



**Monitoring Land Degradation &
Ecosystem Resilience Across
Australian Water-limited
Ecosystems**

Leandro Daniel Giovannini

**This thesis is presented as part of the requirements for the
award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

Climate Change Cluster
Faculty of Science
University of Technology Sydney

February 2019

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Leandro Daniel Giovannini, declare that this thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Science at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis. This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution. This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:

Signature of Student: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 19/02/2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship, and an Australian Research Council Discovery Project (“Impacts of extreme hydro-meteorological conditions on ecosystem functioning and productivity patterns across Australia”). This work was supervised by principle supervisor Professor Alfredo Huete and co-supervisor Associate Professor Andrea Leigh. Thanks to Alfredo for guiding me through this research and giving me a glimpse into the possible depths of scientific research and critical thinking, and thanks to Andy for providing support and feedback from a different perspective.

Thanks to past and present members of the Ecosystem Dynamics, Health and Resilience lab for their technical support and friendship throughout this project, particularly Zunyi Xie and Ngoc Tran for sharing their technical expertise, and Xuanlong (Richard) Ma for acting as an unofficial co-supervisor during the early stages of this research. Also, thanks to Leonardo Hardtke for his assistance in the processing of MODIS EVI data.

Thanks to the Climate Change Cluster for giving me the opportunity to present part of my research at the 2016 International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, by providing travel funds. Thanks to the administrative staff in the School of Life Sciences and Graduate Research School for their hard work.

Finally, thanks to family and friends for their support, and special thanks to Natalya for being there to share the highs and lows of this journey.

PUBLICATIONS

Conference proceedings arising from this research:

- Giovannini, L.D., Ma, X., & Huete, A. (2016). Drought resilience of Australian rangelands under intense hydroclimatic variability. *IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
PUBLICATIONS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	VIII
LIST OF TABLES	XVI
ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS	XVII
ABSTRACT	XIX
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 RESEARCH BACKGROUND.....	2
1.1.1 <i>Land Degradation</i>	2
1.1.1.1 Ecological Concepts Behind Ecosystem Status Assessments	3
1.1.1.2 Drivers & Feedbacks	5
1.1.2 <i>Remote Sensing of Land Degradation</i>	8
1.1.2.1 Remote Sensing of Vegetation	9
1.1.2.2 Land Degradation Assessment.....	11
1.1.3 <i>Degradation of Australian Water-limited Ecosystems</i>	19
1.2 AIMS & OBJECTIVES	23
1.3 REFERENCES	24
CHAPTER 2: THE EFFECT OF ATMOSPHERIC EVAPORATIVE DEMAND ON RUE	35
2.1 INTRODUCTION	36
2.2 DATA AND METHODS.....	40
2.2.1 <i>Study Area</i>	40
2.2.2 <i>MODIS EVI</i>	41
2.2.3 <i>TRMM Precipitation Data</i>	42
2.2.4 <i>Potential Evapotranspiration Data</i>	43
2.2.5 <i>Land Cover Type Data</i>	43
2.2.6 <i>RUE and Cross-site RUE Calculation and Mapping</i>	44
2.3 RESULTS	45
2.3.1 <i>Spatial RUE Variability</i>	45
2.3.2 <i>The Effects of Hydro-meteorological Conditions on RUE</i>	47

