



# Evaluation of remote sensing sensors for monitoring of rehabilitated wetlands

by

Althea Theresa Grundling

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
MAGISTER SCIENTIAE  
In the Faculty of Natural & Agricultural Science  
African Vegetation and Plant Diversity Research Center  
Department of Botany  
University of Pretoria  
Pretoria

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. G.J. Bredenkamp

March 2004

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research was financially supported by the Department of Agriculture:  
Directorate Land and Resources Management.

Thanks to Mr. Chris Kaempffer for his valuable advice and guidance and Mr. Philip Beukes and Mr. Eric Economon for all their assistance.

Special thanks to Mrs. Elna van den Berg for all the pre-processing, processing and classification of image data.

I wish to thank Prof. George Bredenkamp (African Vegetation and Plant Diversity Research Centre, Department of Botany, University of Pretoria) the supervisor for this masters thesis, Mr. Piet-Louis Grundling (Working for Wetlands, Technical Advisor), Mr. Piet Nell (Institute for Soil, Climate and Water, Pedology and Soil Mineralogy), Mr. Hennie van den Berg (Consultant) and Dr. Jan Sliva (Technische Universität München, Chair of Vegetation Ecology) who spend much time helping me, offered information, shared valuable insight and gave crucial comments on the text of the thesis.

Thank you to all the governmental and non-governmental organisations for their support and help regarding the baseline data for each wetland.

# CONTENTS

## Acknowledgements

<b>Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
----------------	----------

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

<b>1.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2.1</b>	<b>Ramsar Convention on wetlands.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2.2</b>	<b>Agenda 21</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....</b>	<b>7</b>

## CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND STUDY

<b>2.1</b>	<b>WETLAND FUNCTIONS AND INFLUENCING FACTORS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.1.1</b>	<b>Overview of important wetland functions.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.1.2</b>	<b>Overview of the important influencing factors.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1.2.1	Climate	8
2.1.2.2	Drainage system	8
2.1.2.3	Hydrology	8
2.1.2.4	Geomorphology	9
2.1.2.5	Wetland vegetation	11
<b>2.2</b>	<b>REHABILITATION AND RESTORATION OF WETLANDS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.2.1</b>	<b>Aims and goals of wetland rehabilitation.....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.2.1.1	Rehabilitation goals.....	11
<b>2.2.2</b>	<b>Rehabilitation measures.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATION.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.3.1</b>	<b>Background.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.3.2</b>	<b>Indication selection criteria.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.3.3</b>	<b>The DPSIR framework.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.3.4</b>	<b>Studies on environmental indication in South Africa.....</b>	<b>20</b>
2.3.4.1	Inland water systems.....	20
2.3.4.2	Wetland systems.....	20
<b>2.3.5</b>	<b>Indication of wetlands using remote sensing data.....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.3.5.1	Image processing techniques known to be suitable for wetland monitoring.....	21
2.3.5.2	Wetland inventories.....	24
2.3.5.3	Wetland features.....	25
<b>2.3.6</b>	<b>Selection of indicators.....</b>	<b>28</b>

## CHAPTER 3: MATERIAL AND METHODS

<b>3.1.</b>	<b>MATERIAL AND METHODS.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3.1.1</b>	<b>Study areas.....</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1.1.1	Selection criteria for the different wetlands .....	35
3.1.1.2	Selected rehabilitated wetlands (Figure 2) .....	35
3.1.1.3	Rehabilitated wetlands site description (Table 5).....	38
3.1.1.4	Identification of test sites.....	40
<b>3.1.2</b>	<b>General literature, maps and other baseline data.....</b>	<b>41</b>
3.1.2.1	Kromme River Wetland.....	41
3.1.2.2	Mbongolwane Wetland.....	54
3.1.2.3	Wilge River Wetland.....	69
3.1.2.4	Seekoeivlei Wetland.....	76
3.1.2.5	Zoar Wetland.....	89
3.1.2.6	Rietvlei Wetland.....	100
<b>3.1.3</b>	<b>Identification of suitable indicators.....</b>	<b>119</b>
3.1.3.1	Kromme River Wetland.....	119
3.1.3.2	Mbongolwane Wetland.....	119
3.1.3.3	Wilge River Wetland.....	119
3.1.3.4	Seekoeivlei Wetland.....	120
3.1.3.5	Zoar Wetland.....	120
3.1.3.6	Rietvlei Wetland.....	120
<b>3.1.4</b>	<b>Remote sensing sensors selection.....</b>	<b>121</b>
3.1.4.1	Kromme River Wetland.....	121
3.1.4.2	Mbongolwane Wetland.....	122
3.1.4.3	Wilge River Wetland.....	122
3.1.4.4	Seekoeivlei Wetland.....	122
3.1.4.5	Zoar Wetland.....	122
3.1.4.6	Rietvlei Wetland.....	122
<b>3.1.5</b>	<b>Identification of optimal time frame for data acquisition.....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>3.1.6</b>	<b>Image processing.....</b>	<b>124</b>
3.1.6.1	Classification and identification of indicator classes.....	124
3.1.6.2	Description of classes.....	126
<b>3.1.7</b>	<b>Calculation of the efficiency.....</b>	<b>127</b>
3.1.7.1	Field data collection.....	127
3.1.7.2	Cost estimation of all evaluated sensors.....	127
3.1.7.3	Remote sensor data.....	130
<b>3.1.8</b>	<b>Validation of data.....</b>	<b>131</b>
3.1.8.1	Field assessment.....	131

