

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Proximal sensing techniques to monitor pasture quality and quantity on dairy farms**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**in**

**Soil Science**

**at Massey University, Manawatu,**

**New Zealand**



**Pullanagari Rajasheker Reddy**

**2011**



## Abstract

Regular and timely measurements of pasture quality and quantity allow dairy farmers to make effective decisions ensuring an adequate supply of nutrients to animals, efficient utilization of pasture, manipulation of stocking rates, management grazing intervals, and optimisation of input resources (e.g. nitrogen fertilisers) which results in more economic, environmentally aware, sustainable grazing systems.

The objectives of this research were to investigate the potential of proximal sensing tools to estimate pasture quality parameters (crude protein, CP; acid detergent fibre, ADF; neutral detergent fibre, NDF; ash, dietary cation-anion difference, DCAD; lignin, lipid, metabolisable energy, ME and organic matter digestibility, OMD) in mixed pastures. Three proximal sensors, ASD FieldSpec<sup>®</sup> Pro FR spectroradiometer (hyperspectral), Cropscan<sup>™</sup> (multispectral) and Crop Circle<sup>™</sup> (multispectral), were employed in this study.

In the hyperspectral study, the spectral reflectance measurements of pasture samples were acquired using an ASD FieldSpec<sup>®</sup> Pro FR spectroradiometer which has a spectral range of 350-2500 nm and attached with canopy pasture probe (CAPP) to ensure ambient light conditions. The acquired spectral data were pre-processed by various procedures: spectral averaging, smoothing and derivative transformation, then partial least squares regression was applied to regress against the corresponding measured values. The regression model was validated with an external dataset to evaluate the reliability and robustness of the model. The performance of both calibration and validation models were more or less similar. The validation model predicted the pasture quality parameters CP, ADF, NDF, ash, DCAD, lignin, ME and OMD with reasonable accuracy ( $0.65 \leq R^2 \leq 0.83$ ;  $1.70 \leq RPD \leq 2.48$ ;  $0.64 \leq NSE \leq 0.83$ ) and the lipid was predicted with lower accuracy ( $R^2=0.55$ ;  $RPD=1.44$ ;  $NSE=0.50$ ).

Cropscan relies on sunlight for its energy source and measures reflectance in 16 broad wavebands; it was evaluated for its potential to assess pasture quality parameters that are collected in one season. The relationship between spectral reflectance measured using the Cropscan and pasture quality parameters were established using single wavebands, new vegetation indices and stepwise multiple linear regression (SMLR) and the models were

validated with an external dataset. Of all the models, the new non-linear new combination of RDVI index models were performed satisfactory results ( $0.65 \leq R^2 \leq 0.85$ ) for predicting CP, DCAD, ME and OMD. CP, ash, DCAD, lipid, ME and OMD were estimated with moderate accuracy ( $0.60 \leq R^2 \leq 0.80$ ) using the SMLR model. The CropScan instrument was also used to test the potential for predicting pasture quality in different seasons (autumn, spring and summer). Improved accuracy was observed with season-specific models as compared to the combined season dataset models.

A three channel active optical sensor, Crop Circle™ was used to estimate herbage biomass and standing crude protein (SCP) using various indices. The results showed that the three channel based pasture index proved a reliable index for estimating biomass ( $R^2 = 0.69$ ;  $RMSE = 518 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and SCP ( $R^2 = 0.77$ ;  $RMSE = 110 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) with moderate accuracy. Based on the calibration of PI, spatial analysis was assessed for biomass in ten dairy fields. In spatial analysis, semivariograms revealed the spatial dependency for biomass was moderate to strong and varied between the fields.

This study indicates that proximal sensors have considerable potential for real-time *in situ* assessment of pasture quality and quantity in mixed pastures. The results indicate that spectral resolution and number of wavelengths used in the sensor are crucial for determining pasture quality with high accuracy which would allow future research to develop proximal sensors with an optimal number of wavelengths and spectral resolution.

## Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to, chief supervisor, Professor Ian Yule for his continuous support and encouragement during this study. His creative and stimulating ideas allowed me to think as an independent researcher. My sincere thanks also go to co-supervisor's: Mike P. Tuohy who taught me the fundamentals of remote sensing and Prof. Mike J. Hedley whose valuable suggestions helped me in all the time of research.

I would like to acknowledge Pastoral 21 Feed Programme and Foundation of Arable Research (FAR) for financial support for this study and also to Massey University for providing scholarships: Colin Homes, DG Bowler, Helen E Akers, Peter During and Sports Turf.

My special thanks go to Dr. Robyn Dynes from AgResearch who provided valuable and critical comments on the manuscripts which have been submitted to various journals. I am also grateful to Dr. Carolyn Hedley from Land Care for her thoughtful ideas and kind suggestions towards improving the quality of thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude to staff from AgResearch, Grant Rennie, Linda Yates, Brian DeVantier, Ray Moss and Westlea Clarke-Hill; and Dairy NZ, Laura Rossi for being involved in field work at various places of New Zealand. My thanks also to the staff of Soil & Earth Sciences for their assistance, Dr. Ranvir Singh, Liza Haarhoff, Bob Toes and Lance Currie.

My immense pleasure to Mathew Irwin, genuine kiwi, for his kind assistance and fun throughout study. In addition, I extend my gratitude to Michel Killick for his help during the field work. During the journey of PhD, in New Zealand, I had great fun and joy with friends, namely, Palash, Anand, Jatin, Ina Draganova, Venu, Thariq, Stefanie and Pip.

Especially, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my family whose patient love enabled me to complete this work successfully.



## Table of Contents

ABSTRACT .....	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	IV
LIST OF TABLES .....	VIII
LIST OF FIGURES .....	X
ACRONYMS .....	XII
<b>CHAPTER 1.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1.    GENERAL BACKGROUND .....	2
1.2.    RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	5
1.3.    THE STUDY AREAS.....	6
1.4.    THESIS OUTLINE.....	8
<b>CHAPTER 2.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1.    GENERAL BACKGROUND OF REMOTE SENSING .....	11
2.2.    REMOTE SENSING OF VEGETATION .....	18
2.3.    COMPUTATION OF SPECTRAL DATA .....	21
2.3.1. <i>Empirical based approaches</i> .....	22
2.3.1.1.    Univariate Statistical Methods .....	22
2.3.1.1.1. <b>Multispectral Indices</b> .....	24
2.3.1.1.2. <b>Hyperspectral Indices</b> .....	25
2.3.1.2.    Multivariate Regression methods.....	26
2.3.1.2.1. <b>Step wise multiple linear regression (SMLR)</b> .....	27
2.3.1.2.2. <b>Partial Least Squares Regression (PLSR)</b> .....	28
2.3.1.3.    Red Edge Position (REP).....	29
2.3.1.3.1. <b>Linear Interpolation</b> .....	29
2.3.1.3.2. <b>Linear Extrapolation</b> .....	30
2.3.1.3.3. <b>Polynomial fitting technique</b> .....	31
2.3.1.3.4. <b>Lagrangian Technique</b> .....	31
2.3.1.3.5. <b>Inverted Gaussian (IG) fitting technique</b> .....	32
2.3.1.4.    Artificial intelligence (AI) .....	33



2.3.1.4.1.	Artificial Neural Networks .....	33
2.3.1.4.2.	Support Vector Machine (SVM) .....	34
2.3.2.	Physically based approach .....	34
2.3.3.	Integrated Approaches .....	35
2.4.	SUMMARY.....	36

