

The University of Southern Queensland



**USING A REMOTELY CONTROLLED PLATFORM
TO ACQUIRE LOW-ALTITUDE IMAGERY FOR
GRAIN CROP MAPPING**

A Dissertation submitted by

Troy Arnold Jensen

B.Eng (DDIAE)

M.Eng (USQ)

For the award

Doctor of Philosophy

November 2008

Dedication

To my Mother, the motivation behind my education

Abstract

Agricultural crops exhibit within-field spatial variation. This variation partly results from relevant bio-physical and environmental factors that influence the crop during the growing season. The plant integrates the effects of nutrition, water, pests and disease, and displays the results in the foliage. Remote sensing techniques allow the foliage to be monitored and the crop status to be assessed.

While the use of conventional remote sensing systems has found many applications in agriculture, it is constrained by a number of issues and problems related to spatial resolution, repeat cycle, minimum area acquired, timeliness of data, etc. Thus, this research explores the potential of developing and assessing low-cost sensing technologies to overcome these limitations. The specific objectives were to: a) identify, evaluate, and analyse the different options for a low-cost low-altitude (LCLA) remote sensing system that has potential for precision agriculture, b) develop a LCLA remote sensing system that is appropriate for use in mapping selected crop attributes (i.e. grain protein, yield, maturity and crop type), and c) evaluate the accuracy of classification and prediction of the cereal crop attributes.

A low-cost sensor system was developed that incorporated two consumer digital still cameras. One camera captured the colour portion of the spectrum, while the other one (with the addition of a band-pass filter) captured the near infrared light. Both cameras were modified to be remotely triggered and externally powered. This sensor arrangement utilised 1.0 megapixel cameras in the earlier investigations and then 5.0 megapixel cameras in most recent missions. The sensors were equally well suited to mounting on a remotely controlled aircraft or suspended beneath a helium balloon.

Various approaches were taken to determine and evaluate the relationships between imagery and crop attributes. Statistical methods included the use of correlation and discriminant function analysis, along with partial least squares regression. Image analysis techniques included the use of both pixel-based

(supervised approach) and object-orientated (multi-resolution segmentation) classifications.

The results showed that low-cost low-altitude remote sensing systems (incorporating consumer digital cameras with helium balloons or remotely controlled aircraft) have great capacity to quantify variability in cereal grain crops. Excellent relationships were found between the 'at-harvest' yield ($R^2=0.902$) and protein content ($R^2=0.660$) of wheat using a single image recorded at flowering. Partial least squares regression, using the cross-validated approach, produced a stronger relationship with a prediction accuracy of 94.2% for yield and 88.5% for protein. This relationship exceeded all other studies reported in the literature.

The same LCLA system has also accurately discriminated (using statistical methods) between: a) different nutrition levels in a wheat crop with 75.6% of the cases correctly classified, and b) between different cereal grain species (with differing nutrition levels) with 86.3% accuracy. These classification accuracies are comparable with, or exceeding other more expensive and/or complicated methods. Attempting to discriminate using image analysis procedures, the pixel-based methods yielded an overall accuracy of 65.9% when classifying cereal grain crop species comprising of nine classes. When merged to six classes, the accuracy improved to 82.1%. Using an object-orientated approach has improved the overall accuracy to 81.0% for the nine-category classification. This study also demonstrated LCLA's ability to assess the various growth stages of a barley crop prior to maturity with 83.5% of cases correctly classified.

This study concluded that it is feasible to accurately assess selected cereal grain crop attributes using low-cost consumer technologies. The accuracies achieved using this system were comparable with, or exceeded, other reported studies that used more complicated and expensive sampling systems. Further work is needed to continue refining the initial work on a fully autonomous unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) started in the later part of this study, to extend the use of the LCLA system into broader scale applications.

Certification of Dissertation

I certify that the ideas, experimental work, results, analyses, software and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

Signature of Candidate

Date

ENSORSEMENT

Signature of Supervisor

Date

Publications

Published International Journal

Jensen, TA, Apan, A, Young, F & Zeller, LC 2007, 'Detecting the attributes of a wheat crop using digital imagery acquired from a low-altitude platform', *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, vol. 59, no. 1-2, pp. 66-77.

Published Conference Proceedings

Hussain, A, Raine, SR, Henderson, CW & Jensen, TA 2008, 'Evaluation of a proximal vision data acquisition system for measuring spatial variability in lettuce growth', paper presented to Global Issues, Paddock Action - 14th Australian Agronomy Conference, Adelaide, Australia, 21-25 September 2008.