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

<b>4.1</b>	<b>RESULTS.....</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>4.1.1</b>	<b>Which indicators were detectable with which sensor type.....</b>	<b>133</b>
4.1.1.1	Landsat ETM and Landsat TM Images.....	133

4.1.1.2	SPOT 5.....	134
4.1.1.3	EROS.....	137
4.1.1.4	KODAC 420 (Near infrared).....	142
4.1.1.5	Duncan Tech CIR.....	146
<b>4.1.2</b>	<b>Comparison of the various remote sensors.....</b>	<b>152</b>
4.1.2.1	Comparison of SPOT 5 and Kodak DCS 420.....	152
4.1.2.2	Comparison of EROS and DuncanTech CIR.....	155
<b>4.2</b>	<b>LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS.....</b>	<b>157</b>

## CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

<b>5.1</b>	<b>DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>158</b>
5.1.1	Description of selected indicators.....	158
<b>5.2</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION.....</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>161</b>

<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>162</b>
-------------------	------------

**APPENDIX 1:** Abbreviations.  
Glossary of terms.

**APPENDIX 2:** Longterm average rainfall data for wetland sites.

**APPENDIX 3:** Rehabilitation measures.

**APPENDIX 4:** Field visit and progress report.

**APPENDIX 5:** Interpretation of aerial photographs depicting landscape changes at the Hudsonvale peat basin in the Kromme River Wetland.

**APPENDIX 6:** Different remote sensor imagery for the wetland study areas  
(A3 size maps).

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1:</b>	Driving Force-Pressure-State-Response framework for rehabilitated wetland sites (adopted from Nell <i>et al.</i> , 2001).	19
<b>Table 2:</b>	South African national environmental indicators for inland water systems (Muller and Pretorius, 2002).	20
<b>Table 3:</b>	Summary of indicators for the monitoring of rehabilitated wetlands with the use of remote sensing applications.	29
<b>Table 4:</b>	Summary of Vegetative Indicators by Wetness Zone (Land-use and Wetland / Riparian Habitat Working Group, 2001).	31
<b>Table 5:</b>	Summary information of each wetland chosen.	38
<b>Table 6:</b>	Kromme River Wetland: Summary of the problems, rehabilitation actions taken in 2001/2002 and the desired results to be attained after the rehabilitation.	49
<b>Table 7:</b>	Mbongolwane Wetland: Summary of the problems, rehabilitation actions taken in 2002 and the desired results to be attained after the rehabilitation.	62
<b>Table 8:</b>	Wilge River Wetland: Summary of the problems, rehabilitation actions taken and the desired results to be attained after the rehabilitation (Collins and Thompson, 2002).	74
<b>Table 9:</b>	Diagnostic species of the <i>Eragrostis plana</i> – <i>Agrostis lachnantha</i> Wetlands.	78
<b>Table 10:</b>	Seekoeivlei Wetland: Summary of the problems, rehabilitation actions taken in 1996 and the desired results to attain after the rehabilitation (Collins and Thompson, 1996).	82
<b>Table 11:</b>	Zoar Wetland: Summary of the problems, rehabilitation actions taken and the desired results to attain after the rehabilitation.	94
<b>Table 12:</b>	Rietvlei Wetland: Summary of the problems, rehabilitation actions taken and the desired results to attain after the rehabilitation.	109
<b>Table 13:</b>	“Window of opportunity” for image acquisition.	124
<b>Table 14:</b>	Remote sensor imagery covering the rehabilitated area around the structures.	128
<b>Table 15:</b>	Cost estimation for evaluated sensors.	129
<b>Table 16:</b>	Image acquisition dates.	130
<b>Table 17:</b>	Landsat TM and Landsat ETM+ characteristics.	133
<b>Table 18:</b>	SPOT characteristics.	135
<b>Table 19:</b>	Evaluation summary for the various remote sensing sensors using categories of Good, Medium and Poor for indicating user friendliness, Short, Medium, Long indicating data processing time as well as High, Medium and Low effectiveness in the indication.	153