2.3.3	<i>Cross-site RUE During Hydro-meteorological Extremes</i>	51
2.4	DISCUSSION	53
2.4.1	<i>Spatial RUE Variability</i>	53
2.4.2	<i>The Effect of Hydro-meteorological Conditions on RUE</i>	53
2.4.3	<i>Cross-site RUE During Hydro-meteorological Extremes</i>	57
2.5	CONCLUSION	59
2.6	REFERENCES	60
CHAPTER 3: THE ROLE OF VEGETATION TYPE ON RUE		66
3.1	INTRODUCTION	67
3.2	DATA AND METHODS.....	71
3.2.1	<i>Study Area</i>	71
3.2.2	<i>Vegetation Type Classification</i>	72
3.2.3	<i>MODIS EVI</i>	77
3.2.4	<i>TRMM Precipitation Data</i>	77
3.2.5	<i>Potential Evapotranspiration Data</i>	77
3.2.6	<i>Water Observations from Space</i>	78
3.2.7	<i>Assessing the Effect of Vegetation Type on Cross-site RUE Relationships</i>	78
3.2.8	<i>Assessing the Effect of PET on RUE Within Vegetation Types</i>	78
3.2.9	<i>Assessing the Influence of Vegetation Type on Cross-site ANPP-Water Relationships</i>	80
3.2.10	<i>Assessing the Effect of Vegetation Type on Cross-site ANPP-Water Relationships During the Driest Year</i>	80
3.3	RESULTS	80
3.3.1	<i>The Effect of Vegetation Type on Cross-site RUE</i>	80
3.3.2	<i>The Effect of PET on RUE Within Vegetation Types</i>	81
3.3.3	<i>The Influence of Vegetation Type on Cross-site eRUE</i>	86
3.3.4	<i>The Effect of Vegetation Type on Cross-site eRUE During the Driest Year</i>	90
3.4	DISCUSSION	93
3.4.1	<i>The Effect of Vegetation Type on Cross-site RUE</i>	93
3.4.2	<i>The Effect of PET on RUE Within Vegetation Types</i>	94
3.4.3	<i>The Influence of Vegetation Type on Cross-site eRUE</i>	96

3.4.3.1	Functional Vegetation Group.....	96
3.4.3.2	Vegetation Class	99
3.4.4	<i>The Effect of Vegetation Type on Cross-site eRUE During the Driest Year.....</i>	<i>102</i>
3.5	CONCLUSION	103
3.6	REFERENCES	104
CHAPTER 4: ASSESSING ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION ACROSS YEARS .. 111		
4.1	INTRODUCTION	112
4.2	DATA AND METHODS.....	115
4.2.1	<i>Study Area.....</i>	<i>115</i>
4.2.2	<i>MODIS EVI.....</i>	<i>115</i>
4.2.3	<i>TRMM Precipitation Data.....</i>	<i>116</i>
4.2.4	<i>Potential Evapotranspiration Data</i>	<i>116</i>
4.2.5	<i>Vegetation Type Aata.....</i>	<i>116</i>
4.2.6	<i>Assessing Vegetation Sensitivity to Interannual P Variability</i>	<i>116</i>
4.2.7	<i>Assessing Vegetation Sensitivity to Interannual PET Variability.....</i>	<i>117</i>
4.2.8	<i>Assessing Vegetation Sensitivity to Interannual P/PET Variability</i>	<i>118</i>
4.2.9	<i>A Comparison Between PMR and AMR</i>	<i>118</i>
4.2.10	<i>Assessing Ecosystem Function Trends & Land Degradation.....</i>	<i>119</i>
4.3	RESULTS	121
4.3.1	<i>PMR Analysis.....</i>	<i>121</i>
4.3.2	<i>The Effect of PET on ANPP.....</i>	<i>124</i>
4.3.3	<i>Vegetation Sensitivity to Interannual P/PET Variability.....</i>	<i>129</i>
4.3.4	<i>A Comparison Between PMR and AMR</i>	<i>131</i>
4.3.5	<i>Ecosystem Function Trends & Land Degradation</i>	<i>136</i>
4.4	DISCUSSION	141
4.4.1	<i>PMR Analysis.....</i>	<i>141</i>
4.4.2	<i>The Effect of PET on ANPP.....</i>	<i>143</i>
4.4.3	<i>Vegetation Sensitivity to Interannual P/PET Variability.....</i>	<i>145</i>
4.4.4	<i>A Comparison Between PMR and AMR</i>	<i>145</i>
4.4.5	<i>Ecosystem Function Trends & Land Degradation</i>	<i>147</i>
4.5	CONCLUSION	149
4.6	REFERENCES	151

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE PERSPECTIVES	157
5.1 INTRODUCTION	158
5.2 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS	159
5.2.1 <i>The Effects of Atmospheric Evaporative Demand on RUE</i>	159
5.2.2 <i>The Role of Vegetation Type on RUE</i>	160
5.2.3 <i>Assessing Ecosystem Function Across Years</i>	160
5.3 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH	161
5.4 CONCLUSION	165
APPENDIX – RUE & ERUE TRENDS.....	166

