LundsUniversitetsNaturgeografiskaInstitution

SeminarieuppsatserNr.64

TheUtilityofNOAAAVHRRDataforVegetationStudiesin Semi-aridRegions

-AMinorFieldStudyintheHoanibCatchmentofNamib ia

BodilElmqvist&JosefineLundström

Foundedbythe DepartmentofSocialandEconomicGeographyatLundUniversity andSLU,Uppsala



Lund,2000

DepartmentofPhysicalGeography, LundUniv ersity Sölvegatan13,S -22100Lund,Sweden



Abstract

Therelationshipbetweenfieldmeasurementsofvegetationinasemiaridregionand NDVIfromthe1kmNOAAAVHRRwasinvestigatedwithinthisstudy.TheHoanib catchmentinthenorthwesternNamibiawaschosenasstudyarea.Thefield measurementswerecarriedoutduringthemonthofFebruary1999.DifferentNDVI valuesandcombinationsofNDVIwereusedanditwasfoundthattheintegrated NDVIuntilthetimeofthefieldmeasurementscorrelatedbesttothegrassvegetation. Nosignificantcorrelationswerefoundwiththewoodyvegetation.

Theutilityofnon-destructive measurements of vegetation was also examined. Since destructive measurements of woody vegetation are both time-consuming and harmful to the environment, two different non-destructive methods were compared. It was found that the result of the two methods differed considerably for species and grow th forms that we renot recorded in the areas where the equations we reestablished. The relationship between NDV land grass measured with destructive or non-destructive methods was also compared. It was found that an on-destructive method returned almost a shigh correlation values as the destructive method.

TherelationshipbetweenNDVIandvegetationforallplots(withalargeprecipitation gradient)werecomparedtotherelationshipforthemosteasterlyplots(withasmall precipitationgradient)todrawattentiontothefactthatatrendinthedataset improvesthecorrelationvalues. This was also the case in the study.

Finally,aMonteCarlosimulationwasusedtostudythesensitivityofthecalculated netprimaryproduction,usingtheMonteithequation,tovariationsinthe parameters.ItwasfoundthattheNPPwasverysensitivetovariationsin sensitivetovariationsinaandb. ThisstudyhasbeencarriedoutwithintheframeworkoftheMinorFieldStudy(MFS) ScholarshipProgram,fundedbytheSwedishInternationalDevelopmentCo-operation Agency(Sida).

TheMFSScholarshipProgramgivestheSwedishuniversitystudentstheopportunity tocarryoutfieldworkinaThirdWorldcountry.Theextentofthefieldwork correspondstoBAorMaster'sdissertations,orsimilarin-depthsstudies.Thestudies focusonareasandissuesofrelevancefordevelopmentproblems,andareconducted incountriessupportedbySwedishdevelopmentassistance.

Sida'smainpurposewiththeMFSScholarshipProgramistostimulatethestudents' interestin, and increase their knowledge about, as well as their understanding for, developing countries and development issues. TheMFS scholarships provide the students with practical experiences of the conditions of development. One further aim for Sidaistowiden the personnel resources for recruitment in the field of development co-operation.

The department of Social and Economic Geography at Lund University is one of the departments, which administers MFSP rogram funds. Studies conducted by students granted scholar ships by this department focus on spatial aspects of different development is sues.

KeyWords

Namibia, Hoanib, RemoteSensing, GIS, Vegetation, NetPrimaryProduction

Acknowledgements

WewouldliketothanktheDesertResearchFoundationofNamibia(DRFN),leadby MarySeely,formakingthisstudypossible.Wewouldspeciallyliketothankour supervisorsKeithLeggettandPatrikKlintenbergatDRFNandLennartOlssonatthe DepartmentofPhysicalGeographyatLundUniversityfortheirpatienceand encouragement.

Manyotherpeoplehavecontributedtothisstudy,whichwearemostgratefulfor:

The department of Social and Economic Geography at Lund University and SLU in Upps ala for the financial support.

MartinHipondokaandW.P.duPlessisatMinistryofEnvironmentandTourism, EtoshaEcologicalInstituteforprovidingtheNOAAAVHRRimagesandgivingideas abouttheconditionsofusingremotesensinginNamibia.

Moses Chakanga and Tomas Selannie miat the Department of Forestry for helping us with the woody dryweight calculations.

DianeDaviesattheMinistryofEnvironmentandTourism,NorthernNamibian EnvironmentalProjectforideasabouttheuseofNDVI.

Further, special thanks are given to Julian Fennessey, Tigana and Gert for knowledge of the Namibian fauna and flora, and all other information that helped us to survive the Namibian bush. This also includes our supervisor Keith Leggetto fcourse.

Finallytheauthorsthankeachotherforsharingtheteapot.

TableofContents

AI	<u>M</u>	9
1	INTRODUCTION	11
Ŧ	INTRODUCTION	11
2	THESTUDYAREA	13
_		12
	2.1 THECOUNTRIOF NAMIBIA	15 14
	2.2 <u>THE HOANBCATCHMENT</u>	14
	2.2.1 Vegetation	14
	2.2.3 Geologyandtopography	16
	2.2.4 Thepeopleandtheirinteractionwiththeenvironment	16
2	THEODY	10
2	<u>IHEORI</u>	19
	<u>3.1</u> <u>SPECTRALSIGNATURES</u>	19
	3.2 NORMALIZED DIFFERENTIAL VEGETATION INDEX	20
	3.3 ADVANCED VERY HIGH RESOLUTION RADIOMETER	20
	<u>3.4</u> <u>THE NET PRIMARY PRODUCTION</u>	21
	3.5 ADVANTAGESANDDISADVANTAGESOFREMOTESENSING	23
<u>4</u>	METHODANDMATERIAL	25
	4.1 IMAGESEROMTHE NOAAAVHRR SENSORAND NDVI	25
	4.1.1 NOAAAVHRRimages	25
	4.1.2 Imageprocessing	25
	4.1.2.1 ConvertingDigitalNumbervaluestoNDVI	25
	4.1.2.2 Creatingdataduetomissingimages	26
	4.1.2.3 <u>Alteringdataduetoatmosphericinfluence</u>	26
	<u>4.1.2.4</u> <u>Subtractingbackgroundvalues</u>	26
	4.1.3 NDV1parameters	27
	4.2 FIELDMEASUREMENTS	20
	4.2.1 <u>Samplingmentoinocalizinguesopiois</u>	29
	4.3 CALCUL ATIONSEROMEIEL DIFEASUREMENTS	50
	4.3.1 Woodydryweightcalculationsusingtwodifferentmethods	31
	4.3.1.1 KOlsson's method	32
	4.3.1.2 DepofForestry'smethod	32
	<u>4.3.2</u> <u>Totalwoodydryweight</u>	34
	<u>4.3.3</u> <u>Canopycover</u>	34
	<u>4.3.4</u> <u>Grassparameters</u>	35
	4.4 SENSITIVITYTESTOFTHE ε, AANDBPARAMETERSINTHE MONTEITHEQUATION	35
	4.5 <u>STATISTICALPREPROCESSING</u>	36
5	RESULTS	37
Ξ.		27
	5.1 <u>NORMALDISTRIBUTIONOFDATA</u>	37
	5.3 CALCUL ATIONSEROMEIEL DIFEASUREMENTS	37
	5.3.1 WoodydryweightcalculationsusingKOlssonsandDenofForestrysmethods	30
	5.3.2 Totalwoodydryweight	40
	5.3.3 Canopycover	41
	5.3.4 Grassparameters	42
	5.4 COMPARINGFIELDMEASUREMENTSWITH NDVI	43
	5.4.1 <u>WoodyparameterswithNDVI</u>	43
	5.4.2 GrassparameterswithNDVI	45
	5.5 SENSITIVITYTESTOFTHE ε, AANDBPARAMETERSINTHE MONTEITHEQUATION	47
6	DISCUSSION	49

	<u>COMPARING THE WOOD TOK I WEIGHT OSING</u> DEFOT TOKESTKT SMETHOD WITH K	
	OLSSON'S	49
	6.1.1 Differencesbetweenthetwomethods	49
	6.1.2 Advantagesanddisadvantages	50
	6.2 COMPARINGWOODYPARAMETERSWITH NDVI	51
	6.2.1 WoodynarameterswithbackgroundNDVI	51
	622 WoodyparameterswithmaxNDVI	52
	6.3 COMPARINGERASSPARAMETERSWITH NDVI	52
	6.4 SENSITIVITYTESTOFTHE ε, AANDBPARAMETERSINTHE MONTEITHEQUATION	52
7	CONCLUSION	57
-	<u></u>	
8	REFERENCES	59
AF	PPENDIX1.PARCALCULATIONS	61
<u>AI</u>	PPENDIX1.PARCALCULATIONS	61
<u>AF</u> AF	PPENDIX1.PARCALCULATIONS	61
<u>AF</u> <u>AF</u>	PPENDIX1.PARCALCULATIONS	61
<u>AF</u> <u>AF</u> AF	PPENDIX1.PARCALCULATIONS PPENDIX2.IMAGEPROCESSING PPENDIX3.WOODYDRYWEIGHT	61 63 65
AF AF AF	PPENDIX1.PARCALCULATIONS	61 63 65

Aim

Theoverallaimofthestudyistoseeifitexistsanyrelationshipsbetweenthefield measurementsofthevegetationandNDVIfrom1kmNOAAAVHRRinasemi-arid regionwithagreatspatialvariationinspeciescomposition,coverandheight.The studyalsofocusesonthefollowingissues:

- The possibility to combine the NDVI values in different ways as well as using single values when investigating the relationships with the field measurements.
- Theutilityofnon-destructivefieldmeasurements, which are not astimeconsuming and harmful to the environment as destructive methods.
- Todrawattentiontothefactthatatrendinthedatasetmightincreasethe correlationvalues.
- ThesensitivityoftheNetPrimaryProductioncalculationsbyMontiethinconcern tovariationsof ε,aandbparameters.

ThemajorityoftheAfricanlivestockand30millionpeopledependentonlivestock liveinthearidandsemi-aridregionsofAfrica(Kruger&Kressirer,1996).Itis importanttodrawattentiontothispartoftheworld,wherethepopulationdepends stronglyonitsresourcesinanunpredictableclimate.

Thisstudyconcentratesontheresourcesofthegrassandthewoodydryweight. The grassdryweightproducedduringtherainyseasonbytheannualgrassesinsemi-arid regionsprovidesanindicationofresourceavailabilityforlivestockforthefollowing dryseason. Additionallytheresourceoffirewoodfromtreesandshrubsistheprimary householdenergysourceforthemajorityofthepeople.

Tostudytheseresourcesinavastregionwouldrequireadensenetworkofground measurements.Toavoidthisdensenetwork,themethodofremotesensingisuseful. NOAAAVHRRhasbeenusedtoquantifyandcharacterizevegetationsincethe beginningofthenineteeneighties.Theaimwasfirsttomonitorandachieveabetter understandingoftheSahelienenvironmentafterthedroughtsinthelatesixtiesand seventies.Todayoneobjectiveistoestimatecropyieldsinthesupportoffood securityandeconomicplanningaswellasnaturalresourcemanagementatanational level(Rasmussen,1996).Whenstudyingtherelationshipsbetweenvegetation characteristics,measuredinsitu,andtheNormalizedDifferentialVegetationIndex (NDVI)asmeasuredwiththeNOAAAVHRRsensor,thefactthatdryaboveground netprimaryproductioncorrelateswellwithNDVIintegratedduringtherainyseason (Rasmussen,1996)isapplied.Muchresearchhasbeencarriedouttoassessthedry weightinphotosynteticallyhomogenousvegetationsuchasagriculturalcrops,natural grasslandsanddenseforests(Franklin&Hiernaux,1991),butextensiveresearch consideringheterogeneousvegetationcovershasnotbeencarriedoutt.

MoststudieshavebeencarriedoutintheSahel,butanotherregionwithsimilar conditionsisNamibia;thedriestcountrysouthoftheSahel.Approximately60% of thepopulationlivesinruralpartsofthecountrywherelivestockproductionisthe maineconomicactivity(Kruger&Kressirer,1996).

TheHoanibrivercatchmentinnorthwesternNamibiawaschosenforthestudy.The catchmentisaparticularlygoodrepresentativeofwesternNamibia,becausethe populationissteadilyincreasingalongwiththenumberoftourists,whilethenatural resourcesremainthesame.TheHoanibisalsoundergoingadditionalstresssincethe independenceofthecountryin1990.Thestressiscausedbytheintensificationof livestock,asthepeopleofHererosaremovingbackintotheareaafterbeing dislocatedsincethe1950's(DirectorateofPlanning,1998).

TheprojectwascarriedouttoachieveamasterinphysicalgeographyatLund UniversityofSweden.Itisaddressedtoanyonewithaninterestinrelationships betweenvegetationandNDVIinsemi-aridregions.Awideknowledgeofneitherthe conditionsofNamibianorremotesensingisnecessary. Namibia as a country and the Hoanib catchmentare described to give an idea of the physical geography as well as the interaction between the local people and the environment.

2.1 ThecountryofNamibia

Namibia, formerSouthWestAfrica, gainedits independence only in 1990 making it one of the young est countries in Africa. It is a large country of 824269 km ² (figure 1) with a population of only 1.6 million people. The population is increasing with 3.3% peryear, which makes it is the fastest growing population of Africa (Jacobson *et al*, 1995). The population consists of 11 main groups of people.



Figure 1. Namibia's location in Africa.