Jensen, TA, Apan, A, Young, F & Zeller, L 2005, 'Grain Crop Attributes Detected Using Digital Imagery Acquired from a Low-Altitude Helium balloon', paper presented to 5th European Conference on Precision Agriculture, Uppsala Sweden, 9-12 June 2005.

Jensen, TA 2004, 'Remote sensing – an innovative balloon platform', paper presented to 8th Annual Symposium on Precision Agriculture Research & Applications in Australasia, Sydney, Australia, 20 August 2004.

Jensen, TA, Apan, A, Young, F, Zeller, LC & Cleminson, K 2003, 'Assessing grain crop attributes using digital imagery acquired from a low-altitude remote controlled aircraft', paper presented to First Spatial Sciences Conference, Canberra, Australia, 22-27 September 2003.

Jensen, TA, Apan, A, Young, F & Zeller, LC 2002, 'Capturing of remotely sensed images to advance the use of yield maps and other spatial information to improve crop management and forecasting.' paper presented to 11th Australasian Remote Sensing and Photogrammetry Conference, Brisbane, Australia, 2-6 September 2002.

Popular Press

Alcorn, G 2004, 'The balloon goes up on crop monitoring', *Australian Grain*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 48-9.

Jensen, TA & Apan, A 2003, 'Small planes big plans', *Position Magazine*, vol. 7, pp. 75-67.

Acknowledgements

I thank my principal supervisor Associate Professor Armando Apan for his infinite wisdom, direction and motivation throughout this work. My associate supervisor, Associate Professor Frank Young, also provided valuable comments and suggestions.

Les Zeller has provided friendship, motivation, electronic skills, assistance in data collection and was also a great sounding board for ideas.

Ken Cleminson provided advice on things remotely controlled and access to his planes, as well as flying them, during the early development stages of this project.

Dr. Wayne Strong expounded his infinite agronomic wisdom to me when I needed assistance.

Ross and Jordie Milne kindly provided access to their plane, as well as in flying the craft in the later stages of the project.

To the ARCAA team from QUT for the use of their autonomous UAV during the final testing of my concept, my thanks.

My appreciation to the now defunct DPI&F Precision Agriculture team for the access to datasets and funds for this work that ran in parallel to their GRDC-funded projects.

Finally, to my wife Leath and children Xanthea, Lucinda and Harry who have been very patient and tolerant whilst I have been in the final stages of this thesis. I am sure they are looking forward to having a father and husband back with them again.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Certification of Dissertation	v
Publications Related to this Thesis	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
List of Figures	x
List of Tables	xvi
Abbreviations	xiii
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Research Problem and its Significance.....	3
1.3	Research Objectives.....	3
1.4	Context, Scope and Delimitation of the Study.....	4
1.5	Organisation of the Thesis.....	6
Chapter 2	Literature Review: Precision Agriculture and Remote Sensing	9
2.1	Precision Agriculture	9
	2.1.1 Definition and Components.....	11
	2.1.2 Purpose and Benefits.....	18
	2.1.3 Limitations and Opportunities of Precision Agriculture	18
2.2	Remote Sensing	19
	2.2.1 Basic Concepts	19
	2.2.2 Methods of Remote Sensing.....	23
	2.2.3 Problems and Limitations of Using Existing Remote Sensing Systems in Precision Agriculture.....	32
	2.2.4 Technologies for use in a Low-Cost Low-Altitude Remote Sensing System.....	33
2.3	Summary	37
Chapter 3	Preliminary Evaluation and Assessment of Sensor and Platform Systems	38
3.1	Potential Systems	38
	3.1.1 Platform	38
	3.1.2 Sensor System	43
3.2	Requirements for a LCLA System for Precision Agriculture.....	44
	3.2.1 Deployment Considerations	44
	3.2.2 Crop Considerations.....	45
	3.2.3 Legislative Requirements.....	45
	3.2.4 Costs	47
3.3	Preliminary Deployment and Assessment of a Sensor and Platform System.....	48
	3.3.1 Platform System	48
	3.3.2 Sensor System	51
3.4	Conclusions	74
Chapter 4	Developing a LCLA Remote Sensing System	76
4.1	The Case for the 2-Camera System.....	76
	4.1.1 Justification for Adoption	76
	4.1.2 Specifications for the Improved System.....	77
	4.1.3 Missions Undertaken with the LCLA Remote Sensing System ...	77

