the Federal Office of Civil Aviation (FOCA) bans the operation of UAV devices on protected areas for water and migratory birds typically.

Regarding the specificities mentioned above, it is not surpassing that UAV monitoring approaches are gaining considerable momentum in geomorphological (Cook, 2017; Śledź et al., 2021) and cryospheric research (Gaffey and Bhardwaj, 2020). With this rapid growth of interest in UAV and SfM research, it can become clear that workflows and protocols need to be standardised. In an initial effort, Dall’Asta et al. (2017) employed fixed-wing UAV and GNSS devices to evaluate the surface displacements on a rock glacier located in the Aosta Valley, Italian Alps. Using SfM-derived datasets, such as orthophotos and DEMs, they evaluated the manual measurement of the rock glacier displacements and two automatic displacement methods based on the least-squares matching (LSM) and Semi-global matching (SGM) algorithms. In this particular case, they demonstrated that automatic methods outperformed the manual measurements of more than 1000 conjugate points by a trained operator. For a two-year period, they achieved similar $R^2$ values than our work but for a narrow range of displacements between 0–3 m. However, their work did not evaluate the stable ground outside the rock glacier, which may be a critical step for the detection of systematic bias during coregistration and the application of automatic displacements methods (Debella-Gilo and Kääb, 2011; Groh and Blöthe, 2019; Sorg et al., 2015).

More recently, the work carried out by Fey and Krainer (2020) also employed UAV and GNSS data to derive flow velocities on the Lazaun rock glacier, which is located in the Schnals Valley, Italian Alps. Nonetheless, because some of the work was entrusted to different external companies (i.e. outsourced), neither the UAV nor the GNSS processing steps could be described in their study. Therefore, intrinsic data processing quality for each survey was not available (like our Table 2). From our side, we performed all the data collection, essential processing steps, and analyses of our datasets. Furthermore, they employed the marked kinematic points as GCPs for the UAV acquisition (between 42 and 71 points), whereas we used such points only for
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the UAV-derived velocities validation (Fig. 3). In this fashion, we want to emphasise that our kinematic points are explicitly used to provide independent accuracy examinations. Besides, such a large number of GCPs will be impractical for some rock glaciers, where terrain constraints such as unstable ground and accessibility will compromise the safety of the monitoring efforts.

5.2 UAV and TGS frameworks

As we indicated in our methodology using sequential orthomosaics, we consider the calculation of UAV-derived velocities using a fixed grid system (video supplement V2) through which the rock glacier surface flows (i.e. Eulerian specification of the surface flow fields). It should be stressed that during the validation step, we actually employed the initial coordinates of the kinematic points that corresponded to each UAV survey acquisition (Sec. 3.3). This procedure was necessary for comparing the UAV-derived and GNSS measured velocities on the same position (i.e. \(x\) and \(y\) coordinates CH1903+ LV95). By contrast, the TGS alone provides velocities values using a moving net of marked boulders (video supplement V3) as it moves along the rock glacier surface (i.e. Lagrangian specification of the surface flow fields). In the case of steady rock glacier velocities, or over short-term periods, the Lagrangian (TGS) and Eulerian (UAV-derived) systems are expected to provide comparable results. However, the values provided by each system might diverge during large displacements. This can be illustrated by the surveyed boulders that were initially labelled to belong to either the rooting or central zones, and which are currently at (or heading to) the rock glacier upper central or frontal zones, respectively (PERMOS, 2019b). Thus, such measurements are not representing the original rock glacier zonification.