Namibiaisconsideredeconomicallyadvancedcomparedtotheothercountriesof southernAfrica, eveniftheeconomical resources are unevenly distributed. After SouthAfrica, Namibiais the country in the region with the highest rate of income per capita. The maine conomic sectors, in the order of economic importance, are mining, agriculture, fishery and tourism (Jacobson *etal*, 1995). Even if agriculture only is the second largest economic sector, itemploys 50% of the work force and is lives tock dominated. Tourism, which to day is for thin the order of economical importance, has the potential of becoming the second most important sector by the year of 2002 (Jacobson *etal*, 1995).

Located mainly in the desert, one of the countries major problems is the lack off resh water. Permanentrivers are found only at the northern and the southern borders of the country, whereas there are several ephermalrivers, flowing only a few days each year after localized rains. The Hoanibis one of the seephermal rivers.

2.2 TheHoanibcatchment

 $The Hoanib catchment is located innorthwest of Namibia (figure 2). The size of the catchment is 17200 km^{-2} (Directorate of Planning, 1998).$



 $\label{eq:Figure2.} The Hoanib catchment and its location in Namibia (modified after Jacobson et al, 1995). The main community Ses fontein is marked as well as the iso hythes (see "Climate" below).$

2.2.1 Climate

The catchment is a semi-aridregion and experiences very low precipitation. The mean precipitation ranges from 0 mmin the west to 325 mmin the east (Jacobson *etal*, 1995) (figure 2). The variability of the precipitation is a shigh 50-70% above or below the mean ¹ (Rhode, 1994). The first rains fall in October to November, although the main rains begin in January and fall all through April (Shell Namibia Ltd, 1996).

During the days in the summer, the temperatures of tenrise above 35 °C, but are sometimes as low as 14 °C. The winters are cooler with temperatures of 5-26 °C during the days (Shell Namibia Ltd, 1994). The high temperatures lead to a high evapotran spiration.

 $^{^{1}} This variability is true for Damaral and, which is the former regions out hof the Hoani briver.$

2.2.2 Vegetation

Theprecipitationisthemaincontrollingfactorforthevegetationintheregion; thereforethesteepprecipitationgradientcoincideswithagradualchangefromdesert inthewesttosavannahandwoodlandsintheeast(Hall-Martin *etal*,1988).Inthe catchment87% is classified as Mopanes avannah (Jacobson *etal*, 1995), consisting mostly of *Colophospermummopane* in the form of tree or shrub. The rest is classified as the northern Namibve getation class, consisting of a desert flora. Except from *Colophospermummopane*, different species of Accacia are also common in the region.

Theriparianforests area main characteristic of the region. With their big trees compared to the surrounding environment they form linear oas es in the landscape. The trees usually have a deeproot system to enable the use of subsurface water, as the occasional floods are not sufficient for their survival.

ThefollowingphotosaresomeexamplesofthevegetationintheHoanibcatchment. Thefirsttwo(figure3aandb)arebothfromthevicinityofSesfontein(seefigure2 forlocation)beforethegrowingseasonhasstarted.Theseareasaredominatedby *Colophospermummopane*.Thethirdphoto(figure3c)istakenintheeasternpartof thecatchmentatthebeginningofthegrowingseasonandisdominatedbydifferent Accaciaspecies.







Figure 3a. The Sesfontein region (see figure 2 for location) where the rewas a very low can opy cover. Figure 3b. The Sesfontein region with a relatively high ertree cover than infigure 3a. The dominant species in figure 3 a and bwas Colophos per mum Mopane. For both the photos the herbace ous cover was non-existing (the growing season had not yet started).

Figure 3c. The eastern part of the catchment dominated by different Accacia species and with an existing grass cover. The red stick seen in photoa and bwas one meter long (note: in photob the stick is placed in the tree).

2.2.3 Geologyandtopography

OnitswaytotheAtlanticOceantheHoanibpassesthroughanareawithrugged terrainofdolomitehills(Owen-Smith,1970),steepcanyonsandplains.Near Sesfonteintherivervalleywidensandformslargeplains.Furthertothewestthe plainsareendedbytheescarpmentmountains,whichrunparalleltothecoast.Before enteringtheoceantherivercrossesthecoastdesertwithitsvastsandfieldsand dunes.

As a result of the slow process of weathering in this aridarea, the soils are fairly thin and poorly developed. The wind pick supeasily in the wide plain and has the potential of carrying away large amounts of its fine-grained alluvial soil.

2.2.4 Thepeopleandtheirinteractionwiththeenvironment

Evenifthereisahighurbanizationrateinthecountry,thepopulationisstill increasinginthecatchmentwithapopulationofalmost8000(Jacobson *etal*,1995). Thepopulationgrowthisashighasfortherestofthecountry(Warden,1997).The populationisnotonlyincreasingbecauseofahighfertilityandareducedmortality, butbecausemanypeopleareresettlingintheregion.Thesepeoplehadtoleavetheir landduringthe1950's,becauseofthecreationoftheEtoshaNationalPark.After Independencein1990whentheHomelandsPolicyisnolongervalidandtheborders ofEtoshaNationalParkareagainchanged,coveringamuchsmallerpartofthe catchment,theregionexperiencesahighandincreasingpopulationpressure (DirectorateofPlanning, 1998). The main community in the catchment is Sesfontein with a population of just above 600 (Warden, 1997).

Themaingroup of people in the catchment is the Hereroes. They are pastoralists and relays trongly on their lives tock for their living. The Hereroes lived alife of nomads for along period of time. Thus after the influence of European settlers the Hereroes have become more sedentary. They have mostly settled in the vicinity of boreholes and natural springs. The livestock, consisting mainly of cattle and go at splay an important role for the people in many different aspects i.e. for milk and meat, ploughing, ceremonial purposes, symbol of status, dung for buildings and for selling.

Exceptlivestock, otheractivities are becoming more and more important, such as tour is mandagriculture. The former being the only one with a potential growth considering the limited agricultural potential in this semi-aridenvironment (Jacobson *etal*, 1995). Since 1990 there has been agreat increase of tour is minthecatchment. Between they ears of 1994-1996 the region experienced an increase of 35%² (Humavindu & Nekwiyu, 1996).

 $^{^2} Several estimations were dones incefor some places the data we rerough and the rewere many gaps. However the number works as an indication of the increasing to urist number.$

Tounderstandwhythetechniqueofremotesensinghasbeenchoseninsteadof groundobservationsthischapterdescribeshowthevegetationmaybecomparedto measurementsfromremotesensing.Aspectstreatedarethespectralsignatureof objects,thevegetationindexNDVI,theremotesensingsensorNOAAAVHRR and theprincipalsforintegratingNDVIduringavegetationseasontoachieveinformation aboutthetotalabove-groundbiomassproduced.Finallytheadvantagesandthe disadvantagesofremotesensingarereviewed.

3.1 Spectralsignatures

When radiation from the Sunhits an object on the Earth, the radiation is absorbed, transmitted or reflected. Different features of the object decide how the radiation behaves in concernt othese three ways. The features are for example color, chemical composition, humidity and the structure of the surface (Nämden förskoglig fjärranalys, 1993). Remote sensing uses the fact that objects may be separated from each other by the intensity of the different wavelengths reflected. In other words, objects are recognized by the irso-called spectral signature.

Thespectral signature of vegetation is distinguished by a reflection maximum in the green spectra and an even greater maximum in the near infrared spectra (figure 4). Reflection minimum sare found in the blue and red parts of the spectrum. The chlorophyllabsorbs in the blue and red parts of the spectrum and the water vapor absorbs some of the wavelength of the middle and high infrared. The large difference in the reflectance of red and near - infrared radiation is typical for vegetation and not found for any other surface.

Thesoilontheotherhandhasamoreevencurverepresentingitsspectralsignature (figure4).Thereflectanceincreasesevenlyinthevisibleandinthenearinfraredpart of the spectra, tomore or less level of finthemiddleinfrared part of the spectra. Figure4 also shows the spectral signature forwater.



Figure4. Typical spectral signature curves for vegetation, soil and water (Lilles and & Kiefer, 1979).

3.2 NormalizedDifferentialVegetationIndex

Differentvegetationindiceshavebeenconstructedtoavoidoneofthefundamental problemsofremotesensing;toseparatethesignalfromthevegetationtothatofthe soil.ThemostwidelyusedindexistheNormalizedDifferentialVegetationIndex (NDVI)(Olsson&Pilesjö,1999).Theindexisconstructedbythewavelengthsband ofthenearinfrared(NIR)andthered(RED)partsofthespectraaccordingtothe followingformula:

$$NDVI = \frac{(NIR - RED)}{(NIR + RED)}$$
(Equation1)

Theratiovaries from-1 to 1, where the higher the ratio, the higher amount of green biomassis included in that particular pixel. The ratio for green vegetation ranges from 0.1 to 0.6, depending on its health and quantity (Eriksson, 1999).

Theratiodifferfrom the simpler ratio of NIR/R by the means that NDVI compensates for the variation scaused by atmospheric effects and different sun angles (Eriksson, 1999).

3.3 AdvancedVeryHighResolutionRadiometer

Manydifferentsensorsregisterredandnear-infraredwavelengthsandmaytherefore construct the vegetation index NDVI. One of the sensors is the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer, AVHHR, carried by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA. Agreated vantage with this satellite is the high temporal resolution of twice aday. This increases the chances of acquiring cloud free images, which is otherwise a high limitation to the use of remote sensing. The disadvantage is the lows patial resolution of 1.1 km at nadir (Nämden förskog lig fjärranlys, 1993).

The registration occurs in different wavelength bands (table 1), where as mentioned the red and near infrared wavelengths are used to create the vegetation index NDVI.

Table1.ThedifferentwavelengthbandofAVHRR (*Campbell,1996*).

Nr	Wavelength(µm)	Description
1	0.58-0.68	Visible(RED)
2	0.72-1.10	Nearinfrared(NIR)
3	3.55-3.93	Thermalinfrared
4	10.30-11.30	Thermalinfrared

3.4 TheNetPrimaryProduction

Theamountofradiationactiveinthephotosynthesisisusedtoestimatetheamountof abovegroundbiomassproductionduringagrowingseason. Thisradiationiscalledthe absorbedphotosyntheticallyactiveradiation(APAR). Thephotosyntheticallyactive radiation(PAR) corresponds to the amount of radiation in the visible region of the spectra (0.4-0.7 μ m), whereas the APAR corresponds to the amount of this radiation actually being absorbed by the vegetation and used in the photosynthesis.

Theradiationinthevisiblespectraistheonlyradiationbeingabsorbedbythe chlorophyllandconsequentlythemostinterestingpartofthespectraforbiomass calculations.PARisdependentonlatitude,timeoftheyearandcloudiness.Direct measurementsofPARabovethecanopyarepreferredbutifthisisnotpossible,PAR isoftenapproximatedto50% of the incomingradiation on the ground (Gower etal, 1999).

TheintegraloftheAPARduringonevegetationseasonequalsthenetprimary production,NPP,forthevegetationseasonasdescribedinthefollowingequation (Olsson&Pilesjö,1999),where ɛstandsforthephotosyntheticefficiencyfactor(ɛis explainedfurtherdown).

$$NPP = \sum_{i=1}^{365} \varepsilon_i \cdot APAR_i$$
 (Equation2)

HoweverAPARisadifficultparametertomeasure. Thisissolvedbyanother parameterthathasbeenfoundlinearlytoNDVI;fractionalabsorbed photosyntheticallyactiveradiation(fAPAR)(equation3a).DividingAPARbyPAR formsthisfraction.Table2showshowtheaandbvaluesmayvaryfromdifferent studies(Lind&Fensholt,1998).ThelinearrelationshipbetweenFAPARandNDVI isvalidaslongasleafareaindexdoesnotexceed2.0(Olsson&Pilesjö,1999).

(Equation3)

Table2.Differentaandbvaluesusedforequation3 (Lind&Fensholt, 1998).

Authors	a	b		
Begue	1.39	-0.125		
Asrar	1.25	0.11		
Hatfield	1.21	-0.19		
Prince&Goward	1.67	0.08		
Pinter	1.41	0.40		

ThelinearrelationshipbetweenFAPAR and NDVI was initially illustrated by Monteithin 1972 and it has been widely used to estimate the NPP forter restrial biomessince then (Gower *etal*, 1999). This relationship makes it possible to estimate the biomass production with remote sensing. Therefore equation 3 can be expressed as equation 4 where the product of FAPAR and PAR substitutes APAR.

 $fAPAR=APAR/PAR \Rightarrow APAR=fAPAR*PAR \Rightarrow APAR=(a*NDVI+b)*PAR$

Thefollowingequation ²isoftenreferredtoastheMonteithequation.

$$NPP = \sum_{i=1}^{365} \varepsilon_i \cdot (a \cdot NDVI_i + b) \cdot PAR_i$$
 (Equation4)

Asmentionedbefore, ε is the photosynthetic conversion factor (sometimes referred to as the biological efficiency factor, since factors independent of photosynthesis also influence ε . See Discussion). This is a coefficient describing the conversion of light to organic matter by plants (g/J) (Gower *etal*, 1999).

Fieldmeasurementsof ɛshowthatexperimentalvalueslaybetween0,2and4,8g/MJ (Prince,1991)butsomestudieshavefoundvaluesaslowas0,07g/MJfordesert areas(Gower *etal*,1999).Theoreticalmaximumof ɛisfoundtobe7,6g/MJ(Prince 1991).Table3showssome ɛvaluesfromdifferentstudies(Gower *etal*,1999).

,

²Thisequationincludesabovegroundbiomassonlyanddoesnottakeintoaccountrespiratorylosses. Additionallyitisvalidundernowaterstress.

