

Measuring Herbage Mass by Non-Destructive Methods: A Review

J. E. López-Díaz, A. I. Roca-Fernández and A. González-Rodríguez

Agrarian Research Centre of Mabegondo, P.O. Box 10, 15080, La Coruña, Spain

Received: September 30, 2010 / Published: July 20, 2011.

Abstract: Accurate assessment of herbage mass (HM) in pasture is a key to budgeting forage in grazing systems worldwide. Different non-destructive techniques to measuring pasture yield are commented. The methods compared include visual estimations, manual and electronic pasture meters and remote sensing. All methods are associated with a moderate to high error, showing that some indirect methods of yield estimation are appropriate under certain conditions. In general terms, no method was found as the most appropriate because many factors as climate variations, soil characteristics, plant phenology, pasture management and species composition must be taken into account to make local calibrations from a general model. Best results were found modifying general methods under local calibrations and under local conditions. In order to give farmers the best method to manage adequately their own grazing systems, researchers must select the most suitable technique considering the scale of operation, the desired accuracy and the resources available.

Key words: Forage mass, estimation methods, pasture yield, non-destructive measuring.

1. Introduction

Vegetation is measured for a wide range of purposes, such as: description in terms of botanical composition, ground cover, amount of dry matter (DM), quality of DM, biological alters in relation to climate changes, and for determining its capacity to provide feed for livestock [1-4]. During the past 70 years, many indirect non-destructive methods for quickly estimation of herbage mass (HM) have been proposed and evaluated [5, 6]. Traditionally, estimates from manually or mechanically clipped quadrants have been used to estimate HM. Many authors agree that clipping provide accurate measures of biomass, however, it is expensive, time intensive and may require numerous samples to obtain reliable pasture estimates [7]. Furthermore, the time and labour required constrain the number of samples that can be collected realistically. Alternative to clipping,

sampling procedure methods that use double sampling techniques are commonly used by researchers to increase the precision of estimations and minimise the amount of work [8]. These methods function by developing a regression relationship of standing crop to predictive values, such as plant height, leaf area, vegetation density, canopy, age, cover, visual obstruction [9] or remote sensing data [10]. However, such estimations usually are associated with a moderate to high experimental error, because relationships between production and pasture variables depend on numerous factors that can interact mutually. The accuracy of estimations can be affected by many factors, such as the density and growth state of plants [11, 12], the season [13-16], species composition of the meadow [17] and grassland management [14]. Traditional methods as visual estimation [18] are considered satisfactory for general grassland inventories, but, as reported by Tucker [19], it suffers from variations among observers and is not a quantitative method. A variety of methods that use

Corresponding author: J. E. López-Díaz, Ph.D., research fields: grassland science, agronomy, dairy systems, grass growth. E-mail: juliolopez@ciam.es.

more sophisticated instruments have been developed during the past 50 years, some of them have been adapted for its commercial use. This paper considers the application of different techniques that may be useful in measuring forage production or standing crop using non-destructive methods.

2. *In Situ* Measurement Instruments

2.1 *Manual Instruments*

The simplest instruments are the *pasture ruler* and the *plate disc*. Pasture ruler relies on a positive relationship between forage yield and uncompressed canopy height. A widely used implement in Europe is the *sward stick* [20], which measures plant height rather than compressed sward height. It employs a 2×1 cm clear window that is lowered vertically on a shaft until its base touches the vegetation. The height contact above the ground is recorded in 0.5 cm bands. However, canopy height can be difficult to measure due to the subjectivity associated with which plant or plan parts should be considered to form a mean height measure [21], so researchers have been added several types of discs or plates to the rule to incorporate an area dimension to the measurement. Plate discs consist in grass meters with a light, horizontal plate (called “weighted disc”, “rising plate”, “drop-disc” or “pasture disc” in bibliography) of about 0.3×0.3 m that can slide up or down a central, vertical and graduated stem [22]. Several authors suggested modifications from this design as the substitution of the metal plate by other materials such an acrylic and transparent plastic with some markers or holes [23]. These holes allow the use of the plate as a squared paper for estimating ground cover of for measuring the occurrence of forage species under the sampling area.

A method called *visual obstruction* was proposed in 1970 by Robel et al. [24, 25]. A striped pole often called the Robel pole measures the lowest point of the pole not visually obstructed by vegetation when placed vertically in a sward. Numerous transects are walked and the observer stops at intervals, sets the pole

vertically in the vegetation, steps back 4 m from the pole, and reads the last visible number toward the lower end of the pole at three heights (0.5, 0.8 and 1.0 m). Such observations are made at the four cardinal directions around the pole. Michalk and Herbert [26] compared this method with hand-clipping and ground cover measures, and obtained a good correlation between height and HM, with an r^2 of 0.81. Harmony et al. [27] found this technique the most suitable in comparison with rising plate meter, LAI analyser and canopy height stick, with an $r^2 = 0.63$. Similar conclusion were found by Ganguli et al. [28] in the same comparison, with an $r^2 = 0.87$. Ackerman et al. [29] obtained a lower value ($r^2 = 0.59$) in a two-year trial, and concluded that this technique has potential for practical use. Ackerman et al. [29] found an r^2 value of 0.88, and Vermeire and Gillen [9] found an $r^2 = 0.90$. As can be seen, all papers reviewed consider visual obstruction technique as a good method for non-destructively estimating. However, there are some considerations about the use of this technique: as shown by Heady [21], some factors difficult exact measures of pasture height: the highest point may be difficult to identify when plants are lodging or dropping, when the point is the tip of an structure, and when several parts are nearly the same height. The second consideration is that not many references exist in the literature, and as reported by Benkobi et al. [30] and Ganguli et al. [28] investigations on the performance of this method in different vegetation types are limited.

