Precision Farming – Using New Technologies to Optimise Grassland Systems

Deriving Sward Height from UAVs

Georg Bareth

Saturation VIs - Motivation & Definitions - Case Studies: Meadows - Case Studies: Pastures - Discussion



D. Hoffmeister, U. Lussem, C. Hütt, A. Bolten, & M. Gnyp, J. Jasper, & A. Schmitz, J. Isselstein, & J. Schellberg



Saturation of VIs



Motivation & Definitions: Nonspectral Crop Traits (field level)



- Motivation & Defintions -

AG GISAN & FERNERKUNDUNG

Status Quo 3D: Tilly et al. 2015 & Bendig et al. 2015



Tilly et al. (2015): Fusion of Plant Height and Vegetation Indices for the Estimation of Barley Biomass. Remote Sensing 7, pp.11449-11480. DOI:10.3390/rs70911449

Bendig et al. (2015): Combining UAV-based Crop Surface Models, Visible and Near Infrared Vegetation Indices for Biomass Monitoring in Barley. Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinf. 39, 79-87. doi:10.1016/j.jag.2015.02.012



		Bivariate BRMs					Multivariate BRMs					
			Whole Period		Pre-Anthesis			Whole Period		Pre-Anthesis		
		Estimator	R ²	SE_{E}^{a}	R ²	SE_{E}^{a}	Estimator ^b	R ²	SE_{E}^{a}	R ²	SE_{E}^{a}	
58	Linear	PH	0.65	250.71	0.76	143.34						
		GnyLi	0.52	293.80	0.68	166.75	GnyLi	0.65	865.76	0.77	635.30	
		NDVI	0.07	409.44	0.34	239.09	NDVI	0.69	537.36	0.76	518.25	
		NRI	0.54	289.57	0.70	159.97	NRI	0.65	876.08	0.77	621.60	
		RDVI	0.13	396.88	0.39	230.33	RDVI	0.69	479.48	0.76	535.08	
		REIP	0.12	398.08	0.58	189.95	REIP	0.73	48353.45	0.76	6462.41	
oma:		RGBVI	0.05	413.80	0.26	252.59	RGBVI	0.68	557.08	0.76	580.76	
ry bi	Exponential	PH	0.84	0.37	0.84	0.34						
a		GnyLi	0.80	0.42	0.85	0.32	GnyLi	0.86	2.43	0.88	2.14	
		NDVI	0.30	0.77	0.61	0.53	NDVI	0.85	2.85	0.88	3.99	
		NRI	0.81	0.40	0.87	0.30	NRI	0.87	2.29	0.89	1.96	
		RDVI	0.41	0.71	0.68	0.48	RDVI	0.85	2.52	0.88	2.84	
		REIP	0.37	0.73	0.77	0.40	REIP	0.84	30.39	0.86	48.43	
		RGBVI	0.23	0.81	0.48	0.60	RGBVI	0.85	2.51	0.87	2.73	

- Status Quo 3D -

Case Studies: Meadows

Status Quo:





UAV-derived Mean Sward Height per Treatment (5 reptititions) 2014 0,5 **RPM-SH vs. CSM-SH (2014-2016)** 0,4 n = 130 (5 rep.; n= 650) $R^2 = 0.8565$ W u u HS-Wd U,3 0,2 0,1 0,3 0,2 0,4 0,1 0,5 CSM-SH in m Bareth and Schellberg (2018): Fusion of Plant Height and

AG GIS & FERNERKUNDUNG



- Case Studies -



Lussem et al.: (2019, in print): Estimating biomass in temperate grassland with high resolution canopy surface models from unmanned aerial vehicle-based RGB images and vegetation indices. JARS.

Case studies: Pastures

BMBF-funded GreenGrass-Projekt (2019-2024): Versuchsgut Relliehausen (9 ha)





- Case Studies -

Horse-grazed Grassland: 1.6 ha (Hoffmeister et al. 2018)



Conclusion and Discussion

- Compressed sward height performs very well as nonspectral estimator!
- UAV-derived sward height performs moderate to well!
- Potential is not fully exploited yet: histogram, 3D ... !
- Direct georeferencing!

AG GIS & FERNERKUNDUNG

- Robustness and transferability!



Näsi et al. (2018): Estimating biomass and nitrogen amount of barley and grass using UAV and aircraft based spectral and photogrammetric 3D features. Remote Sensing 10 (7): 1082. doi: 10.3390/rs10071082

Abstract:

".... Our objective was to develop and assess a methodology for crop biomass and nitrogen estimation, integrating spectral and 3D features that can be extracted using airborne miniaturized multispectral, hyperspectral and colour (RGB) cameras. In the biomass estimation, the best results were obtained when integrating hyperspectral and 3D features, but the integration of RGB images and 3D features also provided results that were almost as good. In nitrogen content estimation, the hyperspectral camera gave the best results."