(Goweretal, 1999)	
Vegetationtype	e(g/MJ)
AgricultureC3	1.02-3.37
AgricultureC4	2.3–3.9
Grasslands	0.07-0.13(desert)
	0.24-0.8(short)
	0.53-2.0(mixed)
	0.8–1.33(tall)
Temperateevergreen	0.19–1.14
Temperatedeciduous	0.64–1.58
Woodland	0.2
Tropicalevergreen	0.24–1.06

 Table3.
 Evalues(g/MJ)fordifferentvegetationtypes

 (Goweretal, 1999)

3.5 Advantagesanddisadvantagesofremotesensing

One of the main advantages of remote sensing is the possibility to frequently cover avast are a at a relatively low cost.

Oneofthemaindifficulties with remotes ensingis the influence of the atmosphere. There exists always a certain amount of particles influencing the pathway like, dust, and watervapor and other aerosols. Also clouds had ows influence the pathway. Another problem is the difficulty to separate the signal of the green vegetation from other surfaces such as the soil. This is especially true in semi-aridare as where the vegetation cover is low. When studying the vegetation, the shad ows of trees is also a problem since it lowers the reflectance in all wavelengths. Thefollowingchapterdescribesthechoiceandprocessingofsatelliteimagesand NDVI.Italsodescribesthefieldmeasurementsandthecalculationsofwoodyand grassparametersfromthesemeasurements.Additionallythemethodusedtostudythe sensitivityofthe ɛ,aandbparametersintheMonteithequationofNPPispresented. Finallythestatisticalpreprocessingofdataisexplained.

4.1 ImagesfromtheNOAAAVHRRsensorandNDVI

The choice and processing of NOAAAVHRR images are described below. When studying the correlation between field measurements of vegetation and NDVI, different parameters (single values or combinations of NDVI) can be used. The choice of NDVI parameters is therefore also explained below.

4.1.1 NOAAAVHRRimages

To obtain a vegetation index from satellite images the NOAAAVHRRs ensorwas chosen, because it enables the creation of timeseries. The images we rereceived from the Etosha Ecological Institute in Namibia and were 10 days mosaics with each pixel showing the maximum NDVI valued uring these 10 days (maximum value composite). Each month is therefore divided into three dekads with one image representing the period from day 1 until day 10 of that month, the second day 1 1 until day 20 and the third day 21 until the last day of the month. This way the risk of getting cloud covered pixels is lowered. Intotal 22 images we received from the last dekad of Septembert othe last dekad of May.

4.1.2 Imageprocessing

Processing of images includes converting DN values into NDVI and to extract pixel values from the images at the same location as the sampling plots in field. It also includes altering NDVI values that are influenced by atmosphere, subtracting background values and creating complete times eries of NDVI. The following steps were used to process data:

4.1.2.1 ConvertingDigitalNumbervaluestoNDVI

TheoriginalNOAAAVHRRimageswerereceivedinIdaformatandwereconverted toIdrisiformat.Avectorfileconsistingofthe30plotsoffieldmeasurementswas created.Thisvectorfilewasusedtogetherwiththeimagesandaprogramthatextract theDigitalNumber(DN)valueofapixelcorrespondingtoaparticularpointina vectorfile.Thisresultsin30DNvaluesforeachimage.

To simplify the work with the values a program was used to convert an I drisi vector file to a plain xyz file. Finally the values were analyzed in Excel.

The DN values in each pixel we retransformed to actual NDVI values according to the following formula received from the Etosha Ecological Institute:

4.1.2.2 Creatingdataduetomissingimages

Since three images we remissing from the first dekad of Septembert othelast dekad of May, NDVI values for these dekads we recreated to receive a complete time series.

Whencreatingdata, only the period of the growing season was taken into account, since this is the only period, which was actually used in the comparisons with the field measurements. The NDVI curve for each plot was studied visually and the start of the growing season was defined as the first dekad with a distinct and continuous increase in NDVI. It was assumed that from the first dekad of the growing season to the dekad of maximum NDVI, the slope of the curve should be positive. It was also assumed that the slope should be negative from the dekad of maximum NDVI to the end of the growing season. In the case of a missing image an ewvalue was formed by calculating the average from the dekad before and after the missing dekad.

4.1.2.3 Alteringdataduetoatmosphericinfluence

AsmentioneditwasassumedthattheslopeoftheNDVIcurveshouldbepositive from the beginning of the growing season until the maximumNDVI. When this was not the case the atmospheric influence was decided not to be acceptable. A new value was formed in the same way as for the creation of data above. Intotal 47 pixels from different dekads were altered (appendix 2). Figure 5 shows an example of data before and after alteration.



Figure 5. Raw and filtered data for plot number 24.

4.1.2.4 Subtractingbackgroundvalues

When using the NDVI, it has to be taken into account that the background may influence the signal (Rasmussen, 1996). The background is composed of the

reflectancefromforexamplethesoilandlitterandvarieswiththesoiltype, water contentanddegreeoftramplingbycattle.

Forthesereasonsthebackgroundvalueofeachplotwasdeterminedandsubtracted fromthevaluesofeachdekad(Rasmussen, 1996). ThefirstdekadofNovemberwas chosenasthebackgroundvalue ²sincevegetationfromtheprecedentgrowingseason wasthoughttobeataminimumatthistime. Thisdekadcoincideswiththetimejust beforethebeginningoftherainyseason, which meansthat the variation in the amount of aerosols, watervapor and dust in the atmosphere might influence the NDVI. Performing the subtractions therefore leads to negative NDVI values in some cases. All the negative numbers were set to the value of 0.

4.1.3 NDVIparameters

FivedifferentNDVIparameters(singlevaluesorcombinationsofNDVI)were chosentostudytherelationshipbetweenNDVIandthefieldmeasurements(table4). Forthegrassmeasurementsthesum,sumfield,sumdecreaseandmaxwerestudied, whereasconcerningthetreemeasurementsthemaxandthebackgroundwereused.

NDVIparameters	Description
Max	ThemaximumNDVIvalueduringthegrowingseason.
Sumfield	ThesumofNDVIvaluesfromthebeginningofthegrowing
	seasonuntilthedekadoffieldmeasurements.Thefield
	measurementscoincidewiththesecond(Khowariband
	Sesfontein)andthirddekadofFebruary1999(Hobatere,
	OmurambaandOtjikovares).
Sum	ThesumofNDVIvaluesfromthebeginningtotheendofthe
	growingseason. The last dekad of Maywas assumed to
	correspondtotheendofthegrowingseason.
Sumdecrease	ThesumofNDVIvaluesuntilaconsiderabledecreasein
	NDVIoccursafterthemaximumvalue(thisdekadisdecided
	visually).
Background	ThevalueofthefirstdekadofNovember

 ${\it Table 4. Description of the five different NDV I parameters.}$

Figure 6 visualizes the definition of the parameters described in table 4.

 $^{^{2}} The first dekadof November was chosen as background value even though its ometimes rains during this period. This is possible since it was clear that no rain fell during this period in 1998.$



Figure6.ThedefinitionoftheNDVIparameterschosen.

4.2 Fieldmeasurements

Thefield measurements were carried out in the month of February 1999. The following five areas were chosen as sampling areas; Khowarib, Sesfontein, Omuramba, Otjikowares and Hobatere (figure 7). The objective when choosing the five areas was to distribute the areas spatially in the catchment (even though the plots tend to be concentrated in the eastern part of the catchment due to the low vegetation cover in the western parts). The accessibility by carand the route of the accompanying researchers also determined the location of the five sampling areas. The borders of the study were set to the ones of the Hoanib catchment, to follow the project carried out by the DRFN.



 $\label{eq:Figure7} Figure7. The Hoanib catchment with the 30 plots of field measurements marked. The communities in vicinity to the plots are used to refer to the plots in the text. Also the main roads we remarked.$

4.2.1 Samplingmethodforlocalizingthe30plots

Fourtoeight50times50mplotswererandomlyselectedinthefiveareas. The procedure below was followed when deciding the location of the 30 plots:

- Thelocalizationofeachplotwascarriedoutusingtheroadsasbaselines.
- Anumberbetween1and5wasrandomizedtorepresentthenumbersof kilometerstobetraveledalongtheroad.
- Theleftorrightsideoftheroadwasrandomized.
- Tominimize the influence of roads 500 meters were walked perpendicular to the road.
- Beforedeterminingtheexactlocationoftheplotafinalnumberbetween1and 100wasrandomizedtorepresentthenumberofmeterstowalkbeforereaching thecorneroftheplot.

The corners of the 50 times 50 meters square were marked with redsticks. A compass was used to make sure that the sides of the plot always were in accordance with four cardinal points to avoid a subjective placement of the plot. Before measuring the vegetation the surrounding area was studied visually and it was determined if the vegetation in the plot was a good representative for the vegetation in the surrounding 1 times 1 km area. If not, an ewlocation of the plot was chosen according to the procedure described above.

4.2.2 Fieldmeasurementsineachplot

Thefollowingdatawascollectedineachplot:

Coordinates

The coordinates, both in WGS84 and Schwarz, in the center of the 50 times 50-meter plotwere noted with the help of a GPS.

Treesampling

Theplotwasinitiallystudiedvisuallytogetanoverviewofthespeciescomposition anddensityandheightofvegetation.Whenoverlookingtheareaoneaveragetree (treealsoreferstoshrubs)ofeachspecieswaschosen. Thisaveragetreewaschosen accordingtoheightandcanopywidth,branchingandnumberofstems.Ifonespecies hadtwoormoredistinctsubgroup,accordingtoheightandcanopywidth,one averagetreefromeachsubgroupwaschosen.Theaveragetreerepresentedall individualsofthatspeciesorsubgroupandallthemeasurementswereonlycarried outonthistree.ThisprocedurewasrecommendedbytheDesertResearchFoundation ofNamibiatomakemeasurementslesstimeconsumingandtosimplifycomparison ofresultsfromtheirstudiesifnecessary.Thetotalnumberofeachspeciesor subgroupwascounted.Individualtreesorshrubslocatedontheborderoftheplot wereincluded.Shrubslessthan50cminheightwereincludedinthegrass measurements.

Themeasurements carried out on each average tree were tree height, can opy diameter, stem circumference and the number of stems (formulti-stemmed trees branching below breas theight). The stem circumference was measured at breas theight. If the tree hads everal stems, all the stems we recounted but only the diameter of the largest and the smallest stem was measured. From this the average stem circumference was calculated. The circumference softhe others tems we reassured equally distributed between the smallest and the largest stem.

 $\label{eq:stimated} Finally the cover in percent of each species or subgroup was estimated according to the scale intable 5. This scale was chosen because it was generally used for estimating vegetation cover at the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia.$

Table5.Thescaleusedt	oclassifythevegetationcover.

Scale	Cover(%)
R	Veryfewindividualsscatteredinthearea
+	Presentbutcoveringlessthan1% of the area
1	Covering1-5% of the area
2a	Covering5–12.5% of the area
2b	Covering12.5–25% of the area
3	Covering25–50% of the area
4	Covering50–75% of the area
5	Covering75–100% of the area

Grasssampling

Themeasurements of the grass (including herbs) weight and coverwere carried out in fiver and omly chosen 1 times 1-meters quares inside each 50 times 50-meter plot. These fives quares were assumed to be representative for the grass in the entire plot. The procedure when localizing the five grass squares inside the plot was as follows. The southeast corner of the plot was used as starting point. Two numbers between 1 and 50 we rerandomized. The first number determined the number of meters to walk from the southeast corner, in a west ward direction, along the plot border. The second number determined the number of meters to walk nor the ward in the plot.

In each grass plot the height and cover of perennial and annual grasses were estimated respectively according to the scale intable 5. The perennial and annual grasses were cut and placed in two separate paper bags. Finally the grasses were dried and weighed. The averaged ryweight (sometimes referred to as weight) and cover of the five 1x1 ms quares were calculated to represent the entire plot.

Photo

Aphotowastakenfromthefirstcornerstickcoveringasmuchaspossibleoftheplot. Thiswasdonetosimplifythecomparisonbetweenplotswhenanalyzingtheresults.

Onlythemeasurementsused in this study are explained in this section. Additional data about for example phenology, browseline and soilty pewere also collected as a part of "Environmental Issues Investigation Project-Hoanib River Catchments tudy" and to simplify future analyzes of the results within this study if necessary.

4.3 Calculationsfromfieldmeasurements

Thetwodifferentmethodstocalculatewoodydryweightfromfieldmeasurements aredescribedbelow.Additionallythemethodstocalculatethetotalwoodydryweight andcoverineachplotarepresentedaswellasthemethodtocalculatedryweight, coverandvolumeofthegrass.

4.3.1 Woodydryweightcalculationsusingtwodifferentmethods

The destructive measurements from two studies were used for calculating dryweight from the field measurements. One study was carried out by the Namibian Department of Forestry in Bushman land, nor thwe stern Namibia (Burke *etal*, 1996) and the other was carried out by KOlsson in an area in western Kordofan, Sudan (Olsson, 1985). They were both carried out in semi-aridare as with similar temperature, rainfall, vegetation type and species composition as in the Hoanib catchment. In both Olsson's and DepofForestry's study several trees were felled and weighed to establish the relationship between the non-destructive parameter and the tree weight. Different non-destructive parameters were used in the two studies, Olsson used the crown diameter and DepofFore stry used the stem diameter in breastheight.

Sincenodestructivemeasurementswereincludedinthisstudyitwasassumedthat thenon-destructivemeasurementsofthewoodydryweightwasacceptableifthetwo methodsgavesimilarresults.

Tosimplifyfurtheranalysesabriefdescriptionofthetwostudiesfollows.