2.2 *Electronic Instruments*

More complex electronic instruments as the *electronic capacitance meter*, first reported by Fletcher and Robinson [31] and sonic sward stick [32] have been developed to improve speed and precision of sampling. The sonic sward stick calculates sward height from the flight time of an ultrasonic pulse bounced off the sward surface. Electronic capacitance meter uses a single rod probe and an electronic system that accumulates the readings from a number of sampling sites within a pasture plot [33, 34]. The

reading-system relies on differences in dielectric constants between air and herbage and it measures the capacitance of the air-herbage mixture, responding mainly to the surface area of the foliage [8]. A variety of capacitance meters have been built under this principle and incorporating various modifications [35-45]. However, and as reported by Murphy et al. [45], readings are affected by water in vegetation, including litter, and is not an accurate method during or immediately following rainfall. Commercial instruments often come with standard equations, and the precision of this instrument depends on the adjustment on these calibration equations. Many studies have shown that the use of indirect methods to obtain a measure of HM, using this standardised equations are not representative in different conditions and situations, because of variations in pastures, management and climate [22]. Dowdeswell [46] reported a poor relationship between yields estimated with a rising plate meter using New Zealand equations and measured yield. Sanderson et al. [8] obtained low correlation coefficients with pasture ruler, rising plate meter and capacitance meter on cool season grass-legume pastures in three dairy farms of north east USA (Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia); the three trials used commercial calibrations made in New Zealand. These authors suggested that an error level upper from 10% could be statistically acceptable, but economically inaccurate. Given the inherent spatial and temporal variability of pastures, it may be difficult for a producer to achieve an error lower than proposed 10%, however, some authors found that local calibrations can reduce error to about 10% [23].

Many experiments which pre- and post-grazing estimations were compared showed that post-grazing measures were poorly correlated with estimations, especially when the residue is very short, due to soil surface roughness combined with the weight of rising-plate, which was too heavy to be supported by the short stubble [45]. An added problem to post-grazing estimations is the effect of trampled HM,

which can affect the calibrations of instruments. Stockdale and Kelly [47] suggested that the aspect of trampling is the major factor that may preclude the rising plate meter from general use in dairy cattle research. If the herbage is evenly trampled, there would not be a problem with either meter; however, dairy cows trample a sward unevenly. Stockdale and Kelly [47] concluded that cutting quadrants was the best way to estimate post-grazing HM when it is unevenly trampled. A possible solution to this problem is to estimate the proportion of the sward that is trampled and apply different regressions to each proportion. In the other hand, as plant density increases in local areas, the number of stems in a given area increases, this higher density may result in a sward which would provide more local resistance to an object which is allowed to settle onto it.

Experimental error due to the sampling method also constitutes an important source of variation. In this way, the sensibility of an instrument varies with the spatial work scale, the sampling area and the *modus operandi* [48]. Aiken and Bransby [49] observed significant differences in measurements of the same grass bulk measured by four different observers, as in the selection of the representative sampling area too, showing that the observer constitutes itself another source of variation. Variability between observers were also reported by Earle and McGowan [50], who suggested that significant differences between observers recommend that meter readings on calibration and in pasture measurements should be taken by the same operator.

2.3 Accuracy of Calibration Equations

According with Rayburn [51] the logical model for rotationally grazed pastures, grazed to a short residual height, is a linear equation that passes through the origin. Under continuously grazed pastures where a thatch build-up occurs, a regression model using a Y intercept is most appropriate. In Table 1 is given a comparison between regression models obtained from

Table 1 Best regression models found in bibliography for herbage mass estimation in most used measurement techniques. Meters are grouped in six categories by type of technique used.

Meter	Model	R ²	Period	Source	Units
Canopy analyzer	$Y = 147 + 847.26 X$	0.32	Annual	Harmoney et al., 1997	kg/ha - units
	$Y = 369.3 + 2517.4 X$	0.67	Summer	Ganguli et al., 2000	kg/ha - units
Capacitance meter	$Y = 1289 + 28 X$	0.89	Annual	Gonzalez et al., 1990	kg/ha - units
	$Y = 330 + 0.617 X$	0.25	Annual	O'Sullivan, 2002	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 901 + 0.34 X$	0.14	Annual	Sanderson et al., 2001	kg/ha - units
	$\ln(Y) = 0.718 + 0.763 X$	0.72	Annual	Terry et al., 1981	g/0.186 m ² - units
	$\ln(Y) = 14.62 + 0.54 X$	0.59	Annual	Terry et al., 1981	g/0.186 m ² - units
	$Y = 5410.8 - 5512.4 e^{-0.06X}$	0.86	Annual	Vickery et al., 1980	kg/ha - units
	$Y = 9.9 X + 600$	0.86	Spring	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1209 + 14 X$	0.84	Spring	Michell and Large, 1983	kg/ha - units
	$Y = -313.6 + 0.9 X$ (pregrazing)	0.42	Spring	Murphy et al., 1995	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -369.1 + 0.89 X$ (postgrazing)	0.13	Spring	Murphy et al., 1995	kg/ha - cm
	$\ln(Y) = 0.16 + 0.918 \ln(X)$	0.82	Spring	Terry et al., 1981	g/0.186 m ² - units
	$Y = 1,200 + 9.5 X$	0.86	Spring-summer	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1,240 + 13.8 X$	0.86	Summer	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1,314 + 20.3 X$	0.83	Summer	Michell and Large, 1983	kg/ha - units
	$\ln(Y) = 0.126 + 0.837 \ln(X)$	0.67	Summer	Terry et al., 1981	g/0.186 m ² - units
Pasture ruler	$Y = 1020 + 12.7 X$	0.86	Summer-autumn	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 990 + 10.4 X$	0.86	Autumn	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$\ln(Y) = 0.363 + 0.911 \ln(X)$	0.82	Winter	Terry et al., 1981	g/0.186 m ² - units
	$Y = 37 + 21.7 X$	0.86	Annual	Gonzalez et al., 1990	kg/ha - mm
	$Y = 876 + 0.29 X$	0.11	Annual	Sanderson et al., 2001	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -31.85 + 0.073 X$	0.72	Spring	Carton et al., 1989	kg/ha - mm
	$Y = 590 + 120 X$	0.81	Spring	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1,340 + 70 X$	0.81	Spring-summer	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1,340 + 172 X$	0.81	Summer	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 810 + 195 X$	0.81	Summer-autumn	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
Plate meter	$Y = 400 + 300 X$	0.81	Autumn	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 762 + 155 X$	0.97	Annual	Earle and McGowan, 1979	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 282 + 29.3 X$	0.91	Annual	Gonzalez et al., 1990	kg/ha - mm
	$Y = 68.11 + 202.9 X$	0.59	Annual	Harmoney et al., 1997	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 36 + 149 X$	0.78	Annual	Hoden et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -507 + 31 X$	0.51	Annual	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -1,061 + 35 X$	0.48	Annual	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 278 + 0.48 X$	0.31	Annual	Sanderson et al., 2001	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -36.34 + 140.63 X$	0.76	Annual	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 10.26 + 128.18 + 0.6 X^2$	0.76	Annual	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 362 + 225 X$	0.71	Annual	O'Sullivan, 2002	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 3 + 452 X$	0.52	Annual	Rayburn and Rayburn, 1998	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 88.01 + 13.8 X$	0.76	Spring	Bransby et al., 1977	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 640 + 125 X$	0.84	Spring	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 371 + 18 X$	0.52	Spring	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 4.3 + 6.24 X$	0.67	Spring	Michalk and Herbert, 1977	g/m ² - cm
	$Y = 1,011 + 271 X$	0.96	Spring	Michell and Large, 1983	kg/ha - cm
$Y = 8.75 + 140.46 X$	0.74	Spring	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm	

