

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND

Defining Sheep Grazing Environments Using Remotely Sensed Data at a Range of Scales

MICHAEL BARRY WHELAN (BAgrSc UQld 1981; MSc SCU 2004)

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of New England.

April, 2012

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the guidance and assistance offered to me by my supervisors (Professor David Cottle, Professor David Lamb and Dr Ken Geenty). I would also like to acknowledge the assistance of Darryl Smith, John Smith, Grant Uphill and Richard Grimson in the field. The following people have been very generous with their time in providing data or assistance with analysis (Norman Santich, Landgate; David Jones, National Climate Centre, Bureau of Meteorology; Edward King, CSIRO Division of Marine and Atmospheric Research and Greg Luker, SCU). The Pastures from Space and Landgate were also very helpful in getting the project off the ground and providing data. In particular I would like to thank Graham Donald and Daniel Brown. I would also like to acknowledge the financial support from Sheep CRC and the support from my employer (Southern Cross University). Finally, I must thank Rhonda for embarking on this journey with me.

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Chapter 1	
Introduction	
1.1 Hypothesis 1	3
1.2 Significance of Hypothesis 1 to the Australian sheep industry	3
1.3 Hypothesis 2 and 3	4
1.4 Significance of Hypothesis 2 and 3 to the Australian sheep industry	4
1.5 Hypotheses 4	6
1.6 Significance of Hypotheses 4 to the Australian sheep industry	6
1.7 Hypothesis 5	6
1.8 Significance of Hypothesis 5 to the Australian sheep industry	6
1.9 Overview of methodology	7
1.10 Thesis structure	8
Chapter 2	
Literature Review	
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Remote sensing	12
2.2.1 Normalised difference vegetation index	16
2.2.2 The concept of scale in remote sensing	17
2.3 Application of remote sensing in the sheep industry	18
2.4 Hypothesis 1: Remotely sensed data could be used to map within paddock variation in pasture biomass in Mediterranean and temperate environments.	19
2.4.1 Causes of within a paddock variation of pasture resources	20
2.4.2 Measuring pasture biomass	21
2.4.3 Non-destructive pasture sampling	22
2.4.4 Mapping within paddock variation in pasture biomass	25
2.4.5 Remote sensing methods of estimating within paddock biomass	26
2.5 Hypothesis 2: Remotely sensed data could be used to differentiate the grazing environment and monitor liveweight change of sheep grazing in different environments	31
2.5.1 Estimating pasture biomass using satellite data	33
2.5.2 Pastures from Space (PfS TM)	35
2.6 Hypothesis 3: A vegetation index derived from satellite data could be used to monitor seasonal changes in wool fibre diameter	36
2.6.1 Wool fibre diameter profiles	37
2.6.2 Wool fibre diameter profiles and the nutritional environment	42
2.7 Hypothesis 4: Remotely sensed data and temperature could be combined to produce a meaningful and robust classification of the sheep grazing environments of Australia.	45
2.7.1 Pasture biomass	47
2.7.2 Pasture quality	48
2.7.3 Remote sensing methods of estimating pasture quality	49
2.7.4 Classifying grazing environment	51
2.8 Hypothesis 5: The classification of sheep grazing environments could be used to detect genotype by environment interactions between linked flocks.	52
2.8.1 Breeding values	53
2.8.2 Genotype and environment interaction	55
2.8.3 Estimation of genotype by environment effects	59
2.8.4 Best linear unbiased prediction of breeding values	61
2.8.5 Significance of genotype by environment interaction	61
2.8.6 Importance of differentiating environment in GxE	63
2.9 Conclusion	64

Table of Contents (continued)

