



Faculty of Health, Engineering and Sciences

School of Civil Engineering and Surveying

**Improving water productivity of irrigated wheat in the
northern grain production region of Australia**

A dissertation submitted by

Allan Stewart Peake BAgrSc(Hons), MAgrSc

for the award of

Doctor of Philosophy

2015

Abstract

While cotton has traditionally been the dominant crop in irrigated broad-acre farming systems of subtropical Australia, high grain prices triggered a record area of irrigated wheat production in the winter of 2008. Unfortunately wheat yields were substantially lower than expected, probably due to widespread lodging (a disorder where crops fall over). And while irrigation water was plentiful for the 2008 season, the typical water availability for irrigated wheat production in the region involves water rather than land being the limiting factor to production.

Little research has been conducted on the potential yield, water use requirement or water productivity of irrigated spring wheat in the northern grain production region of eastern Australia, often referred to as the 'northern grains region'. Such information would allow growers to assess lodging-related yield losses, compare the profitability of irrigated wheat against alternative crops, and determine the irrigation strategies that maximise economic returns. Additionally, there is uncertainty within the region over which agronomic techniques can be used to minimise the risk of lodging without reducing grain yield.

The overarching question to be addressed by this study is therefore: *what are the agronomic practices required to achieve maximum water productivity in irrigated wheat, across the northern grain production region of eastern Australia?* Two specific hypotheses were investigated in answering this question: (1) *that lodging constrains irrigated wheat yields in the northern grains region, and agronomic techniques can be used to control lodging, and (2) that when irrigation water availability is limited, maximum whole-farm crop water productivity for wheat is achieved by partially irrigating a larger crop area rather than fully irrigating a smaller area.* These hypotheses were investigated in the context of spring-wheat production systems within the northern grains region, where water rather than irrigable area is generally the limiting factor to crop production.

The APSIM (Agricultural Production Systems Simulator) model was used to determine the potential yield and water use requirement of irrigated spring wheat, but first required validation against field data. Crop production data (e.g. biomass and grain yield) were collected from 21 wheat crops throughout the northern grains region in 2008 and 2009, and recorded crop conditions and inputs (e.g. weather data, sowing dates, irrigation) were used to parameterise APSIM simulations for each crop.

APSIM predicted biomass production satisfactorily in 2008 but substantially over-predicted grain yield of lodged fields. The mean difference (yield gap) between APSIM-estimated potential yield and farmer-realised yield was 0.9 t ha^{-1} in non-lodged fields, and 2.5 t ha^{-1} in lodged fields. The average effect of lodging was therefore estimated as a decrease in grain yield of 1.6 t ha^{-1} , the difference between the yield gap calculated for lodged and non-lodged fields. In 2009 commercial fields generally experienced little lodging, probably due to the use of in-crop nitrogen (N) application to control canopy development. APSIM generally under-predicted biomass production and yield in these fields, suggesting that the N uptake parameters in APSIM may require adjustment. However, observed yields from fields of a quick-maturing cultivar that experienced little lodging were simulated accurately when N was assumed to be non-limiting. Further simulations of fully irrigated, quick maturing wheat using 50 years of climate data at six representative locations found that the potential yield of irrigated spring wheat in the northern grains region was

approximately 8 to 9 t ha⁻¹, and average growing season evapotranspiration of such crops was approximately 490 to 530 mm, depending on location.

The canopy management techniques of in-crop N application and reduced plant population are widely used in rainfed wheat production in temperate climates. However they are untested on irrigated wheat in the subtropics, and may not reduce lodging risk in the northern grains region without simultaneously reducing yield potential. Irrigated small plot experiments were therefore conducted in 2009 and 2011 to examine the effect of alternative N timing and plant populations on lodging and yield for two cultivars, under well-watered conditions.

Low sowing N treatments exhibited moderate to severe vegetative N stress, having soil plus fertiliser N at sowing of less than 80 kg ha⁻¹ (sometimes as low as 15 kg N ha⁻¹) and the majority of fertiliser N applied in-season. These low sowing N treatments had significantly less lodging and were the highest yielding, exhibiting yield increases of up to 0.8 t ha⁻¹ compared to high sowing N treatments. Increasing plant population above 100 plants m⁻² increased lodging and decreased yield in high N treatments, but did not always increase lodging in low N treatments. Increased LAI, biomass and tiller count at the end of the vegetative growth phase were correlated with increased lodging in both cultivars, although the strength of the correlation varied with cultivar and season. Optimal N regime varied slightly between the cultivars, indicating that the optimisation of canopy management techniques for irrigated spring wheat systems would require further investigation of genotype × management interaction. It was therefore determined that canopy management techniques can be used to simultaneously increase yield and decrease lodging in irrigated spring wheat in the subtropics, but should be implemented differently to the techniques used in temperate regions of Australia, where recommended plant population and sowing N rates are higher than those identified in the present study.

While full irrigation of wheat in 2008 was forecast to be profitable (before the impact of lodging was apparent), irrigation water availability for irrigated wheat growing in the northern grains region is usually limited, and water rather than land is typically the limiting factor to production. Previous studies in other regions indicate that deficit (i.e. partial) irrigation of wheat is often considered to have greater economic water productivity (EWP) under such circumstances. Unfortunately, the cost/revenue functions traditionally used to evaluate alternative irrigation strategies are not applicable across multiple environments, and such studies have not accounted for the intrinsic value of water stored in the soil at the end of the cropping season.