(to be continued)

Meter	Model	R ²	Period	Source	Units
Plate meter	$Y = 16.62 + 134.32 X + 0.27 X^2$	0.74	Spring	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 392.9 + 317.8 X$ (pregrazing)	0.52	Spring	Murphy et al., 1995	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1,237.6 + 53.4 X$ (postgrazing)	0.00	Spring	Murphy et al., 1995	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -4.1 + 1.01 X$	0.94	Spring-summer	Griggs and Stringer, 1988	g/m ² - mm
	$Y = 990 + 130 X$	0.84	Spring-summer	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 14 + 22 X$	0.72	Spring	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -188 + 154 X$	0.77	Summer	Bransby et al., 1977	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -515.44 + 328.39 X$	0.83	Summer	Ganguli et al., 2000	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1,480 + 165 X$	0.84	Summer	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 3,102 + 61 X$	0.79	Summer	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -175 + 47 X$	0.53	Summer	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 925 + 385 X$	0.90	Summer	Michell and Large, 1983	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 1,180 + 159 X$	0.84	Summer-autumn	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -942 + 33 X$	0.62	Summer-autumn	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -844 + 32 X$	0.39	Summer-autumn	Mayne et al., 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$\ln(Y) = 5.65 + 0.52 X - 0.02 X^2$	0.81	Summer-autumn	O'Sullivan et al., 1987	kg/ha - mm
	$Y = 50.4 + 385.8 X$	0.76	Summer-autumn	O'Sullivan et al., 1987	kg/ha - mm
	$Y = -1,393 + 239 X$	0.62	Autumn	Bransby et al., 1977	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 970 + 157 X$	0.84	Autumn	L'Huillier, 1988	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -143 + 209 X$	0.88	Winter	Bransby et al., 1977	kg/ha - cm
Sward stick	$Y = -6.4 + 15.1 X$	0.91	Annual	Duru and Bossuet, 1992	g/m ² - cm
	$Y = 62.6 + 11.9 X$	0.78	Annual	Duru and Bossuet, 1992	g/m ² - cm
	$Y = 485.01 + 56.57 X$	0.55	Annual	Harmony et al., 1997	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -22.08 + 799.93 X$	0.78	Annual	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 100.21 + 44.17 X + 1.7 X^2$	0.80	Annual	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = -117 + 167.7 X$	0.60	Annual	O'Sullivan, 2002	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 48.27 + 82.58 X$	0.81	Spring	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 98.08 + 44.28 X + 1.69 X^2$	0.83	Spring	Mosquera et al., 1991	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 398.1 + 71.6 X$ (pregrazing)	0.49	Spring	Murphy et al., 1995	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 931.8 + 79.9 X$ (postgrazing)	0.10	Spring	Murphy et al., 1995	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 7.5 + 0.78 X$	0.80	Spring-summer	Griggs and Stringer, 1988	g/m ² - mm
Visual obstruction	$Y = 1,093.3 + 91.1 X$	0.63	Annual	Harmony et al., 1997	kg/ha - cm
	$Y = 19 + 113 X$	0.94	Annual	Robel et al., 1970	g/m ² - dm
	$Y = 14.05 + 4.02 X$	0.66	Spring	Michalk and Herbert, 1977	g/m ² - cm
	$Y = -819.47 + 256.62 X$	0.87	Summer	Ganguli et al., 2000	kg/ha - cm

several author in various types of pasture meters and in several pasture conditions, because some authors reported different responses depending on different growth states through the season [52, 53]. Usually the more used regression model is linear, however, some works with plate meters showed an exponential response in highest values of disk meter values [16, 54, 55]. Such mathematical trend has been observed too in capacitance meters [33, 44, 47, 56]. Data given in Table 1 shows that best mean coefficient of determination (r^2) were found in manual instruments,

from higher value of visual obstruction technique ($r^2 = 0.78$), followed by plate meters ($r^2 = 0.74$), pasture rulers ($r^2 = 0.72$) and sward sticks ($r^2 = 0.69$). Worst correlations were found in electronic meters, from capacitance meters ($r^2 = 0.68$), to canopy analyzer ($r^2 = 0.78$), but this last meter only have two data.

Double-sampling techniques are applied to calibrate non-destructive devices by a regression model. The precision of a given estimation technique may be evaluated either by reference to the residual standard deviation (RSD) of a calibration equation, either by

comparing the variance of a sample estimate obtained non-destructively with that from clipping [57]. The variance of a sample estimated obtained by double-sampling was given by Cochran [10]:

$$S^2(\hat{Y}) = \frac{S_{yx}^2}{n} + \frac{S_y^2 - S_{yx}^2}{n'} - \frac{S_y^2}{N} \quad (1)$$

where S_{yx}^2 is the residual mean square from calibration, S_y^2 is the variance of herbage mass observations in the calibration set, n is the number of direct (clipped) observations in the calibration set, n' is the number of total indirect (by a device meter) in calibration plus prediction sets, and N is the population of possible indirect observations in the sampled area (e.g. five 0.2 m² sampling units within a 1 m² area, as provided by Griggs and Stringer [57]. Bransby et al. [16] proposed the RSD of the regression of DM yield Y on meter readings X as Eq. (2):

$$RSD = \frac{\sqrt{\sum(Y - \bar{Y})^2 - \frac{[\sum(X - \bar{X})(Y - \bar{Y})]^2}{\sum(X - \bar{X})^2}}}{n - 2} \quad (2)$$

where n is the number of paired observations made to establish the overall regression equation. Another similar formula was given by McIntyre [58] and simplified by Mitchell [59].