Section	Page
Chapter 3	
Active optical sensing and mapping of the green fraction of a pasture sward at the sub-paddock scale	
3.1 Introduction	70
3.1.1 Non-destructive physical methods of estimating GDM	71
3.1.2 Non-destructive remote sensing methods of estimating GDM	72
3.1.3 Crop Circle™	73
3.2 Methods	74
3.2.1 Descriptions of the two properties	74
3.2.2 Pasture measurement	75
3.3 Results	76
3.4 Discussion	85
3.5 Acknowledgments	88
Chapter 4	
Differentiating the grazing environment of sheep flocks using satellite remotely sensed data and temperature	
4.1 Introduction	92
4.2 Methods	94
4.2.1 Property descriptions	94
4.2.2 Data preparation	95
4.2.3 Data analysis	97
4.3 Results	98
4.3.1 Analysis of NDVI and PGR data between paddocks	99
4.3.2 General linear modelling	102
4.4 Discussion	104
4.5 Acknowledgements	107
Chapter 5	
Relationships between a satellite-derived vegetation index, wool profiles and staple strength in different sheep grazing environments	
5.1 Introduction	112
5.2 Methods	114
5.2.1 Data preparation	114
5.2.2 Comparison of wool fibre diameter normalised difference vegetation index profiles	117
5.3 Results	119
5.3.1 Subjective comparison and cross correlation	119
5.3.2 Correlation of rate of change	120
5.3.3 Fibre diameter, pasture availability and staple strength	121
5.3.4 General linear modelling with sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) as an interaction term	123
5.4 Discussion	125
5.5 Acknowledgements	131

Table of Contents (continued)

Section	Page
Chapter 6	
Classifying Australian sheep grazing environments using a normalised difference vegetation index and monthly average maximum temperature	135
6.1 Introduction	126
6.2 Methods	140
6.2.1 Data used in the analysis	140
6.2.2 Image processing	141
6.2.3 Classification	144
6.2.4 Evaluation of classifications	145
6.2.5 Nutritional environment difference index derived from signature files	146
6.3 Results	146
6.3.1 Comparison with ABARE zones	146
6.3.2 Comparison with Sustainable Grazing Systems (SGS) National Experiment properties	148
6.3.3 Evaluation using Weddin Shire	149
6.3.4 Choosing the most robust classification	151
6.4 Discussion	155
6.5 Acknowledgments	159
Chapter 7	
Classifying sheep grazing environments in Australia to quantify genotype by environment interaction using temperature and satellite data	163
7.1 Introduction	164
7.2 Methods	166
7.2.1 Data preparation	166
7.2.2 Classification	168
7.2.3 Evaluation of sheep grazing environment classes	169
7.2.4 Analysis of Sheep Genetics data	172
7.3 Results	172
7.3.1 Two-way analysis of variance	172
7.3.2 Scaling environmental differences using nutritional environment difference index	177
7.3.3 Sheep Genetics analysis	179
7.4 Discussion	180
7.5 Acknowledgments	183
Chapter 8	
Discussion	189
8.1 Hypothesis 1	187
8.1.1 Significance of outcomes of Hypothesis 1 to the Australian sheep industry	188
8.2 Hypothesis 2	189
8.2.1 Significance of outcomes of Hypothesis 2 to the Australian sheep industry	191
8.3 Hypothesis 3	192
8.3.1 Significance of outcomes of Hypothesis 3 to the Australian sheep industry	192
8.4 Hypothesis 4	193
8.4.1 Significance of outcomes of Hypothesis 4 to the Australian sheep industry	197
8.5 Hypothesis 5	198
8.5.1 Significance of outcomes of Hypothesis 5 to the Australian sheep industry	198
8.6 Evaluation of definition of grazing environment using remotely sensed data.	199
8.6.1 The asymptotic nature of the relationship between NDVI and GDM	199
8.6.2 Water in the sward and its impact on reflectance of EMR	202
8.6.3 Inherent variability in the system	204
8.6.4 Stock management	205
8.7 Future developments from this study	206
8.8 Conclusion	207
References	211

Table of Contents (continued)

Appendices		229
A	Whelan, M., Cottle, D. J., Gheradhi, S. & Clark, A. (2007). The potential for predicting Australian wool supply using remotely sensed data. In <i>International Wool Textile Organisation, Commercial Technology Forum Paper 5</i> Edinburgh.	229
B	Whelan, M. B., Geenty, K. G., Cottle, D. J., Lamb, D. W. & Donald, G. E. (2008). The relationship between a satellite-derived vegetation index and wool fibre diameter profiles. In <i>10th World Conference on Animal Production</i> Cape Town.	237
C	Whelan, M. B., Cottle, D. J., Geenty, K. G. & Brown, D. J. (2009). Classifying sheep grazing environments using satellite data to quantify genotype by environment interactions. . In <i>18th Association for the Advancement of Animal Breeding and Genetics</i> , Vol. 18, 52-55.	243
D	Geenty, K., Whelan, M. & Smith, A. (2009). Relationships between pasture availability, wool profiles and staple strength in different sheep grazing environments. . In <i>Recent Advances in Animal Nutrition - Australia 20th Biennial Conference 12-15 July 2009</i> University of New England, Armidale NSW Australia.	247
E	Detailed comparisons of Sheep Grazing Environment classifications (generated using methods described in Chapter 6) and Australian Bureau of Rural Economics broadacre zones.	261