4.3.1.1 KOlsson'smethod

Thestudyareawaslocated in the Sahelzone, in western Kordofan, Sudan. The rainfall varied in an orth-southward direction between 100 and 600 mm/year. Two main vegetation zones, semi-desert and wood lands avannah with different species of *Acacia*, dominated in the area.

The aim of the study was to estimate the woody dry weight with the help of remote sensing. KOlsson used crown diameter as non-destructive parameters ince there is a direct relationship between crown diameter and NDVI values measured with remote sensing. Field measurements and aerial photos were used to estimate the crown cover in the study area.

Tominimize the influence of the grass vegetation, the study was carried out when most trees had shed their leaves. After the trees we recut down the branches and the stemwere weighed. A number of 39 trees and shrubs of 12 different species were included in the destructive measurements. The linear relationship between crown diameter and the wetweight is described by the following equation (correlation 0.94):

Y=0.19+1.28*X

(Equation6)

Y=logwetweight X=log(crowndiameter)²

Tocompare the result with the Depof Forestry's the dryweight had to be calculated from the weight. Out of the 39 trees that we refelled and weighed within K Olsson's study, 19 trees were also dried and the dryweight was measured. The dry weight for these 19 trees was plotted against their wetweight (these calculations were carried out by Elmqvist & Lundström) and the regression was found as (with a correlation value of 0.99):

Dryweight=0.685*wetweight

(Equation7)

Alltreeswerethenconvertedtodryweightusingthisequation.

4.3.1.2 DepofForestry'smethod

ThestudyareawaslocatedinBushmanlandinnorthernNamibia.Therainfallvaried inaeast-westwardgradientfrom300to400mm/year.Additionalsamplingwas performedintheCaprividistrictinthenorthernstripofNamibiatoincreasethe numberofsamplesandthevariationofspecies.Themainvegetationtypeswereforest andwoodlandsavanna.Dominantspecieswere *Burceaafricana*, *Pterocarpus anglosensis*, *Combretumcollinum*, *Terminaliasericea*, *Lonchocarpusnelsii* and *Colosphermummopane*.

Theaimofthestudywastocarryoutaninventoryofthewoodyresourcesin northeasternNamibia.Thestemdiameteratbreastheightwasusedasthenondestructiveparameter.Mosttreesweresinglestemmedandbranchedabovebreast height. Duringtheproject, 148treesfromsixdifferentspeciesweremeasuredatbreast height, felledandweighed. Eachofthesix species represented one group and all other species found in the area were also recorded and classified into one of the six groups. The treeswere dried and weighed again and volume functions (equation 8 and 9) were established for the six species (the correlation value was not presented in the Depof Forestry's report). The constants a and bare species dependent (see explanation below) and dist the stem diameter in breas the ight. Equation 8 was found to describe the relationship between volume and diameter at breas the ight for *Burkeaa fricana* and *Terminaliasericea*. For *Combretum collinum, Lonchocar pusnelsii, Pterocar pus anglosensis* and *Colos phermum opane*, equation 9 was found to be stdescribe the relationship. Two equations were used to make ite asierto distinguish between variations indensities, water content and growth form for different species. The diameters of the felled trees ranged between 5–75 cm so equation 8 and 9 were only valid for the sediameters.

Apartfromusing different equations for different species, each of the six species had different aand boonstants to use in the equations. Table 6 shows the six different species and the constant sused in the equations 8 and 9.

Burkeaafricana and Terminaliasericea:

$$V=e^{(a_0+a_1/d)}$$
 (dm³) (Equation8)

Combretumcollinum,Lonchocarpusnelsii,Pterocarpusanglosensis and Colosphermummopane :

$$V = (a_0 + a_1 \cdot d + a_2 \cdot d^2) \cdot d^2$$
 (dm ³)(Equation9)

 $Table 6. Volume constants used in equation 8 and 9 for the six different species. Some groups do not require a __2 constants ^l.$

Group	Species	a_0	A_1	A_2
1	Burkeaafricana	8.607856	-58.71163	-
2	Combretumcollinum	0.131382	0.0180767	-0.0000905
3	Lonchocarpusnelsii	0.396588	0.0077865	-
4	Pterocarpusanglosensis	0.667061	-0.008408	0.0002143
5	Terminaliasericea	7.158742	-39.232256	-
6	Colosphermummopane	0.246675	0.01826	-0.0002

The volume was converted to dryweight by multiplying with the basic density. Table 7 shows the basic densities for the six different species.

¹Thesignificantnumbersoftheconstantsarequestionable.

 $Table 7. Basic densities (kg/dm^{3}) for converting volume (dm^{3}) intodry weight (kg). For diameters less than the limit smultiply volume with B1, otherwise use B2.$

Group	Species	Basicdensity,B1	LimitforusingB1	Basicdensity,B2
1	Burkeaafricana	0.805	D<30cm	0.770
2	Combretumcollinum	0.881	D<25cm	0.770
3	Lonchocarpusnelsii	0.977	D<25cm	0.854
4	Pterocarpusanglosensis	0.598	D<30cm	0.525
5	Terminaliasericea	0.754	D<20cm	0.616
6	Colospherummopane	0.803	D<26cm	0.707

4.3.2 Totalwoodydryweight

Toinvestigate the relationship between woodydryweights measured infield and different NDVI values, the total woodydryweight in each plothad to be calculated. This was done using KOlsson's and DepofForestry's equations described above.

KOlsson'sequationcouldbeappliedtoalltreesbutsinceDepofForestry's equationsonlywereapplicabletospecieswithstemdiametersbetween5and75cm, thedryweightoftreeswithotherstemdiameterscouldnotbecalculated.Insteadthey werecalculatedwithequationsestablishedinanotherproject.Thisstudywascarried outintheOtjiwarongodistrictincentralNamibia(Erkkilä&Siiskonen,1992).The woodydryweightin13haofwoodlandwasexaminedandarelationshipbetween stemdiameteranddryweightwasestablishedforthefourspecies *Terminaliasericea*, *Burkeaafricana,Combretumpsidoides* and *Ochnapulchra*.

Theequationfor *Terminaliasericea* (equation10)isvalidforstemdiametersbetween 1and26cm.Since *Terminaliasericea* belongstogroup5(intheDepofForestry's study),equation10wasappliedtoallgroup5specieswithstemdiameterslessthan5 cmthatwerefoundintheHoanibregion.Theequationfor *Combretumpsidoides* (equation11)wasvalidforstemdiametersbetween1and9.3cm. *Combretum psidoides*belongstogroup2(accordingtotheDepofForestry's sstudy)sothedry weightforallgroup2specieswithstemdiameterlessthan5cmwerecalculatedwith equation11.

Terminaliasericea:

 $V = -1,2586 + 0,51309 \cdot d + 0,29737 \cdot d^{2} (1 \text{cm} < \text{d} < 26 \text{cm}) (\text{Equation} 10)$

Combretumpsidioides:

 $V = 0.03701 \cdot d^{2.48634}$ (1cm<d<9.3cm)(Equation11)

4.3.3 Canopycover

The canopy coverist hetotal coverage in percent of trees in one plotse enfrom above and is calculated from the measurements of canopy diameter of the individual trees. The shape of the trees was assumed to be circular.
4.3.4 Grassparameters

TostudytherelationshipbetweentheNDVIandthegrassmeasurements,three differentparameterswereused. Theweight,formedbyadestructivemethod, representedthetotaldryweightoftheannualandperennialgrass. Thetwoother parameters, the coverand the volume, we renon-destructive. The former represented the total cover of the annual and perennial grass and the laterwas formed by the cover and the height of the grass according to equation 12 below. The annual swere separated from the perennials in the equations ince they we remeasured separately in field even though this was not taken into consideration when investigating the correlation values with NDVI.

(Equation12)

Volume(m $^{3}/ha$)= (cover(m $^{2}/ha$)*height(m)) (annual)+(cover(m $^{2}/ha$)*height(m)) (perennial)

4.4 Sensitivitytestofthe ε,aandbparametersinthe Monteithequation

AsensitivitytestoftheMontiethequation(equation4)tovariationsofthe ɛ,aandb parameterswerecarriedoutwithaMonte-Carlosimulation.ThismeansthatNPPwas calculatedwiththeMonteithequationseveraltimesandforeachcalculationanumber for ɛ,aorbwasrandomized.The ɛ,aandbparameterswererandomizedbetweenthe maximumandminimumvaluefoundforeachparameterinliterature(seeTheory, *Net PrimaryProduction*)(table8).Thetotalnumberofcalculationscanbesettoany valuebut100calculationswerechosenforthisstudy.

Table8.Minimumandmaximumvaluesfor

e,uunub		
Parameter	Minimum	Maximum
8	0.07	3.9
А	1.21	1.67
В	-0.19	0.4

Threedifferentoptionsweretriedtotestthesensitivity:

- 1. ε,aandbwerevaried
- 2. Onlyevariedandaandbwereheldconstant
- 3. Aandbvariedandewasheldconstant

The average of the values found in literature was used for the parameters that were held constant.

 $\label{eq:particular} PAR was approximated to 50\% of the incoming radiation and calculated according to appendix 1. Incoming radiation depends on latitude, time of the year and cloudiness. The cloudiness was not taken into considerations ince there was no access to cloud data for the time of the field measurements. To simplify calculations of PAR and later NPP, an average latitude (-19.00.00), longitude (13.00.00) and day of the year (16th of February) was chosen.$

TheMonteCarlosimulationwascarriedoutforplotnumber22only.Thisplotwas randomlychosenoutofthe22plotswithadistinctgrowingseason.Theaverage, minimumandmaximumNPPwerecalculatedaswellasthestandarddeviation.

4.5 Statisticalpreprocessing

Forstatistical purposes the population and the sample must be normally distributed (Shaw & Wheeler, 1997). Therefore the normal distributions for all the parameters used in the comparisons were studied initially. If nonormal distribution existed, the datawastrans formed (for example 10 the logaritmors quareroot). If this improves the distribution the transformed datawas used for the analysis. If no clear evidence of improved normal distribution was found after transformation, raw datawas used for the analyses. All these decision were taken on a subjective basis by visually studying histograms.

Anotherfactorthathastobekeptinmindisthepresenceofatrendinthedata.As mentionedthevegetationisaffectedbytheeast-westerlyprecipitationgradient.The annualprecipitationisthreetimesashighinthemosteasterlyplotscomparedtothe mostwesterlyplots(300mmand100mmrespectively).Thegreatrainfallvariability of50-70% alsohastobekeptinmind.Thisprecipitationgradientinfluencesthe vegetationtoagreatextent, since the precipitationisthemajor controlling factor of thevegetationintheregion.

Toinvestigate the effect of a trend in the data on the correlation values, not only the total number of plots was studied, but also a smaller statistical population representing the easternare as (the 16 plots in Otjikowares, Omuramba and Hobatere) with a less varied annual precipitation and therefore also a more similar veget at ion type.

Athirdfactoristheoneofspatialandtemporalautocorrelation.Spatial autocorrelationisexpectedbecauseseveralplotsarelocatedverycloseandshouldbe influencedbyeachother.Thetemporalautocorrelationisduetothefactthatthe NDVIvalueforonedekadisdependentontheNDVIvaluefortheprecedingdekad. Nothingwasdonetotestthisproblem,butithastobekeptinmind.

With the restrictions mentioned above inmind, along with the caution needed for smalls amples, the relationship between the NDVI and vegetation parameters measured in the field we restudied.

 $The results of the measurements and calculations of woody and grass parameters are described in this chapter. The time series of NDVI are also presented as well as the correlation between the woody and grass parameters with NDVI. Finally the result of the sensitivity test of ϵ_a, and be parameters in the Monteithe quation is presented.$

Before studying these relationships, the normal distribution of data was examined.

5.1 Normaldistributionofdata

 $\label{eq:someparameters} From the visual interpretation of data it was found that the normal distribution of some parameters was not satisfying. When transforming data only the grass volume was improved when transformed into the 10 $$^{th}\logarithm. The logarithm is volume of grass will therefore be used with the correlation stoNDVI. Since the normal distributions of the other parameters were not significantly improved after transformation, raw data was used.$

5.2 TimeseriesofNDVIduringthegrowingseason98/99

Theperiodofavailableimages, the last dekadof Septembert othe last dekadof May, was divided into three time periods to simplify the description of the variation of the NDVI values. The lengths of the three time periods varied for the different areas, but lasted approximately from the end of Septembert oN ovember, from Decembert oJ anuary and finally from February to May (figure 8).



Figure 8. The variation of NDVI from the last dekadof Septembert othe last dekadof May for the five different areas (some of the dekads during the growing season were either altered or created: see Method and Material, Altering data due to atmospheric influence). The field measurements were carried outduring the second dekadof February in the Ses fontein and Khowaribare as and during the third dekadof February for the areas: Omuramba, Otjikovares and Hobatere.

TheendofSeptembertoNovemberwascharacterizedbyflatNDVIcurvesforall areas,withvaluesrangingfromabout0.1inKhowaribtojustabove0.15in Otjikovares.ForallregionsexceptOtjikovarestherewasaslightdecreaseorconstant levelsofNDVIduringthetimeperiod.

When entering these condimeperiod, Decemberto January, an increased variation in NDVI was noted for all areas as well as an overall decrease. The change in atmospheric constitution from dry to humid probably caused this decrease of NDVI at the beginning of the rainy season (Rasmussen, 1996). The increased amounts of clouds were likely to have caused the drops in NDVI for some dekads.