As an alternative to models that use a single variable, in recent years another methods appeared for estimating biomass that use simultaneously many parameters as physical, chemical and climate variables, quality and pasture management, etc. Recent advances in computers and statistical techniques can provide simulation models of pasture yield that can be used to predict grass growth [60-63]. These tools also allow estimating growth under simulated conditions and can be considered as decision support systems [64].

3. Remote Estimation Systems

Modern information technologies such as *remote sensing* and *geographical information systems* are being used increasingly as tools to assist in grassland resource inventory, modelling and forecasting to

support decision-making. The principle of remote estimation is based on the spectral radiance reflected by plant canopy. Radiation reflectance is affected by leaf area index (LAI), which is related to vegetation cover, which may be used as a measure of total forage biomass. LAI can be estimated by measuring light transmission within stands by a photometer. Numerous commercially available instruments, such as Decagon ceptometer or LI-COR LAI-2000 plant canopy analyser [65] are used to indirectly estimate LAI. Spectral estimations use two wavelengths regions: the red (0.60-0.70 μm) and the near infrared (0.75-1.00 μm). The first region corresponds to the *in vivo* red region of chlorophyll absorption and is inversely related to the chlorophyll density. The second region is related to the fragment of spectrum where reflectance is proportional to the green leaf density. Vegetation indices derived from remote sensing data have emerged as an important tool to quantify vegetation biomass, as intermediaries in the assessment of LAI, percent green cover, green biomass, and fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (fAPAR).

Many factors can affect reflectance in any given waveband, such as: senescence of the plant [66], soil background [67], species composition [68], fertiliser status [69], nitrogen contents [70] and presence of trees in large samples [71]. Another factors non-dependent of plants can influence the received signals. Tueller [72] has reported that in rangelands, especially arid and semi-arid rangelands, soil background conditions and shadows often influence the signal received by a multispectral scanner, so frequently a pre-processing procedure of remote sensing data often has to be made to improve quality of correlation coefficients [71]. Because the large amount of factors affecting spectral reflectance, the use of vegetation indices, less dependent of external factors, reduce measurement variability due to soil type, sunlight intensity, angle of sunlight incidence [73] and eliminate noise produced by these and other cited factors.

Most used vegetation indices are normalised differenced vegetation indices (NDVI) and simple ratio index (SR). First index used was SR [74], formed by dividing the NIR response by the corresponding 'red' band output, ($SR = X_{nir}/X_{red}$) where X can be digital counts, at-satellite radiances, top of the atmosphere apparent reflectances, land leaving surface radiances, surface reflectances, or hemispherical spectral albedos. However, for densely vegetated areas, the amount of red light reflected approaches very small values and this ratio, consequently, increases without bounds. Deering [75] normalised this ratio from -1 to +1, by rationing the difference between the NIR and red bands by their sum ($NDVI = [X_{nir} - X_{red}] / [X_{nir} + X_{red}]$). For terrestrial targets the lower boundary became approximately zero and the upper boundary approximately 0.80. Other commonly used indices are perpendicular vegetation index (PVI) [76] and soil adjusted vegetation index (SAVI) [77, 78]. A review of vegetation indices was reported by Jackson and Huete [79] and Thenkabail [80].

Many studies have shown vegetation indices to be related to LAI, pasture biomass, percent green cover and fAPAR [81-85]. Relationships between fAPAR and NDVI have been shown to be linear [86-89], in contrast with the non-linear relationship with LAI [82, 90, 91], because the signal saturates as the LAI value becomes higher than 2 or 3, and as reported by Laca and Lemaire [92] estimation of LAI has to be restricted to periods of leaf area expansion just after sowing or severe defoliation. Other studies have shown the NDVI to be related to carbon-fixation, canopy resistance, and potential evapotranspiration allowing its use as input to models of biogeochemical cycles [83, 93-96].

Imaging spectrometers (called hyperspectral scanners) may provide data at several scales of observation: either at surface level by mounting teledetection systems at land surface, either by airborne systems mounted in aircraft, which more typical are Airborne Visible-infrared Imaging

Spectrometer (AVIRIS) and Compact Airborne Spectrographic Imager (CASI). These systems can provide reflectance measures in up to 256 wavelength intervals at 4 m/pixel, providing both very high spatial and spectral resolutions. In a spatial scale, Earth Observation Satellites carry broad-waveband sensors are commonly used in grassland remote sensing: Landsat Enhanced Thematic Mapper (ETM+) and Thematic Mapper (TM), Multispectral scanner (MSS), Le Systeme pour l'observation de la terre (SPOT), the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) of the polar orbiting series of NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) and the Indian Remote Sensing (IRS) and Linear Imaging Self-Scanning (LISS).

These sensors have provided information in many studies, the most developed applications concern the land use and the vegetation classification, where thematic pixels are chosen as reference classes, and all the other pixels are sorted in these classes. Remote sensing from satellite data have provided accurate estimates of drought monitoring [97], estimation of primary productivity in large regions [98-100], biophysical and yield characteristics of agricultural crops [101-105], crop moisture variations [106, 107], leaf pigments [108, 109], characterising natural vegetation [110, 111], assessing crop or vegetation stress [112, 113], highlighting nitrogen or organic matter deficiencies [114], detection of crop phenology [115], etc. However, as reported by Roderick et al. [116] there are some problems of spatial resolution, for example pixel size provided for NOAA-AVHRR (1100 m) is not suitable at landscape and paddock scales and more reduced dimension has to be used [117]. It is expected that new satellite systems such as Earth Observing System (EOS) and Earth Observing-1 (EO-1) carrying hyperspectral scanners will open researches a new phase in terrestrial applications.

Some interesting applications of remote sensing data are to integrate multispectral data into

quantitative models to estimate growth. For example, Maas et al. [118] and Moran et al. [119] used remotely sensed estimates of LAI and evapotranspiration as inputs to a single alfalfa growth model. Lobell et al. [120] combined multi-date Landsat ETM+ imagery with a field-based model of crop production, obtaining good correlation between predicted and real yield ($r^2 = 0.82$). Others similar studies are increasing in literature with the apparition of new data and new technologies to develop or to correct some growth models [121, 122]. Another interesting application is the use of remote sensing data to obtain multi-temporal series over time in grasslands, which have direct applications in study of global climatic changes. With the recent projects of development of new satellites in a near future [123] resolution could increase to 1-5 m, offering vastly improve spatial resolution. But as reported by Roderick et al. [116] best applications come from the development of a global broad-band communication network that may improve global grassland management.