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. a) Stable ecosystems may exhibit some temporal variability while retaining structural and functional integrity; unstable ecosystems are in danger of transitioning to an alternative stable state. b) Resilient ecosystems are able to absorb a certain level of disturbance while remaining in a stable state; however, if disturbances are sustained and a threshold is crossed, the ecosystem becomes unstable and transitions to an alternate stable state of degradation. Source: D’Odorico et al. (2013)..... 5

Figure 2. Spectral signature of healthy vegetation. Visible EMR interacts with leaf pigments, NIR is reflected by leaf and canopy structure, and short-wave infrared (SWIR) interacts with water content properties. Source: adapted from Chuvieco & Huete (2009)..... 9

Figure 3. The mean RUE of a healthy ecosystem (green line) as calculated from 6 years of data (stars). A similar ecosystem which has been degraded by a reduction in plant fractional cover would have a lower mean RUE (red line), as calculated from 6 years of data (squares). 12

Figure 4. Examples showing the linear relationship between ANPP and precipitation (red lines) in healthy ecosystems that have non-zero y-intercepts. RUE values are represented by thin black lines. In both cases, a change in precipitation results in a change in RUE..... 13

Figure 5. Differences in PMR (i.e. slope) between a grassland (green line) and shrubland (red line). Note that sites of different plant functional type may share a similar mean RUE or mean ANPP (represented as the intersection between the green and red lines). PRM differences would make these sites easily distinguishable (Veron et al., 2006)..... 16

Figure 6. Residuals trend (RESTREND) analysis displaying a negative trend in ANPP residuals (red line), which indicates land degradation (Evans & Geerken, 2004; Wessels et al., 2007). 17

Figure 7. The albedo-vegetation feature space (Ma et al., 2011). The A-C line represents dry soils, while the B-D line represents wet soils. A shift of data points from D to A may indicate land degradation..... 18

Figure 8. Mean hydro-meteorological conditions across Australia from July 2000 to June 2011. a) Map of Australia showing differences in aridity (hyper-arid climates of $AI < 0.05$ are non-existent), b) map of MAP, and c) map of mean annual PET. $AI > 1$ is represented in grey..... 41

Figure 9. iEVI is plotted against MAP for a random sample of 5% of all the data to aid visualisation. The cross-site RUE relationship is represented by the slope of the regression, or red line..... 46

Figure 10. Map showing spatial differences in mean RUE during the study period. Masked areas are represented in grey, and include: $AI \geq 1$; agricultural land cover types; aquatic environments; and sites with extremely low mean iEVI. . 47

Figure 11. The relationship between RUE and MAP (a), RUE and PET (b), and RUE and P/PET (c). Data density is represented by a colour gradient, with high and low data density shown in yellow, red, blue and grey, respectively..... 48

Figure 12. Cross-site RUE relationship (slope of iEVI plotted against MAP) over a continental range of PET, represented by a colour gradient (a); and for 3 distinct PET classes (b). The PET classes are described in Table 1..... 48

Figure 13. Cross-site effective RUE (eRUE) relationship (slope of iEVI plotted against P/PET) over a continental range of PET, represented by a colour gradient (a); and for 3 distinct PET classes (b)..... 49

Figure 14. Scatterplot between iEVI and P/PET with fitted linear model (blue line; Equation 9) and non-linear model (red line; Equation 10). 50

Figure 15. Cross-site RUE relationships during the driest years, the mean, and the wettest years (a random sample of 1% of all the data are shown to aid visualisation)..... 51

Figure 16. Cross-site RUE relationships (iEVI plotted against P) during the driest years (a) and wettest years (b). PET values are represented by a colour gradient and cross-site RUE values (slope) for 3 PET classes are shown on the bottom edge. All years data are shown in grey for reference..... 52

Figure 17. Cross-site eRUE relationships (iEVI plotted against P/PET) for the driest years (a) and wettest years (b). PET values are represented by a colour gradient. The cross-site eRUE relationships for the entire study area are represented by the red line. All years data are shown in grey for reference. 53