Precision Farming – Using New Technologies to Optimise Grassland Systems

Deriving Sward Height from UAVs

Georg Bareth

Saturation VIs - Motivation & Definitions - Case Studies: Meadows - Case Studies: Pastures - Discussion



D. Hoffmeister, U. Lussem, C. Hütt, A. Bolten, & M. Gnyp, J. Jasper, & A. Schmitz, J. Isselstein, & J. Schellberg



Crop Surface Model (CSM)

Multi-temporal Crop Surface Models



Plant Height_{total} = $t_3 - t_0$ Plant Height_{in-season1} = $t_1 - t_0$ Plant Height_{in-season2} = $t_2 - t_0$ Plant Growth_{in-season3} = $t_2 - t_1$ Plant Growth_{in-season4} = $t_3 - t_2$ Plant Growth_{in-season5} = $t_3 - t_1$



HOFFMEISTER et al. (2010): High resolution CSM and CVM on field level by terrestrial lasers canning. In: Proc SPIE, Vol. 7840, 78400E: DOI: 10.1117/12.872315

- Discussion -

New Papers: Grassland, UAVs, Machine Learning

4. Discussion

Our study was the first to integrate various structural and spectral features from a drone multispectral photogrammetric system using machine learning techniques for the grass sward biomass estimation in the context of silage production. The best results were obtained when combining different height, RGB and VI features. The correlations and RMSEs were at best 0.98 and 0.34 t/ha (12.7%) for the DMY and 0.98 and 1.22 t/ha (11.05%) for the FY, respectively. The MLR and RF provided quite similar results (Table 10). Overall, the most important features for the RF were the new indices ExG + H_{p90} and ExG + H_{max} (introduced in this study), the height features and the GrassI (Table 11 and Appendix B, Table A5). Additionally, the CHM-features gave better correlations to the DMY and the FY than the regressions with the physical canopy height measurements by the height stick (H_{ref}) at the three growth stages of the silage sward studied resulting from the three first measurement dates.

	Date					N-Level (kg/ha)						
	6 June	15 June	19 June	28 June	0	50	75	100	125	150		
DMY												
MSAVI	0.95	0.94	0.96	0.95	0.62	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.87	0.94		
NDVI	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.89	0.75	0.95	0.94	0.95	0.88	0.91		
ExG	0.77	0.75	0.87	0.89	0.75	0.88	0.68	0.84	0.85	0.90		
ExG + H _{p90}	0.91	0.94	0.96	0.90	0.80	0.92	0.96	0.96	0.93	0.88		
GrassI _{p90}	0.88	0.91	0.96	0.90	0.87	0.89	0.95	0.94	0.92	0.89		
FY												
MSAVI	0.96	0.95	0.97	0.99	0.59	0.95	0.87	0.90	0.94	0.92		
NDVI	0.94	0.92	0.92	0.81	0.73	0.95	0.92	0.94	0.96	0.91		
ExG	0.82	0.71	0.84	0.89	0.77	0.94	0.79	0.89	0.92	0.91		
ExG + H _{p90}	0.95	0.92	0.94	0.83	0.75	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.91		
GrassI _{p90}	0.93	0.88	0.92	0.85	0.87	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.94		
H _{ref}												
MSAVI	0.85	0.94	0.93	0.81	0.71	0.89	0.89	0.85	0.88	0.87		
NDVI	0.86	0.97	0.94	0.88	0.77	0.93	0.95	0.92	0.89	0.86		
ExG	0.72	0.85	0.89	0.76	0.75	0.88	0.71	0.87	0.79	0.85		
ExG + H _{p90}	0.84	0.97	0.96	0.89	0.76	0.93	0.99	0.97	0.88	0.94		
GrassI _{p90}	0.82	0.96	0.96	0.89	0.80	0.93	0.98	0.97	0.89	0.95		

Table 9. Pearson correlation coefficients for VIs and DMY, FY and H_{ref} on different dates and different Nitrogen

fertilizer levels (0-150 kg/ha). DMY: dry matter yield; FY: fresh yield; and H_{ref}: reference height measurement.





Article

A Novel Machine Learning Method for Estimating Biomass of Grass Swards Using a Photogrammetric Canopy Height Model, Images and Vegetation Indices Captured by a Drone

Niko Viljanen ^{1,*}, Eija Honkavaara ¹, Roope Näsi ¹, Teemu Hakala ¹, Oiva Niemeläinen ² and Jere Kaivosoja ²



Discussion -

•

- •
- •
- •
- •
- •
- •

- •
- •