4. Conclusions

Many works has shown that non-destructive HM estimations in grasslands are statistically acceptable when are present both choice of an accurate system and the development of a correct model. The choice depends of the work scale, resources available and precision required. Remote sensing data has shown a potential use but not an exact management of agricultural systems in past years, due to restrictions derived from spatial resolution and technical limitations. Modern systems and information accessible by networks and international programs are increasing researches possibilities to provide farmers an improved management of grazing systems.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the support from the UE-Project Grazemore QLRT-2000-02111 Frame Work-7.

References

- [1] M. O'Sullivan, W.F. O'Keefe, M.J. Flynn, The value of pasture height in the measurement of dry matter yield, *Irish Journal of Agricultural Research* 26 (1987) 63-68.
- [2] P.J. L'Hullier, N.A. Thomson, Estimation of herbage mass in ryegrass/white clover dairy pastures, *Proceedings of the New Zealand Grassland Association* 49, 1988, pp. 117-122.
- [3] R. Mosquera, A. González, Non-destructive methods for the estimation of sward production, in: *Proceedings of the XVIII International Grassland Congress, Canada, 1997*, pp. 115-116.
- [4] L'T. Mannelje, Measuring biomass of grassland vegetation, in: L'T. Mannelje, R.M. Jones (Eds.), *Field and Laboratory Methods for Grassland and Animal Production Research*, pp. 151-177, Cabi-Publishing, UK, 2000.
- [5] W.R. Catchpole, C.J. Wheeler, Estimating biomass: a review of techniques, *Australian Journal of Ecology* 171 (1992) 121-131.
- [6] R.J. Lucas, K.F. Thomson, Pasture assessment for livestock managers, in: R.H.M. Langer (Ed.), *Pastures, Their Ecology and Management*, Oxford University Press, New York, EE. UU., 1994, pp. 467-471.
- [7] J.E. Brummer, J.T. Nichols, R.K. Engel, et al., Efficiency of different quadrant sizes and shapes for sampling standing crop, *Journal of Range Management* 47 (1994) 84-89.
- [8] M.A. Sanderson, C.A. Rotz, S.W. Fultz, et al., Estimating forage mass with a commercial capacitance meter and pasture ruler, *Agronomy Journal* 93 (2001) 1281-1286.
- [9] L.T. Vermeire, L.R. Gillen, Estimating herbage standing crop with visual obstruction in tallgrass prairie, *Journal of Range Management* 54 (2001) 57-60.
- [10] W.G. Cochran, *Sampling Techniques*, 3rd ed., John William & Sons, Inc., New York, USA, 1977, p. 428.
- [11] R. Mosquera, A. González, T. Brea, La altura de la pradera como un método de predicción de su producción en pastoreo, in: *XXXI Reunión Científica Sociedad Española Estudio Pastos*, Murcia, Spain, 1991, pp. 285-290.
- [12] R. Mosquera, A. González, Relationship between height and sward quality in rotational dairy systems, in: *Proceedings of the XVIII International Grassland Congress, Canada, 1997*, pp. 115-116.
- [13] D.S.M. Phillips, S.E. Clarke, The calibration of a weighted disc against pasture dry matter yield, in: *Proceedings of the New Zealand Grassland Association*, New Zealand, 1971, pp. 68-75.
- [14] T.L. Powell, Evaluation of a weighted disc meter for pasture yield estimation of intensively stocked dairy