Thethirdtimeperiod, FebruarytoMay, coincided with the growing season. The start was represented by a sudden increase in NDVI. Omurum baand Otjikovares were the regions where the growing season first was noted, which occurred during the first dekadof February. The differences in amplitudes for the five areas were at maximum during this third period. The differences in maximum NDVI values were as high as 0.275. Otjikovares was the area where the highest NDVI value was reached (0.36). Thereafter followed Omurum ba, Hobatere, Khowariband Sesfontein indecreasing order of maximum NDVI.

Noactual growingseason was observed in Sesfontein. For this reason the 8 plots located in the Sesfontein area were all excluded from the correlation to the grass vegetation and the maximum NDV I concerning the woody vegetation. Therefore only 22 plots were used in these cases. The correlation between woody parameters and background NDV I on the other hand, all the plots could be used, since this NDV I parameter was formed during the period before the growing season.

The appearance of the NDV I curves after the last dekadof Maywas obviously not clear. Even though the NDV I was increasing for the Khowariband Ses fonteinarea it was assumed that there would be a continuous decrease in NDV I after the last dekad of Mayuntil the beginning of the next growing season.

5.3 Calculationsfromfieldmeasurements

Theresultsfrom the comparisons of the woody dryweight calculated using Depof Forestry's and KOlsson's equations are described below as well as the woody and grass parameters calculated for each plot.

5.3.1 WoodydryweightcalculationsusingKOlssonsandDepof Forestrysmethods

Totally114treesorshrubsweremeasuredwithinthisstudy.60ofthesehadstem diameterslessthan5cmandcouldnotbecalculatedusingtheDepofForestry's equations.Thereforeonly53treeswereusedforthecomparisons.Outofthe53trees examined,25treesbelongedtogroup2,4and6andwerecalculatedusingDepof Forestry'sequationnumber1.28treesbelongedtogroupnumber5andwere calculatedusingequationnumber2.Nogroup1and3treeswerefoundinthefive areas.Appendix3showsthecalculateddryweightforthe53treescomparedwithin thisstudy.

 $\label{eq:link} Infigure 9 the dryweight calculated using Dep. of Forestry's equation are plotted against the dryweight calculated using Olsson's equation.$



Figure 9. Woodydry weight calculated using Dep. of Forestry's equation plotted against woodydry weight calculated with Olsson's equation. The trees in the square a) are also shown in figure 10.

Thefourtreesinsidesquareb)areallgroup6species(the7treesinsidesquarec)areallgroup5species(*Persika*and *FaidherbaAlbida*). Colosphermummopane) and AccaciaTortillis , Salvadore

Treeswithlowdryweightwerenotsatisfactorydisplayedinfigure9.Figure10 displaysonlythetreesinsidesquarea).Theclusteringofdatainaverticaldirectionis duetothefactthatthecanopymeasurementswereonlymeasuredwithahalf-meter accuracy.



Figure10.Treesinsidesquarea)infigure9

To find how well the dry weight calculated using KOlsson's equation corresponds to the Dep. of Forestry's dry weight, the correlation between the two results was

examined. The correlation between Olsson and DepofForestry dryweights was 0.29 and is just above 0.266, which is the table value for a two-tailed significance at a 0.05 level.

Tofindwhichtreesthatwereresponsiblefortherelativelylowcorrelationvalue,the ratioofthedryweightcalculatedusingDepofForestry'sandOlsson'sequationswas calculated(fromnowoncalledF/Oratio)foreachtree(appendix3).Formthisratioit wasfoundthatover80% of the trees resulted in a higher dryweight using Dep. of Forestry's equation. The *Combretumimberbe* for example, inplotnumber2, had a dry weight calculated using Dep. of Forestry's equation that was more than 500 times larger than the dryweight calculated with Olsson's equation.

ToinvestigateifDepofForestry'sequation8or9generallyresultedinhigheror lowerdryweightcomparedtoOlsson's,itwasnoticedthattreesthatover90% of the treesthatwerecalculatedwithequation9mainlyresultedinF/Oratiosabove1. Usingequation8resultedinapproximately50% of the treeswithF/Oratiosabove1.

Toseeiftheanswertotherelativelylowcorrelationvaluecouldbefoundinthe differencesingrowthform,theratiothecrownandstemdiameterwascalculated.The resultshowedthatthecrowndiameterwasbetween2and30timesgreaterthanthe stemdiameter(appendix3)forallthe53trees.

It was also found that over 60% of the trees measured in this project had more than 1 stem in breastheight and over 30% had more than 4 stems, which also has been taken into consideration when studying the growth form.

5.3.2 Totalwoodydryweight

Thetotalwoodydryweightinthe30plotscalculatedusingDepofForestry's(with theadditionalcalculationsfromErkilläandSiiskonen)andKOlsson'sequationsare showninfigure11.Severalplots,forexample13and14,showedgreatdifferences betweenthedryweightscalculatedusingKOlssonandtheDepofForestrys equations.Thewoodyvegetationintheseplotsconsistedoftreeswithverylargestem diameters.Additionally,thewoodydryweightvariesconsiderablybetweentwo plots,evenforadjacentplotsinthesamearea.Notreeswerefoundinplotnumber19 andthedryweightofthetreesfoundinplotnumber17istosmall(8kg/hausingK Olsson'sequationand48kg/hausingDepofForestry's)tobedisplayedinfigure11.



Figure 11. The woodydryweight (kg/ha) for each plot calculated with Olssons and DepofForestrys equations (plot number 1-2 and 5-8 are located in the Kowaribarea, 3-4 and 9-14 in Sesfontein, 15-20 in Omuramba, 21-24 in Otjikowares and 25-30 in the Hobaterearea).

Theaveragedryweightsforallplotswere3600kg/hausingKOlsson's equation and 7600kg/hausingDepofForestry's equation.

5.3.3 Canopycover

The canopy cover in each plot is shown in figure 12. The canopy cover in plot number 17 was too small (0.1%) to be displayed. As for the woody dry weight the cover varied a lot between different plots even for plots located in the same area.



Figure12.Thecanopycover(%)ineachplot(plotnumber1-2and5-8arelocatedintheKowarib area,3-4and9-14inSesfontein,15-20inOmuramba,21-24inOtjikowaresand25-30intheHobatere area).

The can opy cover inmost plots did not exceed 10% even though the cover in three plots was over 50%.

5.3.4 Grassparameters

Asforthewoodyparametersagreatvarianceexisted within and between each of the five areas for the grassweight, cover and volume (figure 13a, bandc). This was also the case for nearby situated plots. As a result of this, it was difficult to depict any trends in the dataset, but to get an ideas omere sults are listed below.

The grass cover in the Khowari bare an ever exceeded 20% for any plot. For all the other areas the maximum varied between 70% and 80%, even if some of the plots in the areas experienced values as low as in Khowari b.

 $The cover and the logarithm of the volume showed evidently similar trends. The highest coverwas recorded in plot number 19 with 78\%, where a splot number 15 recorded the highest volume of 600 m <math display="inline">^3/ha.$





³/ha).(plot

Figure 13. Presentation of grass cover (%), grassweight (kg/ha) and grass volume (m number 1-2 and 5-8 are located in the Kowaribarea, 15-20 in Omuramba, 21-24 in Otjikowares and 25-30 in the Hobaterearea. The Sesfonte in areawas not included in the results, since the growing seas on had not yet started.

5.4 ComparingfieldmeasurementswithNDVI

TherelationshipbetweenthedifferentNDVIandthewoodyandgrassparameters calculatedfromfieldmeasurementsarepresentedbelow.Therelationshipwasstudied forallplots(30plotsforwoodyparameterswithbackgroundNDVIand22forwoody andgrassparameterswiththeotherNDVIparameters).Asmentionedbeforewhen investigatingifthecorrelationvaluesdifferedwithadecreasingtrendindata,the16 plotsinOtjikovares,OmurambaandHobaterewerestudiedseparately.The correlationswerestudiedwiththefieldmeasurementsastheindependentvariableand theNDVIasthedependent.

Asaresultofthesmallnumberofplotsspecialattentionshouldbegiventothevisual interpretationofthescatterplots, which are present in the case of significant correlations (appendix 4).

5.4.1 WoodyparameterswithNDVI

AsmentionedbeforethebackgroundandmaxNDVIwerecorrelatedtothewoody dryweightandcanopycover.Figure14showsthecorrelationfortheall30plots betweenbackgroundNDVIandthewoodydryweightandcanopycover.The horizontallinerepresentsthetablevalueforaonetailedtestandasignificancevalue of0,05.EventhoughcanopycovershowedthebestcorrelationtobackgroundNDVI allcorrelationswerewellbelowthesignificancelevel.Thecorrelationtothedry weightcalculatedwiththeDepofForestry'sequationshowedanegativecorrelation.



Figure 14. Correlations between the woodydryweight and can opycover with background NDVI for 30 plots. The dotted lines hows the table value for a one tailed test at a significance value of 0.05.

Figure15showsthecorrelationwithmaximumNDVI,insteadofbackgroundNDVI. Thenumberofplotswasreducedto22sincetheplotsinSesfonteinwereexcluded fromthecorrelationsduringthegrowingseason.Thebestrelationshipwasfoundfor woodydryweightusingKOlsson'sequationbutnoneofthecorrelationswere significant.ThewoodydryweightusingDepofForestry'sequationsshoweda negativecorrelationvalue.



 $\label{eq:stable} Figure 15. Correlations between the woody dryweight, can opy cover and maximum NDVI for 22 plots. The dotted line represents the table value for a one-tailed test at a significance value of 0.05.$

To investigate if the correlation values differed with a lower trend in the dataset, the correlation between the woody parameters and NDVI we restudied for the 16 plots in Otjikovares, Omuramba and Hobatere (figure 16). No improvement of correlation

valueswasfoundwheninvestigatingonly16plots.Thewoodydryweightcalculated usingDepofForestry'sequationswasevenmorenegativewith16plots.The significancelevelofcorrelationwasneverreached.



 $\label{eq:Figure16.} Figure16. Correlations between the woody dryweight, can opy cover and background and maximum NDV I for 16 plots. The dotted line represents the table value for a one-tailed test at a significance value of 0.05$

5.4.2 GrassparameterswithNDVI

AsmentionedbeforetheNDVIparameterscorrelatedtothegrassmeasurementswere max, sumfield, sumdecreaseandsum (seeMethodandMaterial, *NDVIParameters* fordescriptionofparameters). The grassparameters were the cover, the weight and the logarithm of the volume. For both the 16 and 22 plots, the sumfield, sum, max and sumdecrease correlated to the grassparameters in decreasing or derof magnitude (figure 17 and 18).

The correlation values for the 22 plots we regenerally more significant than the 16 plots. This was visualized in figure 17 and 18 by the horizontal line representing the table value for a one-tailed test at a significance value of 0.05. For the 22 plots the values ranged from 0.32 to 0.62 (table value of 0.360) and 11 of the 12 correlation values we refound significant. For the 16 plots the values ranged from 0.10 to 0.65 (table value of 0.426) and 40 fthe 12 correlation values we refound significant.

Forboththe22andthe16plotsthesumfieldgenerallycorrelatedbesttothegrass measurements, eventhough the values inmost cases were almost as high for the sum (excluding correlation values that we renot significant). The relatively highest correlation of all was 0.62 and was returned for the 22 plots between the sum field and the weight as well as between the sum and the logarithm of the volume.

The sum decrease and the max returned the lowest correlation values of the four.



Figur 17. The correlation values for all four NDVI parameters to the grass parameters for the 22 plots. The total of 22 plots corresponds to a table value of 0.360 at a significance level of 0.05, which is represented by a horizontal line in the figure.



Figur 18. The correlation values for all four NDVI parameters to the grass parameters for the 16 plots. The total of 16 plots corresponds to a table value of 0.426 at a significance level of 0.05, which is represented by a horizontal line in the figure.

It is not only interesting to study how the different NDV I parameters correlated to the measurements of the grass, but also how the three different grass measurements are structured in the structure of the s

influenced the correlation. When correlating with the logarithm of the volume the values were almost as high as for the weight for the 22 plots, where as the correlation values with the cover were the lowest for both the 22 and the 16 plots.

TherelationshipsbetweentheNDVIandgrassparametersfoundsignificantwere visualizedinscatterplots(appendix4).

5.5 Sensitivitytestofthe ε,aandbparametersinthe Monteithequation

Table9showstheaverage, minimum, maximum and standard deviation values from 100NPP calculations in plot number 22 for the three options listed below:

- 1. ε,aandbvaried
- 2. Onlyevaried and a and bwasheld constant
- 3. aandbvariedandewasheldconstant

Table9.TheresultingNPP(kg/ha)oftheMonte-Carlosimulationforplotnumber22.										
Opt.	8	а	b	AverageNPP	Std	MaxNPP	MinNPP			
•				(kg/ha)						
1	0.07-3.9	1.21-1.67	-0.19-0.4	2676	1709	6483	148			
2	0.07-3.9	1.44	0.105	2591	1555	5276	135			
3	1.98	1.21-1.67	-0.19-0.4	3400	426	4315	2547			

Table9showsthatvaryingallparameters(option1)gavethehigheststandard deviationandthelargestrangebetweentheresultingminimumandmaximumNPP. ThefirstoptionresultedinanaverageNPPof2676kg/haandastandarddeviationof justabove1700kg/ha.TheNPPvariedfromjustbelow150kg/hatojustabove6480

kg/ha.

The second option gave as lightly lower average NPP and standard deviation. The maximum NPP we relower than for option 1 but the minimum value was just as low.

The result from option 3 showed that NPP calculations we requite insensitive to variations in a and b parameters. The average NPP was 3400 kg/ha and the standard deviation was only 426 kg/ha.