List of Figures

Number	Title	Page
Figure 1.1	Sheep numbers (1966-2010) and wool price (1974-2010) .	1
Figure 1.2	Distribution of sheep population throughout Australia.	5
Figure 2.1	Spectral reflectance of a tobacco leaf with the spectral resolution of a) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR), b) Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS), c) Satellite Pour l'Observation de la Terre (SPOT) and d) Crop Circle™.	14
Figure 2.2	Relationship between leaf area index (LAI) and red and near infrared (NIR) reflectance.	15
Figure 2.3	Calculation of rate of change (Roc 1) and Roc 2 on a wool fibre diameter profile.	38
Figure 2.4	Estimate of price paid for wool of different fibre diameters and varying tensile strength in the 08-09 season.	40
Figure 2.5	Relationship between time of year, wool fibre diameter and fibre length growth.	43
Figure 2.6	Relationship between wool fibre diameter and pasture digestible dry matter.	44
Figure 2.7	Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics (ABARE) zones overlaid on the distribution of sheep population.	46
Figure 2.8	Hypothesised example of a genotype by environment interaction (GxE) scale effect of a trait of two genotypes (A & B) in a poor and a good environment.	57
Figure 2.9	Hypothesised example of a genotype by environment interaction (GxE) ranking effect of a trait of two genotypes (A & B) in a poor and a good environment.	57
Figure 2.10	Hypothesised example of a genotype by environment interaction (GxE) combined scale and ranking effect of a trait of two genotypes (A & B) in a poor and a good environment.	58
Figure 2.11	Hypothesised example of no genotype by environment interaction (GxE).	58
Figure 2.12	Illustration of genotype by environment interaction (GxE) of two genotypes at three environments as per Perkins (1968).	60
Figure 3.1	Plots of soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI) and green dry matter (GDM) (left), pasture height (PHt) and GDM (centre) and SAVI*PHt (right) at Chiswick by year.	81
Figure 3.2	Plots of soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI) and green dry matter (GDM) (left), pasture height (PHt) and GDM (centre) and SAVI * PHt (right) at Turretfield by year.	82
Figure 3.3	Map showing the variation in green dry matter (GDM) in paddocks at Turretfield July 2006.	85
Figure 4.1	Normalised difference vegetation index NDVI values (2008 – 2010) for Kirby, Trangie, Hamilton and Katanning.	101
Figure 4.2	Normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) divided by maximum temperature (2008 – 2010) for Kirby, Trangie, Hamilton and Katanning.	101
Figure 5.1	Location of flocks (Sheep CRC Project 1.2.7) used in comparison of normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and wool fibre diameter profile (FDP).	115
Figure 5. 2	Examples of a Poor (top), Neutral (centre) and Strong (bottom) correlations between normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and wool fibre diameter profile.	116
Figure 5.3	Normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) rate of change (Roc1) and Roc2 measurement (top) and wool fibre diameter profile (FDP) Roc1 and Roc2 measurement (bottom).	118
Figure 5.4	Examples of good matching of normalised difference vegetation index profile and fibre diameter profiles.	119
Figure 5.5	Relationship between rate of change in normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and wool fibre diameter profile (FDP).	120
Figure 5.6	Relationship between wool staple strength and (a) maximum – minimum fibre diameter, (b) coefficient of variation (CV) in fibre diameter, (c) CV along the fibre and (d) CV across the fibre.	122
Figure 5.7	Relationship between staple strength and negative rate of change in wool fibre diameter and negative normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI).	123
Figure 5.8	Relationship between rate of change in normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and wool fibre diameter profile (FDP) in sheep grazing environment class (SGEclass) 24 (top - the strongest relationship) and SGEclass 19 (bottom - the weakest relationship).	124

List of Figures (continued)