- pasture, *New Zealand Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 2 (1974) 237-241.
- [15] E.W. Vartha, A.G. Matches, Use of weighted-disc measure as an in sampling the herbage yield on tall fescue pastures grazed by cattle, *Agronomy Journal* 69 (1977) 888-890.
- [16] D.I. Bransby, A.G. Matches, G.P. Krauge, Disk meter for rapid estimation of herbage yield in grazing trials, *Agronomy Journal* 69 (1977) 393-396.
- [17] M.E. Castle, A simple disc instrument for estimate herbage yield, *Journal of the British Grassland Society* 17 (1976) 89-100.
- [18] J.A. Baars, C.B. Dyson, Visual estimates of available herbage on hill country sheep pastures, *New Zealand Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 9 (1981) 157-160.
- [19] C.J. Tucker, A critical review of remote sensing and other methods for non-destructive estimation of standing crop biomass, *Grass and Forage Science* 35 (1980) 177-182.
- [20] M. Duru, L. Bosquet, Estimation de la masse d'herbe par le "sward-stick", *Premieres Resultats Fourrages* 131 (1992) 283-300.
- [21] H.F. Heady, The measurement and value of plant height in the study of herbaceous vegetation, *Ecology* 38 (1957) 313-320.
- [22] J. Frame, Herbage mass, in: A. Davies, R.D. Baker, S.A. Grant, S. Laidlaw (Eds.), *Sward Measurement Handbook*, The British Grassland Society, Reading, UK, 1993, pp. 59-63.
- [23] B. Rayburn, S.B. Rayburn, A standardised plate meter for estimating pasture mass in on-farm research trials, *Agronomy Journal* 90 (1998) 238-241.
- [24] R.J. Robel, J.N. Briggs, J.J. Cebula, et al., Greater prairie chicken ranges, movements and habitat usage in Kansas, *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 34 (1970) 286-306.
- [25] R.J. Robel, J.N. Briggs, L.C. Hulbert, Relationships between visual obstruction measurements and weight of grassland vegetation, *Journal of Range Management* 23 (1970) 295-297.
- [26] D.L. Michalk, P.K. Herbert, Evaluation of the forage disk method in mixed rangeland in Kansas, *Journal of Range Management* 40 (1977) 467-471.
- [27] K.R. Harmony, J.K. Moore, J.R. George, et al., Determination of pasture biomass using four indirect methods, *Agronomy Journal* 89 (1997) 665-672.
- [28] A.C. Ganguli, L.T. Vermeire, R.B. Mitchell, et al., Comparison of four non-destructive techniques for estimating standing crop in shortgrass plains, *Agronomy Journal* 92 (2000) 1211-1215.
- [29] C.J. Ackerman, H.T. Purvis, G.W. Horn, et al., Estimation of forage mass of Old World bluestem using a visual obstruction measurement technique, *Animal Science Research Report, Agricultural Experiment Station-Oklahoma* 973 (1999) 194-199.
- [30] L. Benkobi, D.W. Uresk, G. Schenbeck, et al., Protocol for monitoring standing crop in grasslands using visual obstruction, *Journal of Range Management* 53 (2000) 627-633.
- [31] J.E. Fletcher, M.E. Robinson, A capacitance meter for estimating forage weight, *Journal of Range Management* 9 (1956) 96-97.
- [32] N.J. Hutchings, A.H. Phillips, R.C. Dobson, An ultrasonic rangefinder for measuring the undisturbed surface height of continuously grazed grass swards, *Grass and Forage Science* 45 (1990) 119-127.
- [33] P.J. Vickery, I.L. Bennett, G.R. Nicol, An improved electronic capacitance meter for estimating herbage mass, *Grass and Forage Science* 35 (1980) 245-252.
- [34] M.A. González, M.A. Hussey, B.E. Conrad, Plant height, disk and capacitance meter used to estimate bermudagrass herbage mass, *Agronomy Journal* 82 (1990) 861-864.
- [35] A.G. Campbell, D.S.M. Phillips, E.D. O'Reilly, An electronic instrument for pasture yield estimation, *Journal of the British Grassland Society* 17 (1962) 89-100.
- [36] F.J. Hyde, J.T. Lawrence, Electronic assessment of pasture growth, *Electronic Engineering* 36 (1964) 666-670.
- [37] M.B. Alcock, An improved electronic instrument for estimation of pasture yield, *Nature* 203 (1964) 1309-1310.
- [38] E.J. Dowling, K. Spencer, D. Bouma, The performance of capacitance measuring instruments for estimating yield in subterranean clover pastures, *Field Station Record, CSIRO* 4 (1965) 103-107.
- [39] G.C. Johns, G.R. Nicol, B.R. Watkin, An modified capacitance probe technique for estimating pasture yield, *Journal of Agricultural Science* 79 (1965) 273-280.
- [40] W.B. Morse, Heterodyne vegetation meters: electronic devices measures the volume of plant growth, *Popular Electronics* 26 (1967) 72-102.
- [41] W. Kreil, J. Matschke, Studies on the determination of pasture yields with an electronic measuring instrument, *Zeitschrift für Landeskultur* 9 (1968) 75-99.
- [42] G.M. Van Dyne, F.M. Glass, P.A. Opstrup, Development and use of electronic capacitance meters to measure standing crop of herbaceous vegetation, *Publication, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL-TM 2247* (1968) 47.
- [43] R.J. Jones, K.P. Haydock, Yield estimation of tropical and temperate pasture species using an electronic capacitance meter, *Journal of Agricultural Science* 75 (1970) 27-36.
- [44] W.S. Terry, D.H. Hunter, B.F. Swindel, Herbage capacitance meter: an evaluation of its accuracy in Florida rangelands, *Journal of Range Management* 34

- (1981) 240-241.
- [45] W.M. Murphy, J.P. Silman, A.D. Mena, A comparison of quadrat, capacitance meter, sward stick, and rising plate for estimating herbage mass in a smooth-stalked, meadow grass-dominant white clover sward, *Grass and Forage Science* 50 (1995) 452-455.
- [46] A. Dowdeswell, Grass 99 Monitor Farms Project, DRC Dairylink, May-April, 1998.
- [47] C.R. Stockdale, K.B. Kelly, A Comparison of a rising-plate meter and an electronic capacitance meter for estimating the yield of pastures of dairy cows, *Grass and Forage Science* 39 (1984) 391-394.
- [48] N.J. Hutchings, Spatial heterogeneity and other sources of variance in sward as measured by the sonic and HFRO sward sticks, *Grass and Forage Science* 46 (1991) 277-282.
- [49] G.E. Aiken, D.I. Bransby, Observer variability for disk meter measurements of forage mass, *Agronomy Journal* 84 (1992) 603-605.
- [50] D.F. Earle, A.A. McGowan, Evaluation and calibration of an automated rising plate meter for estimating dry matter yield of pasture, *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture and Animal Husbandry* 19 (1979) 337.
- [51] B. Rayburn, An acrylic pasture weight plate for estimating forage yield, University Extension Service, 1997, available online at: <http://www.caf.wvu.edu/~forage/pastplate.htm>.
- [52] O.P. Vázquez, A. González, J. López, Descripción de la evolución de la altura y producción de una pradera durante el pastoreo de primavera con vacas de leche, in: K. Osoro, A. Argamentería, A. Carraceta (Eds.), *Producciones agroganaderas, Gestión eficiente y conservación del medio natural, Libro de Actas de la XLV Reunión Científica de la Sociedad Española para el Estudio de los Pastos*. Gijón, Asturias, Spain, 2005, pp. 191-198.
- [53] J. López, A. González, O.P. Vázquez, Revisión de métodos no destructivos de estimación de biomasa aérea en pastos, in: P. Fernández, A. Gómez, J.E. Guerrero et al. (Eds.), *Pastos, clave en la gestión de los territorios: Integrando disciplinas. Libro de Actas de la XLVII Reunión Científica de la Sociedad Española para el Estudio de los Pastos*, Córdoba, Andalucía, Spain, 2008, pp. 315-321.
- [54] G.D. Li, K.R. Helyar, L.J. Castleman, et al., The implementation and limitations of using a falling plate meter to estimate pasture yield, in: D.L. Michalk, J.E. Pratley (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th Australian Agronomy Conference*, Sydney, Australia, 1998, pp. 20-23.
- [55] O. Correll, J. Isselstein, V. Pavlu, Studying spatial and temporal dynamics of sward structure at low stocking densities: the use of an extended rising-plate meter method, *Grass and Forage Science* 58 (2003) 450-454.
- [56] K.D. Greathead, J. Wallace, J.N. Boulton, The nature of the relationship of electronic capacitance meter readings to pastures on offer in short swards, *Grass and Forage Science* 42 (1987) 161-167.
- [57] T.C. Griggs, W.C. Stringer, Prediction of alfalfa herbage mass using sward height, ground cover and disk technique, *Agronomy Journal* 80 (1988) 204-208.
- [58] G.A. McIntyre, Statistical aspects of vegetation sampling, in: L.T. Mannerje (Ed.), *Measurement of Grassland Vegetation and Animal Production*, Bull. 52, Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, Farnham Royal, UK, 1978, pp. 8-21.
- [59] P. Mitchell, Value of a rising-plate meter for estimating herbage mass of grazed perennial ryegrass-white clover swards, *Grass and Forage Science* 37 (1982) 81-87.
- [60] A.S. Laidlaw, T.J. Gilliland, Adaptation of a mechanistic model of grass growth for use under field conditions and its validation, in: D.A. McGilloway (Ed.), *Weather and Agro-Environmental Management, AgMet Millennium Conference*, Dublin, Ireland, 2000, pp. 104-105.
- [61] A.J. Breerton, E. O'Riordan, A comparison of grass growth models, in: N.M. Holden (Ed.), *Agro-Meteorological Modelling-Principles, Data and Applications*, Dublin, Ireland, 2001, pp. 136-154.
- [62] M. Höglind, A. Schapendonk, M. Van Oijen, Timothy growth in Scandinavia: combining quantitative information and simulation modelling, *New Phytologist* 151 (2001) 355-367.
- [63] P.D. Barrett, A.S. Laidlaw, C.S. Mayne, GrazeGro: a European herbage growth model to predict pasture production in perennial ryegrass swards for decision support, *European Journal of Agronomy* 23 (2005) 37-56.
- [64] A. González, J. López, O.P. Vázquez, External validation in northwest Spain of a decision support system for grazing dairy cows: Grazemore, in: F.P. O'Mara, R.J. Wilkins, L.T. Mannerje (Eds.), *XX International Grassland Congress*, Dublin, Ireland, 2005, p. 906.
- [65] G. Deblonde, M. Penner, Measuring leaf area index with the LICOR LAI-2000 in pine stands, *Ecology* 75 (1994) 1507-1511.
- [66] C.J. Tucker, Post-senescence grass canopy remote sensing, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 10 (1978) 127-150.
- [67] J.L. Heilman, W.E. Boyd, Soil background effects on the spectral response of a three component rangeland scene, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 19 (1986) 127-137.
- [68] G. Asrar, R.L. Weiser, D.E. Johnson, et al., Distinguishing among tall grass prairie cover types from measurements of multispectral reflectance, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 19 (1986) 139-169.
- [69] P.J. Vickery, D.A. Hedges, Use of Landsat MSS data to