Figure 18. Conceptual diagram showing the contrasting response of RUE to water supply and water demand.	54
Figure 19. Vegetation type classification based on DLCD. The original 34 classes were simplified to 11, as described in Table 2 below. Water Observations from Space (WofS; blue areas) were derived from the dataset described in section 3.2.6.	72
Figure 20. Land cover type map based on the NVIS major vegetation groups (MVG). The 33 MVG classes were simplified 7 classes for illustration.	73
Figure 21. Coefficient of determination values for cross-site RUE and cross-site eRUE relationships within each vegetation type investigating if spatial ANPP-water relationships for each vegetation types are better explained by precipitation (i.e. cross-site RUE) or precipitation and PET (i.e. cross-site eRUE).	82
Figure 22. Cross-site RUE (a) and cross-site eRUE (b) relationship for the "forests/woodlands" class. PET values are represented by a colour gradient....	83
Figure 23. Cross-site RUE (a) and cross-site eRUE (b) relationship for the "open forests" tree cover class. PET values are represented by a colour gradient.	83
Figure 24. Cross-site RUE (a) and cross-site eRUE (b) for the "other grasslands" class. PET values are represented by a colour gradient.	84
Figure 25. Cross-site RUE (a) and cross-site eRUE (b) for the "croplands" class. PET values are represented by a colour gradient.	85
Figure 26. Cross-site eRUE relationships for "Functional Vegetation Group" vegetation types. Data for all vegetation types are shown in grey.	87
Figure 27. Cross-site eRUE values for all tested vegetation types. Differences in cross-site eRUE among vegetation types were tested using the chow test. Most vegetation types resulted in significantly different cross-site eRUE relationships, except "Tussock grasslands" and "Chenopod shrublands" (denoted by the letter "a").	88
Figure 28. Cross-site eRUE relationships for "Vegetation Class" vegetation types (coloured lines). Data for all vegetation types are shown in grey.	89
Figure 29. Cross-site eRUE values for the mean (grey bars) and driest year (white bars). Cross-site eRUE _{dry} was significantly different than cross-site eRUE for all	

vegetation types, except “other grasslands” (denoted by the letter “a”). Cross-site $eRUE_{dry}$ was significantly different among all vegetation types..... 91

Figure 30. Cross-site $eRUE_{dry}$ relationships for each “Vegetation Class” vegetation type during the driest year (dashed lines). Cross-site $eRUE$ is represented by the solid lines. 92

Figure 31. Cross-site $eRUE_{dry}$ relationships for “Vegetation Class” vegetation types (dashed lines). Solid lines represent mean cross-site $eRUE$ relationships. 93

Figure 32. The relationship between PET standard deviation and the difference between cross-site RUE and $eRUE$ R^2 values. “Functional Vegetation Group” vegetation types are represented by blue circles. “Vegetation Class” vegetation types are represented by red squares, except “croplands” (open square) and “open woodlands” (grey square)..... 95

Figure 33. Conceptual plot showing how PMR is calculated. In this plot PMR is the slope of the regression between $iEVI$ and P for one site using 11 years of data (2000 to 2010). PMR was calculated for every site..... 117

Figure 34. Conceptual plot show how RESTREND is calculated. In this plot RESTREND is the median slope of the relationship between PMR residuals (e_{PMR}) and time across a total of 11 years (2000 to 2010). In this example a negative RESTREND is shown, which indicates that ANPP has declined over time, independently from precipitation trends. RESTREND was calculated for every site. 120

Figure 35. Top panel: Map of PMR values across the study area. Low PMR indicates low $iEVI$ sensitivity to interannual P variability, and is represented by red. High PMR indicates high $iEVI$ sensitivity to interannual P variability, and is represented by blue. Bottom panel: Map of PMR values only showing statistically significant PMR relationships. Regions with PMR close to 0 generally resulted in non-significant PMR relationships..... 122

Figure 36. Scatterplots show the relationship between PMR and MAP (a), PET (b), and P/PET (c). All relationships were statistically significant (solid lines; $p < 0.001$), but were weak. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. Agricultural lands were excluded from analysis. 123