Number	Title	Page
Figure 5.9	Fibre diameter profiles (FDPs) of rams (top) and ewes (bottom) on the same property in the same season. Dashed line (NDVI) Solid line (FDP).	126
Figure 5.10	Normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and fibre diameter profiles of flock from properties in best Sheep grazing class (SGEclass 25) (upper portion) and SGEclass 24 (lower portion). Solid line FDP and dashed line NDVI.	128
Figure 5.11	Relationship between number of sheep and annual greasy wool production.	130
Figure 6.1	Distribution of the Australian sheep population provided by Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001) overlaid on the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics Australian Broadacre zones (ABARE, 1998).	136
Figure 6.2	Map of the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics Australian Broadacre Zones (ABARE, 1998) and Sustainable Grazing Systems properties (Andrew and Lodge, 2003).	139
Figure 6.3	Summary of image processing to produce maps of sheep grazing environments (SGEclasses) of Australia using monthly normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and monthly maximum temperature (T_{max}) from 1996 to 2005.	142
Figure 6.4	Maps showing the areas masked from the normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and monthly maximum temperature (T_{max}) images. (a) number of sheep in statistical local area (SLA) <1000; (b) tenure other than Freehold and Leasehold; (c) remnant vegetation >30%; (d) a, b and c combined.	143
Figure 6.5	Map of sheep grazing environments (SGEclasses) of Australia derived from monthly normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) divided by average maximum temperature (T_{max}) from 1996 to 2005.	147
Figure 6.6	Sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) in Weddin Shire from the classification of average monthly maximum temperature (T_{max}) and normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) from 1996 to 2005 using different methods: (a) combining the layers ($T_{120}+VI_{120}$); (b) calculating monthly averages and combining layers ($T_{12}+VI_{12}$); (c) dividing NDVI by T_{max} (VI/T_{120}); (d) calculating monthly averages and dividing NDVI by T_{max} (VI/T_{12}).	150
Figure 6.7	Map of sheep grazing environments (SGEclasses) of Western Australia.	153
Figure 6.8	Map of sheep grazing environments (SGEclasses) of South Australia.	153
Figure 6.9	Map of sheep grazing environments (SGEclasses) of Victoria and Tasmania.	154
Figure 6.10	Map of sheep grazing environments (SGEclasses) of New South Wales.	154
Figure 6.11	Map of sheep grazing environments (SGEclasses) of Queensland.	155
Figure 7.1	Maps showing the areas removed from the NDVI_MT image (a – statistical local areas with fewer than 1000 sheep, b – all land use other than leasehold or freehold, c – remnant perennial vegetation greater than 30% cover and d – final masking used).	168
Figure 7.2	Sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) of Australia derived from normalised difference vegetation index and maximum average temperature records from 1996 to 2005.	170
Figure 7.3	Comparison of mean hogget body weight (with 95% confidence intervals) of progeny of four sires present in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	173
Figure 7.4	Comparison of mean wool fibre diameter (FD) (with 95% confidence intervals) of progeny of five sires present in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	175
Figure 7.5	Comparison of mean greasy fleece weight (GFW) (with 95% confidence intervals) of progeny of two sires present in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	176
Figure 7.6	Comparison of hogget body weight (Wt) of four sires present in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) using nutritional environment difference index (NEDI) to scale differences between classes.	177
Figure 7.7	Comparison of mean wool fibre diameter (FD) of five sires present in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) using nutritional environment difference index (NEDI) to scale differences between classes.	178
Figure 7.8	Comparison of mean greasy fleece weight (GFW) of two sires present in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) using nutritional environment difference index (NEDI) to scale differences between classes.	179

List of Figures (continued)

Number	Title	Page
Figure 8.1	Seasonal changes in Normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) at Hamilton Victoria (2008-2010) showing the periods when supplementary feeding was reported. There were no site reports in 2009 at the time of the trough in 2009.	190
Figure 8.2	Seasonal changes in Normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) – top and NDVI divided by maximum temperature (Pasture value) – bottom, for a property near Harden, NSW (2003-2006).	191
Figure 8.3	Seasonal changes in Normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and NDVI/Maximum temperature at 9 properties used in Chapter 5. The Sheep Grazing Environment class (SGEclass) and Nutritional Environment Difference Index (NEDI) value from the poorest class.	195-6
Figure 8.4	The impact of using log transformations (July 2008 at Turretfield) on 95% confidence interval of a predictive regression.	200
Figure 8.5	Relationship between green biomass and wool growth. Derived from (Brown and Williams, 1970).	201
Figure 8.6	Hypothesised relationship between normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and fibre diameter.	201
Figure 8.7	Hypothesised relationship between normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and sheep grazing environment illustrating the zone of differentiation.	202
Figure 8.8	Relationship between normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and pasture moisture.	203