4.2	Development of the Data Acquisition System	77
4.2.1	Platform	79
4.2.2	1.0 Megapixel Digital Camera Sensor System.....	81
4.2.3	5.0 Megapixel Digital Camera Sensor System.....	94
4.2.4	Tasking and Deployment.....	103
4.2.5	Costings for the LCLA System	105
4.3	Conclusions	106
Chapter 5	Crop Mapping Methods using the LCLA System.....	108
5.1	Introduction	108
5.2	Grain Yield and Protein Mapping.....	110
5.2.1	Study Area.....	110
5.2.2	System Deployment	116
5.2.3	Image Processing and Analysis	123
5.2.4	Statistical Analysis.....	132
5.3	Crop Type Discrimination and Mapping	134
5.3.1	Study Area.....	134
5.3.2	System Deployment	135
5.3.3	Pixel-Based Image Processing and Analysis.....	143
5.3.4	Object Orientated Image Classification.....	153
5.4	Further Refinement.....	156
5.4.1	Crop Maturity Mapping	156
5.4.2	Autopilot Evaluation.....	164
5.5	Conclusions	170
Chapter 6	Performance of the LCLA system for Crop Mapping	171
6.1	Introduction	171
6.2	Grain Yield and Protein Mapping.....	171
6.2.1	The Yield-Protein Relationship.....	172
6.2.2	Analysis of Variance.....	172
6.2.3	Correlation Analysis	173
6.2.4	Discriminant Function Analysis	180
6.2.5	Partial Least Squares Regression.....	184
6.3	Crop Type Discrimination and Mapping	191
6.3.1	Discriminant Function Analysis	191
6.3.2	Pixel-Based Image Classification.....	201
6.3.3	Object-Oriented Image Classification.....	228
6.4	Further Refinements	236
6.4.1	Crop Maturity Mapping	236
6.4.2	Autopilot Evaluation.....	247
6.5	Synthesis of Findings.....	253
6.5.1	Sensor	253
6.5.2	Platform	254
6.6	Conclusions	254
Chapter 7	Conclusions and Recommendations	256
7.1	Introduction	256
7.2	Summary of Findings.....	256
7.3	Conclusions	259
7.4	Recommendations for Future Work.....	261
References	262
Appendices	277

List of Figures

Figures	Page
1.1	The schematic layout of this thesis. 8
2.1	The precision agriculture wheel (McBratney & Whelan 2001). 13
2.2	A simplified cross-section of the human eye (Mather 2004). 20
2.3	Trichromatic theory of colour vision (Jensen 2007). 20
2.4	The visible portion and other components of the electromagnetic spectrum (Jensen 2007). 21
2.5	Spectral reflectance curves for natural features in the range 400–2500 nm (Geoimage 2005). 22
2.6	Bayer filter pattern. 36
3.1	The 'Magic' UAV and the 36 MHz radio control gear used at UQG (Mission #4). 50
3.2	The components of the 2.4 GHz surveillance video system—transmitter (left), camera (middle) and receiver (right). 52
3.3	The analogue video stream is intercepted by the video receiver and recorded on the digital video recorder. The 12 V battery is powering the video receiver. 52
3.4	The 'Zephyr' UAV with wing removed (left), radio control gear (middle) and starter box containing fuel and battery charger (right) prior to deployment. 53
3.5	The 'Zephyr' UAV showing the hole for the mini video camera in the underside of the fuselage (between the two white strips). 54
3.6	A frame-grabbed image showing a car driving along a dual carriage-way (note the banding in the image) acquired during Mission #1. 55
3.7	The spectral response for the Kodak KAI-0340 (Kodak 2008) showing the response for the monochrome sensor in black and that of the blue/green/red sensors in the corresponding colours. 56
3.8	Transmittance of the Hoya R72 filter for the various wavelengths of light. 57
3.9	An NIR image collected with the video camera-frame grabber setup on Mission #1 (note the bright signature of the row of trees through the centre of the image). 57
3.10	A 35 mm instamatic camera, installed in a mounting frame and utilising a servo to depress the shutter button, that was used to take images from a UAV. 59
3.11	The Kodak DC3200 digital camera. 60
3.12	The single DC3200 camera attached to the underside of the 1.4 m wingspan 'Magic' UAV. 61
3.13	The DC3200 mounted underneath the UAV (note the rotary servo to depress the shutter release button). 63
3.14	An image capture on Mission #3 showing the layout of the land. 63
3.15	More detailed information captured during Mission #3. 64
3.16	A low-level image collected during Mission #3. 65
3.17	A photo of a tree in standard colour mode (left) and with a Hoya 'R72' filter placed in front of the camera (IR mode, right). 66