Thischapterincludesadiscussionwhethernon-destructivemeasurementsofwoody dryweightsarepossibleornotusingthetwomethodsdescribedinthisstudyornot. Theresultofthecomparisonsbetweenvegetationparametersmeasuredinfieldand differentNDVIparametersarealsodiscussed.

6.1 ComparingthewoodydryweightusingDepof Forestry'smethodwithKOlsson's

Toinvestigate the utility of the non-destructive measurements of woody dryweight the calculated dryweight using DepofForestry's was compared to the dryweight using KOlsson's. The correlation value between the two calculations of dryweight was just above the significant level. This indicates that using existing equations for calculating dryweight from non-destructive measurements might be apossible alternative to the time consuming and harmfuldes tructive measurements. It can be concluded though that the remust be some important differences between the two methods that can explain the considerable differences indryweight for some trees that has to be taken into consideration. Therefore the discussion is focused on the differences and the advantage and disadvantage with the two methods.

6.1.1 Differencesbetweenthetwomethods

Oneofthereasonsforthedifferencesindryweightcouldbethattwodifferent equationsandsixdifferentconstantswereusedwhencalculatingdryweightusing DepofForestry'smethodwhileonlyoneequationwasappliedtoallspeciesusingK Olsson'smethod.Thismeansthatifthevariancesinforexampletreedensityand watercontentwerelargebetweenthespeciesinthearea,thesedifferenceswouldnot bereflectedaswellusingKOlsson'sequation.

Anotherexplanationtothedifferencesindryweightcouldbethatstemdiameterwas raisedbythepowerof4inDepofForestry'sequation9.Thisindicatesthatsmall errorsinwhenmeasuringstemcircumferenceinfieldwouldresultinincreasederrors indryweight.

Further, KOlsson's equation suggested that there was a constant relationship between crown diameter and the woody dryweight of the tree. In a reaswith a large number of different species, growing conditions and grazing pressure, the relationship between crown and stem diameter might vary alot. This was shown when examining the crown to stem ratio for the trees measured in the Hoanib catchment. The ratio varied from 2 to just over 30. The *Combretumin berbe* that differed indryweight over 500 times between DepofForestry's and KOlsson's calculationshad acrown to stem ratio of 3. The *Combretumin berbe* is of great importance to people, lives to ck and game in Namibia. A part from being browsed by an imalsitis an outstanding fuel-wood and its leaves and roots are used medicinally (Van Wyk, 1998). Because of its utility the crown of these trees is of the very narrow and the dryweight calculated with KOlsson sequation will therefore be underestimated.

Anotherimportant difference was probably the fact that the DepofForestrys equations were based on the measurements of single-stemmed treess incemost trees measured in Bushman landor Caprivionly hadonestem in breas the ight where as many multistemmed trees occurred in the Hoanib catchment. When calculating the woody dry weight of multi-stemmed trees using DepofForestry's equations, the dry weight for the average stemwas initially calculated. This was then multiplied with the number of stems toget the total woody dry weight of the tree. The accuracy of this procedure is dependent on the characteristic soft he branching since the branching of a multi-stemmed tree can either start at ground level, just below breas the ight or any where in between. The measured dry weight of two trees with the same stem diameter and number of stems in breas the ight will be different if the branching start at ground level for one tree or just below breas the ight for the other. The calculated dry weight, on the other hand, will be the same independent of the level of branching. This in combination with the sensitivity to stem diameter in equation 9 can probably to some extent explain the differences in dry weight with the two methods.

Eventhoughcrowndiameterwasusedasthenon-destructiveparameterinKOlsson's equationthenumberofstemswillprobablyinfluencetheresult.Thereasonisthatthe crownofeachsteminamulti-stemmedtreewillcompeteforspacewithitsneighbors. Amulti-stemmedtreeisthereforemorelikelytohaveasmallercrowndiameterthana treewithonlyonestem.Thiswillresultinanunderestimateddryweightwith Olssonsequationformultistemmedtrees.

Fromthediscussionaboveitwasclearthatthedryweightequationsweredependent onthespeciesandgrowthformthattheywereestablishedfor.Itisdifficultto evaluatethecalculateddryweighttothetruedryweightsincenodestructive measurementsofwoodyvegetationwascarriedoutwithinthisproject.Whenusing existingequationsfromdestructivemeasurementsinthefutureitistherefore importantcarefullystudythespeciescompositionandthegrowthformofthespecies usedtoestablishtheequation.Itisalsoimportanttolettheadvantageand disadvantagewiththemethodsdecidewhichonetochoose.

6.1.2 Advantagesanddisadvantages

TheadvantagewithKOlsson'smethodisthatthereisadirectrelationshipbetween crowndiametermeasuredinfieldandNDVIvaluesfromNOAAimages.Stem diametercanonlyberelatedtoNDVIinanindirectway.

Measuringcrowndiameterisalsoaquickandeasywayofestimatingdryweight sincethespeciescompositionisirrelevantandcrowndiameterisaneasyparameterto measure.Forindividualsthatbranchbelowbreastheightitismoreconvenientand probablymoreaccuratetomeasurecrowndiametereventhoughthecompetitionfor spaceisalimitingfactor.Applyingoneequationtoallspeciesincludesmany generalizationsthough.

TheadvantageoftheDepofForestrysmethodisthattwoequationsandseveral constantswillprobablyresultinamoreaccuratedryweight.Theaccuracyofthedry weightcalculationsisnotvalidatedwithinthisprojectthough.Thedisadvantageis thatthespeciescompositionhastobeknownwhichistimeconsuming.Theequations

arealsobasedonthefactthattreesbranchabovebreastheight, which is not always the case in semiaridareas.

Before deciding which one of the two methods to use one has to validate the accuracy of the two different methods.

6.2 ComparingwoodyparameterswithNDVI

Before the correlations between the woodydry weight and NDVI were examined it was important to know if the calculated dry weights were reasonable. Therefore the calculated woodydry weight was compared with results from other studies. It has to bekept in mind that since these studies have not been performed in identical regions to the Hoanib catchment, they can only be seen as roughest imates. Table 10 shows the average woodydry weight perhect are calculated within this study and the results from a four other studies. It can be concluded that the woodydry weight calculated in this study were in the same magnitude as the result from the other studies.

5		1		, ,
Author	Dryweight(kg/ha)	Precipitation (mm)	Studyarea	Typeofvegetation
Elmqvist&Lundström (2000)	KOlsson:3600 DepofForestry:7600	100-300 100-300	Namibia	Mopanesavannah
Kelly&Walker(1976)	21400	500	Zimbabwe	Mopanewoodlands
Olsson(1985)	4700-15000	150-450	Sudan	Woodland
UNESCO(1979)	3500	250	Senegal	Mixedwoodland
Nichol(1989)	3000-10500	600	Nigeria	Shrubland
	30800			Forestreserve

Table 10. Estimates of above groundwoody dryweight from the literature (Franklin & Hiernaux, 1991)

Since the correlation between the woody parameters and NDVI were not significant when studying the plots in Otjikowares, Omuramba and Hobatereitis not further discussed within this section. See grass correlation with NDVI for discussion in detail.

6.2.1 WoodyparameterswithbackgroundNDVI

Otherstudieshavefoundsignificantcorrelationsbetweencanopycoverand backgroundNDVI.KOlsson(1985)measuredcanopycoverinfieldandinaerial photosinanareainSudanandestablishedsignificantcorrelationstoNDVIfrom LandsatMSSimagesduringdryseason.Thiswasexplainedbythedifferencesinthe amountofshadowsforareaswithdifferentcanopycovers.Anotherreasonwasthe factthatthedisturbingreflectancefromgrassvegetationwasabsentduringthedry season.Therefore,significantcorrelationsbetweenbackgroundNDVIandcanopy coverwasexpectedinthisstudytoo.BackgroundNDVIwasalsoexpectedto correlatefairlywelltothewoodydryweightbecauseofthefactthatmostareaswitha densecanopycoveralsohasalargedryweight.Neithercanopycovernorwoodydry weightcalculatedinthisstudyshowedsignificantcorrelationstobackgroundNDVI though.Thiscanhaveseveralexplanations.

Thetreecoverinmostplotsdoesnotexceed10%.Areaswithalowtreecoverhada largepercentagebaresoil.Thereflectancefromthesoilvarieswithforexamplesoil type,watercontent,degreeoftramplingfromcattleandtheamountoflitteronthe ground.ThelowerthetreecoverthegreateristheNDVIvaluesaresultofdifferences

inbackgroundproperties. The differences inshadows between areas were probably to small to be detected in the NDVI values. The correlations can be improved by taking differences insoil type into account. Rasmussen (1996) tried to add a soil factor and found that soil information improved the explanation of dryweight variations for millet in Senegal.

The difficulty inchoosing representatives ampling plots can also contribute to the low correlations. The location of the 30 plots was chosen randomly but befores ampling the surrounding areas was visually investigated. If the species composition and vegetation cover in the plot were nogo of representative of the vegetation in the surrounding 1 times 1 km, another plot area was chosen. Even though effort was made inchoosing plots, the difficulties indeciding representative plots had to be considered as a source of error. If the plot was located for example close to an ephermal river the measured dry weight and can opy cover in the plot would be much higher than the surrounding area. The correlation stocan opy cover could have been improved if the can opy cover was measured in aerial photos since the cover in the entire pixel could be measured instead of only 50 times 50 meter. This would reduce the error caused by letting the cover in only one plot represent an area with a possibly different cover.

6.2.2 WoodyparameterswithmaxNDVI

Noneofthecorrelations between woody parameters and maxNDVI werefound significant. This can probably also be explained the low tree cover in the region. The reflectance from the growing grass vegetation might influences the NDVI values more than the reflectance from the trees. In a reaswhere grass lands are mixed with trees such as the Hoanib catchment the NDVI values represent the overall production of grass vegetation and leaves in the area. A classification of the area into different vegetation types could improve the result. Rasmussen (1996) tried to apply a vegetation parameter to the NPP equation and found that this improve the result.

Apartfrom the influence of the herbace ous vegetation the increase damount of shadows during growing season also lowers the NDVI in areas with a dense tree cover. This will affect the correlations considerably since the reflectance from the trees in areas with a dense cover, that otherwises hould have high NDVI values, will be much lower due to shadows.

6.3 ComparinggrassparameterswithNDVI

Therelativeorderofcorrelationvalues for 22 and 16 plots was the similar for each grass measurement; therefore the discussion is the same for the two cases. As mentioned the 22 plots included all the plots except the one saround Ses fontein, where the growing season was not yet detected by the NDVI values. The 16 plots on the other hand included only the eastern plots (Omuramba, Otjikovares and Hobatere).

The datawas analyzed with 22 and 16 plots respectively to drawattention to the fact that atrend in the dataset might increase the correlation values. This was shown by the fact that the 22 plots returned more significant values than the 16 plots. To avoid the trend in the data caused by the east-westerly precipitation gradient, measurements could instead be carried out along as outh-northerly axis in the catchment where the vegetation types would be more similar. The rewould still exist differences caused by

for example differents oil types and erratic precipitation, but the trend due to the annual precipitation gradient of the data would probably decrease.

Incommonforboththe22andthe16plotswasthatthesumfieldshowedthe strongestrelationshiptothegrassmeasurementsinmostcases.Ithadtobenoted thoughthattheincreaseinNDVIinKowaribdidnotoccuruntilafterthefield measurementswerecarriedout,whichaffectedthecorrelationvalues(seappendix4). Thegrowingseasonintheotherareashadstartedwhenthefieldmeasurementswere carriedoutandwasalsoregisteredbytheNDVI,eventhoughitwasonlynotedin1 to3dekads(figure8).However,thecorrelationvalueswiththesumfieldwerein mostcasesfoundsignificant,whichwasalsofoundbyotherstudies(Wylie *etal*, 1991andPrince,1991).

Interestingtonoteisthattherelationshipswiththesumdidnotdifferconsiderably fromthoseofthesumfield. ThisisnoticeablesincethesumismadeupbyNDVI valuesregisteredaftertheperiodoffieldmeasurements. Itwasevidentlyasourceof errortocomparefieldmeasurementsfromonedatewithNDVIvaluesfromlater dekads, asthefieldmeasurementswerecarriedouttooearly. Italsohastobekeptin mindthattheearlierthegrassstartstogrow; the longertime is available for the grass to accumulatedryweight. This might be there as on why the sum and the sumfield showed similar results. I deally the field measurements should be carried out when the vegetation is just at or close to its maximum. In other words the sumfield should correspond to the same period of time as the sum decrease or the sum. It is often hard to match the period in the field with the phenology of the vegetation though, as the precipitation is soun predictable. The similarities in correlation values might suggest that these kinds of studies are not that dependent on when the field measurements are carried out after all.

SumdecreaseshouldreturnahighercorrelationthanthesumaccordingtoWylie (1992). Theyfoundthatthecorrelationincreasedifthetimeperiodwhenthe reflectancefromthestandingdeadvegetationobscuringtheNDVIsignalwasnot considered. SimilarresultswerefoundbyTodd *etal* (1998) when studyinggrazed and ungrazed grasslands. The grazed grasslands returned higher correlation values than the ungrazed, because not much litter influenced the signal in the case of the grazed grasslands. The same relations between the sum and the sum decrease we renot true for this study; may be because the litter did not obscure the signal as an imal sand humans in the region more or less directly consume it.

Alsomaxhavebeenshowntogivehighercorrelationvaluesthanthesum(Fuller, 1998&Tucker *etal*, 1985),butitwasnotthecaseinthisstudy.

