



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**IMAGE-BASED MEASUREMENT OF LEAF AREA INDEX AND
RADIATION INTERCEPTION FOR MODELLING OF OIL PALM**

MD. ABDUL AWAL.

FK 2005 68



**IMAGE-BASED MEASUREMENT OF LEAF AREA INDEX AND RADIATION
INTERCEPTION FOR MODELLING OF OIL PALM**

MD.ABDUL AWAL

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA
2005**



**IMAGE-BASED MEASUREMENT OF LEAF AREA INDEX AND RADIATION
INTERCEPTION FOR MODELLING OF OIL PALM**

By

MD.ABDUL AWAL

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia
in Fulfilment of Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

December 2005



Dedicated to
My Dear Parents
And
My Beloved Wife & Son



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**IMAGE-BASED MEASUREMENT OF LEAF AREA INDEX AND RADIATION
INTERCEPTION FOR MODELLING OF OIL PALM**

By

MD. ABDUL AWAL

December 2005

Chairman: Professor Ir. Wan Ishak Wan Ismail, PhD

Faculty: Engineering

Leaf area index (LAI) is an important parameter for precise characterization of the plant canopy structure. LAI describes a fundamental property of the plant canopy that has often been used as a critical variable to simulate the growth and yield models. The present conventional method used in determining LAI is laborious, difficult and time consuming. Thus an image-based measurement using camera system with fish eye lens offers an alternative means for accurate indirect measurement of LAI in oil palm. In this study leaf area index was determined by direct and indirect methods. The LAI-2000 plant canopy analyser (PCA), fish eye lens with charge couple device (CCD) camera and radiation sensor were used as indirect methods. Results show that the LAI value was overestimated (30.8%-153%) for immature palm and underestimated (24%-52%) for mature palm as compared to direct measurement. The LAI-2000 PCA reading varies according to the condition of sky, measuring technique, view cap, height of the measuring point and shade. Four models (leaflet shape factor model,



frond area model, leaflet dry weight model and leaflet area model) were tested for accurate estimation of leaf area. Results show that the leaflet dry weight was strongly correlated ($r = 0.98$) with leaflet area.

Light interception by a canopy is a fundamental requirement for crop growth and important for biomass production and plant growth modelling. In this study, two operational methods for estimating the amount of photosynthetically active radiation intercepted by a canopy of the oil palm were developed, i.e. "Triangular" method and "Circular" method. Results show that both methods were suitable for oil palm PAR measurement. A non-linear relationship was found between radiation interception and LAI. Results show that the radiation interception decreased with increasing distance from the frond base to frond tip.

Hemispherical photography was used in this study to estimate the leaf area index and gap fraction in oil palm plantation. Photographs were taken from different palm ages i.e. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 16-year old after field planting. The average LAI values obtained from photography method were 0.68 to 1.71 for 2 to 16-year old palms. The average LAI value was underestimated as compared to destructive method. The LAI values need to be multiplied by a conversion factor to get the accurate LAI as obtained from the photography method. For palms less than 5-year olds, the photographic method gave the accurate LAI value. The gap fractions obtained from photographic method ranged from 0.51 to 0.18 for palm age range from 2 to 16-year old palms. The gap fraction was linearly correlated ($r = 0.99$) with leaf area index.

Computer simulation models have become powerful tools to enhance information derived from costly and laborious field experiments. Particularly in oil palms where field experiments are expensive, time consuming and labours intensive. A computer simulation model was developed using Visual C++ computer language for simulation of leaf area index and yield of oil palm. The simulated results were reasonably comparable to the field data for both LAI and yield. The LAI data was collected by field experiment for 2 to 16-year old palms, whereas yield data was obtained from Malaysian Palm Oil Board (MPOB). A strong linear relationship was found between the measured LAI and the simulated LAI with correlation coefficient r of 0.96. A good linear relationship ($r = 0.95$) was found between the simulated LAI and the simulated yield. Also a strong relationship ($r = 0.98$) was found between the simulated yield and observed yield.