- determine the fertiliser status of improved grasslands, Proceedings of 4th Australian Remote Sensing Conference, Adelaide, USA, 1987, pp. 287-304.
- [70] I. Filella, L. Serrano, J. Serra, et al., Evaluating wheat nitrogen status with canopy reflectance indices and discriminant analysis, *Crop Science* 35 (1995) 1400-1405.
- [71] H.D. Williamson, Estimating biomass of an improved pasture using SPOT HRV data, *Grass and Forage Science* 45 (1990) 235-241.
- [72] P.T. Tueller, Remote sensing technology for rangeland management applications, *Journal of Range Management* 42 (1989) 442-453.
- [73] K.C. Olson, R. Cochran, Radiometry for predicting tallgrass prairie biomass using regression and neural models, *Journal of Range Management* 51 (1998) 186-192.
- [74] C.F. Jordan, Derivation of leaf area index from quality of light on the forest floor, *Ecology* 50 (1969) 663-666.
- [75] D.W. Deering, Rangeland reflectance characteristics measured by aircraft and spacecraft sensors, Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas, USA, 1978, p. 338.
- [76] A.J. Richardson, C.L. Wiegand, Distinguishing vegetation from soil background information, *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 43 (1977) 1541-1552.
- [77] A.R. Huete, A soil-adjusted vegetation index (SAVI), *Remote Sensing of Environment* 25 (1988) 295-309.
- [78] J. Qi, A. Chehbouni, A.R. Huete, et al., A modified soil adjusted vegetation index, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 48 (1994) 119-126.
- [79] R.D. Jackson, A.R. Huete, Interpreting vegetation indices, *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 11 (1991) 185-200.
- [80] P.S. Thenkabail, R.B. Smith, E. De Pauw, Hyperspectral vegetation Indices for determining agricultural crop characteristics, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 71 (2000) 158-182.
- [81] P.J. Curran, Relative reflectance data from pre-processed multispectral photography, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 1 (1980) 77-83.
- [82] G. Asrar, M. Fuchs, E.T. Kanemasu, J.L. Hatfield, Estimating absorbed photosynthetic radiation and leaf area index from spectral reflectance in wheat, *Agronomy Journal* 76 (1984) 300-306.
- [83] P.J. Sellers, Canopy reflectance, photosynthesis and transpiration, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 6 (1985) 1335-1372.
- [84] S.W. Running, R.R. Nemani, Relating seasonal patterns of the AVHRR vegetation index to simulated photosynthesis and transpiration of forest in different climates, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 24 (1988) 347-367.
- [85] S.N. Goward, K.F. Huemmrick, Vegetation canopy PAR absorbance and the normalized difference vegetation index: an assessment using the SAIL model, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 39 (1992) 119-140.
- [86] C.L. Wiegand, A.J. Richardson, D.E. Escobar, et al., Vegetation indices in crop assessments, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 35 (1991) 105-119.
- [87] C.S.T. Daughtry, K.P. Gallo, S.N. Goward, et al., Spectral estimates of absorbed radiation and phytomass production in corn and soybean canopies, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 39 (1992) 141-152.
- [88] A. Begue, Leaf area index, intercepted photosynthetically active radiation, and spectral vegetation indices: a sensitivity analysis for regular-clumped canopies, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 46 (1993) 45-59.
- [89] P.J.Jr. Pinter, Solar angle independence in the relationship between absorbed PAR and remotely sensed data for alfalfa, *Remote Sens. Environ* 46 (1993) 19-25.
- [90] E.M. King, G.T. Barthram, A comparison of spectral reflectance and sward surface height measurements to estimate herbage mass and leaf area index in continuously stocked ryegrass pastures, *Grass and Forage Science* 41 (1986) 251-258.
- [91] N. Aparicio, D. Villegas, J. Casadesus, et al., Spectral vegetation indices as non destructive tools for determining durum wheat yield, *Agronomy Journal* 92 (2000) 83-91.
- [92] E.A. Laca, G. Lemaire, Measuring sward structure, in: L'T. Mannelje, R.M. Jones (Eds.), *Field and Laboratory Methods for Grassland and Animal Production Research*, Cabi-Publishing, UK, 2000, pp. 103-121.
- [93] Y. Fung, C.J. Tucker, K.C. Prentice, Application of Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer vegetation index to study atmosphere-biosphere exchange of CO₂, *Journal of Geophysical Research* 92 (1987) 2999-3015.
- [94] S.W. Running, R.R. Nemani, D.L. Peterson, et al., Mapping regional forest evapotranspiration and photosynthesis by coupling satellite data with ecosystem simulation, *Ecology* 70 (1989) 1090-1101.
- [95] S.W. Running, Estimating terrestrial primary productivity by combining remote sensing and ecosystem simulation, in: H. Mooney, R. Hobbs (Eds.), *Ecological Studies: Remote Sensing of Biosphere Functioning*, Springer-Verlag, USA, 1990, pp. 65-86.
- [96] J.W. Raich, W.H. Schlesinger, The global carbon dioxide flux in soil respiration and its relationship to vegetation and climate, *Tellus* 44B (1992) 81-99.
- [97] C.F. Hutchinson, Uses of satellite data for famine early warning in sub-Saharan Africa, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 12 (1991) 1405-1421.
- [98] C.J. Tucker, C.L. Vanpraet, J. Sharman, et al., Satellite remote sensing of total herbaceous biomass production in