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1:</b>	The “Driving Force-Pressure-State-Impact-Response” framework.	18
<b>Figure 2:</b>	The location of the six rehabilitated wetland study sites in South Africa.	36
<b>Figure 3:</b>	The location of the selected rehabilitated wetlands within the different terrain units and the wetland types (Adapted from Kotze <i>et al.</i> , 1994).	37
<b>Figure 4:</b>	The Kromme River wetland.	41
<b>Figure 5:</b>	Topographical map section of the Kromme valley with 1954 aerial photograph showing an alluvial fan at Hudsonvale.	42
<b>Figure 6:</b>	Palmiet ( <i>Prionium serratum</i> ).	43
<b>Figure 7:</b>	Extensive channel bank erosion exposing bedrock. Horizons of dark organic, sometimes peat-like material, alternating with lighter coloured sands (relatively poor in organic material) reveal the episodic nature of the sediment supply from the tributary catchments.	45
<b>Figure 8:</b>	The area around the structure must be fenced off to prevent over-grazing and trampling by cattle.	47
<b>Figure 9:</b>	Topographical maps (3324 CD, 3324CC, 3323 DD) showing the locations of the rehabilitation structures 1- 5 as well as the headcut of the Kromme Wetland in the Eastern Cape.	48
<b>Figure 10:</b>	Landscape around the headcut at a tributary of the Kromme River. This rehabilitation was done in a first order stream and not in a wetland.	50
<b>Figure 11:</b>	Close-up photo of the headcut rehabilitation structure at a tributary of the Kromme River. This rehabilitation structure will not form part of the Wilge River Wetland study but indicates rehabilitation measures in the catchment.	50
<b>Figure 12:</b>	Rehabilitation structure 1: Concrete Weir being constructed.	51
<b>Figure 13:</b>	Rehabilitation structure 2: Concrete Weir being constructed.	51
<b>Figure 14:</b>	Rehabilitation structure 3: Concrete Weir being constructed.	52
<b>Figure 15:</b>	Rehabilitation structure 4: Gabion weir at Kompanjiesdrif.	52
<b>Figure 16:</b>	Rehabilitation structure 5: Gabion weir at Hudsonvale. Note the revegetation on the sides.	53
<b>Figure 17:</b>	Part of the Mbongolwane wetland with cattle grazing on the wet grassland and harvested sugar cane in the foreground.	55
<b>Figure 18:</b>	A root crop ( <i>Colocasia esculenta</i> ) referred to by the Zulu people as madumbes.	56
<b>Figure 19:</b>	Harvesting ikhwane for making sleeping mats and bags.	57
<b>Figure 20:</b>	Site 1: Amatigulu. Aerial photographs depicting landscape changes.	58
<b>Figure 21:</b>	Site 2: Uvova. Aerial photographs depicting landscape changes.	59
<b>Figure 22:</b>	Some of the activities which impact on Mbongolwane Wetland: Sugar cane, forestation, cash crops, washing clothes.	60