3.18	Features of the Gatton trial site (Mission #4), 21st March 2003.	66
3.19	The NIR image of the same corner of the field as in Figure 3.18 (Note the location of the car and points A & B both images).....	67
3.20	Image of tree with Hoya R72 filter (left) and in normal mode (right), (Mission #5).....	69
3.21	The camera settings when taking the images in Figure 3.20.	70
3.22	Spectral response with and without IR cut-out (Vaytek 2003)	71
3.23	The DC 3200 pulled apart showing the 'blue' IR cut-out filter.....	72
3.24	Testing the output of the 29 MHz 2 channel radio control transmitter.	73
3.25	The change in the output signal from the receiver when the throttle / rudder stick was moved. The output was noisy, making it difficult to measure.	74
4.1	The 2-camera sensor system.	82
4.2	The image pair, with the NIR (top) and CIR image (bottom), taken out of the car window at 60 kph.	84
4.3	The sensor installed under the 'Hannibal' UAV at the TARMAC test, 12 June 2003.....	85
4.4	Simultaneous images captured from a UAV, utilising a Hoya R72 filter (top) and the CIR (bottom).	86
4.5	The sensor installed underneath the helium balloon, 14 June 2003.	88
4.6	The colour (top) and NIR (bottom) image collected from the helium balloon at Argyle, 14 June 2003.	89
4.7	The 2-camera sensor installed under the 'Hannibal' UAV during the 'Argyle' mission, 1 August 2003.....	90
4.8	The 'Hannibal' UAV ready for take-off, 1 August 2003.	91
4.9	The 2-camera sensor with camera-status detection.....	93
4.10	The Kodak CX7525 digital zoom camera.	94
4.11	The CX7525 that has been modified to increase sensitivity to near-infrared light and to enable electronic triggering.	96
4.12	The 2-camera sensor utilising the CX7525 cameras (top view).	98
4.13	The underside view of the 2-camera sensor and the radio control transmitter.	99
4.14	The CX7525 2-camera sensor installed in the 'Milne' UAV.....	100
4.15	The 'Milne' UAV being prepared for takeoff, 20 September 2005.	100
4.16	The near-infrared image collected on the 'Daybreak' mission, 20 September 2005.....	101
4.17	The matching colour image for Figure 4.16.	102
5.1	The sequences for digital image analysis adopted in this research.	109
5.2	Location of the Colonsay trial in the Central Darling Downs region of Queensland.	110
5.3	Schematic layout of 'Colonsay' site for 2003.	112
5.4	Example of a plot with low nutrition levels (left) and high nutrition levels (right).....	113
5.5	The range of nutrition levels in adjacent plots as captured by the LCLA remote sensing system.	113