The proposed photographic method for LAI estimation, different regression models, methodology for PAR measurement as well as computer program for LAI and yield simulation have potential application in oil palm sector, oil palm R&D and also as teaching tools.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**PENGUKURAN INDEK LUAS DAUN DAN INTERSEPSI RADIASI
BERPANDUKAN IMEJ UNTUK PERMODELAN KELAPA SAWIT**

Oleh

MD. ABDUL AWAL

December 2005

Pengerusi: Professor Ir. Wan Ishak Wan Ismail, PhD

Fakulti: Kejuruteraan

Indek Luas Daun (ILD) merupakan parameter yang penting dalam menentukan struktur kanopi pada sesuatu pokok. ILD ialah sifat utama dalam daun pokok, banyak digunakan sebagai pembolehubah yang digunakan secara kritikal dalam simulasi permodelan untuk tumbesaran dan hasil pertanian. Kaedah penggunaan ILD secara konvensional masakini adalah tidak sistematik yang beroperasi dengan kos yang tinggi. Dalam kajian ini, ILD ditentukan secara kaedah terus dan tidak langsung. Kaedah tidak langsung yang digunakan dalam pengukuran ILD adalah dengan menggunakan LAI-2000 'Plant Copy Analyser' (PCA), 'Charge Couple Device' (CCD) kamera bersama *fish eye lens* dan sensor radiasi. Pelbagai kaedah optikal digunakan bersama LAI-2000 'Plant Canopy Analyser' (PCA). Keputusan mendapati nilai ILD akan terlebih anggaran (30.8-153%) untuk pokok yang belum matang manakala untuk pokok yang sudah matang nilai ILD adalah dalam nilai anggaran. Anggaran untuk nilai ILD dengan menggunakan perisian PCA adalah diantara 24% hingga 52% berbanding pengukuran secara terus. Pembacaan untuk LAI-2000 PCA berubah-ubah



bergantung kepada keadaan cuaca, teknik pengukuran, pandangan cap (cap review) ketinggian titik pengukuran dan bentuk. Untuk kaedah terus purata indek Laus daun adalah sebanyak 0.69 hingga 4.05 untuk 2 hingga 16 tahun umur pokok kelapa sawit. Bagi kaedah secara tidak langsung, purata index keluasan daun adalah didapati sebanyak 1.75 hingga 3.05 bagi pokok kelapa sawit berumur 2 hingga 16 tahun. Empat *model* pengukuran (model factor kecerunan daun, model keluasan pelepah, model berat daun kering, model keluasan daun) digunakan dalam menentukan keluasan daun. Keputusan menunjukkan berat daun kering berkait rapat ($r = 0.98$) dengan keluasan daun.

Pencerapan cahaya oleh pokok adalah penting dalam tumbesaran dan pengeluaran biomass serta pemodelan penumbuhan tanaman. Dalam kajian ini, dua kaedah digunakan dalam penganggaran jumlah '*photosynthetically active radiation*' (PAR) yang diserap oleh pokok kelapa sawit iaitu kaedah 'triangular' dan 'circular'. Keputusan menunjukkan dua kaedah ini sesuai untuk menentukan PAR bagi tanaman kelapa sawit. Hubungan tidak linear didapati diantara pencerapan radiasi dan nilai ILD. Keputusan menunjukkan cerapan radiasi akan berkurangan dengan pertambahan panjang pelepah.

Photography Hemisferical telah digunakan dalam kajian ini untuk menganggar indek luas daun dan pecahan jarak dalam penanaman kelapa sawit. Foto telah diambil dari umur kelapa sawit yang berbeza-beza iaitu 2,3,6,7,9,13 dan 16 tahun selepas penanaman. Purata nilai ILD yang terdapat dalam kaedah foto adalah 0.68 hingga 1.71 untuk pokok kelapa

sawit berumur 2 hingga 16 tahun. Purata nilai ILD dalam anggaran seperti yang dibandingkan pada kaedah destructive. Nilai ILD yang diperlukan akan didarabkan dengan factor penukaran 2.14 untuk pokok 5 hingga 9 tahun, 2.33 untuk 10 hingga 14 tahun, dan 2.37 untuk 15 tahun umur pokok kelapa sawit dan untuk mendapatkan nilai ILD yang tepat, kaedah fotografi digunakan. Untuk pokok kelapa sawit dibawah umur 5 tahun, nilai ILD didapati dengan tepat jika kaedah fotografi digunakan. Jarak pecahan diperolehi dari kaedah fotografi dengan nilai dari 0.51, hingga 0.18 bagi pokok kelapa sawit berumur 2-16 tahun. 'Gap fraction' didapati berhubung terus ($r = 0.99$) dengan 'leaf area index'.