5.3 Recent kinematic behaviour

Overall, the rock glacier has displayed a nearly continuous acceleration and the ongoing development of a scarp feature during the survey period. This landform does not fit the conveyor belt advancing model (Kääb and Reichmuth, 2005) and corresponds to the less frequent rock glacier configuration with an advancing and eroding terminus (rock glacier type B sensu Kummert et al., 2018). At the front, active erosion processes have compensated the average frontal displacement of 18 m between October 2016 and September 2019. Besides, sediments are efficiently evacuated at the front of the rock glacier through a steep gully (Kummert and Delaloye, 2018), and therefore the rock glacier terminus is oscillating from season to season (Fig. 6). During most of the snow cover periods, the freezing of the active layer explains the net frontal advances identified in mid-June. This freezing leads to increasing ice content and cementing rock particles, and consequently, reducing the frontal erosion rates during the cold periods (Kummert et al., 2018). Contrarily, the thawing of the active layer and the freshly exposed permafrost ground during the snow-free periods generates increased erosion rates and net frontal retreats (Fig 6). The high frontal velocities and the enhancement of the transversal scarp feature indicate a destabilisation phase (Marcer et al., 2019). However, a potential collapse of the landform is not expected, even if the high velocities persist, due to two main reasons: (1) the net surface elevation gain observed along the rock glacier front which is leading toward to a concave profile (Fig 7) and; (2) the incremental sediment transfer rates concomitant with the rock glacier acceleration (Kummert and Delaloye, 2018).
The onset of the scarp feature predates the monitoring period using UAV surveys, and the use of sparse kinematic points from previous TGS can help reveal the initial conditions of this feature. As can be seen from Figure 9, two kinematic points representing the lower (15) and upper (33) sections are plotted between 2004 and 2020. They show a clear divergence in their surface velocities from 2012 onwards. The ongoing change in rock glacier dynamics has gradually produced a situation where the active layer and the upper permafrost core in particular (mostly coarse-grained rocks and boulders with interstitial ice, see Figure 8b) are no capable to deform fast enough to compensate the stress-induced failures. Contrarily, around the position of the shear horizon (mostly a finer-grained sediment frozen layer) plastic deformation can still occur (Moore, 2014), and therefore, could prevent the superficial failure to split the rock glacier into two independent sections brutally. This particular behaviour has been previously observed at Petit-Velan (Delaloye and Morard, 2011) and Grosse Grabe (Delaloye et al., 2013) rock glaciers, which are also situated in the Western Swiss Alps.

In a recent example, Strozzi et al. (2020) presented results of satellite radar interferometry (InSAR) to monitor the kinematics of Tsarmine rock glacier between 2009 and 2020. Using early Cosmo-SkyMed and recent Sentinel-1 radar imagery, they were able to display the occurrence of a substantial seasonal variability of the uppermost section of the rock glacier, which has been mostly in line with the one observed by the permanent GNSS station on its terminal part (see Fig. 1). However, decorrelation problems between 2016 and 2019 caused by rapid displacements and the relatively small rock glacier surface area inhibited the capture of the spatial variability of the surface velocities. Hence, Strozzi et al. (2020) presented the results that could not detect the significant velocity variations along the entire length of the central profile (Fig 5) between October 2016 and September 2019 and are restricted to the uppermost slower portion. Regarding the recent popularity and extensive analysis of rock glaciers using InSAR (e.g. Bertone et al., 2019; Villarroel et al., 2018), precautions on the interpretation of landform kinematic should be taken when small and rapid features with heterogeneous kinematic values are investigated. The quality of the high-resolution UAV-derived datasets leads us to stress that regular and spatially distributed surface velocity measurements based on the proposed uncertainty analysis would permit landform-wide kinematics to be better monitored.

6 Conclusions

The customised UAV data acquisition and the subsequent robust data processing workflow delivered spatially distributed rock glacier kinematics for the 2016–2019 period. Between June and September 2019, superficial velocities in excess of 10 m yr⁻¹ were measured on the lower part of the rock glacier. The DoD analysis highlighted large elevation changes concentrated on the lower rock glacier section. The applied methodology of the UAV campaigns has provided valuable data that is in good agreement with those obtained by TGS using GNSS equipment. Our results provide strong support for the use of UAV and automatic image matching for the enhanced analysis of the spatio-temporal rock glacier kinematic, as well as going beyond traditional survey methods.
Furthermore, thanks to the very high resolution and spatial coverage, the scarp development and the abrupt velocity differences between the lower and upper rock glacier sections could be documented. During similar periods, these characteristics have been described by neither TGS surveys nor other remote sensing data such as InSAR. In this regard, we stress the importance of timely and high-resolution surface observations to decipher landform dynamics and to improve our understating of rock glacier behaviour during destabilisation phases.