List of Tables

Number	Title	Page
Table 1.1	Draft publications presented in Chapters 3 to 7 with the percentage contribution from Michael Whelan.	8
Table 2.1	Principal divisions of the electromagnetic spectrum.	13
Table 2.2	Spatial, spectral and temporal resolution of common satellite remote sensing systems.	17
Table 2.3	Factors regarded by 2016 meat and wool producers as very important in the success of a grazing enterprise.	20
Table 2.4	Examples of physical and visual methods of pasture assessment/sampling used in grazing experiments.	21
Table 2.5	Reliability (R^2 and root mean square error (RMSE)) of physical non-destructive and non-optical methods of pasture biomass estimation.	23
Table 2.6	Examples of mapping of within paddock variation of pasture resources using passive optical sensors.	28
Table 2.7	Summary of coefficients of determination of vegetation indices (highest reported) and biomass (dry weight) of different agricultural cover types using the Crop Circle TM .	29
Table 2.8	Summary of studies that have used remotely sensed data to estimate pasture biomass.	34
Table 2.9	Examples of studies that have reported that nutrition impacts wool fibre diameter or fibre diameter profiles (FDP).	39
Table 2.10	Description of Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics (ABARE) zones grazing zones.	46
Table 2.11	Examples of genotype by environment interaction (GxE) in sheep trials.	62
Table 3.1	Reliability (R^2 and root mean square error (RMSE)) of non-destructive physical methods of estimating pasture biomass. Where a regression of predicted biomass versus actual biomass was performed the R^2 is in italics. Otherwise, the reliability of a predictive equation is given.	71
Table 3.2	Reliability (R^2 and root mean square error (RMSE) DM kg/ha) of non-destructive remote sensing (optical and active) techniques used to estimate pasture biomass.	73
Table 3.3	Dates of pasture and Crop Circle TM sampling and at Chiswick (C) and Turretfield (T).	76
Table 3.4	Correlation matrix (R values) between all variable measured in the analysis; normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI), near infrared (NIR), red reflectance (red), soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI), pasture height (PHt), green % in the sward (Gr%), fresh green biomass (FrGr), fresh dead weight (FrD), green dry matter (GDM), dead dry matter (DDM), fresh total biomass (FrTot), total biomass dry matter (TotDM), green dry matter % (GDM%), dead dry matter % (DDM%), Total dry matter % (TotDM%).	77
Table 3.5	Strength (R^2 and root mean square error (RMSE) DM kg/ha) of relationships between normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI), soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI), pasture height (PHt), green dry matter (GDM). A log transformation of biomass is denoted by $\ln(\text{GDM})$.	78
Table 3.6	Strength (R^2 and root mean square error (RMSE) DM kg/ha) of relationships between the $\text{NDVI} * \text{PHt}$ and $\text{SAVI} * \text{PHt}$ and green dry matter (GDM). A log transformation of biomass is denoted by $\ln(\text{GDM})$.	80
Table 3.7	General linear modelling results (Full Model –FM incorporated all factors (Year – Y, Season – S, Location – L and interactions) with green dry matter (GDM) as the dependent variable and soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI) and pasture height (PHt) as independent variables.	84
Table 4.1	Descriptions of the properties, paddocks, breeds and animals used. B – average date of birth, W – date of weaning; Maternal-50 (Border Leicester, Coopworth, Corriedale, Dohne and South African Mutton Merinos X Merino), Merino-50 (Merino X Merino), Terminal-50 (Maternal-50 X Merino), Terminal-XB (Terminal-50 X Maternal), Syndicate-50 (A group of Merino rams), 26 denotes sires that were progeny from the Information Nucleus Flock, 50 – Merino, CM – Commercial Maternals).	95
Table 4.2	Structure of the database used for analysis. Fields in bold were used in statistical analysis. Pasture growth rate (PGR) and normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) were obtained from Pastures from Space TM . Temperature was obtained from the Bureau of Meteorology.	97

List of Tables (continued)

