

Geomatic Techniques to Support Phytosanitary Products Tests within the EPPO Standard Framework

Samuele Bumbaca

University of Turin

July 17, 2025



SAGEA
Group



DISAFA



**UNIVERSITÀ
DI TORINO**

① Introduction & Background (20 minutes)

- Research problem and motivation
- Theoretical framework
- Methodology overview

② Three Case Studies (18 minutes total)

- Plant Counting (6 minutes)
- Phytotoxicity Scoring (6 minutes)
- Anomaly Detection (6 minutes)

③ Conclusions & Future Work (2 minutes)

Traditional Approach Issues:

- **Human-dependent blocking:** Environmental variability assessment relies on experimenter experience
- **A priori identification:** Must identify variance sources BEFORE data collection
- **Limited statistical power:** When assumptions fail, must resort to non-parametric tests
- **Regulatory requirements:** EPPO standards demand $R^2 > 0.85$ performance

The Challenge:

How can we capture environmental variability mathematically rather than through human judgment?

Geostatistical Methods

Advantages:

- ✓ **Mathematical modeling** of environmental variability
- ✓ **Post-hoc analysis** - no need for prior knowledge
- ✓ **Superior performance** in handling spatial heterogeneity
- ✓ **EPPO recognized approach**

Current Barrier:

- ✗ **Requires spatially referenced observations**
- ✗ **Traditional manual assessments lack coordinates**
- ✗ **Implementation gap** in practical field trials

Can geomatics technologies provide spatially referenced observations that enable geostatistical analysis within EPPO-compliant Plant Protection Product trials?

Specific Objectives:

- ① Establish minimum dataset requirements for digital data collection
- ② Demonstrate feasibility across all EPPO variable types
- ③ Validate performance against traditional methods
- ④ Provide practical implementation guidelines

Key Standards:

- **PP 1/152(4):** Design and analysis of efficacy evaluation trials
- **PP 1/333(1):** Digital technology adoption guidelines

Variable Types in EPPO Assessments:

- ➊ **Continuous/Discrete:** Plant counts, measurements
- ➋ **Ordinal:** Severity scales (0-100%), damage ratings
- ➌ **Binary/Nominal:** Healthy/diseased, disease classification

Benchmark: $R^2 > 0.85$ compared to manual assessment

PPP Categories:

- Fungicides
- Insecticides
- Herbicides
- Plant growth regulators
- Acaricides
- Nematicides

Critical Evaluation Needs:

- **Efficacy:** Does it work?
- **Selectivity:** Is it safe for crops?
- **Environmental impact:** Side effects?

Core Technologies:

- **Photogrammetry:** 3D model generation from 2D images
- **Spectral Imaging:** Multi/hyperspectral sensors
- **Machine Learning:** Object detection, classification, regression
- **GNSS/UAV:** Precise spatial positioning

[Technology diagram would go here]

Problem Statement:

Manual plant counting is:

- **Time-consuming:** Hours per plot
- **Subjective:** Inter-observer variability
- **Error-prone:** Missed or double-counted plants
- **Non-spatial:** No coordinate information

[Plant counting example image]

Solution Approach:

- UAV photogrammetry
- Deep learning object detection
- Automatic spatial referencing
- $R^2 > 0.85$ validation

Architecture	Images Needed	R ²
RT-DETR (Transformer-mixed)	60	0.89
YOLOv8 (CNN)	110	0.87
YOLOv5 (CNN)	130	0.86
Few-shot models	N/A	< 0.85
Zero-shot models	N/A	< 0.85

Table: Performance comparison across architectures

Critical Finding:

NO out-of-distribution trained model achieved $R^2 > 0.85$

In-domain training data is essential for agricultural applications

Questions & Discussion

Contact Information:

Samuele Bumbaca

University of Turin

Email: samuele.bumbaca@unito.it

Key Publications:

- 1 "On the Minimum Dataset Requirements..." - *Remote Sensing* (2025)
- 2 "Supporting Screening of New Plant Protection Products..." - *Agronomy* (2024)
- 3 "Anomaly Detection for Plant Disease Classification" - *In preparation*