Model simulasi komputer merupakan alat terbaik dalam menghasilkan maklumat yang tepat berbanding dengan kaedah eksperimen yang berorientasikan tenagakerja disamping kosnya yang tinggi. Ini terutamanya untuk penggunaan di perladangan kelapa sawit yang memerlukan eksperimen diladang yang mahal, masa yang panjang serta berinsentifkan pekerja. Program bahasa komputer *Visual C++* telah digunakan bagi pembangunan model simulasi komputer untuk pengukuran indek keluasan daun dan penganggaran hasil tanaman kelapa sawit. Hasil simulasi menunjukkan data eksperimen antara ILD and hasil pertanian adalah serupa. Maklumat untuk nilai ILD telah diperolehi hasil dari kajian tapak untuk pokok kelapa sawit yang berumur antara 2-16 tahun sementara maklumat untuk hasil pertanian telah diperolehi dari maklumat simpanan MPOB. Perhubungan yang kukuh telah diperolehi diantara nilai ILD yang diukur berbanding nilai simulasi ILD dengan pekali korelasi r adalah 0.96. Begitu juga perhubungan

yang kukuh didapati diantara nilai simulasi ILD berbanding nilai simulasi hasil pertanian ($r = 0.95$) dan perhubungan yang kuat ($r = 0.98$) diperolehi antara simulasi hasil pertanian berbanding nilai hasil pertanian yang diukur.

Penggunaan perisian yang dibangunkan dengan kaedah fotografi ini sesuai digunakan untuk penganggaran nilai ILD, perbezaan model regression, kaedah pengukuran PAR dan simulasi hasil pertanian dan ia mempunyai potensi yang luas dalam penggunaan di sektor perladangan, di sector penyelidikan dan pembangunan kelapa sawit serta sesuai untuk digunakan sebagai alat bantu pengajaran.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My greatest and ultimate debt and gratitude to Allah (S.W.T) the Most Beneficent and the Most Merciful who enabled me to complete the research work.

I would like to express my heartiest gratitude and indebtedness to my supervisor, Prof. Ir. Dr. Wan Ishak Wan Ismail, for his time, valuable advice and suggestions, consistent guidance and constant encouragement throughout the course of study. A word of thanks and appreciation to my co-supervisors, Associate Prof. Dr. Johari Endan and Dr. Mohd. Haniff Harun, who have offered continuous help in my research work and to check my thesis draft, for their time, effort and critical comments that was vary valuable in making this thesis a reality.

I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh for allowing me to pursue my PhD study programme by providing leave from my service. Furthermore, I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to the scholarship donor, Department for International Development (DFID, UK) and Research and Extension in Farm Power Issues (REFPI) authority, especially Prof. Dr. R. I. Sarker, Prof. Dr. ATM Ziauddin and Gerard Hendriksen. Special thanks also go to British Council, Bangladesh, especially Ms Shamim Ahmed for her nice cooperation during study period.



I would like to thank and appreciate the Biological Division, Malaysia Palm Oil Board for kindly allowing data collection from their plots and provide every logistic support to complete this research. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all staff members of Biology Division, especially Dr I. E. Henson for his constructive suggestion time to time. I would also like to acknowledge and thanks to the IRPA (Project no 01-02-04-0000-PR0038/05), Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, Malaysia, financial support for field experiment.

I also would like to express my appreciation and thanks to Dr Marvin, Mr Farayi, Mr. Mohd. Hudzari, Alison, Asgor and Firdaus for assistance during fieldwork and laboratory work. Special thanks to all staff of ITMA, Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering and my fellow students for making my studies so stimulating and rewarding. Very special thanks to, Mr. Sarwar, Sarizal and all of my friends who directly or indirectly assist me during the course of study.