Number	Title	Page
Table 4.3	Correlation (R) between quantitative measures (N = 652). Pasture growth rate (PGR) and normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) from Pastures from Space and temperature (Temp), Interval, length of supplementary feeding (SuppL), age of cohort and weight change (WtChange) from Information Nucleus Flock database.	99
Table 4.4	Correlation (R) between quantitative measures with intervals with supplementary feeding removed (N = 163). Pasture growth rate (PGR) and normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) from Pastures from Space and temperature (Temp), Interval, age of cohort and weight change (WtChange) from Information Nucleus Flock database.	99
Table 4.5	Correlation (R) between normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and Pasture Growth Rate (PGR) for paddocks at Kirby (a), Trangie (b), Hamilton (c) and Katanning (d). Lower diagonal NDVI. Upper diagonal PGR.	100
Table 4.6	Correlation (R) between liveweight change (WtChange) and normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI), NDVI/temperature, pasture growth (PGR) from Pastures from Space and PGR/temperature at the four properties a) Kirby, NSW; b) Trangie, NSW; c) Hamilton, Victoria and d) Katanning, Western Australia.	102
Table 4.7	Impact of removing non-significant terms from the full model (Breed, Location, Year, SuppL, normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI), Breed x SuppL and Breed x NDVI, Location x Group x Year and Location x Group x Year x SuppL and Location x Group x Year x NDVI).	103
Table 4.8	Impact of removing non-significant terms from the full model (Breed, Location, Year, pasture growth rate (PGR)/temperature (Temp), Breed x PGR/Temp, Location x Group x Year and Location x Group x Year x PGR/Temp).	104
Table 5.1	Output of General Linear Modelling fibre diameter profile (FDP) rate of change (Roc) as the dependant variable.	123
Table 5.2	Regression of fibre diameter profile (FDP) rate of change (Roc1) and Roc2 and normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) Roc1 and Roc2. NEDI values were based on the difference between the class listed and sheep grazing environment class (SGEclass) (the poorest class).	125
Table 6.1	Description of methods used to classify monthly normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and maximum temperature (T_{max}) from 1996 to 2005 to create sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	144
Table 6.2	Comparison between Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics (ABARE) zones and maps of sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) from different methods of classifying normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and maximum monthly temperature (T_{max}).	148
Table 6.3	Comparison of the grazing environment index (GrEI) of Sheep Grazing System properties and maps of sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) from different methods of classifying normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and maximum monthly temperature (T_{max}). Nutritional environment difference index (NEDI) between the poorest environment and SGEclass of the SGS property is shown in parentheses.	149
Table 6.4	Correlation coefficients of differences in nutritional environment difference index (NEDI) and the grazing environment index (Δ GrEI) of properties in the Sheep Grazing System study for the five methods used to classify normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and maximum monthly temperature (T_{max}).	149
Table 6.5	Nutritional environment difference index (NEDI) of VI/T120 map of sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) within Weddin Shire.	151
Table 6.6	Nutritional environment difference index (NEDI) matrix of the 25 sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) based on the VI/T120 classification.	152
Table 7.1	Comparison between Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics (ABARE) broadacre (High Rainfall –HRZ, Wheat-sheep – WSZ, Pastoral – PZ) zones and sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses). Values represent the number of cells of a SGEclass present in the ABARE zone.	169

List of Tables (continued)

Number	Title	Page
Table 7.2	Data extracted from the MERINOSELECT database. For a full description of the database refer to (Brown <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Sheep Genetics, 2009)	171
Table 7.3	Nutritional environment difference index matrix of the 25 sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	171
Table 7.4	Analysis of variance results for hogget body weight (Wt) of four sires in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	173
Table 7.5	Analysis of variance results for hogget body weight (Wt) of four sires in two ABARE zones (High Rainfall and Wheat-sheep).	173
Table 7.6	Analysis of variance results for fibre diameter (FD) of progeny from five sires in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	174
Table 7.7	Analysis of variance results for fibre diameter (FD) of progeny from five sires in two ABARE zones (High Rainfall and Wheat-sheep).	174
Table 7.8	Analysis of variance results for greasy fleece weight (GFW) of progeny of two sires in five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses).	176
Table 7.9	Analysis of variance results for greasy fleece weight (GFW) of progeny of two sires in two ABARE zones (High Rainfall and Wheat-sheep).	176
Table 7.10	Regression of hogget body weight (Wt) of progeny and nutritional environment difference index (NEDI).	177
Table 7.11	Regression of wool fibre diameter (FD) of progeny and nutritional environment difference index (NEDI).	178
Table 7.12	Regression of greasy fleece weight (GFW) of progeny and nutritional environment difference index (NEDI).	179
Table 7.13	Phenotypic variance (σ^2_p), direct (h^2_d) and maternal (h^2_m) heritabilities, maternal permanent environmental (c^2) and sire by flock (Model 2) or sire by sheep grazing environment class (SGEclass) (Model 3) (s^2) effects as a proportion of phenotypic variance with and without sire by flock or SGEclass interactions included in the model (se in parentheses).	180
Table 8.1	Strength (R ²) of the relationship between normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI), pasture height (PHt), green dry matter (GDM) with all observations, observations <2000 kg/GDM/ha only and observations <1200 kg/GDM/ha only.	179