- the Senegalese Sahel: 1980-1984, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 17 (1985) 233-249.
- [99] S.D. Prince, A model of regional primary production for use with coarse resolution satellite data, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 12 (1991) 1313-1330.
- [100] S.D. Prince, Satellite remote sensing of primary production: comparison of results for Sahelian grasslands 1981-1988, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 12 (1991) 1301-1311.
- [101] A.J. Richardson, C.L. Wiegand, D.F. Wanjura, et al., Multisite analysis of spectral-biophysical data for sorghum, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 47 (1992) 71-82.
- [102] P. Gong, R. Pu, J.R. Miller, Coniferous forest leaf area index estimation along the Oregon transect using compact airborne spectrographic imager data, *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 61 (1995) 1107-1117.
- [103] G.A. Carter, Reflectance wavebands and indices for remote estimation of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance in pine canopies, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 63 (1997) 61-72.
- [104] D.T. Shaw, T.J. Malthus, J.A. Kupiec, High-spectral resolution data for monitoring Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) regeneration, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 19 (1998) 2601-2608.
- [105] G.P. Asner, C.A. Wessman, C.A. Bateson, et al., Impact of tissue, canopy, and landscape factors on the hyperspectral reflectance variability of arid ecosystems, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 74 (2000) 69-84.
- [106] J. Peñuelas, I. Filella, C. Biel, et al., The reflectance at the 950-970 region as an indicator of plant water status, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 14 (1993) 1887-1905.
- [107] J. Peñuelas, I. Filella, P. Lloret, et al., Reflectance assessment of mite effects on apple trees, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 16 (1995) 2727-2733.
- [108] G.A. Blackburn, Relationships between spectral reflectance and pigment concentrations in stacks of deciduous broadleaves, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 70 (1999) 224-237.
- [109] G.A. Blackburn, C.M. Steele, Relationships between Spectral Reflectance, Pigment, and Biophysical Characteristics of Semiarid Bushland Canopies, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 70 (1999) 278-292.
- [110] M.A. Friedl, J. Michaelsen, F.W. Davis, et al., Estimating grassland biomass and leaf area index using ground and satellite data, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 15 (1994) 1401-1420.
- [111] P.S. Thenkabail, Characterisation of the Alternative to slash-and-burn benchmark research area representing the Congolese rainforests of Africa using near-real-time SPOT HRV data, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 20 (1999) 839-877.
- [112] G.A. Blackburn, Spectral indices for estimating photosynthetic pigment concentrations: a test using senescent tree leaves, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 19 (1998) 657-675.
- [113] T.P. Dawson, P.J. Curran, A new technique for interpolating the reflectance red edge position, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 19 (1998) 2133-2139.
- [114] K. McGwire, T. Minor, L. Fenstermaker, Hyperspectral mixture modelling for quantifying sparse vegetation cover in arid environments, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 72 (2000) 360-374.
- [115] G.D. Badhwar, K.E. Henderson, Estimating developmental stages of corn using spectral data-an initial model, *Agronomy Journal* 73 (1981) 748-755.
- [116] M.L. Roderick, V. Chewings, R.C.G. Smith, Remote sensing in vegetation and animal studies, in: L.T. Mannetje, R.M. Jones (Eds.), *Field and Laboratory Methods for Grassland and Animal Production Research*, Cabi-Publishing, UK, 2000, pp. 205-225.
- [117] G. Bastin, G. Pickup, G. Pearce, Utility of AVHRR data for land degradation assessment: a case study, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 16 (1995) 651-672.
- [118] S.J. Maas, M.S. Moran, R.D. Jackson, Combining remote sensing and modelling for regional resource monitoring, Part II, A simple model for estimating surface evaporation and biomass production, *Proceedings of 1992 ASPRS/ACSM Convention, Monitoring and Mapping Global Change*, Washington DC, EE.UU., 1992, pp. 225-234.
- [119] S.M. Moran, S.J. Maas, Jr. P. J. Pinter, Combining remote sensing and modelling for estimating surface evaporation and biomass production, *Remote Sensing Reviews* 12 (1995) 335-353.
- [120] D.B. Lobell, G.P. Asner, J.I. Ortiz-Monasterio, Regional wheat yield prediction using Landsat 7 satellite imagery, *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Geospatial Information in Agriculture and Forestry*, Denver, Colorado, 2001.
- [121] E. Mougou, D.L. Seen, S. Rambal, et al., A regional Sahelian grassland model to be coupled with multispectral satellite data, II: Toward the control of its simulations by remotely sensed indices, *Remote Sensing of Environment* 52 (1995) 194-206.
- [122] G.J. Carbone, S. Narumalani, M. King, Application of remote sensing and GIS technologies with physiological crop models, *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 62 (1996) 171-179.
- [123] P. Aplin, P.M. Arkinson, P.J. Curran, Fine spatial resolution satellite sensors for the next decade, *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 18 (1997) 3873-3881.