The APSIM model was therefore used to determine whether growing larger areas of deficit irrigated wheat is more profitable than full irrigation of a smaller area in the northern grains region, when water rather than land is the limiting factor. The analyses accounted for the value of stored soil water across the entire farm by simulating rainfed crop production on unirrigated land, and/or by assigning an economic value to stored soil water remaining at the end of the season. Whole-farm profitability was assessed for alternative economic analyses where different values (inexpensive vs. expensive) were assumed for both irrigation water and stored soil water. Optimal irrigation strategies were those considered to be the most risk-efficient, being closest to a 1:2 'line of indifference' that identifies the two unit increase in risk (measured as standard deviation) acceptable to farmers in return for a unit increase in profit.

The results of the simulation study demonstrated that irrigation strategies involving deficit irrigation of larger areas of wheat generally had greater levels of

absolute profitability, and were typically more risk-efficient than smaller areas of fully irrigated wheat. When precipitation or stored soil water at sowing was increased, the most risk-efficient strategies were those that spread the water across a larger area at a reduced frequency of irrigation. However in a low rainfall environment when water was expensive and soil water was given the same economic value as irrigation water, fully irrigated wheat in conjunction with fallow land was found to be the most profitable and risk-efficient option. The importance of evaluating farm-management strategies using EWP (i.e. incorporating gross margins) instead of crop water productivity (grain yield per unit of water use) was evident, as re-ranking of farm-management strategies occurred between these alternative methods of calculating whole-farm EWP. Accounting for the intrinsic value of stored soil water and precipitation was fundamental to understanding the benefit of deficit irrigation strategies in water limited situations, as the larger crop area sown in conjunction with deficit irrigation strategies accessed much larger absolute volumes of soil water and precipitation. Future evaluations of deficit irrigation strategies should account for such considerations.

The results of this study therefore support the hypothesis that lodging constrains irrigated wheat production in the northern grain production region of eastern Australia, and that agronomic techniques can be used to control lodging. The study also supports the second hypothesis that maximum whole-farm water productivity is achieved by partially irrigating a larger area of wheat when water availability is limited, except in low rainfall environments where irrigation water is expensive and soil water is assigned an economic value equivalent to the irrigation water.

Certification of dissertation

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

Signature of Candidate: _____ **Date:** _____

Signature of Supervisors:

Principal Supervisor: _____ **Date:** _____
(Professor Steven Raine)

Associate Supervisor: _____ **Date:** _____
(Professor Rod Smith)

External Supervisor: _____ **Date:** _____
(Dr Peter Carberry)

Acknowledgements

There are many people who have contributed in various ways to the work described herein. First and foremost I would like to thank the many growers and agronomists who were involved in the on-farm monitoring that occurred in 2008 and 2009, for either hosting the on-farm monitoring, taking the time to show me how to get to the fields, and/or assisting with data collection. In particular I would like to thank Glen Milne, Jamie Streets, Peter Haslem, Hamish Bligh, Paul Castor and Graham Spackman. These gentlemen not only assisted with field monitoring but have also answered numerous follow up questions to assist me in constructing simulation scenarios that are relevant to growers of the northern grains region.

I would like to thank my supervisors: Professors Steven Raine and Rod Smith, as well as Dr Peter Carberry for their patient, helpful and insightful input. I also thank Dr Mike Robertson, Dr Zvi Hochman and Dr Neil Huth from CSIRO (the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation) who have given feedback on chapter drafts as they ebbed through the publication process. I thank my employer CSIRO for allowing me the opportunity to conduct this study alongside my normal day to day responsibilities, and in particular I thank Dr Peter Stone who gave initial approval for my studies to commence.

The assistance of technical staff at CSIRO Gatton Research Station (Greg Roberts, Terry Collins), CSIRO Toowoomba (John Lawrence, Daniel Moye) and the Australian Cotton Research Institute (ACRI) was greatly appreciated in collecting biomass and soil samples. I also thank Verity Gett and Rod Jackson (ACRI) for overseeing the data collection for the soil water data presented in Chapter 5 as part of a collaborative experiment between CSIRO and the New South Wales Department of Primary Industries. The assistance of Kerry Bell (Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries in Queensland) in running statistical analyses in Chapter 4 under my direction was also greatly appreciated.

Of course I also thank my wife Kathy and children Rebecca, Rachel, Isaac and Sarah for their patience with my absences as I travelled around the countryside, and their patience with my mental absences as I contemplated experimental challenges at the dinner table!

Finally, I thank the Lord God for giving me life and helping me to live it.