I am grateful to my family, father, mother, wife, son, sister, brother in law, and parents in law, there are no words that could describe my feeling to all of you. Thank you for your moral support, encouragement, patience, sacrifices, love and prayers. I would like to express my humbly apology to those persons, who helped me but may not find their names in my narration here.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|--------------|
| DEDICATION | II |
| ABSTRACT | III |
| ABSTRAK | VI |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | X |
| APPROVAL | XI |
| DECLARATION | XIV |
| LIST OF TABLES | XXI |
| LIST OF FIGURES | XXIII |
| LIST OF PLATES | XXIX |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | XXX |
| | |
| CHAPTER | |
| | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1.1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1.1 |
| 1.2 Technological Advances in Agriculture | 1.6 |
| 1.3 Economic Influences | 1.7 |
| 1.4 Problem Statement | 1.9 |
| 1.5 Objectives of the Study | 1.10 |
| 1.6 Study Site | 1.12 |
| | |
| 2 THE OIL PALM MORPHOLOGY, RADIATION AND MODELLING | 2.1 |
| 2.1 The Oil Palm | 2.1 |
| 2.1.1 Stem | 2.3 |
| 2.1.2 Leaf Phyllotaxis | 2.5 |
| 2.1.3 Oil Palm Fronds | 2.9 |
| 2.2 Plant Growth and Environmental Factors | 2.11 |
| 2.2.1 Light | 2.12 |
| 2.2.2 Role of Radiation in Plant Growth | 2.13 |
| 2.3 Canopy Structure and LAI Estimation Methods | 2.15 |
| 2.3.1 Ground-based LAI Estimation Methods | 2.16 |
| 2.3.1.1 Direct Method of LAI Determination | 2.16 |
| 2.3.1.2 Indirect Method of LAI Determination | 2.16 |
| 2.3.2 Extinction Coefficient | 2.21 |
| 2.4 Background of Hemispherical Photography | 2.23 |
| 2.5 Characteristics of Hemispherical Canopy Photography | 2.24 |
| 2.6 Hemispherical Photography System | 2.25 |
| 2.6.1 Image Acquisition | 2.26 |
| 2.6.2 Image Digitisation | 2.26 |
| 2.6.3 Image Analysis | 2.26 |
| 2.7 Growth Model and Simulation | 2.26 |
| 2.7.1 Crop Production Level | 2.26 |
| 2.7.2 Crop Growth Process | 2.28 |
| 2.7.3 Agricultural Production System | 2.30 |
| 2.7.4 System Analysis | 2.32 |
| 2.7.4.1 System | 2.32 |
| 2.7.4.2 Model | 2.32 |
| 2.7.4.3 Types of Model | 2.33 |



| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 2.7.4.4 | Static and Dynamic Models | 2.35 |
| 2.7.4.5 | General and Specific Models | 2.35 |
| 2.7.4.6 | Explanatory and Descriptive Models | 2.35 |
| 2.7.4.7 | Verifiable and Speculative Models | 2.35 |
| 2.7.4.8 | Deterministic and Non-deterministic Models | 2.36 |
| 2.7.4.9 | Ultimate and Non-ultimate Models | 2.36 |
| 2.7.5 | Simulation | 2.36 |
| 2.7.6 | The Process of Simulation | 2.37 |
| 2.7.7 | Simulation Model | 2.39 |
| 2.7.7.1 | System State Variables | 2.39 |
| 2.7.7.2 | Global Variables | 2.40 |
| 2.7.7.3 | Statistics Collectors | 2.40 |
| 2.7.8 | Model Verification and Validation | 2.40 |
| 2.7.9 | Use of Simulation Model | 2.42 |
| 2.7.10 | Computer Simulation Language | 2.42 |
| 3 | DIRECT AND INDIRECT METHODS FOR DETERMINATION OF THE OIL PALM LEAF AREA INDEX | 3.1 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 3.1 |
| 3.2 | Materials and Methods | 3.5 |
| 3.2.1 | Study site | 3.5 |
| 3.2.2 | Instrument description | 3.5 |
| 3.2.3 | Basic Theory Related to Light Interception and Gap Fraction | 3.8 |
| 3.2.4 | Gap Fraction | 3.9 |
| 3.2.5 | Amount of Foliage | 3.11 |
| 3.2.6 | Accuracy Assessment of PCA LAI-2000 | 3.11 |
| 3.2.6.1 | Different Measuring Technique | 3.12 |
| 3.2.6.2 | Sensor Height | 3.14 |
| 3.2.6.3 | Distance from Trunk to Frond Tip | 3.14 |
| 3.2.6.4 | Sky Condition | 3.17 |
| 3.2.6.5 | View Cap | 3.17 |
| 3.2.7 | LAI Determination Using PCA for Different Palm Age Groups | 3.18 |
| 3.2.8 | Measurement of Leaf Area by Direct Method (Destructive Sampling) | 3.18 |
| 3.2.8.1 | Sampling of the Palm in the field | 3.19 |
| 3.2.8.2 | Choice of Frond | 3.19 |
| 3.2.8.3 | Identification of Frond 17 | 3.20 |
| 3.2.8.4 | Direct Method Comparison of PCA LAI | 3.22 |
| 3.2.8.5 | LAI Determination for Different Palm Age Groups | 3.24 |
| 3.3 | Results and Discussion | 3.26 |
| 3.3.1 | Accuracy Assessments of PCA LAI-2000 | 3.26 |
| 3.3.1.1 | Effect of Different Measuring Technique | 3.26 |
| 3.3.1.2 | Effect of Height | 3.26 |
| 3.3.1.3 | Effect of Distance from Trunk to Frond Tip | 3.27 |
| 3.3.1.4 | Effect of Sky Condition | 3.31 |
| 3.3.1.5 | Effect of View Cap Angle | 3.32 |



| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 3.3.1.6 | PCA LAI between Different Methods | 3.34 |
| 3.3.2 | LAI Determination for Different Palm Age Groups | 3.35 |
| 3.3.2.1 | LAI Determination by Indirect Method | 3.35 |
| 3.3.2.2 | LAI Determination by Direct Method | 3.37 |
| 3.3.2.3 | Comparison of LAI from Direct Method and PCA Method | 3.39 |
| 3.4 | Conclusion | 3.41 |
| 4 | DETERMINATION OF EMPIRICAL COEFFICIENT OF THE LEAFLET FOR INDIRECT ESTIMATION OF LEAF AREA AND SPECIFIC LEAF AREA | 4.1 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 4.1 |
| 4.2 | Materials and Methods | 4.6 |
| 4.2.1 | Instrument Description | 4.6 |
| 4.2.1.1 | Leaf Area Meter | 4.6 |
| 4.2.2 | Measurement of Leaf Area for Estimation of Empirical Coefficient of Leaflet | 4.8 |
| 4.2.2.1 | Direct Leaf Area Measurement | 4.8 |
| 4.2.2.2 | Leaf Area Measured of by Leaf Area Meter | 4.10 |
| 4.2.2.3 | Relationship between Linear Measurements of a Leaflet | 4.10 |
| 4.2.3 | Specific Leaf Area and Frond Area Regression Model | 4.11 |
| 4.2.3.1 | Measurement of Leaf Area | 4.11 |
| 4.2.3.2 | Confirmation of the Regression Models | 4.13 |
| 4.2.3.3 | Determination of Frond Area Coefficient | 4.13 |
| 4.2.3.4 | Determination of Leaflet Dry Weight | 4.14 |
| 4.3 | Results And Discussion | 4.14 |
| 4.3.1 | Variation of Frond Leaflet Area with Frond Age | 4.14 |
| 4.3.2 | Calculation of Leaflet Coefficients | 4.16 |
| 4.3.2.1 | Statistical Regression Equations | 4.16 |
| 4.3.2.2 | Calculated and Measured Leaf Area | 4.16 |
| 4.3.2.3 | Confirmation of the Regression Models | 4.19 |
| 4.3.3 | Relation between Leaflet Length and Width Against Leaflet Area | 4.21 |
| 4.3.4 | Frond Area Coefficients | 4.23 |
| 4.3.5 | Relationship between Specific Leaf Area and Frond Age | 4.25 |
| 4.3.6 | Relation between leaflet mass, leaflet area and SLA | 4.27 |
| 4.3.7 | Relationship between SLA with Leaflet Area and Leaflet Dry Weight | 4.31 |
| 4.4 | Conclusion | 4.33 |
| 5 | MEASUREMENT OF RADIATION INTERCEPTION AND EXTINCTION COEFFICIENT OF OIL PALM BY QUANTUM SENSOR | 5.1 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 5.1 |
| 5.2 | Extinction Coefficient | 5.4 |
| 5.3 | Materials and Methods | 5.7 |
| 5.3.1 | Experimental Site | 5.7 |
| 5.3.2 | Equipment for Light Measurement | 5.7 |



| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 5.3.3 | Calibration Methodology | 5.11 |
| 5.3.4 | Methodology for Measurements of Radiation Interception | 5.12 |
| | 5.3.4.1 Measurement Outline | 5.12 |
| | 5.3.4.2 Measurements Procedure | 5.13 |
| | 5.3.4.3 Experimental Design for Spatial Effect | 5.17 |
| 5.3.5 | Determination of Canopy Extinction Coefficient | 5.19 |
| 5.4 | Results and Discussion | 5.20 |
| 5.4.1 | Measurement of FRI and FRT | 5.20 |
| 5.4.2 | Relationship between FRI and LAI | 5.22 |
| 5.4.3 | Relationship between FRI and Palm Age | 5.25 |
| 5.4.4 | Assessment of Factors that Affect on FRI and FRT | 5.27 |
| | 5.4.4.1 Effect of Spatial Variation | 5.27 |
| | 5.4.4.2 Effect of Vertical Height | 5.30 |
| | 5.4.4.3 Effect of Canopy Thickness | 5.32 |
| 5.4.5 | Determination of Extinction Coefficient (EC) | 5.34 |
| 5.4.6 | Assessments of Factors That Affect on EC | 5.35 |
| | 5.4.6.1 Effect of Sensor Height | 5.36 |
| | 5.4.6.2 Effect of Canopy Thickness | 5.36 |
| | 5.4.6.3 Effect of Spatial Variability | 5.39 |
| 5.4.7 | Extinction Coefficient Model | 5.40 |
| 5.4.8 | Determination of LAI by Quantum Sensor Method | 5.42 |
| | 5.4.8.1 Palm Age and Quantum Sensor LAI | 5.43 |
| | 5.4.8.2 Direct LAI and Line Quantum Sensor LAI | 5.43 |
| | 5.4.8.3 Direct Method and Line Quantum Sensor Method | 5.45 |
| 5.5 | Conclusions | 5.47 |
| 6 | HEMISPHERICAL PHOTOGRAPHY FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF LAI AND GAP FRACTION IN OIL PALM | 6.1 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 6.1 |
| 6.2 | Study Locations | 6.6 |
| 6.3 | Principles of Hemispherical Photography | 6.6 |
| 6.4 | Measuring Principles of the Geometry of Canopy Openings | 6.9 |
| 6.5 | Calculation of Gap Fraction | 6.11 |
| 6.6 | Estimation of LAI from Hemispherical Photographs | 6.12 |
| | 6.6.1 Inversion Models | 6.12 |
| | 6.6.2 Non-linear Elimination Models | 6.13 |
| | 6.6.3 Log-average Model | 6.13 |
| | 6.6.4 Assumptions of LAI Models | 6.14 |
| | 6.6.5 Hemispherical Image Processing Procedure | 6.14 |
| | 6.6.5.1 Image Acquisition | 6.15 |
| | 6.6.5.2 Field Protocol for Hemispherical Photograph Acquisition | 6.16 |
| | 6.6.5.3 Self-Levelling Camera Mount | 6.16 |
| | 6.6.5.4 Camera Positioning and Orientation | 6.19 |
| | 6.6.5.5 Camera Exposure Setting and Image Capturing | 6.20 |
| 6.7 | Materials and Methods | 6.20 |
| | 6.7.1 Experimental Design | 6.20 |



| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 6.7.2 | Photograph Acquisition from the Field | 6.23 |
| 6.7.3 | Image Analysis | 6.24 |
| 6.7.3.1 | Alignment of Images | 6.25 |
| 6.7.3.2 | Segmentation of Images | 6.28 |
| 6.7.3.3 | Thresholding of Images | 6.30 |
| 6.7.3.4 | Overlay of Sky map, Sun map and Day track | 6.32 |
| 6.7.3.5 | Computation of Results | 6.35 |
| 6.8 | Results and Discussion | 6.37 |
| 6.8.1 | Estimation of LAI by Hemispherical Photography | 6.37 |
| 6.8.2 | Estimation of Gap Fraction by Hemispherical Photography | 6.38 |
| 6.8.3 | Relationship between Gap Fraction and Palm Age | 6.39 |
| 6.8.4 | Relationship between Gap Fraction and LAI | 6.41 |
| 6.8.5 | Relationship between Photographic LAI and Palm Age | 6.41 |
| 6.8.6 | Comparison of Direct LAI and Photographic LAI | 6.43 |
| 6.8.7 | Relationship between Photographic LAI and Direct LAI | 6.44 |
| 6.8.8 | Determination of Correction Factor | 6.48 |
| 6.8.9 | Estimating Correction Factor with Respect to Palm Age | 6.49 |
| 6.9 | LAI Model | 6.52 |
| 6.10 | Conclusion | 6.54 |
| 7 | COMPUTER MODELING AND SIMULATION OF LAI AND YIELD | 7.1 |
| 7.1 | Introduction | 7.1 |
| 7.2 | Growth and Yield of Oil Palm | 7.4 |
| 7.3 | Development of the Model | 7.5 |
| 7.3.1 | Model Input and the System | 7.5 |
| 7.3.2 | Assumption of the Model | 7.7 |
| 7.3.3 | Description of the Model | 7.7 |
| 7.3.3.1 | Simulation of Leaf Area Index | 7.8 |
| 7.3.3.2 | Simulation of Yield | 7.10 |
| 7.3.3.3 | Temperature Factor | 7.11 |
| 7.3.3.4 | Solar Radiation Factor | 7.13 |
| 7.3.3.5 | Photosynthesis Calculation | 7.15 |
| 7.3.3.6 | Gross Photosynthesis | 7.16 |
| 7.3.3.7 | Maintenance Respiration | 7.18 |
| 7.3.3.8 | Vegetative Growth | 7.21 |
| 7.4 | Description of Algorithms | 7.24 |
| 7.5 | Results and Discussion | 7.33 |
| 7.5.1 | Simulation Model for Oil Palm LAI and Yield Prediction | 7.33 |
| 7.5.1.1 | System Requirement | 7.33 |
| 7.5.1.2 | Program Installation Procedure | 7.33 |
| 7.5.1.3 | Operating the Programme | 7.34 |
| 7.5.2 | Relationship between Simulated LAI and Palm Age | 7.41 |
| 7.5.3 | Relationship between Simulated LAI and Measured LAI | 7.41 |
| 7.5.4 | Palm Age vs. Simulated LAI and Measured LAI | 7.43 |
| 7.5.5 | Relationship between Simulated LAI and Simulated | 7.43 |



| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| | Yield | |
| 7.5.6 | Relationship between Palm Age and Simulated Yield | 7.45 |
| 7.5.7 | Relationship between Simulated Yield and Observed Yield | 7.45 |
| 7.5.8 | Relationship between Simulated LAI and the Observed and Simulated Yield | 7.47 |
| 7.5.9 | Relationship between Palm Age and the Observed and Simulated Yields | 7.47 |
| 7.6 | Sensitivity Analysis | 7.49 |
| 7.7 | Conclusion | 7.52 |
| 8 | SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 8.1 |
| 8.1 | Comparison of LAI Measuring Methods | 8.1 |
| 8.2 | Practical Considerations of Method Selection for LAI Measurement | 8.3 |
| 8.3 | Conclusions | 8.7 |
| 8.4 | Major Findings | 8.18 |
| 8.5 | Recommendations for Future Work | 8.20 |
| | REFERENCES | R.1 |
| | APPENDICES | A.1 |
| | BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR | B.1 |



LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| 1.1 | Contributions of the oil palm sector to the GDP of Malaysia | 1.8 |
| 2.1 | Values of extinction coefficient determined in different experiments | 2.22 |
| 3.1 | Comparison of PCA LAI readings obtained with the different techniques | 3.26 |
| 3.2 | Height effect on LAI measurement | 3.27 |
| 3.3 | Effect of distance on LAI from frond base to frond tip of palm (North Side) | 3.28 |
| 3.4 | Effect of distance on LAI from frond base to frond tip of palm (South Side) | 3.28 |
| 3.5 | Effect of distance on LAI from frond base to frond tip of palm (East Side) | 3.28 |
| 3.6 | Effect of distance on LAI from frond base to frond tip of palm (West Side) | 3.29 |
| 3.7 | PCA LAI variation in sky condition | 3.31 |
| 3.8 | Effect of Shadow on PCA LAI Values | 3.31 |
| 3.9 | View cap angle effect on LAI | 3.32 |
| 3.10 | Percentages difference between LAI values for the different measuring method for 6-year old oil palms | 3.34 |
| 3.11 | Summary of PCA LAI values for 2 to 16-year old palms | 3.35 |
| 3.12 | Summary of average LAI results for 2 to 16-year old palms | 3.37 |
| 3.13 | Mean LAI values obtained from the direct method (destructive) and PCA method | 3.39 |
| 5.1 | Sample procedure of calculation of FRI ($\mu\text{Mol}/\text{m}^2/\text{s}$) | 5.21 |
| 5.2a | Average FRI obtained by the circular method | 5.21 |
| 5.2b | Average FRT obtained by the circular method | 5.22 |
| 5.3a | Average FRI obtained by the triangular method | 5.22 |
| 5.3b | Average FRT obtained by the triangular method | 5.22 |



| | | |
|-----|--|------|
| 5.4 | Extinction coefficient (k) for the 2 to16-year old palms obtained by the Circular Method | 5.34 |
| 5.5 | Extinction coefficients (k) for the 7 to16-year old palms obtained by the Triangular Method | 5.35 |
| 5.6 | Summary results for average LAI measured by Line Quantum Sensor for 2 to16-year old palm | 5.42 |
| 6.1 | Example of LAI calculation for 2-year old palms group | 6.36 |
| 6.2 | Example of mean LAI for four plots of 2-year old palms group | 6.36 |
| 6.3 | Example of overall mean LAI results for 2-year old palms plantation | 6.37 |
| 6.4 | Summary of average LAI measured by hemispherical photography | 6.38 |
| 6.5 | Average Gap Fraction measured by Hemispherical Photography | 6.39 |
| 6.6 | LAI values obtained from the destructive method and the photographic method | 6.43 |
| 6.7 | Factor calculation of photographic LAI measurement | 6.49 |
| 7.1 | Dry weight of vegetative parts of different age groups of oil palm in Malaysia | 7.20 |
| 7.2 | Average chemical composition of leaf, trunk, bunch and roots in kg dm / kg CH ₂ O | 7.24 |
| 8.1 | Advantages and disadvantages of four LAI measuring methods | 8.6 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | | Page |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 1.1 | Planted oil palm area under in major oil palm growing countries of the world (Source: FAO, 2005) | 1.3 |
| 1.2 | Total production of oil palm in major oil palm producing countries in the world | 1.3 |
| 1.3 | FFB yield performance of the oil palm in Malaysia in relation to world production (Source: FAO, 2005) | 1.5 |
| 1.4 | Total yield production of major industrial crops (i.e. oil palm, rubber and cocoa) in Malaysia plotted with world production | 1.5 |
| 1.5 | Location map of Malaysian Palm Oil Board (MPOB) | 1.13 |
| 1.6 | Sketch of the oil palm field | 1.14 |
| 2.1 | Diagrammatic representation of the oil palm stem (adapted from Hartley, 1988) | 2.4 |
| 2.2 | Diagram of the phyllotaxy of the oil palm (adapted from Hartley, 1988) | 2.6 |
| 2.3 | Right-handed Palm | 2.8 |
| 2.4 | Left-handed Palm (adapted from, MPOB) | 2.8 |
| 2.5 | 1- diagram of the oil palm leaf; 2-cross-section of petiole; 3-cross-section of rachis; 4-leaf apex of palm; 5-central portion of rachis from above, showing irregular leaflet insertion; 6-cross-section of leaf viewed end-on, showing two-ranked insertion of leaflets (adapted from Hartley, 1988) | 2.10 |
| 2.6 | Absorption spectrum of isolated chlorophyll and carotenoid pigments (adapted from Wim Vermaas, 2005) | 2.14 |
| 2.7 | The electromagnetic spectrum (adapted from Simmon, 2004) | 2.14 |
| 2.8 | Schematic diagram of an ellipsoidal plane | 2.21 |
| 2.9 | Diagram showing the relationships of a system at production level 1 when light is the limiting factor (Forrester, 1961) | 2.29 |