Anotherinteresting fact was the good correlation values with the logarithm of the volume. This signifies that this non-destructive method (measuring the coverage and the height) might be an alternative to the destructive method of the weight (cutting, drying and weighing the grass).

It is also evident that even if the grass was not very high it is important to consider the height parameter, which was concluded from the fact that the correlation values were higher for the logarithm of the volume than for the cover.

etal

Additionally, it has to be noted that all the grass comparisons were influenced by the tree cover; their greenness as well as shadows from the trees. This draws attention to the problem of separating grass and woody biomass with NDVI. As mentioned for the woody vegetation, apossible vegetation classification of the region could be done. Other sources of errors were as for the woody dry weight the small plots ize and the influence of the ground, because of the low vegetation cover.

6.4 Sensitivitytestofthe ε,aandbparametersinthe Monteithequation

TheresultoftheMonte-Carlosimulationshowedthatthecalculatednetprimary production,NPP,werequiteinsensitivetovariationsinaandbparametersbutvery sensitivetovariationsin ε.

Itisfoundthattheabilitytoconvertlightintoorganicmatter, ε , isspeciesdependent, whichnecessitatesvariationin ε overlargeheterogeneousareastogetcorrect calculationsofNPP.Variationsinthephysicalenvironmentsuchastemperature, soils, waterandnutritionarealsofoundtoaffectthe ε value(Prince, 1991).Other factorsfoundtoinfluence ε aretheatmosphericconditions, suchasclouds. ε is increased undercloudy conditions since the radiation is distributed more uniformly overall leaves in the canopyrather than saturating some leaves that are sunlitand leave others indarkshade (Gower *etal*, 1999 after Norman and Arkebauer, 1991).

Thevariationin εisnotonlyspatialbutalsotemporal.Insemiaridregionsthe ε valuewillvaryoverthegrowingseasoninaccordancetoperiodsofrainfallandthe intermittentperiodsofdrought(Prince,1991).

Severalstudieshavefoundthateventhough(Prince1991,afterGosse *etal*,1986, Kniry *etal* 1989andRussel *etal* 1989)thespatialvariationsinvegetationtypeand physicalenvironmentinfluencethe ɛvalues,thevariationsonlyoccupyaquite narrowrange.Theythereforesuggestedthat ɛcouldberegardedasconstant throughouttheentiregrowingseason.Theresultofthisstudyindicatesthatusinga constant ɛwillcauseerrorsinthecalculatedNPP,evenifthevariationsin ɛaresmall.

Thismeansthatthechoiceof ɛvalueisofgreatimportanceandthattheuseofa constant ɛinlargeareasisprobablyasourceoferrorwhencalculatingNPP.The advantagewithusingNDVIfromNOAAimagesisthatthenetprimaryproduction overtheentiregrowingseasoncanbecalculatedforlargeareas.Sincethesensitivity ofthemodellimitstheuseofaconstant ɛ,theadvantagewithNDVIfromNOAA decreaseswhencalculatingNPP.Tosolvethisproblemthevariationsinvegetation andphysicalenvironmenthastobeincludedinthe ɛvalue.Differentapproachesare:

- Include the variations of vegetation in classes and to determine aspecific evalue for each class.
- Usethermal-infraredmeasurementstoestimatethevariationsinsurface temperatureandsoilmoisture.
- Estimatethecloudcoverfromthermal-infraredwavelengthbandsandadjustthe valuesfromtheseestimations.

ε

FinallyitwouldhavebeeninterestingtocomparethecalculationsofNPPwithdry weightcalculatedfromthefieldmeasurements. Thiscouldhavebeendonewiththe grassweightcalculatedinthisstudy. It has not been done though, since estimations of foliage would probably be needed to receive acceptable results. Foliage estimations were not possible within this study.

Some other sources of errors that might have influenced the measurements were positioning errors in the GPS, difficulties of choosing an average tree and the rough estimate in the calculations of PAR.

Whenstudying the relationships between NDVI and the field measurements of the woody vegetation, no significant correlation values were found. This was believed to be are sult of for example the low tree cover, the influence of grass vegetation and possible errors when calculating woody dry weight. The correlation values for the grass on the other hand we refound significant. The NDVI integrated during the growing season until the dekad corresponding to the field measurements returned the high est correlation values of the parameters investigated. For all the correlation values attention has to be paid to the small number of plots.

Comparing the two non-destructive methods to calculate woodydry weight showed that the correlation value was just above the level of significance. This indicates that using existing equations for non-destructive measurements of woodydry weight might be apossible alternative to the time consuming and harmfuldes structive measurements. Comparing the calculated dry weight for individual trees revealed large differences indry weight for some trees though. Some of the trees we respect to the time consumer the trees with growth form that differed to agreate xtent from the trees that we reused to establish the equations. This indicates that alot of effort has to be done when choosing equations of that species composition and growth form in the two study areas are in agreement.

Forthegrassmeasurementsitissuggested that non-destructive measurements might be a suseful as destructive ones, since the logarithmized volume of the grass returned almost as significant values as the dryweight.

Thisstudyalsodrawsattentiontothefactthatatrendinthedatasetincreasedthe correlationvaluesinthecaseofthegrass.Oneshouldthereforetrytoavoidthe annualprecipitationgradientwhenchoosingsamplingareas,iftheprecipitationisthe controllingfactorforthevegetation.

TheNPPcalculationsfrom the Monteithe quationshowed to be very sensitive to variations in Ebutless sensitive to variations in a and b parameters. This indicates the importance to vary covertime and space instead of using a constant value since dependent on species, physical environment and atmospheric conditions. When calculating NPP using Monteithe quation in the future, a stratification of the area into different calculases might increase the accuracy of the results.

εis

BurkeA.,JuolaV.andKorhonenK.T.,1996,FieldInstructionsWestern Bushmanland1996, *NationalForestInventoryProject*, DepartmentofForestry.

Cambell, J.B., 1996, Introduction to Remote Sensing , Taylor & Francis.

DirectorateofPlanning, Ministry of Agriculture, Waterand Rural Development, 1998, *Environmental Issues Investigation Project–Hoanib River Catchment Study* unpublished.

ErikssonH., 1999, Undersökningavsambandetmellanstrålningstemperatureroch NDVIiSahel, *LundsUniversitetsNaturgeografiskaInstitution, Seminarieuppsatser Nr.63*.

ErkkiläA.andSiiskonenH.,1992, *ForestryinNamibia1850-1990–SilviaCarelica* 20,UniversityofJoensuu,FacultyofForestry.

FranklinJ.andHiernauxP.H.Y.,1991,Estimatingfoliageandwoodybiomassin SahelianandSudanianwoodlandsusingaremotesensingmodel, *International JournalofRemoteSensing*, vol.12,no.6.

Fuller, 1998, TrendinNDVItimeseries and their relation to range land and crop production in Senegal 1987-1993, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, vol. 19, no. 10.

GowerS.T.,KucharikC.J.andNormanJ.M.,1999,DirectandIndirectEstimation ofLeafAreaIndex,f _{APAR},andNetPrimaryProductionofTerrestrialEcosystems, *RemoteSensingoftheEnvironment* ,70:29-51.

Hall-MartinA., WalkerC., BothmaJ.duP., 1998, *Kaokoveld-Thelastwilderness. Background*, SouthernBookPublisher.

HumavinduM.andNekwiyuW.,1996,ReportonTourismDatainKuneneRegion, *MinistryofEnvironmentandTourism*, unpublished.

JacobsonP.J., JacobsonK.M. and M. Seely, 1995, *EphermalRiversandtheir Catchment-SustainingPeopleandDevelopmentinWesternNamibia*, Desert ResearchFoundationofNamibia.

KrugerA.S.andKressirerR.F.,1996,TowardsSustainableRangelandManagement andLivestockProductioninNamibia, *Agricola*.

LillesandT.M.andKieferR.W., 1979, *RemoteSensingandImageInterpretation*, JohnWiley&Sons.

Nämdenförskogligfjärranalys, 1993, *FlygbildsteknikochFjärranalys*, Skogsstyrelsen.

OkeT.R., 1987, *BoundaryLayerClimates*, LondonandNewYork.

OlssonK.,1985, *RemoteSensingforFuelwoodResourcesandLandDegradation StudiesinKordofan,theSudan*, MeddelandefrånLundsUniversitetsGeografiska Institution,AvhandlingarC.

OlssonL.andPilesjöP.,1999, Developmentandapplicationsofspatiallydistributed hydrologicalmodelsinaGISenvironment inSkidmoreA., Environmentalmodelling withGISandRemoteSensing ,TaylorandFrancis.Inpress.

Owen-SmithG.L., 1968-1970, The Kaokoveld: an Ecological Base for Future Development Planning, unpublished.

PrinceS.D., 1991, AModelofRegionalPrimaryProductionforUsewithCoarse ResolutionSatelliteData *InternationalJournalofRemoteSensing*, vol. 12, no. 6.

RasmussenM.S.,1996, *TheAssessementofCropYieldintheSahelusingRemote* SensingandGISTechniques–Applyingenvironmentalandclimaticinformationto simplearlinearNDVI/AVHRRmodelsinSenegal,PhDDissertation,Universityof Copenhagen.

RohdeR., 1994, Thinkering with chaos: Towards a communal land tenure policy in former Damaraland, *SSDD is cussion Paper 8*.

ShawG.andWheelerD., 1997, *StatisticalTechniquesinGeographicalAnalysis*, DavidFultonPublisher.

ShellNamibiaLtd, *TheShellMapofKaokoland-KuneneRegion*, 1996, JohnMeinert Ltd, Windhoek.

ToddS.W.,HofferR.M.andMilchunasD.G.,1998,Biomassestimationongrazed and ungrazed rangeland susing spectral indices, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, vol.19, no.3.

TuckerC.J., VanpraetC.L., SharmanM.J., IttersumvanG., 1985, SatelliteRemote SensingofTotalHerbaceousBiomassProductionintheSengaleseSahel: 1980-1984, *RemoteSensingofEnvironment*, 17:233-249.

VanWyk,B.andP.vanWyk,1998, *FieldGuidetoTreesofSouthernAfrica*, Struik Publishers.

Warden T.H., 1997, Workshopfor Land Management Plan Khowarib Basin, Sesfontein, Khowarib, Warmquelle, Anabis, Oruvau and Axabarea, *Ministryof Agriculture, Rural Water Supply and Rural Development*, unpublished.

WylieB.K., HarringtonJ.A., PrinceS.D. and DendaI., 1991, Satelliteand groundbased pasture production assessment in Niger, 1986-1988, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, vol. 12, no. 6.

Appendix1.PARCalculations

ThefollowingPARcalculations(Oke,1987)areapplicableatthe16 thofFebruary forthestudyareawiththeapproximatelatitudeandlongitude: Latitude=-19.00.00 Longitude=13.00.00

The photosynthetic active radiation (PAR) is approximated to 50% of the incoming radiation at the top of the atmosphere (SI) according to the following equation.

PAR=50%*SI

S1inturncanbecalculated with:

S1=Icosz

z=zenithangle I=solarconstant=1367W/m²

Thezenitangleistheanglebetweenthesun'sraysandthezenithdirectionanditcan becalculated with:

 $cosz=sin \phi^*sin \delta+cos \phi^*cos \delta^*cosh$

φ=latitude ≈-19 δ=thesolardeclination h=thehourangle

The solar declination is the angle between the sun's rays and the equatorial plane. The hour angle is the angle through which the Earthmust turn to bring the meridian of the site X directly under the sun. tis a function of the day. So lardeclination, δ , for the 16th of February and the hour angle, his calculated with:

 δ =-23,4cos(360(tj+10)/365) δ =-13fortj=47(Juliandaynumberforthe16thofFebruary)

h=15(12-t)

tisthelocalapparentsolartimeandiscalculatedbyadding4minutestothelocal standardtimeforeachdegreeoflongitudethepointiseastofthestandardmeridian. Thisgivesthelocalmeansolartime,t _{local}.Ifthemeridianofthestudyareais 13.00.00

t local=13*4=52min.

Toreceivetthet local hastobeadded with the equation time of correction. If 1Feb=-13,6 and 1 mars=-12,6 the 16Feb=-13,1. This gives t= 52-13,1=38,9 min=0,648 h hcannowbecalculated15(-0,648) h=-9,725

When δ andhisknownzcanbecalculated:

 $\cos z = \sin(-19) * \sin(-13) + \cos(-19) * \cos(-13) * \cos -9,725$ $\cos z = (0,073) + (0,908) = 0,981$ z = 11,2 °

ItisnowpossibletocalculateSIandfinallyPAR:

SI=1367*0,981=1341W/m ²

PAR=0,5*1341=670,5W/m ²

Dekads being altered because of believed atmospheric effects are listed below as well as entirely missing dekads.