Publications Arising

(Listed in Chronological Order)

- Peake, A.S., Angus, J.F., 2009. Increasing yield of irrigated wheat in Queensland and Northern NSW. GRDC Northern Region Grains Research Updates, Goondiwindi, 3-4 March, 2009.
- Peake, A.S., 2010. Improving yields in irrigated wheat: 2009 trial update. GRDC Northern Region Grains Research Updates, Goondiwindi, 3-4 March, 2010.
- *Peake, A.S., Hochman, Z., Dalglish, N.P., 2010. A rapid method for estimating the plant available water capacity of Vertosols. In: Dove, H., Culvenor, R.A. (Eds.), Food Security from Sustainable Agriculture - Proceedings of the 15th Australian Agronomy Conference, Lincoln, New Zealand, 15-18 November 2010.
- Peake, A.S., Rebetzke, G., Chapman, S., Dreccer, F., McIntyre, L., Hundt, A., Bell, K., 2012. Agronomy for high yielding cereal environments: varieties, agronomic strategies and case studies, GRDC Northern Region Grains Research Updates, Goondiwindi, 6-7 March, 2012.
- **Peake, A., Bell, K., Poole, N., Lawrence, J., 2012. Nitrogen stress during tillering decreases lodging risk and increases yield of irrigated bread-wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) in north-eastern Australia. In: Yunusa, I. (Ed.), Capturing Opportunities and Overcoming Obstacles in Australian Agronomy - Proceedings of the 16th Australian Agronomy Conference, Armidale, NSW, 14-18 October 2012.
- Peake, A.S., Gardner, M., Poole, N., Bell, K., 2014a. Beyond 8 t/ha: varieties and agronomy for maximising irrigated wheat yields in the northern region. GRDC Northern Region Grains Research Updates, Goondiwindi, 4-5 March, 2014.
- ***Peake, A.S., Huth, N.I., Carberry, P.S., Raine, S.R., Smith, R.J., 2014b. Quantifying potential yield and lodging-related yield gaps for irrigated spring wheat in sub-tropical Australia. *Field Crops Res.* 158, 1-14.

*This conference paper is a slightly modified version of Appendix A.

**This conference paper formed the basis of Chapter 4.

***This journal paper is an abbreviated version of Chapter 3.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Certification of dissertation	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Publications Arising	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
List of Figures	xvi
List of Tables.....	xxi
Chapter 1 - Introduction	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. Objectives.....	3
1.3. Structure of dissertation.....	3
Chapter 2 - Literature review.....	4
2.1. Water productivity and ceiling yield terminology	4
2.1.1. Water productivity indices	4
2.1.2. Ceiling yield terminology	5
2.1.3. Summary	6
2.2. Ceiling yield of irrigated wheat	6
2.2.1. Ceiling yield of wheat in the northern grains region.	6
2.2.2. Ceiling yield of spring wheat in southern Australian and international environments.....	7
2.2.3. Determining potential yield through crop modelling	7
2.3. Improving crop water productivity of irrigated wheat	8
2.3.1. Limitations to improving crop water productivity	8
2.3.2. Cause, effect and control of lodging in wheat.....	9
2.3.3. Maximising crop water productivity for individual production fields.....	11
2.3.4. Maximising water productivity on a whole-farm basis	11
2.4. Conclusions	15
Chapter 3 - Quantifying potential yield and lodging related yield- gaps for irrigated spring wheat in the northern grains production region of eastern Australia	16
3.1. Introduction.....	16
3.2. Materials and methods	17

3.2.1. Overview	17
3.2.2. Field measurements	18
3.2.3. APSIM validation simulations.....	19
3.2.4. Simulation of potential yield and water use	20
3.3. Results	21
3.3.1. Field observations	21
3.3.1.1. <i>Seasonal conditions</i>	21
3.3.1.2. <i>Agronomic characteristics of monitored fields</i>	23
3.3.1.3. <i>Crop yield</i>	27
3.3.2. Validation of the APSIM model	27
3.3.2.1. <i>Simulation of phenology (2008 and 2009)</i>	27
3.3.2.2. <i>Simulation of biomass, grain yield and yield components from 2008 crops</i>	27
3.3.2.3. <i>Simulation of biomass, grain yield and yield components from 2009 crops</i>	29
3.3.2.4. <i>Summary of APSIM validation for the cultivar Kennedy in 2008 and 2009 assuming no N limitation to crop growth...</i>	32
3.3.2.5. <i>APSIM prediction of crop water use in 2008</i>	32
3.3.3. Assessment of agronomic management factors potentially contributing to lodging in the 2008 crops.	33
3.3.4. APSIM simulated potential yield and water use for irrigated wheat in the northern grains region	34
3.4. Discussion	36
3.4.1. APSIM validation	36
3.4.1.1. <i>Phenology</i>	36
3.4.1.2. <i>Prediction of biomass & grain yield in lodged fields in 2008</i> ...	37
3.4.1.3. <i>Prediction of biomass & grain yield in canopy managed fields in 2009</i>	37
3.4.1.4. <i>Prediction of ceiling yield</i>	38
3.4.2. Potential yield and water use for irrigated wheat under different agronomic management regimes in the northern grains region	39
3.4.3. Causes and impacts of lodging on irrigated wheat production in the northern grains region in 2008.	39
3.4.3.1. <i>Mechanisms and causes of lodging</i>	39
3.4.3.2. <i>The effect of agronomic management on lodging in 2008</i>	40
3.5. Conclusions	41
Chapter 4 – An investigation into the ability of agronomic methods to reduce lodging in irrigated spring wheat in the northern grains production region of eastern Australia.....	42
4.1. Introduction.....	42
4.2. Methods.....	43
4.2.1. Experimental design	43
4.2.2. Field measurements	45
4.2.3. Lodging ratings and statistical analysis.....	46