Figure 37. Mean PMR (\pm standard deviation) for each vegetation type. Vegetation types denoted by “a” were not significantly different from each other ($p > 0.05$). 124

Figure 38. Top panel: Map of Pearson’s r derived from the correlation between PMR residuals (e_{PMR}) and PET. Negative correlations indicate that iEVI was negatively affected by interannual PET variability and are represented by red-orange-yellow. Positive correlations indicate that iEVI was positively affected by interannual PET variability and are represented by green-blue-purple. Bottom panel: Map of Pearson’s r only showing statistically significant relationships between e_{PMR} and PET. Non-significant relationships are represented in dark grey, masked areas are represented in light grey. 126

Figure 39. Scatterplots show the relationship between $e_{PMR} \sim$ PET slopes and MAP (a), PET (b), and P/PET (c). All relationships were statistically significant (solid lines; $p < 0.001$), but were weak. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. Agricultural lands were excluded from analysis..... 127

Figure 40. Scatterplots show the relationship between $e_{PMR} \sim$ PET slopes and MAP (a), PET (b), and P/PET (c), including only sites with statistically significant $e_{PMR} \sim$ PET relationships (solid lines; $p < 0.001$). Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. Agricultural lands were excluded from analysis..... 127

Figure 41. Mean $e_{PMR} \sim$ PET slopes (\pm standard deviation) for each vegetation type. Values close to 0 indicate that interannual PET variability generally did not affect ANPP. White bars represent the mean slope as derived from all sites within each vegetation type. The grey bars represent the mean slope as derived from sites with statistically significant $e_{PMR} \sim$ PET relationships only. Vegetation types denoted by a common letter were not significantly different from each other ($p > 0.05$). 128

Figure 42. Map of AMR values across the study area. Low AMR indicates low iEVI sensitivity to interannual P/PET variability, and is represented by red. High AMR indicates high iEVI sensitivity to interannual P variability, and is represented by blue. Masked areas are represented in grey..... 129

Figure 43. Scatterplots show the relationship between AMR and MAP (a), PET (b), and P/PET (c). All relationships were statistically significant (solid lines; $p < 0.001$), but were weak. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. Agricultural lands were excluded from analysis. 130

Figure 44. Mean AMR (\pm standard deviation) for each vegetation type. Vegetation types denoted by “a” were not significantly different from each other ($p > 0.05$). 131

Figure 45. Scatterplot showing the relationship between AMR and PMR (solid line; $p < 0.001$). AMR and PMR values were calculated for each site. The dashed line represents the 1 to 1 ratio. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. 132

Figure 46. Scatterplot showing the relationship between AMR R^2 and PMR R^2 (solid line; $p < 0.001$). The dashed line represents the 1 to 1 ratio. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. 133

Figure 47. Scatterplots show the relationship between AMR-PMR differences and MAP (a), PET (b), and P/PET (c). All relationships were statistically significant (solid lines; $p < 0.05$), but were weak. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. Agricultural lands were excluded from analysis. 134

Figure 48. Mean AMR-PMR differences (\pm standard deviation) for each vegetation type. Vegetation types denoted by common letter were not significantly different from each other ($p > 0.05$). 134

Figure 49. Scatterplot showing the relationship between $e_{PMR \sim PET}$ slopes and AMR-PMR differences (solid line; $p < 0.001$). Sites in quadrant II were positively affected by interannual PET variability, and were more sensitive to interannual P variability. Sites in quadrant IV were negatively affected by interannual PET variability, and were more sensitive to interannual P/PET variability. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. 135

Figure 50. Map of RESTREND_{PMR} value across the study area. Negative trends indicate that declines in iEVI occurred for the period 2000-2010 that were

independent from P trends, and are represented by red-orange-yellow. Positive trends indicate that increases in iEVI occurred that were independent from P trends, and are represented by green-blue-purple. Non-significant trends are represented in dark grey, masked areas are represented in light grey. 136

Figure 51. The total number of significant RESTREND pixels for each vegetation type. White bars indicate positive trends; grey bars indicate negative trends. 137

Figure 52. The percentage of significant RESTREND pixels for each vegetation type. White bars indicate positive trends; grey bars indicate negative trends. 138