## **CHAPTER 3 ..... 39**

### **IN-FIELD HYPERSPECTRAL PROXIMAL SENSING FOR ESTIMATING QUALITY PARAMETERS OF MIXED PASTURE..... 39**

ABSTRACT .....	40
3.1. INTRODUCTION .....	40
3.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	42
3.2.1. Study area .....	42
3.2.2. Spectral measurements .....	42
3.2.3. Sampling .....	44
3.2.4. Chemical Analysis.....	45
3.2.5. Data processing and statistical analysis .....	45
3.2.5.1. Data manipulations .....	45
3.2.5.2. Data Analysis.....	46
3.2.6. Quantifying Model Accuracy.....	47
3.3. RESULTS .....	50
3.3.1. Summary statistics of NIRS data .....	50
3.3.2. Correlation among the pasture quality parameters .....	52
3.3.3. Principal component analysis.....	52
3.3.4. PLSR models for calibration and validation datasets.....	53
3.3.5. Important wavebands explaining the variance of pasture quality components.....	54
3.4. DISCUSSION.....	57
3.5. CONCLUSION .....	61

## **CHAPTER 4 ..... 62**

### **MULTISPECTRAL RADIOMETRY TO ESTIMATE PASTURE QUALITY COMPONENTS ..... 62**

ABSTRACT .....	63
----------------	----

4.1.	INTRODUCTION .....	63
4.2.	MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	66
4.2.1.	<i>Reflectance readings</i> .....	67
4.2.2.	<i>Data analysis</i> .....	68
4.3.	RESULTS .....	69
4.3.1.	<i>Summary of reflectance spectrum and pasture quality components data</i> .....	69
4.3.2.	<i>Single band relationships for pasture quality estimation</i> .....	71
4.3.3.	<i>Combinations of broad-band vegetative indices relationships with pasture quality components</i> .....	74
4.3.4.	<i>Stepwise multiple linear regression (SMLR) for pasture quality assessment</i> .....	76
4.4.	DISCUSSION .....	77
4.5.	CONCLUSION .....	81
<b>CHAPTER 5.....</b>		<b>83</b>
<b>PROXIMAL SENSING OF THE SEASONAL VARIABILITY OF PASTURE NUTRITIVE VALUE USING MULTISPECTRAL RADIOMETRY .....</b>		<b>83</b>
	ABSTRACT .....	83
5.1.	INTRODUCTION .....	83
5.2.	MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	85
5.2.1.	<i>Study Area and sampling</i> .....	85
5.2.2.	<i>Data analysis</i> .....	86
5.3.	RESULTS .....	88
5.2.1.	<i>Relationship between pasture nutritive value parameters and spectral reflectance</i> .....	88
5.2.2.	<i>Seasonal-specific models between pasture nutritive value parameters and spectral reflectance</i> .....	92
5.4.	DISCUSSION .....	95
5.5.	CONCLUSION .....	97
<b>CHAPTER 6.....</b>		<b>99</b>
<b>ESTIMATION OF PASTURE BIOMASS, STANDING CRUDE PROTEIN AND SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF HERBAGE BIOMASS USING AN ACTIVE OPTICAL SENSOR .....</b>		<b>99</b>
	ABSTRACT .....	100

6.1.	INTRODUCTION .....	100
6.2.	MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	103
6.2.1	<i>Canopy Reflectance</i> .....	103
6.2.2	<i>Data analysis</i> .....	104
6.2.1.1.	Development and validation of calibration models.....	104
6.2.1.2.	Spatial analysis of herbage biomass on commercial dairy fields .....	105
6.3.	RESULTS .....	107
6.4.	DISCUSSION.....	112
6.5.	CONCLUSION .....	113
<b>CHAPTER 7 .....</b>		<b>115</b>
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK.....</b>		<b>115</b>
7.1.	OVERALL SUMMARY.....	116
7.1.1.	<i>Hyperspectral sensor study</i> .....	116
7.1.2.	<i>Multispectral sensors study</i> .....	118
7.2.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK.....	120
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>		<b>122</b>
<b>AUTHOR'S PUBLICATIONS .....</b>		<b>143</b>