4.3. Results	47
4.3.1. Field observations.....	47
4.3.1.1. <i>Seasonal conditions</i>	47
4.3.1.2. <i>Agronomic characteristics of monitored fields</i>	47
4.3.2. Analysis of management regimes × bed types across experiments in 2009.....	48
4.3.2.1. <i>Established plant population</i>	48
4.3.2.2. <i>Anthesis date</i>	48
4.3.2.3. <i>Grainfill lodging and grain yield</i>	48
4.3.2.4. <i>Anthesis and maturity biomass and yield components</i>	51
4.3.2.5. <i>Vegetative growth traits and their relationship to lodging</i>	52
4.3.3. Analysis of cultivar × N rate × seed rate at Gatton in 2011.....	56
4.3.3.1. <i>Established plant population</i>	56
4.3.3.2. <i>Anthesis date</i>	56
4.3.3.3. <i>Grainfill lodging and grain yield</i>	59
4.3.3.4. <i>Anthesis and maturity biomass and yield components</i>	60
4.3.3.5. <i>Vegetative growth traits and their relationship to lodging</i>	61
4.4. Discussion	62
4.5. Conclusions	65
Chapter 5 – An investigation into the whole-farm water productivity of alternative irrigation strategies relevant to the northern grains production region of eastern Australia....	66
5.1. Introduction	66
5.2. Materials & Methods	68
5.2.1. Overview.....	68
5.2.2. Validation of the APSIM model.....	68
5.2.2.1. <i>Field experiments</i>	68
5.2.2.2. <i>APSIM validation simulations</i>	69
5.2.3. Investigation of whole-farm economic water productivity using long-term APSIM simulation experiments.....	69
5.2.3.1. <i>Land-use simulations</i>	70
5.2.3.2. <i>Farm-management strategies</i>	70
5.2.3.3. <i>General methods for land-use simulations</i>	71
5.2.3.4. <i>Determination of partial gross margins</i>	74
5.2.3.5. <i>Evaluation terminology</i>	75
5.3. Results	76
5.3.1. APSIM Validation.....	76
5.3.1.1. <i>Field observations and agronomic management</i>	76
5.3.1.2. <i>Comparison of simulated and observed yield and water use</i>	77
5.3.2. Land-use simulations.....	79
5.3.2.1. <i>Environmental characterisation</i>	79
5.3.2.2. <i>Comparison of land-use simulations</i>	82
5.3.3. EWP analysis of farm-management strategies.....	84
5.3.3.1. <i>Risk/return analyses - Emerald</i>	86
5.3.3.2. <i>Risk/return analyses - Goondiwindi</i>	88

5.3.3.3. <i>Risk/return analyses - Gunnedah</i>	88
5.3.3.4. <i>Sensitivity analysis to increased farm water allocation</i>	91
5.4. Discussion	94
5.4.1. APSIM validation	94
5.4.2. Water productivity analyses	95
5.4.2.1. <i>The effect of rainfed cropping on the selection of optimum farm-management strategy</i>	96
5.4.2.2. <i>The effect of assigning an economic value to soil water on the selection of optimum irrigation strategy</i>	97
5.4.2.3. <i>The effect of additional irrigation water and stored soil water at sowing</i>	97
5.4.2.4. <i>The effect of environment and year-to-year variability on the choice of risk-efficient irrigation strategies</i>	98
5.5. Conclusions	98
Chapter 6 - General discussion and conclusions	100
6.1. General discussion	100
6.1.1. Implications for researchers and limitations of the study	100
6.1.1.1. <i>Applicability of the APSIM model to irrigated wheat production systems.</i>	100
6.1.1.2. <i>Prediction of potential yield by the APSIM model.</i>	101
6.1.1.3. <i>Evaluation of agronomic techniques for reducing lodging risk</i>	102
6.1.1.4. <i>Evaluation of deficit irrigation</i>	104
6.1.2. Implications for irrigated wheat producers.....	104
6.1.2.1. <i>Understanding potential yield and the impact of lodging in irrigated wheat production fields</i>	104
6.1.2.2. <i>Irrigation scheduling for maximising profitability when irrigation water is limited</i>	105
6.1.2.3. <i>Managing lodging risk through improved agronomy</i>	105
6.1.2.4. <i>Implementation of research</i>	106
6.2. Conclusions	107
References	109
Appendix A - Development of a rapid method for estimating the plant available water capacity of Vertosols	120
A.1. Introduction	120
A.2. Materials and methods	120
A.2.1. Revisiting the relationship between DUL and CLL on Vertosols.....	121
A.2.2. Consolidation of data into 11 'typical' soil types.....	121
A.2.3. The development of a hand assay to assess plant available water and match gravimetric data to the most appropriate 'Typical Vertosol'.	122
A.3. Results and discussion	122
A.4. Conclusions	124
A.5. Appendix A - References	125

Appendix B – Parameterising APSIM simulations to account for reduced light interception in furrow irrigated fields.....	126
B.1. Introduction	126
B.2. Background: The APSIM ‘skip_row_factor’ parameter	126
B.3. Materials and Methods	127
B.3.1. Overview	127
B.3.2. Determining the effect of increased furrow gap area on grain yield.....	128
B.3.3. Calculation of reduced light interception for north-south aligned furrow gaps	128
<i>B.3.3.1. Trigonometric calculation of ground area intercepting solar radiation.</i>	<i>128</i>
<i>B.3.3.2. Calculation of hourly and daily solar radiation interception....</i>	<i>129</i>
B.3.4. Calibration of ‘skip_row_factor’ for reducing light interception..	130
B.4. Results and discussion.....	130
B.4.1. The effect of increased furrow gap area on grain yield.....	130
B.4.2. Calculation of reduced light interception in north-south aligned furrow gaps	131
B.4.3. Calibration of ‘skip_row_factor’ for reducing light interception..	131
B.4.4. General discussion	132
B.5. Conclusion.....	132
B.6. Appendix B – References	133