<b>Figure 23:</b>	Topographical maps (2831CC & 2831 CD) showing the locations of the two rehabilitation structures (Uvova and Amatigulu).	62
<b>Figure 24:</b>	Amatigulu site. View of the damaged geocell chute after July 2002 floods. Note the lush green grass after the rains.	63
<b>Figure 25:</b>	Before flooding. Photo taken downstream on 4 July 2002 at the Amatigulu site.	64
<b>Figure 26:</b>	After flooding. Photo taken downstream after July 2002 at the Amatigulu site. Geocell chute preparation at 1:5 gradient (Photo: M. Astrup).	64
<b>Figure 27:</b>	Before flooding. Photo taken upstream on 4 July 2002 at the Amatigulu site	65
<b>Figure 28:</b>	After flooding. Photo taken upstream after July 2002 at the Amatigulu site. Geocell chute preparation at 1:5 gradient (Photo: M. Astrup).	65
<b>Figure 29:</b>	Before flooding. Photo taken on 4 July 2002 at the Uvova site.	66
<b>Figure 30:</b>	Uvova site damage to chute preparation after July 2002 floods (Photo: M. Astrup).	66
<b>Figure 31:</b>	Reparation work on the Uvova site was done during September and October 2002 (Photo: M. Astrup).	67
<b>Figure 32:</b>	An eroding headcut situated on the Uvova stream. The stream enters the Mbongolwane wetland. Photo taken on 4 July 2002.	68
<b>Figure 33:</b>	The Wilge River Wetland and rehabilitation structure at the headcut.	69
<b>Figure 34:</b>	Wilge River Wetland is one of the sites where the Whitewinged Flufftail occurs regularly and/or in significant numbers (Taylor and Grundling, 2003).	70
<b>Figure 35:</b>	A headcut (consisting of a headcut and a channel) were found in the Wilge River. The remote sensing imagery will focus on the area indicated.	72
<b>Figure 36:</b>	Road crossing downstream of the rehabilitation structure.	72
<b>Figure 37:</b>	Topographical map (2829BA) showing the location of the rehabilitation structure.	74
<b>Figure 38:</b>	Close up of the headcut rehabilitation structure.	75
<b>Figure 39:</b>	Re-established wetland vegetation in the foreground.	75
<b>Figure 40:</b>	The Seekoeivlei wetland near Memel.	76
<b>Figure 41:</b>	Photo taken at Merel's vlei. This erosion channel forms the main flow of the Klip River.	78
<b>Figure 42:</b>	Topographical map (2729DA) showing the locations of the rehabilitation structures.	81
<b>Figure 43:</b>	Site no. 1. Area north of the confluence of the drainage channel that stretches from east to west across the width of the floodplain.	84
<b>Figure 44:</b>	Site no. 1. Concrete weir.	84
<b>Figure 45:</b>	Site no. 2. Concrete weir.	85
<b>Figure 46:</b>	Site no. 2. Bank erosion.	85



<b>Figure 47:</b>	Site no. 3. Merel's vlei. The gabion structure was constructed in 1997/8. Measures were put in place to try and stabilise the bank erosion.	86
<b>Figure 48:</b>	Site no. 4. Merel's vlei. A small weir drowned below the water surface.	86
<b>Figure 49:</b>	Site no. 5. Gabion structure.	87
<b>Figure 50:</b>	Site no. 6. The work involved lifting the existing structure higher, strengthening the structure and closing the drain holes (1997). Note that most of the plugs have been washed out.	87
<b>Figure 51:</b>	Site no. 7. The Northern border of the Seekoeivlei Nature Reserve. A gabion structure was constructed in the flow of the Klip River to promote the flooding of the floodplain and to raise the water table.	88
<b>Figure 52:</b>	The Zoar wetland in a Mondi Forestry area. Photo taken on 3 July 2002 after a veld fire.	89
<b>Figure 53:</b>	Drain in the wetland before rehabilitation (80 m long and 0.7 m deep). Photo taken from Mondi Wetlands Project report (2000).	90
<b>Figure 54:</b>	Artificially straightened channel before rehabilitation. Photo taken from Mondi Wetlands Project report (2000).	90
<b>Figure 55:</b>	Photo of the Zoar wetland after the plantation trees were removed from the wetland (Photo: D. Lindley).	91
<b>Figure 56:</b>	View of a flooded Zoar wetland. Note how the clay plugs act like dam walls (Photo: D. Lindley).	92
<b>Figure 57:</b>	Topographical map (2630CD) showing the locations of the rehabilitation structures.	94
<b>Figure 58:</b>	Site no 1: Clay plugs in a badly eroded channel at the northern border with private owners.	96
<b>Figure 59:</b>	Site no 2: Main natural channel.	96
<b>Figure 60:</b>	Site no 3: Service road controlled by Mondi Forestry.	97
<b>Figure 61:</b>	Site no 4: Drains draining the wetland lead to the desiccation of the wetland.	97
<b>Figure 62:</b>	Site no. 5: Dirt road with culverts. The culverts concentrate the flow of the water and cause eroded channels.	98
<b>Figure 63:</b>	Site no. 5: Main drain with smaller drains along the side. Clay plugs act like dam walls.	98
<b>Figure 64:</b>	Site no 6: Note the drain in the burned tributary area that feeds into the wetland.	99
<b>Figure 65:</b>	Site no 7: Zoar wetland southern border with private owners. Headcut erodes back into the wetland.	99
<b>Figure 66:</b>	The Rietvlei wetland. Previous peat mining activities can be seen in the foreground of the wetland.	102