List of Equations

Number	Title	Page
Equation 2.1	Formula used to calculate normalised difference vegetation index (Rouse <i>et al.</i> , 1973).	16
Equation 2.2	Equation used to estimate green dry matter (GDM) from pasture height (MLA, 2009).	23
Equation 2.3	Equation used to estimate green dry matter (GDM) from pasture height measured with a raising plate meter (Earle and McGowan, 1979).	23
Equation 2.4	Equation used to estimate green dry matter (GDM) from pasture height measured with a pasture stick for a variety of pasture species (Harmoney <i>et al.</i> , 1997).	24
Equation 2.5	Equation used to estimate green dry matter (GDM) from pasture height measured with a raising plate meter for a variety of pasture species (Harmoney <i>et al.</i> , 1997).	24
Equation 2.5	Formula used to calculate soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI) (Huete, 1988).	30
Equation 2.6	Simple model of phenotypic performance (Perkins, 1968).	59
Equation 2.7	Simple model of phenotypic performance (Dominik and Kinghorn, 2001).	60
Equation 2.8	General equation for best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP).	61
Equation 3.1	Formula used to calculate soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI) (a) (Huete, 1988) and normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) (b) (Rouse <i>et al.</i> , 1973).	75
Equation 3.2	Equations used to calculate green dry matter from pasture height (a) (MLA, 2004), (b) (Earle and McGowan, 1979) and (c) present study.	83
Equation 3.3	Equations used to calculate green dry matter (GDM) from soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI).	84
Equation 4.1	Formula used to calculate normalised difference vegetation index (Rouse <i>et al.</i> , 1973).	96
Equation 5.1	Formula used to calculate normalised difference vegetation index (Rouse <i>et al.</i> , 1973).	113
Equation 6.1	Formula used to calculate normalised difference vegetation index (Rouse <i>et al.</i> , 1973).	137
Equation 6.2	Method used to combine output from Sustainable Grazing experiment into a single grazing environment index (GrEI).	145
Equation 7.1	Formula used to calculate normalised difference vegetation index (Rouse <i>et al.</i> , 1973).	166
Equation 7.2	Formula used to calculate “pasture value” from normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and maximum temperature.	167

Glossary

ABBREVIATION/TERM	MEANING
ABARE	Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics
ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ArcMap	ArcMap is a geographic information system produced by the ESRI company
ASBV	Australian Sheep Breeding Values
ASReml	A REML package produced by Gilmore et al.
AVHRR	Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer
AWI	Australian Wool Innovation Limited
CFW	Clean Fleece Weight
Crop Circle™	Active hand-held sensor produced by Holland Scientific
CSIRO	Commonwealth Science and Industry Research Organisation???
Design Matrix	<p>A design matrix is a matrix of zeros and ones and it is used to allocate individual observations to groups. For example if we had a vector of observations [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] and we wanted to allocated them to two groups [Group 1 – 1, 2, 3] and [Group 2 – 4, 5, 6] then we would create a design matrix as per below.</p> $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$
DM	Dry Matter
EBV	Estimated Breeding Value
EMR	Electromagnetic Radiation
ERDAS	Earth Resources Data Analysis System
ESRI	Environmental Systems Research Institute
FD	Fibre Diameter
FDP	Fibre Diameter Profile
FM+	Fibre Meat Plus
FOO	Feed on Offer (kg DM/ha)
GDM	Green Dry Matter
GFW	Greasy Fleece Weight
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
GrEI	Grazing Environment Index – an index developed as part of this thesis to combine data from the SGS experiment
GxE	Genotype by Environment Interaction
HRZ	High Rainfall Zone
IFOV	Instantaneous Field of View
IGF1	Insulin Growth Factor-1
ISODATA	Iterative self-organising data analysis technique (ISODATA) (Tou and Gonzalez, 1974) developed to classify multi-dimensional data.
LAI	Leaf Area Index
LANDSAT	Landsat is a series of Earth-observing satellite missions
LED	Light Emitting Diode
LUE	Light Use Efficiency
Majority Filter	A majority filter is used on thematic layers to reduce spatial variability. For each pixel the eight surrounding pixels (3x3 filter) is assessed. The central pixel's value is changed so that it is the same as the majority of the surrounding pixels. It is possible to use a filtering matrix of any size.
MapInfo	Map Info is a GIS produced by Pitney Bowes MapInfo Corporation
MLA	Meat and Livestock Australia
MODIS	Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer
MSS	MultiSpectral Scanner
MT _{max}	Maximum Monthly Temperature
MVC	Maximum-Value Composite – The value of pixels of an area are compared in a