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Map of the states of Queensland (QLD) and New South Wales (NSW), Australia, showing lines of latitude and the major towns near field monitoring and simulation experiment sites from this study. The shaded area represents the approximate boundaries of the northern grain production region of eastern Australia.....	1
Figure 2.1. The original French and Schultz (1984a) scatter plot of grain yield vs. in-season water use, incorporating (— — —) the French and Schultz line for maximum transpiration efficiency (TE); (————) an overlaid function indicating the highest crop water productivity (CWP) of all the data points ($12.7 \text{ kg ha}^{-1} \text{ mm}^{-1}$); and (- - -) the decreased CWP function ($10.7 \text{ kg ha}^{-1} \text{ mm}^{-1}$) for a lower yielding data point close to the maximum TE function.	9
Figure 2.2. The relationship between water use efficiency and grain yield for winter wheat from Musick et al. (1994).....	12
Figure 2.3. The relationship between water use efficiency and grain yield for (a) bread wheat and (b) durum wheat from Zhang and Oweis (1999).....	12
Figure 2.4. Cost and revenue functions ($c(W_A)$ and $R(W_A)$) showing the amount of applied water required to achieve maximum yield (W_m) and maximum profit per hectare when land (W_l) and water (W_w) are limiting. The figure also shows the depth (or amount of equivalent rainfall) of applied water at which the net whole-farm profit is equal to that at W_m for the land (W_{el}) and water (W_{ew}) limiting situations. From North (2007a) as adapted from English and Rajah (1996).	13
Figure 3.1. A late planted, quick maturing cultivar (Kennedy) sown on 1m beds with north-south furrows at St George, showing a ‘furrow gap’ not intercepting midday light, one week prior to anthesis.	20
Figure 3.2. The difference between average weekly temperature and long term average weekly temperature for (a) Dalby, Goondiwindi and St George in 2008, and (b) Emerald and Gatton in 2009.....	22
Figure 3.3. The difference between average weekly solar radiation and long term average weekly temperature for (a) Dalby, Goondiwindi and St George in 2008, and (b) Emerald and Gatton in 2009.....	23
Figure 3.4. Phenology gap (difference in days between observed and simulated time to reach a growth stage) vs. the observed near-anthesis growth stage of the crop for the 2008 and 2009 commercially monitored fields, (a) prior to and (b) after the reconfiguration of cultivar phenology parameters. Cultivar key: ○ = Baxter, ● = Ventura, × = CQ Kennedy, □ = Kennedy, ◆ = Strzelecki, △ = EGA Gregory).	28
Figure 3.5. Simulated vs. observed (a) above-ground biomass for each sampling date throughout the season and (b) farmer-measured grain yield for the (○) lodged and (●) non-lodged crops monitored in 2008. Horizontal bars in (a) represent the standard error of observed biomass.	28

Figure 3.6. Simulated vs. observed (a) grain number and (b) kernel dry weight for the (○) lodged and (●) non-lodged monitored fields in 2008. Linear regression in (a) excluded the outlier Field 9 which also lodged (*). 29

Figure 3.7. Simulated vs. observed (a) above-ground biomass for each sampling date throughout the season, (b) grain yield, (c) grain number and (d) average kernel dry weight for the 2009 crops: (○) Gatton high N Kennedy, (●) Gatton low N Kennedy, (□) Gatton high N Gregory, (■) Gatton low N Gregory, and (×) Kennedy grown in central Queensland. The dashed line (- - -) represents the 1:1 line, the solid line (—) in (a) represents the grouped linear regression for all data. Duplicate points at Gatton are derived from two plant populations within the same experiment. 30

Figure 3.8. Simulated vs. observed (a) above-ground biomass for each sampling date throughout the season, (b) grain yield and (c) grain number and (d) average kernel dry weight, for N non-limiting simulations of the 2009 crops: (○) Gatton high N Kennedy, (●) Gatton low N Kennedy, (□) Gatton high N Gregory, (■) Gatton low N Gregory, and (×) Kennedy crops grown in central Queensland. The dashed line (- - -) represents the 1:1 line, the solid line (—) in (a) represents the grouped linear regression for all data. 31

Figure 3.9. Simulated - observed grain yield vs. observed grain yield when using N non-limited simulations for all Kennedy crops monitored in 2008 and 2009, when (a) maximum kernel weight of 0.041 g was used for all crops, and (b) maximum kernel weight of 0.045 g was used for crops where observed kernel weight was greater than 0.041 g. (×) canopy managed crops experiencing severe early N stress, (○) canopy managed crops experiencing moderate early N stress, (●) non-canopy managed crops with high soil mineral N levels at sowing, and (△) crops experiencing prolonged N stress through to maturity. The area within the dashed lines includes crops where simulated yield varied from observed yield by less than 10%. 32

