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Introduction

- Unique opportunity to study a Greenfields operation the Mpumalanga Highveld of South Africa
- A full system of CTL machines were purchased and Forestry at Stellenbosch University was given full access to these operations
- Study was done on *Pinus spp.* saw timber
- Two different capacity machines were studied
  - Ponsse Bear and
  - Ponsse Beaver
  - These machines were purchased for clear-felling and thinning operations respectively
Introduction

- All the machines recorded tree data in the StanForD standard
- Strong relationship between tree size and harvesting productivity
- Machine productivity is influenced by the operator and this is well researched but difficult to apply in large tree data set and this was part of another study
- Is there a proverbial ‘sweet spot’ when harvesting trees
  - Best suited for the capacity of the machine
  - Most productive and optimal in terms of cost
- Traditionally harvesting productivity assessments are done as a snapshot in time
  - Single machine on a limited time frame
  - Selection of trees
- This study was done on most of the trees for an extended time frame
Introduction

• Using harvester data could be the next evolution of machine productivity assessments
• All data is collected, trends are visible and accurate (depending on the level of machine calibration)
• Much cheaper than conventional time studies (traditional time studies contain greater detail)
Objectives

- Model harvester productivity on a big StanForD data set
- Understand the differences in productivity between machines
- Attempt to close the gap in the understanding of the cost, tree size and productivity relationship
Methodology

- One year's data collected on 4 machines
- Only clear-felling and *Pinus patula* data assessed
- Data was cleaned – only to avoid striking errors
  - Time to harvest tree > 300 seconds
  - If the tree produced < 1 log
  - Removing trees that were harvested at a point of delay;
  - If the stem length was < 250 cm
- The data were interrogated, and a representative curve was fitted to these data
- A non-linear mixed effects in R were used
- An iterative approach was used to determine the best combination of fixed and random effects to use
Results and discussion

What does the data look like?
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Tree distributions

Small machine - Histogram of trees per DBH class

Large machine - Histogram of trees per DBH class
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Productivity based on DBH class

Large machine - Boxplot of Productivity

Small machine - Boxplot of Productivity
The model

- A Type II combined exponential and power function was fitted to these data using a Non-Linear Mixed Effects in R

- The function:

\[ \text{Productivity} = a \cdot DBH^b \cdot e^{c \cdot DBH} \]

- Constants a, b and c were set as fixed effects and in order to characterise the differences in productivity, the machine types were set as random effects
- Other factors like operator and site were also tested
- Similarly productivity over volume
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Productivity trends

All machines:
40cm DBH, 1.2m³ tree volume
77m³/hr
Bear:
42.5cm DBH, 1.4m³ tree volume
92m³/hr
Beaver:
40cm DBH, 1m³ tree volume
64m³/hr
Rate of productivity change

- We can now see where the machine work optimally
- Not really a point but more of a range
- Target where the machine work optimally
Conclusion

- Machine productivity is limited by tree size
- The efficiency of the machines is better in the ideal tree size range
- Need to optimise costs, productivity and tree growth
- It is not cost effective applying a machine not suited a particular tree size to an area
  - Repair costs go up
  - Productivity goes down
- Big data in this case has a lot of noise, but the trends are still there
- Unique approach for RSA forestry