Figure 53. Scatterplot showing the relationship between RESTREND_{AMR}-RESTREND_{PMR} differences and PET trends (solid line; $p < 0.001$) for sites where e_{PMR} was negatively correlated with PET. Sites in quadrant I resulted in lower RESTREND_{PMR} and positive PET trends (expected result). Sites in quadrant II resulted in lower RESTREND_{PMR} and negative PET trends (unexpected result). Sites in quadrant III resulted in higher RESTREND_{PMR} and negative PET trends (expected result). Sites in quadrant IV resulted in higher RESTREND_{PMR} and positive PET trends (unexpected result). Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. 139

Figure 54. Scatterplot showing the relationship between RESTREND_{AMR}-RESTREND_{PMR} differences and PET trends (solid line; $p < 0.001$), however, only site with statistically significant negative e_{PMR} -PET relationships were included. Sites in quadrant I resulted in lower RESTREND_{PMR} and positive PET trends (expected result). Sites in quadrant II resulted in lower RESTREND_{PMR} and negative PET trends (unexpected result). Sites in quadrant III resulted in higher RESTREND_{PMR} and negative PET trends (expected result). Sites in quadrant IV resulted in higher RESTREND_{PMR} and positive PET trends (unexpected result). Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. 140

Figure 55. Maps of y-intercept values derived from PMR (top) and AMR (bottom) relationships. 167

Figure 56. Maps of coefficient of determination values derived from the power function between RUE and P (top), and between eRUE and P/PET (bottom). 168

Figure 57. Scatterplot showing the relationship between RUE trends and P trends (top), and eRUE trends and P/PET trends. Data points are coloured according to data density, with high to low data density shown in yellow-orange-red-blue-grey. 169

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Basic statistics of the three PET classes.	49
Table 2. Vegetation type classifications based on the DLCD. Masked land cover types are coloured grey. The number of pixels in each DLCD class is also shown.	76
Table 3. Regression models used to determine if vegetation type (VT) has a significant effect on spatial ANPP-water relationships. The inclusion of interaction terms between predictor variables is denoted by *.....	78
Table 4. Regression models used to determine if cross-site eRUE improves upon cross-site RUE within vegetation types (VT). The inclusion of interaction terms between predictor variables is denoted by *.....	79
Table 5. Linear and multiple linear regression R^2 and ΔAIC results for “Functional Vegetation Group” and “Vegetation Class” categorisations investigating the effect of vegetation type on cross-site RUE relationships. All models were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).	81
Table 6. Linear and multiple linear regression R^2 and ΔAIC results based on “Functional Vegetation Group” and “Vegetation Class” categorisations investigating the influence of PET on spatial ANPP-precipitation relationships within vegetation types. All models were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$)..	86
Table 7. Linear and multiple linear regression R^2 and ΔAIC results based on “Functional Vegetation Group” and “Vegetation Class” categorisations investigating the influence of PET on spatial ANPP-precipitation relationships within vegetation types for the driest year. All models are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).....	90

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

AI	Aridity index
ACRIS	Australian Collaborative Rangelands Information System
AMR	Aridity marginal response
ANPP	Above-ground net primary productivity
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation
CLUM	Catchment-scale land use map
D	Drainage from the root zone
DLCD	Dynamic Land Cover Dataset
E_s	Soil evaporation
EMR	Electromagnetic radiation
eRUE	Effective rain-use efficiency
ET	Evapotranspiration
GPP	Gross primary production
I	Evaporation from the wet canopy
IGBP	International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme
iEVI	Integrated enhanced vegetation index
ISO	International Standards Organisation
IWUE	Inherent water-use efficiency
LAI	Leaf area index
MAP	Mean annual precipitation
MODIS	Moderate-resolution imaging spectroradiometer
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NDVI	Normalised difference vegetation index
NIR	Near-infrared
NSW	New South Wales
NVIS	National Vegetation Information System
P	Precipitation
PET	Potential evapotranspiration
Qld.	Queensland
PMR	Precipitation marginal response
R	Run-off