Figure 3.10. Observed (●) and simulated (continuous lines) profile extractable soil water for (a) Field 1a, (b) Field 3, and (c) Field 4. The dashed line (- - -) and open circle (○) in (b) represent simulated and observed soil water from a section of the field which received one less irrigation, but from which no yield estimate was obtained. 33

Figure 3.11. Yield gap (simulated - observed grain yield) vs. (a) visual lodging severity ratings for all 2008 monitored fields, and (b) 0-90cm soil mineral N at sowing for (○) lodged and (●) non-lodged fields, including a linear regression (solid line) for the relationship between yield gap and soil mineral N for the lodged fields. 34

Figure 3.12. Relationship between yield gap (simulated - observed grain yield) and fertile tillers number, when calculating fertile tiller number on (a) the whole field basis, and (b) the bed area basis (i.e. excluding unsown areas in furrows) for (○) lodged fields, (●) non-lodged fields and including a linear regression (solid line) for the relationship between yield gap and fertile tillers for the lodged fields. 34

Figure 3.13. Boxplots for potential yield from 110 year simulations of cv. Kennedy under best industry practice irrigation at (a) Dalby, (b) Emerald (c) Goondiwindi, (d) Gunnedah (e) St George and (f) Walgett. Simulation analyses were for ‘1m’ bed furrow irrigation, ‘2m’ bed furrow irrigation, CPLM (Centre Pivot-Lateral Move) irrigation systems, and CPLM+ (CPLM systems with higher potential kernel weight). Boxed areas indicate the upper and lower quartiles, whiskers represent the upper and lower deciles, and the area bounded by circles represents 90% of all years. Median year is represented by the solid line within the interquartile range box..... 35

Figure 3.14. Boxplots of evapotranspiration water use from potential yield simulations for cv. Kennedy under best industry practice irrigation at (a) Dalby, (b) Emerald (c) Goondiwindi, (d) Gunnedah (e) St George and (f) Walgett. Simulation analyses were for ‘1m’ bed furrow irrigation, ‘2m’ bed furrow irrigation, CPLM (Centre Pivot-Lateral Move) irrigation systems, and CPLM+ (CPLM systems with higher potential kernel weight). Boxed areas indicate the upper and lower quartiles, whiskers represent the upper and lower deciles, and the area bounded by circles represents 90% of all years. Median year is represented by the solid line within the interquartile range box..... 36

Figure 4.1. (a) Average grain yield and (b) average grainfill lodging for the four 2009 experiments. All means for grain yield and lodging are significantly different ($p < 0.05$). 50

Figure 4.2. Management regime \times experiment interaction patterns for maturity biomass in (a) Kennedy and (b) Gregory, for the low sowing N (white bars) and high sowing N (grey bars) experiments. ‘Low 0’ = low seeding rate with zero additional sowing N, ‘High 0’ = high seeding rate with zero additional sowing N, ‘High 50’ = high seeding rate with an additional 50 kg ha⁻¹ N applied at sowing. Paired data marked with ‘n.s.’ are not significantly different ($p > 0.05$), paired data marked with an asterisk (*) are significantly different ($p < 0.05$). 51

Figure 4.3. Management regime \times bed type interaction patterns for maturity biomass, showing 1m beds (white bars) and 2m beds (grey bars). ‘Low 0’ = low seeding rate with zero additional sowing N, ‘High 0’ = high seeding rate with zero additional sowing N, ‘High 50’ = high seeding rate with an additional 50 kg ha⁻¹ N applied at sowing. Paired data marked with ‘n.s.’ are not significantly different ($p > 0.05$). 52

Figure 4.4. Management regime \times experiment interaction patterns for Leaf Area Index at late GS32 for (a) Kennedy and (b) Gregory, for the low sowing N (white bars) and high sowing N (grey bars) experiments in 2009. ‘Low 0’ = low seeding rate with zero additional sowing N, ‘High 0’ = high seeding rate with zero additional sowing N, ‘High 50’ = high seeding rate with an additional 50 kg ha⁻¹ N applied at sowing. Paired data marked with ‘n.s.’ are not significantly different ($p > 0.05$), paired data marked with an asterisk (*) are significantly different ($p < 0.05$). 53

Figure 4.5. Grainfill lodging vs. (a,d) tiller count (b,e) biomass and (c,f) LAI measured at GS32 for the six management \times bed type treatments, averaged across (a,b,c) all 2009 Gatton experiments, and (d,e,f) presented separately for the (○) Kennedy and (●) Gregory experiments. 54

Figure 4.6. Progression of lodging at Gatton in 2009 for the main effect of (a) experiments with (---) low residual soil N, (—) high residual soil N, (○) Kennedy and (●) Gregory, (b) management regimes with (■) high seed rate, no additional sowing N (□) low seed rate, no additional sowing N (△) high seed rate with an additional 50 kg ha⁻¹ N at sowing, and (c) bed types (□) two metre beds (■) one metre beds. 55