5.6	The range of nutrition levels evident in two-thirds of the trial site as captured by the LCLA remote sensing system.	114
5.7	The range of plant available water contents for the various soil depths across the range of nitrogen treatment plots, immediately prior to planting in 2003.....	115
5.8	The range of available nitrogen for the various soil depths across the range of nitrogen treatment plots, immediately prior to planting in 2003.	116
5.9	Tieing-off the inflated latex balloon with soft cotton string.	117
5.10	A schematic representation of the sensor as deployed on 2 September 2003.	118
5.11	Preparing for sensor deployment at 'Colonsay'.	119
5.12	The sensor is airborne.	119
5.13	Colour image of the NW corner of the trial site.	120
5.14	The NIR image that matches with the colour image shown in Figure 5.13. ...	120
5.15	A schematic representation of the sensor as deployed on 14 October 2003.	122
5.16	The balloon attached to the stabilising frame with the sensor suspended underneath prior to deployment at a football stadium.....	123
5.17	The colour image that was further processed.....	124
5.18	The ground control points used to geo-reference the image.....	125
5.19	Ground control points chosen to register the colour to the NIR image.....	127
5.20	Selecting the areas of interest for the whole treatment and the '5x5 kernel' study.....	128
5.21	Box-plots of the digital numbers for the various bands, selected using the '5 x 5' kernel (left) and whole plot (right) AOIs (subplots 45 and 46).....	129
5.22	Selecting the area of interests (AOIs) for each of the plots (note the two pixel margin around each plot).....	130
5.23	Box-plot of the digital numbers for all six bands for plot 41 (0 kg/ha N applied – left) and plot 51 (40 kg/ha N applied – right).	131
5.24	Box-plot of the digital numbers for all six bands for plot 57 (80 kg/ha N applied – left) and plot 43 (120 kg/ha N applied – right).	131
5.25	Location of the 'Dunkerry South' trial, near Nindigully, in south-western Queensland.	134
5.26	Schematic representation of the 'Dunkerry South' farming systems trial showing the treatments and plot layout.	136
5.27	The sensor being retrieved at Nindigully (note the breeze blowing the balloon).....	137
5.28	A schematic representation of the sensor as deployed, 13 September 2004.	138
5.29	The sensor ready to be deployed at Nindigully, with two tether-lines for increased stability.....	139
5.30	An image captured on the first mission covering adjacent plots showing a range of species present, as captured by the LCLA remote sensing system.....	140
5.31	The NIR image showing the majority of plots 41-48, as captured by the LCLA remote sensing system.....	140

5.32	The species present in plot 38, as captured by the LCLA RS system.....	142
5.33	The NIR image that matches with the colour image shown in Figure 5.32. ...	142
5.34	Selecting AOIs for each of the subplots within plot 38.....	145
5.35	Box-plots for wheat 40 N (left) and chickpeas (right) for the 6 bands.....	145
5.36	Average digital number values for the sub-plots within plot 38 for the various bands.....	146
5.37	Box-plots of the pixel values for the polyline positioned down the centre of the row for each of the six bands for wheat 40 N (left) and chickpeas (right).....	148
5.38	Plot 41 and surrounding plots showing different species present.....	149
5.39	The layer stacking procedure of the 2 images in the analysis software.	150
5.40	A close-up of the polyline area-of-interest for the wheat 50 N plot.....	152
5.41	Signature editor showing the 12 classes.	152
5.42	Segmentation parameters used in the object-oriented approach (showing the 30 scale as an example)	154
5.43	Classes adopted in the classification	155
5.44	The location of the trial site at 'Lundavra' in southern Queensland.....	157
5.45	Conventional aerial image taken of the wheat (top) and barley (bottom) variety trial site at 'Lundavra', October 2005. The area indicated in red box is the area analysed.	158
5.46	Schematic layout of the barley variety trial at 'Lundavra' showing the area analysed in the red box.	159
5.47	Looking into the field towards the wheat trial area (note the advanced stage of the crop).	160
5.48	Preparing the 'Milne' UAV for deployment at 'Lundavra'.	161
5.49	Some of the variability evident in the wheat trial area.	161
5.50	Selecting the AOIs from the individual plots in the investigated area covered by the red box in Figure 5.45.	163
5.51	Location of the Watts Bridge Memorial Airfield.....	165
5.52	The QUT UAV read for take-off.	166
5.53	The avionics installed in the QUT UAV.....	167
5.54	The pod opened to remove the SD cards from the LCLA sensors.....	167
5.55	The ground control station software showing the path and the flight details of the UAV being monitored in the autopilot flight software (note the waypoints in pink).....	169
6.1	The relationship between yield and protein for the 'Colonsay' dataset.	172
6.2	Scatterplot of the 6 bands and yield / protein.....	173
6.3	Scatterplot of the derived indices and yield / protein.	174
6.4	The relationship between yield and digital number for the NIRR band (left) and DVI (right) for the various N application rates.	176
6.5	The relationship between protein and digital number for the NIRR band (left) and from DVI (right) for the various N application rates.	178
6.6	The canonical plot for the various N application rates.	182
6.7	Plot of predicted grain yield values vs. measured grain yield values from	185