ABREVIATION/TERM	MEANING
	sequence of images and the maximum value is used in the composite. This technique is used to account for cloud cover when calculating NDVI.
NDVI	Normalised Difference Vegetation Index
NEDI	Nutritional Environment Difference Index – an index developed as part of this study to differentiate grazing environment classes.
NIR	Near Infrared
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
PfS TM	Pastures from Space
PGR	Pasture Growth Rate (DM kg /ha/day)
PZ	Pastoral Zone
REML	Restricted Maximum Likelihood
RMSE	Root means square error
SAVI	Soil Adjusted Vegetation Index
SGEclass	Sheep Grazing Environment Class
SGS	Sustainable Grazing Systems
Shape files	Shape files are used to represent geographic features in a GIS
Sheep Genetics	<i>“national genetic information and evaluation service for the meat and wool sectors of the sheep industry delivered as LAMBPLAN and MERINOSELECT”</i>
Sheep grazing environment	For the purposes of the present study sheep grazing environments is defined as the quantity (green dry matter (kg/ha)) and quality (digestibility) of pasture available to sheep.
SLA	Statistical Local Area
SPOT	Satellite Pour l'Observation de la Terre
SS	Staple Strength
TM	Thematic Mapper
VI	Vegetation Index

Abstract

The grazing environment (i.e. the quantity and quality of pasture available) drives sheep production in Australia. The long-term viability of the sheep industry is dependent on the sustainable use of pasture, which requires monitoring. Remotely sensed data have the potential to monitor changes in pasture resources within and between seasons. Remotely sensed data have the potential to; map pasture resources within a paddock, differentiate paddocks within a farm, differentiate farms within a region and differentiate grazing environments across the country. This thesis examines the application of remotely sensed data in the sheep industry at three scales (within a paddock, at the paddock/farm scale and at a continental scale).

Data from a hand-held active sensor (Crop CircleTM) were used to estimate green dry matter (GDM) within a paddock and produce a map that highlighted the variability within the paddock. The normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) and soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI) were used to estimate GDM in mixed annual and perennial swards over three years at two sites. Comparisons between NDVI, SAVI, pasture height and GDM indicated that producers should continue to use pasture height to estimate GDM but the Crop CircleTM could be used to map GDM variability within a paddock.

NDVI data provided by Pastures from Space collected at a paddock level were compared with liveweight changes at four properties. Weak correlations between NDVI and liveweight changes were observed. The weak correlations were possibly due to extended periods of supplementary feeding on all properties. At a property scale the relationship between NDVI and fibre diameter profiles and staple strength were explored. The relationship between NDVI and fibre diameter were strong in some environments and NDVI was positively related to staple strength.

At a continental scale NDVI data were divided by temperature data (as a factor related to pasture quality) to produce a meaningful and robust classification of grazing environments. Twenty-five sheep grazing environment classes (SGEclasses) were created and an index was generated to quantify differences between them. The robustness of SGEclasses was evaluated using Sheep Genetics data to determine if they could explain genotype by environment interactions (GxE). Analysis demonstrated that the Sire by SGEclass interaction explained a similar amount of variation to the Sire by Flock interaction. Therefore, clustering flocks into SGEclasses could improve estimates of breeding values. SGEclasses were also used as a factor in multivariate analysis separate relationships between NDVI and wool fibre parameters.

The present study showed that remotely sensed data have the potential to help define grazing environment and increase the efficient use of pastures in the sheep industry.