New and adaptable monitoring techniques are further needed to monitor rock glaciers and other mountain landforms that are reacting quickly to environmental changes. This work detailed the use of UAV surveys and SfM techniques to monitor rapid kinematic changes on an active rock glacier with enhanced temporal and spatial details. Hence, the monitoring of rock glacier kinematics with in-situ techniques (i.e. TGS and TLS) can be complemented with regular UAVs surveys over selected rock glaciers. Where rock glaciers are becoming highly unstable and dangerous, repeated UAV surveys are an adequate tool to monitor such landforms.

In Tsarmine, additional work should address the influence of the rock glacier acceleration on the scarp development and evolution to better understand the rheology of destabilised rock glaciers. This includes modelling approaches and quantifying historical velocities by reanalysis of archival aerial photographs available for this rock glacier. Moreover, further developments on rock glacier studies should target the assessment of volumetric changes and geodetic mass balance (see Kellerer-Pirklbauer and Kaufmann, 2018) at very high resolution using the high-quality UAV-derived data such as DEMs or point clouds.

**Data availability.** The corresponding author upon request can provide additional data for this study. The complete series of interactive 3D models from Tsarmine rock glacier is available at https://sketchfab.com/UNIL-IDYST/collections/tsarmine-rock-glacier. The kinematic data from Tsarmine rock glacier is available from the PERMOS office upon request. The reference website link is http://www.permos.ch/data.html.

**Video supplement.** Videos are the animation of the sequential hillshaded DEM and orthomosaics of the Tsarmine rock glacier between 2016 and 2019. The V1 corresponds to the hillshade animation where the ongoing scarp development can be seen. V2 and V3 are the orthomosaics animations illustrating the difference between TGS and UAV frameworks.
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Figure 1. Overview of the Tsarmine rock glacier and its surveying setting. (a) Location of the rock glacier within the Western Swiss Alps (green star). (b) Oblique aerial image from Tsarmine in June 2017. (c) UAV-derived orthomosaic from September 2019. White dashed areas correspond to the stable sectors without the significant vegetation used for coregistration assessments during the image matching step (section 3.3). White and red circles correspond to the GCPs used during each UAV survey. Blue and black lines correspond to the permanent GNSS station trajectories between 2016.01–2017.06 and 2017.06–2020.01, respectively. Red dashed lines correspond to the lateral levees. Black dots and yellow triangles correspond to the rock glacier kinematics and control points (stable points) network, respectively.
Figure 2. (a) SfM processing example from the UAV survey in June 2017. (b) Multitemporal co-registration during the SfM processing using four permanent GCP outside the rock glacier.
Figure 3. Scatterplots of five consecutive periods between velocities derived from UAV analysis and GNSS measurements on 35 kinematic points. The error bars show the calculated uncertainty for UAV-derived and GNSS measured velocities.
Figure 4. Maps of the horizontal surface velocities between 2016 and 2019. Background images correspond to the first orthomosaic used during each period of image matching. Black dashed lines correspond to the kinematical discontinuity between the lower and upper sections. Red dashed lines correspond to the lateral levees.
Figure 5. Longitudinal velocity profiles between 2016 and 2019 extracted from the red line shown on the inset. The envelopes display the 90 % confidence level ($1.645 \times \sigma_{\text{L}}$) on for each period.
Figure 6. (a) Fluctuations of the front line edge between 2016 and 2019 based on the analysis of the respective orthomosaics. Dashed and continuous lines represent late spring/early summer and late summer/early autumn frontal rock glacier positions, respectively. The mean front line displacements relative to the 2016 position are indicated in parentheses. The background images correspond to a DEM-derived hillshade from June 2019. (b) The delineation of the southwestern margin (SWM) is indicated on the orthomosaic from June 2019 as an example.
Figure 7. DoD showing the elevation difference for the period 2016-2019. Black and red dashed lines correspond to scarp in 2016 and the lateral levees limits, respectively. The continuous black line indicates the southwestern margin (SWM). The background image corresponds to a DEM-derived hillshade from September 2019.
Figure 8. (a) Hillshade derived from the 24 September 2019 UAV survey. (b) Photograph acquired during the same day of the UAV survey. Yellow and red dashed lines correspond to the scarp's top and the southern lateral levee, respectively.
Figure 9. Annual horizontal surface velocities for two kinematics points from 2004 to 2020, representing the behaviour of the lower and upper rock glacier sections (PERMOS, 2019b). Black dashed line suggest the onset of the scarp development.