	the PLS regression model involving raw imagery values.	
6.8	Plot of predicted grain yield values vs. measured grain yield values from the PLS regression model involving vegetation index values.	185
6.9	Plot of predicted grain protein values vs. measured grain protein values from the PLS regression model involving raw imagery values.	186
6.10	Plot of predicted grain protein values vs. measured grain protein values from the PLS regression model involving vegetation index values.	186
6.11	Regression coefficients for the cross-calibrated prediction model involving grain yield and raw imagery values.	188
6.12	Regression coefficients for the cross-calibrated prediction model involving grain yield and vegetation index values.	189
6.13	Regression coefficients for the cross-calibrated prediction model involving grain protein and raw imagery values.	190
6.14	Regression coefficients for the cross-calibrated prediction model involving grain protein and vegetation index values.	190
6.15	The canonical plot for the various species and fertiliser rates.	194
6.16	The canonical plot for the various species and fertiliser rates.	198
6.17	The band histogram information for the training sets for the chickpea signature.	202
6.18	The band histogram information for the training sets for the wheat 50N signature.	202
6.19	The key to the colours used in the histograms and the classification.	203
6.20	The histograms for the merged signatures of the non-cropped areas.	203
6.21	The histograms for the merged signatures of the cropped areas.	204
6.22	The feature space plot for the 12 classes.	205
6.23	The alarm mask function of ERDAS Imagine.	209
6.24	The classified image using the 12 classes.	211
6.25	Performing an accuracy assessment on the image.	212
6.26	The colours chosen and the pixel count for the 9 classes.	217
6.27	Histograms for the 9 classes.	219
6.28	Feature space plot for the 9 classes.	219
6.29	The classification using 9 classes.	220
6.30	The 6 class signatures.	222
6.31	The histograms for the 6 classes.	223
6.32	The area when classified using 6 classes.	223
6.33	The histograms for the 4 classes.	226
6.34	The area when classified using 4 classes.	226
6.35	Objects created after image segmentation at various scales: (a) 30 scale, (b) 50 scale, (c) 80 scale, and (d) 100 scale.	228
6.36	Classified image from the 30-scale image segmentation.	231
6.37	Classified image from the 50-scale image segmentation.	232
6.38	Classified image from the 80-scale image segmentation.	233
6.39	Classified image from the 100-scale image segmentation.	234

6.40	The frequency and distribution for the 14 different growth stages.....	237
6.41	The frequency and distribution for the 6 grouped secondary growth stages.....	242
6.42	The frequency and distribution for the 3 principal growth stage classes.	245
6.43	The flight paths and target positioning, Watts Bridge 5 March 2008.	248
6.44	Image 100_4814 taken at 3:27:44 pm.	249
6.45	Image 100_4815 taken just over 3min after image 100_4814 (shown in Figure 6.44).....	249
6.46	Altitude details for flight 4 (note the UAV reduced altitude to acquire images).....	251

List of Tables

Table		Page
2.1	Imaging properties of some remote sensing satellites.....	24
2.2	Potential vegetation indices that can be calculated with multispectral remotely sensed data.....	31
3.1	Comparison of various UAV platform types to perform LCLA remote sensing applications in agriculture (☀☀☀☀ indicates high compliance, ☀ indicates no or low compliance).....	40
3.2	Some applications of UAVs in remote sensing.....	41
3.3	The missions undertaken as part of the preliminary investigation.....	48
3.4	Black and white video camera specifications.....	51
3.5	Specifications and computer requirements for Studio DV Version 7.....	55
3.6	The specifications of the Kodak DC3200 digital still camera.....	61
3.7	The specifications of the Canon PowerShot G2.....	68
4.1	Missions with the LCLA remote sensing system.....	78
4.2	The specifications for the Kodak CX7525 digital camera.....	95
4.3	Comparison between the DC3200 and CX7525 digital cameras.....	96
4.4	Deployment checklist for completion before each mission.....	104
5.1	The band information for the stacked image.....	150
5.2	Explanation of the growth stages describing the barley crop based on Zadok et al. (1974).....	164
6.1	The analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine statistical differences between the classes.....	173
6.2	Correlations between yield / protein and the 6 bands and 5 indices.....	175
6.3	Tests of equality of group means.....	180
6.4	Pooled within-group matrices.....	181
6.5	Summary of canonical discriminant functions (Eigenvalues (top) and Wilks' lambda (bottom)).....	181
6.6	The structure matrix.....	182
6.7	Prediction accuracy of fertiliser treatment classification using discriminant analysis.....	183
6.8	PLS regression results of imagery values and yield and protein.....	187
6.9	Tests of equality of group means.....	192
6.10	Pooled within-group matrices.....	192
6.11	Summary of canonical discriminant functions (Eigenvalues (top) and Wilks' lambda (bottom)).....	193
6.12	The structure matrix.....	193
6.13	Classification results for the n=50 case study.....	195
6.14	Tests of equality of group means.....	196
6.15	Pooled within-group matrices.....	196