<b>Figure 67:</b>	Aerial photograph (2000) indicating remnants of a drain (A) responsible for the desiccation of the wetland. Transects (B) were cut through the Phragmites to be able to delineate the wetland before rehabilitation could commence. Note the headcuts (C) & (D), irrigation furrow (E), shallow erosion feature (F) and donga (G).	103
<b>Figure 68:</b>	The area between site no. 4 and site no. 5.	106
<b>Figure 69:</b>	Aerial photograph (2000) indicates the area before rehabilitation was done at sites no. 4 – 5.2.	107
<b>Figure 70:</b>	Topographical map (2528CD) showing the locations of the rehabilitation structures.	108
<b>Figure 71:</b>	Site no. 1. A man-made drift was built across the entry point into the Rietvlei Nature Reserve. Due to this the flow of water has been concentrated.	111
<b>Figure 72:</b>	Site no. 1. Energy dissipaters were constructed along the drift to spread the flow and dissipate the energy.	111
<b>Figure 73:</b>	At site no. 2.1 the shallow erosion gully was stabilized with grass bales.	112
<b>Figure 74:</b>	Site no. 2.3. Water damming behind the earth berm at the bottom end of a shallow erosion gully. Re-vegetation of desiccated areas is taking place down-and upstream of the structure.	112
<b>Figure 75:</b>	Headcut and donga (incised drainage channel) at site no. 3.1. The donga sides need to be sloped and re-vegetated.	113
<b>Figure 76:</b>	Site no. 4. Eroded culverts on the road crossing were replaced by a concrete weir.	113
<b>Figure 77:</b>	Site no. 4. A bypass furrow used during the construction of a concrete weir in the causeway was blocked to prevent channel erosion.	114
<b>Figure 78:</b>	Site no. 4. A causeway was applied as a structure to disperse water and to raise the water level in the wetland. Downstream of the structure the erosion was stabilised by using rock packs.	114
<b>Figure 79:</b>	Site no. 5.1. A bypass furrow has been constructed to allow the construction of a gabion weir to facilitate the raising of the water table and to disperse the water.	115
<b>Figure 80:</b>	Construction of a gabion in progress at site no. 5.1.1. Flooding is taking place.	115
<b>Figure 81:</b>	Site no. 5.1.2. Sedimentation taking place behind the structure.	116
<b>Figure 82:</b>	Gabion structure at site no. 5.2. Note the difference in the water table upstream and downstream of the structure.	116
<b>Figure 83:</b>	Site no. 6.1. Note the higher water table behind the structure. The bent grass on the bank of the channel indicates a previous flooding event.	117
<b>Figure 84:</b>	A drowned gabion structure between sites no. 6.1 and 6.2 due to an increase in back flooding from the structure at site no. 6.3.	117