Figure 4.7. (a) Date of anthesis for N rate × cultivar means, and (b) grain yield vs. anthesis date for N rate × seed rate means for (○) Kennedy and (●) Gregory, at Gatton in 2011.	59
Figure 4.8. Yield (○) and average grainfill lodging (■) across 3 N regimes for (a) Kennedy and (b) Gregory in 2011. Means on the same response curve with different superscript letters are significantly different (p<0.05).	60
Figure 4.9. Grainfill lodging vs. (a) tiller count (b) biomass and (c) LAI measured at GS31 for the six N rate × seed rate treatments at Gatton in 2011 for (○) Kennedy and (●) Gregory.	61
Figure 4.10. Progression of grainfill lodging at Gatton in 2011 for the (a,c) low and (b,d) high seed rate treatments of (a,b) Kennedy and (c,d) Gregory for (□) low sowing N, (●) medium sowing N and (✕) high sowing N treatments.	62
Figure 5.1. Maximum and minimum temperature and daily rainfall for the 2011 field experiment.....	76
Figure 5.2. Simulated vs. observed grain yield for the three irrigation treatments in the 2011 field experiment, prior to applying corrections to the simulation of the in-crop N application treatment. The dashed line (- - -) represents the 1:1 ratio between observed and simulated data, the horizontal error bars represent the standard error of the mean observed grain yields.	78
Figure 5.3. APSIM simulated total soil water (solid line) and measured total soil water (red squares) for a range of management regimes at Narrabri in 2011: (a) irrigated at sowing with all N applied at sowing (b) irrigated at sowing with one in-crop irrigation, and all N applied at sowing, and (c) sown into stored moisture at sowing with low residual soil N levels, with four in-crop irrigations and two in-crop N applications. The dotted line in (c) shows simulated water use from an additional APSIM simulation that was amended to prevent the underestimation of biomass in response to severe early N stress.	79
Figure 5.4. Average daily temperature (June to November) as obtained from the SILO database (Jeffrey et al., 2001) from 1889-2013 for Emerald, Goondiwindi and Gunnedah. .	80
Figure 5.5. Average daily radiation (June to November) as obtained from the SILO database (Jeffrey et al., 2001) from 1889-2013 for Emerald, Goondiwindi and Gunnedah.....	80
Figure 5.6. Average monthly rainfall (June to October) as obtained from the SILO database (Jeffrey et al., 2001) from 1889-2013 for Emerald, Goondiwindi and Gunnedah.....	81
Figure 5.7. Boxplots for grain yield, evapotranspiration, CWP_{ET} (Grain yield/ ET) and CWP_{ET+IE} (Grain yield/(ET + drainage + irrigation storage losses)) for the five cropped land-use options and three locations, for long term simulations using 100 mm of stored soil water at sowing. Boxed areas indicate the upper and lower quartiles, whiskers represent the upper and lower deciles, and the area bounded by circles represents 90% of all years. Median year is represented by the solid line within the interquartile range box, while the mean value is represented by the dotted line.	83

Figure 5.8. Partial GM ('GM₄₀') vs. (a) growing season rainfall, and (b) growing season rainfall decile, for the farm-management strategies compared at Goondiwindi when zero soil water was available at sowing. (◇—) = 'S', i.e. all irrigation at sowing; (*---) = S+1/F; (◆—) = S+2/F; (+---) = S+3/F 85

Figure 5.9. Mean partial GM (GM₄₀) vs. standard deviation of the mean for farm-management strategy comparison at Goondiwindi when zero soil water was available at sowing. (—) Risk/return frontier; (- - -) 1:2 line of indifference; ▲ = all irrigation at sowing ('S'); ■ = S+1/F, ● = S+2/F, × = S+3/F. Points 1-3 lie on the risk/return frontier, while point 4 lies slightly below and is not joined to the risk/return frontier..... 85

Figure 5.10. (a,f) Farm scale CWP_{ET+IE} vs. standard deviation of the mean, and (remaining graphs) EWP vs. standard deviation of the mean, from the comparison of farm-management strategies at Emerald with (a-e) 100 mm or (f-j) zero soil water at sowing. The alternative methods of calculating EWP were (b,g) GM₄₀; (c,h) GM₄₀+ΔSW; (d,i) GM₁₂₀; (e,j) GM₁₂₀+ΔSW. Farm-management strategies are denoted as follows: × = S (a-e) or S+F (f-j), ● = S+1/F; ■ = S+2/F, ▲ = S+3/F; ○ = S+1/R; □ = S+2/R, △ = S+3/R 87

Figure 5.11. (a,f) Farm scale CWP_{ET+IE} vs. standard deviation of the mean, and (remaining graphs) EWP vs. standard deviation of the mean, from the comparison of farm-management strategies at Goondiwindi with (a-e) 100 mm or (f-j) zero soil water at sowing. The alternative methods of calculating EWP were (b,g) GM₄₀; (c,h) GM₄₀+ΔSW; (d,i) GM₁₂₀; (e,j) GM₁₂₀+ΔSW. Farm-management strategies are denoted as follows: × = S (a-e) or S+F (f-j), ● = S+1/F; ■ = S+2/F, ▲ = S+3/F; ○ = S+1/R; □ = S+2/R, △ = S+3/R 89

Figure 5.12. (a,f) Farm scale CWP_{ET+IE} vs. standard deviation of the mean, and (remaining graphs) EWP vs. standard deviation of the mean, from the comparison of farm-management strategies at Gunnedah with (a-e) 100 mm or (f-j) zero soil water at sowing. The alternative methods of calculating EWP were (b,g) GM₄₀; (c,h) GM₄₀+ΔSW; (d,i) GM₁₂₀; (e,j) GM₁₂₀+ΔSW. Farm-management strategies are denoted as follows: × = S (a-e) or S+F (f-j), ● = S+1/F; ■ = S+2/F, ▲ = S+3/F; ○ = S+1/R; □ = S+2/R, △ = S+3/R 90