## List of Tables

Table 2.1 Selected multispectral sensors and their characteristics.....	15
Table 2.2 Current and future hyperspectral sensors and their characteristics .....	17
Table 2.3 Various vegetation indices listed in literature .....	23
Table 3.1 The experimental site locations .....	43
Table 3.2 Descriptive statistics of the pasture quality parameters of calibration ( $n=107$ ) and validation sets ( $n=107$ ) measured by NIRS .....	50
Table 3.3 Intercorrelation coefficients of measured pasture quality parameters .....	51
Table 3.4 PLSR results between first derivative reflectance and pasture quality concentrations for cross-validated calibration and validation datasets .....	56
Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics of pasture quality components .....	70
Table 4.2 Coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) between canopy reflectance at 16 individual wavelengths and pasture quality components.....	72
Table 4.3 Best performing RDVI indices (top two-band combinations) with high coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) values for selected pasture quality components .....	75
Table 4.4 Coefficients of determination ( $r^2$ ) between crop reflectance of best regressors and pasture quality components using stepwise linear regression to select important wavelengths .....	76
Table 5.1 Descriptive statistics (mean, minimum, maximum, standard deviation; SD, coefficient of variation %; CV) of pasture nutritive value parameters for the calibration dataset ( $n=210$ ) and calibration model results measured at four sites during three seasons (autumn, spring and summer) in 2009-2010 in Waikato, Tarnaki, Manawatu and Catebury regions, New Zealand.....	90

Table 5.2 Descriptive statistics (mean, minimum, maximum, standard deviation; SD, coefficient of variation %; CV) of pasture nutritive value parameters for the validation dataset (n=210) measured at four sites during three seasons (autumn, spring and summer) in 2009-2010 in Waikato, Taranaki, Manawatu and Canterbury regions, New Zealand ....	90
Table 5.3 Descriptive statistics (mean, minimum, maximum, standard deviation; SD, coefficient of variation %; CV) of pasture nutritive value parameters measured at four sites for individual seasons (autumn, spring and summer) in 2009-2010 in Waikato, Taranaki, Manawatu and Canterbury regions, New Zealand.....	92
Table 5.4 Calibration and cross-validation of spectral and pasture nutritive value data using partial least squares regression (PLSR) at four sites during three seasons (autumn, spring and summer) in 2009-2010 in Waikato, Taranaki, Manawatu and Canterbury regions, New Zealand.....	94
Table 6.1 The selected vegetation indices.....	105
Table 6.2 Descriptive statistics of pasture biomass and standing crude protein for the calibration dataset (n=200).....	107
Table 6.3 Regression equations for predicting biomass and standing crude protein from various indices.....	108
Table 6.4 Summary of variogram parameters (nugget, partial sill and range), model type and root mean square error (RMSE) of pasture biomass at 10 fields .....	110

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Study farms located across New Zealand; 1) Ruakura dairy farm, AgResearch 2) Tokanui dairy farm, AgResearch 3) Scot dairy farm, AgResearch 4) Dairy No. 1, Massey University dairy farm 5) Dairy No. 4, Massey University dairy farm 6) Aorangi dairy farm, AgResearch 7) WESTPAC dairy farm, DairyNZ 8) Brian dairy farm 9) Lincoln University dairy farm 10) Synlait dairy farm 11) Mackie dairy farm 12) Greendale dairy farm 13) Pang Born dairy farm 14) Ward dairy farm .....	7
Figure 2.1 Electromagnetic spectrum (NASA, 1998).....	11
Figure 2.2 Spectral signatures for various feature types (Lillesand <i>et al.</i> , 2004) .....	13
Figure 2.3 Interaction between energy source, leaf structure and spectral sensor (Lillesand <i>et al.</i> , 2004); the diagram of the leaf structure adapted from <a href="https://dbscience3.wikispaces.com/Drew">https://dbscience3.wikispaces.com/Drew</a> .....	18
Figure 2.4 Spectral signatures of green and dry vegetation (NASA, 1994) .....	20
Figure 2.5 The various computational approaches for analysing spectral data.....	21
Figure 3.1 (a) Mean reflectance (b) Mean and standard deviation of first derivative reflectance of acquired pasture samples ( $n=214$ ) .....	44
Figure 3.2 Score plot of first and second principal components from the PCA.....	52
Figure 3.3 Variable importance in projection (VIP) plot showing the importance of each waveband in developing a model of pasture quality attributes across the electromagnetic spectrum; X-axis represents wavelength (nm) and Y-axis represents VIP-scores.....	54
Fig. 4.1 Canopy spectral mean reflectance ( $n=151$ ) and coefficient of variation values at 16 wavelengths .....	70