RESTREND	Residuals trend
RUE	Rain-use efficiency
SA	South Australia
SAVI	Soil-adjusted vegetation index
SWIR	Short-wave infrared
T	Transpiration
Tas.	Tasmania
TRMM	Tropical Rainfall Measurement Mission
TSS-RESTREND	Time-series segmented residuals trend
W_p	Vegetation water content
W_s	Soil water content
WA	Western Australia
WARMS	Western Australia Rangeland Monitoring System
WofS	Water observations from space
WUE	Water-use efficiency
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
VI	Vegetation index
Vic.	Victoria
VPD	Vapour-pressure deficit
VSI	Vegetation sensitivity index
VT	Vegetation type

ABSTRACT

Degradation of dryland ecosystems has been of interest to ecologists for many decades, and has been reported on every populated continent. Rain-use efficiency (RUE), which describes the relationship between annual above-ground net primary productivity (ANPP) and annual precipitation (P), is a commonly used measure of ecosystem function across water-limited arid and semi-arid ecosystems. The goal of this thesis was to improve our understanding of spatial and temporal RUE relationships across Australian water-limited ecosystem in order to monitor land degradation and ecosystem resilience. A remote sensing approach was taken, as it is the only practical method that allows for spatially and temporally comprehensive assessment of RUE relationships at a continental scale.

The first step was to assess spatial RUE variability in relation to spatial variability in precipitation (P) and potential evapotranspiration (PET), as water availability is primarily determined by hydro-meteorological conditions that encompass both water supply (P) and atmospheric evaporative demand, or PET. The results showed that water-limited ecosystems did not adhere to a well-defined spatial ANPP-rainfall relationship due to strong impacts of PET on RUE. Therefore, a new index that normalised RUE by PET was developed and tested - “effective RUE” (eRUE). The eRUE relationship (i.e. the regression between ANPP and the quotient of precipitation and PET) resulted in a spatially well-defined ANPP-water model compared to RUE (which does not consider the effect of PET). Also, during extreme dry years ecosystems showed stronger convergence to a common maximum ANPP-water relationship when the effects of both P and PET were included. This driest-years spatial eRUE relationship (i.e. cross-site $eRUE_{dry}$) defines theoretical water-limitation boundary conditions. Thus, while critically low rainfall can lead to vegetation water stress and contribute to ANPP losses, increasing PET caused by future climate change is likely to exacerbate drought-induced impacts on ecosystem structure and function, including the frequency of drought-induced mortality events.

Vegetation type was also considered as a contributing factor to spatial RUE and eRUE variability. The results showed that vegetation types exhibited significant

differences in eRUE (and RUE). Furthermore, these differences were also expressed during the driest years, suggesting that each vegetation type exhibits a unique spatial eRUE relationship during periods of severe water limitation. As such, if cross-site eRUE_{dry} is to be used as a theoretical drought resilience threshold, it should be defined by vegetation type-specific cross-site eRUE_{dry} relationships.

Ecosystem function trends were assessed as indicators of land degradation. First, ANPP interannual variability was assessed in relation to interannual P variability, which revealed differences in sensitivity among vegetation types. Tussock grasslands, chenopod shrublands and agricultural lands were identified as the most sensitive to interannual P variability, suggesting that these vegetation types may be most sensitive to future climate change. The residuals trend (RESTREND) method was used to assess ecosystem function trends that were independent from climate trends. Sites with negative ecosystem function trends were observed across the study area, and represent potential sites of land degradation. Open woodlands, mulga shrublands, chenopod shrublands, hummock grasslands, and agricultural lands were identified as widely affected.

This thesis has contributed to our understanding of spatial and temporal RUE relationships within the context of P, PET and vegetation type variability. At the continental scale ANPP spatial variability was strongly affected by P and PET. This led to the development of the eRUE metric, which was also applied during the driest years. The cross-site eRUE_{dry} represents theoretical water limitation boundary conditions that encompass water supply and atmospheric evaporative demand. Vegetation type was found to play a significant role in spatial eRUE relationships, suggesting that each vegetation type is likely to have a unique drought resilience threshold. The analysis did not reveal strong effects of PET trends on ANPP trends, perhaps indicating that negative effects of PET may be limited to drought periods. Finally, the possible presence of land degradation processes was identified across several vegetation types.