Figure 5.13. (a) Farm scale CWP_{ET+IE} vs. standard deviation of the mean, and (b-e) EWP vs. standard deviation of the mean, for the alternative whole-farm analysis where 2800 ML of irrigation water was available at sowing at Goondiwindi, in which 100 mm of soil water was available at sowing. The alternative methods of calculating EWP were (b) GM₄₀; (c) GM₄₀+ΔSW; (d) GM₁₂₀; (e) GM₁₂₀+ΔSW. Farm-management strategies are denoted as follows: ⊗ = S+1; ■ = S+2/F, ▲ = S+3/F; □ = S+2/R, △ = S+3/R; 92

Figure A.1. CLL_{g g⁻¹} vs. DUL_{g g⁻¹} for the 0-15cm layer 123

Figure A.2. Typical PAWC graphs matched to sowing soil water content and measured CLL using Rapid Soil Characterisation at (a) Brookstead and (b) Collarenebri. 124

List of Tables

Table 3.1a. Location, agronomic details and crop performance at 18 monitored fields from 2008 (fields 1-13), and 2009 (fields 14-18)	24
Table 3.1b. Location, field alignment, simulated evapotranspiration, soil type, PAWC at sowing and irrigation schedule for monitored fields from 2008 (fields 1-13), and 2009 (fields 14-18).....	25
Table 3.1c. Location, soil mineral N and fertiliser N applications for monitored fields from 2008 (fields 1-13), and 2009 (fields 14-18)	26
Table 4.1. Residual soil N and in-crop N regimes for the 2009 and 2011 experiments.	44
Table 4.2. Average daily temperature and irrigation volumes for the experimental period in 2009 and 2011.....	47
Table 4.3. REML F probabilities and main effect means from the analysis of management × bed type × experiment at Gatton in 2009.....	49
Table 4.4. Established plant populations for the three management treatments within each of the four experiments in 2009. Treatments with different suffix letters within each column are significantly different ($p < 0.05$).....	50
Table 4.5. REML F probabilities and main effect and significant higher order interaction means for traits measured at GS31, from the analysis of cultivar × N rate × seed rate at Gatton in 2011.....	57
Table 4.6. REML F probabilities and main effect means for traits measured at anthesis or maturity, from the analysis of cultivar × N rate × seed rate at Gatton in 2011.....	58
Table 5.1. Proportion of land-use areas used for the seven farm-management strategies when 100 mm of stored soil water was available at sowing prior to irrigation, and 140 mm of irrigation was applied on average for both sowing and in-crop irrigations.	71
Table 5.2. Proportion of land-use areas used for farm-management strategies when zero stored soil water was available prior to sowing, an irrigation of 230 mm was applied at sowing, and average in-crop irrigation was 140 mm.	71
Table 5.3. Fertiliser N application regime for the different land-use simulations	72
Table 5.4. Soil mineral N status, fertiliser N and irrigation water volumes for the validation experiment at Narrabri in 2011.....	77
Table 5.5. Simulated water lost (as % of the 1400 ML of irrigation water stored at sowing) from storage as evaporation or seepage for the simulated irrigated land-uses at Emerald, Goondiwindi and Gunnedah	82

Table 5.6. The four alternative analyses used for calculating whole-farm EWP.	84
Table 5.7. The difference between the y-intercept of the 1:2 line of indifference which intersected the optimum farm management strategy, and the y-intercept of the line of indifference that intersected each of the remaining farm management strategies, when 1300 ML of water was available at sowing. The unit of measure was kg mm ⁻¹ in the CWP analyses, and (\$'000) in the EWP analyses. The optimum strategy (where difference = zero) is highlighted in dark grey, while near-optimum strategies (within 0.5 kg mm for the CWP analyses, or within \$10/ha for the EWP analyses) are highlighted in light grey.....	93
Table 5.8. The difference between the y-intercept of the 1:2 line of indifference which intersected the optimum farm management strategy, and the y-intercept of the line of indifference that intersected each of the remaining farm management strategies, when 2600 ML of irrigation water and 100 mm of soil PAW was available at sowing at Goondiwindi. The unit of measure was kg mm ⁻¹ in the CWP analyses, and (\$'000) in the EWP analyses. The optimum strategy (where difference = zero) is highlighted in dark grey, while near-optimum strategies (within 0.5 kg mm for the CWP analyses, or within \$10/ha for the EWP analyses) are in light grey.....	94
Table A.1. Rules for estimating soil moisture status of vertosols using a hand assay.	122
Table A.2. Regression equation and r ² value for the relationship between CLL _{g g⁻¹} and DUL _{g g⁻¹}	123
Table B.1. Calculation equations used to develop reference times for the movement of shaded zones within furrow gaps prior to the suns zenith, for north-south configured beds.	129
Table B.2. Grain yield of centre rows vs. entire quadrats (incorporating furrow gaps) for four genotypes and two N application regimes at Gatton, 2012.	130
Table B.3. Calculated light interception by crops grown under one metre and two metre bed configurations for a north-south configured wheat crop at Gatton, 2006.	131