6.16	Summary of canonical discriminant functions (eigenvalues top and Wilks' lambda bottom).....	197
6.17	The structure matrix.	198
6.18	Classification results for the n=80 case study.	200
6.19	Contingency matrix for the 12 classes.	207
6.20	Transformed divergence for the 12 classes.	209
6.21	The error matrix for the 12 class accuracy assessment.	213
6.22	The accuracy totals for the 12 class classification.	215
6.23	Kappa statistics for the 12 class classification	216
6.24	The contingency matrix for the 9 classes.....	218
6.25	The accuracy totals including kappa statistics for the 9 class classification.	221
6.26	The contingency matrix for the 6 classes.....	222
6.27	The accuracy totals including kappa statistics for the 6 class classification.	224
6.28	The contingency matrix for the 4 classes.....	225
6.29	The accuracy totals including kappa statistics for the 4 class classification.	227
6.30	Results of image segmentation and feature optimisation	229
6.31.	Accuracy of images classified from the object-oriented approach.....	235
6.32	Tests of equality of group means	237
6.33	Pooled within-group matrices.....	238
6.34	Summary of canonical discriminant functions (Eigenvalues top and Wilks' lambda bottom).....	238
6.35	The structure matrix	239
6.36	The classification result for the 14 Zadoks class study.....	240
6.37	The Zadoks range for the grouped secondary growth stages	242
6.38	The classification accuracy for the grouped secondary growth stages.	244
6.39	The Zadoks range of the 3 principal growth stage classes.....	245
6.40	The classification results for the 3 principal growth stages.....	246
6.41	The classification results for the primary growth stages.	246
6.42	Details of the errors for the images acquired over the target.....	250

Abbreviations

AGL	Above ground level
AMSA	Australian Maritime Safety Authority
ANOVA.....	Analysis of variance
AOI	Area-of-interest
ARCAA.....	Australian Research Centre for Aerospace Automation
ASTER	Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflectance Radiometer
B	Blue
BSD	Best separation distance
CASA.....	Civil Aviation Safety Authority
CCD.....	Charged couple device
CF.....	CompactFlash
CIR	Colour infrared
CMOS.....	Complementary metal-oxide semiconductor
DA	Discriminant function analysis
DAS	Days after sowing
DC	Direct current
DGPS	Differential GPS
DN	Digital number
DPI&F.....	Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries (Queensland)
DVI	Difference Vegetation Index
G.....	Green
GCP.....	Ground control point
GIS	Geographic information system
GLCM.....	Grey level co-occurrence matrix
GNDVI.....	Green Normalised Difference Vegetation Index
GPS.....	Global positioning system
GRDC.....	Grains Research and Development Corporation
JPEG	Joint Photographic Experts Group
LCLA	Low-cost low-altitude
LED	Light emitting diode
ML	Maximum likelihood
NASA.....	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NDVI.....	Normalised Difference Vegetation Index
NiMH	Nickel-metal hydride
NIR	Near infrared
NIRB.....	Near infrared detected with the blue sensor
NIRG	Near infrared detected with the green sensor

NIRR.....	Near infrared detected with the red sensor
NOTAM	Notice to airmen
PA.....	Precision agriculture
PCI	Peripheral component interconnect
PCMCIA	Personal Computer Memory Card International Association
PLS.....	Partial least squares
PPR	Plant pigment ratio
PSRI.....	Plant Senescence Vegetation Index
QUT.....	Queensland University of Technology
R.....	Red
RCA.....	Remotely controlled aircraft
RGB.....	Red-green-blue
RMS	Root mean squared
RMSEP.....	Root mean squared error of prediction
RTK	Real-time kinematic
RVI	Red Ratio Vegetation Index
SIPI.....	Structure insensitive pigment index
SLR	Single lens reflex
SSCM.....	Site-specific crop management
TARMAC	Toowoomba Amateur Radio Model Club
TM	Thematic mapper
UAV	Unmanned aerial vehicle
UQG	University of Queensland Gatton
US	United States
USQ.....	University of Southern Queensland
UV	Ultra violet
VRT	Variable rate-application technology
VMC	Visual meteorological conditions