Dekad	Plotnumber
3October	1-30
1November	1-30
2February	15,16,20
3February	16,19,20,28
1March	2,19,22,23,24,26,29
2March	2,15,17,19,28,30
3March	15,17,18,19
1April	1,21,24,25,27
2April	6,15,16,20
3April	17,18,19,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30
1May	25
2May	1-30

Appendix 3.Woodydryweight

Group	Species	Crown	Stem	KOlsson	DepofForestry	F/O	Crown/
no		diam(m)	diam(m)	dry weight(kg)	dryweight (kg)		Stem
5	Accaciatortillis	4,2	0,43	42,07	5,51	0,131	9,70
5	Terminaliaprunoides	3	0,41	17,78	3,50	0,197	7,36
5	Salvadorepersika	7	1,37	155,57	38,35	0,247	5,13
5	Salvadorepersika	4	1,10	37,13	11,60	0,312	3,63
5	Terminaliaprunoides	5	0,26	65,74	31,56	0,480	19,21
5	Bosciafoetida	2,5	0,27	11,15	6,93	0,622	9,35
5	Faidherbaalbida	9	0,37	296,03	231,05	0,780	24,59
5	Accaciatortillis	8	0,26	218,97	176,12	0,804	30,65
6	Colospherummopane	3,5	0,12	26,38	21,80	0,826	28,19
5	Accaciatortillis	12	0,80	618,27	591,92	0,957	15,08
5	Accaciatortillis	10	0,63	387,68	423,52	1,092	15,95
5	Accaciatortillis	6	0,75	104,84	118,84	1,134	7,99
4	Maeruaschinzii	3	0,09	17,78	20,29	1,141	32,50
4	Maeruaschinzii	2	0,20	6,30	7,88	1,251	10,13
6	Colospherummopane	4	0,55	37,13	50,17	1,351	7,28
4	Ziziphusmucronata	3	0,19	17,78	24,35	1,370	16,11
5	Accaciatortillis	7,5	0,50	185,62	277,92	1,497	14,96
5	Bosciafoetida	3	0,56	17,78	28,60	1,609	5,35
5	Commiphoramultiljuga	2,5	0,57	11,15	18,38	1,648	4,36
5	Accaciatortillis	7	0,37	155,57	271,10	1,743	19,12
5	Accaciatortillis	8	0,54	218,97	383,46	1,751	14,78
6	Colospherummopane	5	0,52	65,74	117,03	1,780	9,55
4	Maeruaschinzii	2,5	0,09	11,15	20,29	1,820	27,08
4	Maeruaschinzii	4	0,16	37,13	70,24	1,892	25,65
5	Bosciafoetida	2,7	0,32	13,58	28,01	2,063	8,48
5	Salvadorepersika	5	0,25	65,74	166,35	2,530	19,88
5	Accaciatortillis	4	0,83	37,13	124,41	3,350	4,81
6	Colospherummopane	2,5	0,27	11,15	39,93	3,582	9,24
4	Maeruaschinzii	2	0,15	6,30	23,70	3,763	13,66
5	Eucleapseudobenus	3	0,32	17,78	69,41	3,904	9,52
5	Accaciatortillis	5	0,37	65,74	271,10	4,124	13,66
6	Colospherummopane	3	0,65	17,78	78,24	4,401	4,64
6	Colospherummopane	4	0,50	37,13	165,36	4,453	7,98
5	Accaciatortillis	2	0,11	6,30	28,64	4,549	17,95
5	Accaciatortillis	3,5	0,22	26,38	136,11	5,160	15,71
5	Terminaliaprunoides	4	0,28	37,13	195,13	5,255	14,28
6	Colospherummopane	1,8	0,10	4,81	29,50	6,135	18,85
4	Bosciaalbitrunca	3	0,19	17,78	127,53	7,173	15,71
6	Colospherummopane	3	0,18	17,78	129,77	7,299	16,83
5	Bosciafoetida	2	0,21	6,30	48,93	7,771	9,38
6	Colospherummopane	2,5	0,25	11,15	106,23	9,529	10,20
4	Bosciaalbitrunca	1	0,05	1,07	10,99	10,296	18,48
6	Colospherummopane	3	0,39	17,78	185,01	10,406	7,66

Calculations of woody dryweight using KOlsson's and Dep of Forestry's method.

6	Colospherummopane	2	0,14	6,30	69,07	10,970	14,61
5	Bosciafoetida	4	1,09	37,13	441,20	11,882	3,65
4	Bosciaalbitrunca	2	0,30	6,30	82,47	13,097	6,68
4	Maeruaschinzii	2	0,34	6,30	97,92	15,552	5,90
6	Colospherummopane	6	1,05	104,84	1666,37	15,894	5,71
6	Colospherummopane	8,2	3,24	233,26	4118,96	17,658	2,53
6	Colospherummopane	6	0,75	104,84	1952,21	18,620	8,02
4	Bosciaalbitrunca	1,7	0,32	4,15	122,76	29,554	5,31
6	Colospherummopane	5,4	1,34	80,06	3624,16	45,270	4,04
2	Combretumimberbe	0,4	0,13	0,10	52,80	516,292	3,06

Appendix4.GrassparametersvsNDVI

ScatterplotsvisualizingallthesignificantcorrelationsbetweenanygrassandNDVI parameter(22and16plots).







LundsUniversitetsNaturgeografiskainstitution.Seminarieuppsatser.Uppsatsernafinns tillgängligapåNaturgeografiskainstitutionensbibliotek,Sölvegatan13,22362LUND.

Thereports are available at the Geo-Library, Department of Physical Geography, University of Lund, Sölvegatan 13, S-22362 Lund, Sweden.

- 1. Pilesjö, P.(1985): Metoderförmorfometriskanalysavkustområden.
- 2. Ahlström, K.& Bergman, A. (1986): Kartering averosionskänslig a områden i Ringsjöbygden.
- 3. Huseid, A. (1986): Stormfällning och dessorsakssamband, Söderåsen, Skåne.
- 4. Sandstedt, P.&Wällstedt, B. (1986): Krankesjönunderytan-ennaturgeografiskbeskrivning.
- 5. Johansson, K. (1986): Enlokalklimatisk temperaturstudie på Kungsmarken, österom Lund.
- 6. Estgren, C. (1987): Isälvsstråket Djurfälla-Flädermo, norrom Motala.
- 7. Lindgren, E. & Runnström, M. (1987): Enobjektivmetodförattbestämmaläplanteringars läverkan.
- 8. Hansson, R. (1987): Studieavfrekvensstyrdfiltringsmetodförattsegmenterasatellitbilder, med försökpå Landsat TM-dataöverettskogsområdei S. Norrland.
- Matthiesen, N.&Snäll, M. (1988): Temperaturochhimmelsexponeringigator: Resultatav mätningari Malmö.
- 10A. Nilsson, S. (1988): Veberöd. Enbeskrivning av sam hället soch bygden sut byggnadoch utveckling från början av 1800-talet till vårtid.
- 10B. Nilson, G., 1988: Isförhållandeisödra Öresund.
- 11. Tunving, E. (1989): Översvämning i Murcia provinsen, sydöstra Spanien, november 1987.
- 12. Glave, S. (1989): Termiskastudieri Malmömedvärmebilderochkonventionellmätutrustning.
- 13. Mjölbo, Y. (1989): Landskapsförändringen-hurskalldenövervakas?
- 14. Finnander, M-L. (1989): Vädretsbetydelseförsnöavsmältningeni Tarfaladalen.
- 15. Ardö, J. (1989): Sambandmellan Landsat TM-dataochskogligabeståndsdatapåav delningsnivå.
- 16. Mikaelsson, E. (1989): Byskeälvensdalgånginom Västerbottenslän. Geomorfologiskkarta, beskrivning och naturvärdesbedömning.
- 17. Nhilen, C. (1990): Bilavgaserigatumiljöochderasberoendeavvädret. Litteraturstudieroch mätningmed DOAS vidmotortrafikled i Umeå.
- 18. Brasjö, C. (1990): Geometriskkorrektionav NOAAAV HRR-data.
- 19. Erlandsson, R. (1991): Vägbanetemperatureri Lund.
- 20. Arheimer, B. (1991): Näringsläckage frånåker markinom Bråånsdränering som råde. Lokalisering och åtgärdsförslag.
- 21. Andersson, G. (1991): Enstudieavtransversalmoränerivästra Småland.
- 22A. Skillius,Å.,(1991):WaterhavestinginBakul,Senegal.
- 22B. Persson, P. (1991): Satellitdataföröver vakningavhöstsåddarapsfältiSkåne.
- 23. Michelson, D. (1991): Land Use Mapping of the That Luang-Salakham Wetland, LaoPDR, Using Landsat TM-Data.
- 24. Malmberg,U.(1991):EnjämförelsemellanSPOT-ochLandsatdataförvegetationsklassningi Småland.
- 25. Mossberg, M.& Pettersson, G. (1991): A Study of Infiltration Capacity in a Semiarid Environment, Mberengwa District, Zimbabwe.
- 26. Theander, T. (1992): Avfallsupplagi Malmöhuslän. Dränering och miljöpåverkan.
- 27. Osaengius, S. (1992): Stranderosionvid Löderupsstrandbad.
- 28. Olsson, K. (1992): SeaIceDynamicsinTimeandSpace. Basedonupwardlookingsonar, satellite images and a timeseries of digitalice charts.
- 29. Larsson, K. (1993): GullyErosionfromRoadDrainageintheKenyanHighlands. AStudyof AerialPhotoInterpretedFactors.
- 30. Richardson, C. (1993): Nischbildningsprocesser-enfältstudievid Passglaciären, Kebnekaise.
- 31. Martinsson, L. (1994): Detection of Forest Changein Sumava Mountains, Czech Republic Using Remotely Sensed Data.
- 32. Klintenberg, P.(1995): The Vegetation Distribution in the Kärkevagge Valley.
- 33. Hese,S.(1995):ForestDamageAssessmentintheBlackTriangleareausingLandsatTM,MSS andForestInventorydata.
- 34. Josefsson, T. och Mårtensson, I. (1995). Avegetation map and a Digital Elevation Model over the KappLinnéarea, Svalbard-with analyses of the vertical and horizontal distribution of the vegetation

- 35. Brogaard, SochFalkenström, H. (1995). Assessing salinization, sandencroachment and expanding urbanare as in the NileValley using Landsat MSS data.
- 36. Krantz, M. (1996): GISsomhjälpmedelvidväxtskyddsrådgivning.
- 37. Lindegård, P. (1996). VINTERKLIMATOCHVÅRBAKSLAG. Lufttemperaturoch kådflödessjukahosgranisödraSverige.
- 38. Bremborg, P. (1996). Desertification mapping of HorqinSandyLand, InnerMongolia, by means of remote sensing.
- 39. Hellberg, J. (1996). Förändringsstudieavjordbrukslandskapetpå Söderslätt 1938-1985.
- 40. Achberger, C. (1996): Quality and representability of mobile measurements for local climatological research.
- 41. Olsson, M. (1996): Extremalufttrycki Europaoch Skandinavien 1881-1995
- 42. Sundberg, D.(1997): EnGIS-tillämpadstudieavvattenerosionisydsvenskjordbruksmark.
- Liljeberg, M. (1997): Klassningochstatistiskseparabilitetsanalysavmarktäckningsklasseri Halland, analysavmultivariatadataLandsatTMochERS-1SAR.
- 44. Roos, E. (1997): Temperature Variations and Landscape Heterogeneity in two Swedish Agricultural Areas. An application of mobile measurements.
- 45. Arvidsson, P.(1997): RegionalfördelningavskogsskadoriförhållandetillmängdSO ₂under vegetationsperiodeninorraTjeckien.
- 46. Akselsson, C.(1997): Kritisk belastning avaciditet förskogsmarkinorra Tjeckien.
- 47. Carlsson, G. (1997): Turbulensoch supraglacial meandring.
- 48. Jönsson, C. (1998): Multitemporalavegetationsstudierinordöstra Kenyamed AVHRRNDVI
- 49. Kolmert, S. (1998): Evaluation of a conceptual semi-distributed hydrological model A cases tudy of Hörbyån.
- 50. Persson, A. (1998): Kartering av markanvändning med meteorologisk satellit dataförförbättring av en at mosfärisk spridnings modell.
- 51. Andersson, U. och Nilsson, D. (1998): Distributed hydrological modelling in a GIS perspective anevaluation of the MIKESHE model.
- 52. Andersson, K. och Carlstedt, J. (1998): Different GIS and remotes ensing techniques for detection of changes invegetation cover-Astudy in the Nam Ngumand Nam Likcatch mentare as in the LaoPDR.
- 53. Andersson, J., (1999): Användningavglobalsatllitdataföruppskattningavspannmålsproduktioni västafrikanskaSahel.
- 54. Flodmark, A.E., (1999): UrbanGeographicInformationSystems, TheCityofBerkeleyPilotGIS
- Tagesson, I., och Wramneby, A., (1999): Kväveläckageinom Tolångaånsdräneringsområde– modelleringochåtgärdssimulering.
- 56. Almkvist, E., (1999): Högfrekventatryckvariationerunderdesenaste århundradena.
- 57. Alstorp, P., och Johansson, T., (1999): Översiktligbuller-ochluftföroreningsinventeringi Burlövs Kommunår 1994 med hjälpavge og rafiska informationssystem möjligheter och begränsningar.
- 58. Mattsson, F., (1999): AnalysavmolnklottermedIRST-datainomdettermalainfraröda våglängdsområdet
- 59. Hallgren, L., och Johansson, A., (1999): Analysinglandcoverchangesinthe Caprivi Strip, Namibia, using Landsat TM and Spot XS imagery.
- 60. Granhäll, T., (1999): Aerosolersdygnsvariationerochlångvägatransporter.
- 61. Kjellander, C., (1999): Variations in the energy budget above growing wheat and barley, Ilstorp 1998-agradient-profile approach
- 62. Moskvitina, M., (1999): GISasaToolforEnvironmentalImpactAssessment-Acasestudyof EIAimplementationfortheroadbuildingprojectinStrömstad, Sweden
- 63. Eriksson, H., (1999): Undersökning av sam bandet mellanstrålningstemperatur och NDVI i Sahel.
- 64. Elmqvist, B., Lundström, J., (2000): The Utility of NOAAAVHRR data for Vegetation Studies in Semi-arid Regions–a Minor Field Study in the Hoanib Catchment of Namibia