<b>Figure 85:</b>	Site no. 6.3. The bypass furrow must be closed and the energy must be dissipated to prevent the concentration of water resulting in channel erosion.	118
<b>Figure 86:</b>	Spectral profile for SPOT 5 Imagery.	134
<b>Figures 87 – 90:</b>	Landscape 1 (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) SPOT: Kromme River wetland - site 5.	136
<b>Figures 91 – 96:</b>	Landscape 2 (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) EROS example 1: Mbongolwane wetland – Uvova.	138
<b>Figures 97 – 101:</b>	Landscape 3: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) EROS example 2: Seekoeivlei wetland – site 3 and site 4.	139
<b>Figures 102 – 107:</b>	Landscape 4: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) (A3). EROS example 3: Seekoeivlei wetland – site 5.	141
<b>Figure 108:</b>	Reflectance values of KODAK 240 (Near infrared).	143
<b>Figures 109 – 112:</b>	Landscape 5: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) KODAK 240 (Near infrared) example 1: Kromme River wetland - site 5.	144
<b>Figures 113 – 117:</b>	Landscape 6: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) KODAK 240 (Near infrared) example 2 : Kromme River wetland – site 1 and site 4.	145
<b>Figure 118:</b>	Spectral Profile for DuncanTech CIR.	146
<b>Figures 119 – 124:</b>	Landscape 7a: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) DuncanTech CIR example 1: Mbongolwane wetland – Uvova.	148
<b>Figure 125:</b>	Landscape 7b: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) DuncanTech True colour example 1: Mbongolwane wetland – Uvova	149
<b>Figures 126 – 129:</b>	Landscape 8: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) DuncanTech CIR / True colour example 2: Zoar wetland.	150
<b>Figures 130 – 135:</b>	Landscape 9: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) DuncanTech CIR / True colour example 3: Rietvlei wetland.	151
<b>Figures 136 – 139:</b>	Landscape 10: (Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) Comparison of SPOT 5 and Kodak DCS 420 images. Kromme River wetland - site 5.	154
<b>Figures 140 – 146:</b>	Landscape 11:(Folder: PHASE 5 A3 size layouts) Comparison of EROS and DuncanTech CIR images. Mbongolwane wetland – Amatigulu.	156

## Summary

<b>Title:</b>	Evaluation of remote sensing sensors for auditing and monitoring of rehabilitated wetlands.
<b>Student:</b>	Althea Theresa Grundling (87517303)
<b>Supervisor:</b>	Prof. G.J. Bredenkamp
<b>Department:</b>	Department of Botany University of Pretoria
<b>Degree:</b>	MAGISTER SCIENTIAE
<b>Date:</b>	10 March 2004

This study contributed to the development of a procedure for monitoring rehabilitated wetlands. Eleven measurable indicators were identified that could be used with the application of remote sensing techniques to monitor the impacts of rehabilitation measures on selected wetlands, namely: erosion, sedimentation, open water, wet surface area, water quality, wetland vegetation, terrestrial vegetation, alien vegetation, bare soil, disturbances (e.g. cultivation) and rehabilitation structures. A general overview enlightens the use of different sensors, their capabilities, limitations as well as associated costs. The high resolution remote sensing sensors evaluated were:

- Airborne sensors (DuncanTech CIR and Kodak DCS 420 Near Infrared)
- Satellite recorded sensors (Landsat TM and Landsat ETM, EROS, SPOT 5).

A generalized land cover classification was done for all six study areas. The classification was recoded into seven classes by using image interpretation and the measurable indicators identified, namely:

- Class 1: *Erosion / bare soil / harvesting wetland vegetation,*  
Class 2: *sedimentation,*  
Class 3: *open water,*

- Class 4: *wetland vegetation* that reflects the hydrological conditions of the wetland,  
Class 5: *terrestrial vegetation / burn scars*,  
Class 6: *alien vegetation* and  
Class 7: *cultivation*.

The exact location of the rehabilitation structures was recorded using a GPS.

Ten of the eleven selected indicators were represented in the wetland study areas, the exception being water quality. Issues related to mapping these indicators are the optimum time of year, the bands required and the spatial resolution to produce accurate maps versus the cost of data and time to process the data. The resolution of the data plays a vital role in the mapping process, depending on what the objective of the mapping is. The structures were visible on all the images, but the best results were from the Kodak DCS 420 Near Infrared and DuncanTech CIR images.

To map and monitor the status of the rehabilitation structures, the data should be of resolution 1 m or better. This would make it possible to detect structural damage, erosion activity, open water behind the structure and the movement of headcuts and gully erosion. For mapping vegetation, multispectral data with band width 0.52 to 0.90  $\mu\text{m}$  is of great importance and should be of ground resolution 1.8 m or better. However, indicators must be monitored over time. In order to monitor rehabilitated wetland vegetation over a longterm period, the compatible images must represent the same season but from different years. It is recommended that future possible studies include the analysis of vegetation dynamics linked with the hydrology to investigate the change in wetland vegetation after rehabilitation. The choice between the different remote sensing sensors will largely depend on the application of the sensor, state of the rehabilitation structure or the vegetation response to the rehabilitation measures.