Table 1. Details of the UAV surveys of Tsarmine rock glacier.

| UAV survey          | Interval (Days) | Time (HH:MM) | Nº Images | Sensor       | Average GSD (m) |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| 16 October 2016     | -               | 11:57–12:07  | 99        | SONY WX      | 0.05            |
| 20 June 2017        | 247             | 11:49–11:59  | 97        | S.O.D.A.     | 0.06            |
| 22 September 2017   | 94              | 13:55–14:09  | 60        | S.O.D.A.     | 0.08            |
| 19 June 2018        | 270             | 11:32–11:43  | 132       | S.O.D.A.     | 0.05            |
| 20 September 2018   | 93              | 12:59–13:11  | 149       | S.O.D.A.     | 0.05            |
| 24 June 2019        | 277             | 13:19–13:50  | 217       | S.O.D.A.     | 0.05            |
| 24 September 2019   | 92              | 8:54–9:25    | 243       | S.O.D.A.     | 0.05            |

Table 2. Block orientation values using the same four ground control points (GCPs, see Fig.1) and a variable quantity of checkpoints (CPs) located on the rock glacier surface. The RMS error in $x$, $y$ and $z$ coordinates (in pixel) is indicated for each UAV survey.

| UAV survey          | GCP RMS x | GCP RMS y | GCP RMS z | Nº CPs | CP RMS x | CP RMS y | CP RMS z |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| 16 October 2016     | 0.25      | 0.14      | 0.58      | -      | -        | -        | -        |
| 20 June 2017        | 0.33      | 0.40      | 0.46      | 5      | 0.44     | 0.29     | 0.88     |
| 22 September 2017   | 0.38      | 0.19      | 0.49      | 3      | 0.31     | 0.11     | 0.40     |
### Table 3. Information on the minimum (Min), maximum (Max) and mean LoD for each period.

| Periods              | Min LoD (m) | Max LoD (m) | Mean LoD (m) |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| 2016.10‒2017.06      | 0.31        | 0.36        | 0.32         |
| 2017.06‒2017.09      | 0.08        | 0.10        | 0.09         |
| 2017.09‒2018.06      | 0.11        | 0.13        | 0.13         |
| 2018.06‒2018.09      | 0.08        | 0.13        | 0.09         |
| 2018.09‒2019.06      | 0.10        | 0.12        | 0.10         |
| 2019.06‒2019.09      | 0.09        | 0.14        | 0.13         |

### Table 4. Mean horizontal displacements (\(\bar{d}\)) and velocities (\(\bar{v}\)) for the different periods on the lower and upper rock glacier zones.

| Periods              | Lower \(\bar{d}\) (m) | Lower \(\bar{v}\) (m yr\(^{-1}\)) | Upper \(\bar{d}\) (m) | Upper \(\bar{v}\) (m yr\(^{-1}\)) |
|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2016.10‒2017.06      | 3.40                   | 5.02                            | 2.26                   | 3.34                            |
| 2017.06‒2017.09      | 1.27                   | 4.93                            | 0.77                   | 2.99                            |
| 2017.09‒2018.06      | 3.64                   | 4.92                            | 2.09                   | 2.83                            |
| 2018.06‒2018.09      | 1.40                   | 5.50                            | 0.77                   | 3.02                            |
| 2018.09‒2019.06      | 5.54                   | 7.30                            | 3.14                   | 4.13                            |
| 2019.06‒2019.09      | 2.20                   | 8.74                            | 1.12                   | 4.43                            |