Figure 4.2 The 2-D correlograms showing the amount of variation in pasture quality components explained ( $r^2$ values colour bar) by spectral reflectance acquired in the field and expressed as RDVI indices calculated from 16 discrete wavelengths .....	74
Figure 4.3 The amount of variation in pasture quality components explained ( $r^2$ ) by spectral reflectance acquired in the field using four different predictive modelling techniques.....	79
Figure 5.1 (a) The relative proportion of variation explained by the six principal components in the principal component analysis (PCA) (b) The score plot of third and fourth principal components with respective seasons (autumn, spring and summer) in 2009-2010.....	89
Figure 5.2 Relationship between near infrared spectroscopy (NIRS) measured pasture nutritive values and values predicted by multispectral radiometer of validation (n = 210) dataset of total (autumn ●, spring ● and summer * datasets) dataset using partial least squares regression (PLSR) method .....	91
Figure 5.3 Average pasture canopy reflectance (lines) and coefficient of variation (%) (bars) during autumn, spring and summer seasons in 2009-2010 at the three sites (Waikato, Taranaki, Manawatu and Canterbury) across New Zealand.....	93
Figure 6.1 Typical shape of a spherical variogram model.....	107
Figure 6.2 Relationship between measured and predicted herbage biomass in the validation dataset (n=207) using vegetation indices.....	109
Figure 6.3 Semivariograms of herbage biomass of 10 fields.....	111

## Acronyms

AI	artificial intelligence
ANN	artificial neural networks
AOAC	association of official analytical chemists
ASD	analytical spectral devices – ASD Inc.
ADF	acid detergent fibre
AVIRIS	airborne visible infrared imaging spectrometer
CAPP	canopy pasture probe
CCRS	canada centre for remote sensing
CV	coefficient of variation
DCAD	dietary cation-anion difference
DM	dry matter
EM	electromagnetic
FDR	first derivative reflectance
FOV	field of view
GIS	geographic information system
GPS	global positioning system
IR	infrared
LAI	leaf area index
LIBERTY	leaf incorporating biochemistry exhibiting reflectance and transmittance yields
LV	latent variable
ME	metabolisable energy
MIR	mid infrared
NASA	national aeronautics and space administration
NDF	neutral detergent fibre
NDVI	normalised difference vegetation index
NIR	near infrared region
NSE	nash-sutcliffe efficiency
NV	nutritive value



NIRS	near infrared reflectance spectroscopy
OMD	organic matter digestibility
PCA	principal component analysis
PCR	principle component regression
PLSR	partial least squares regression
PRESS	predicted residual error sum of square
$R^2$	coefficient of determination
RDVI	renormalized difference vegetation index
REP	red edge position
RMSE	root mean square error
RMSECV	root mean square error of cross-validation
RMSEP	root mean square error of prediction
RPD	ratio prediction to deviation
SD	standard deviation
SAIL	scattering by arbitrarily inclined leaves
SAR	synthetic aperture radar
SAVI	soil adjusted vegetation index
SMLR	stepwise multiple linear regression
SWIR	shortwave infrared
SVM	support vector machines
SVR	support vector regression
USDA	united states department of agriculture
UV	ultra violet
VI	vegetation indices
VIP	variable importance for the projection
Vis/VIS	visible
Vis-NIRS	visible near infrared spectroscopy