Assessing waterlogging conditions across Ethiopia's rainfed agricultural landscapes

EGU General Assembly 2025, EGU25-15183 Vienna, Austria

Peter Molnar¹, **Mosisa Wakjira²**, Katrien Descheemaeker²

¹Institute of Environmental Engineering, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland (<u>molnar@ifu.baug.ethz.ch</u>) ²Plant Production Systems, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands

Presenter: Mosisa Wakjira (mosisa.wakjira@wur.nl or mosisatujuba@gmail.com)









Crop-water use and yield relations



Key drivers of waterlogging

Humid climate/overirrigation/shallow watertable

~50% of the rainfed agriculture (RFA) region receives >1000mm rainfall

Poorly drained clayey soils

Vertisols cover about nearly 27% of cultivable lands in 30 most productive districts (Elias, 2016)

Flat to gentle slope

 ${\sim}14\%$ of the region has slope ${<}2\%$

Research Questions:

- Which parts of the RFA region are affected?
- What is the yield loss associated with waterlogging?
- How effective are agronomic and soil drainage measures?

Rainfed agricultural region of Ethiopia



Rainfall: CHIRPS (1981-2010) (Funk et al., 2015); soil: Soilgrids (Poggio et al., 2021); slope: derived from SRTM DEM



Assessment steps and results

Join us at the discussion: PICO spot A, PICOA.6



Waterlogging hotspots



Associated yield losses (wheat)



Suitability for rice – grass pea intensification



To the detailed slides



Crop-water use and yield relationship – management perspective



Reality (wheat yield)

Data: annual agricultural sample survey for the main growing season at 62 administrative zones of Ethiopia (CSA, 2003-2010)



Soil moisture regimes

Water management objective is to maintain plant-available water at optimal level (or at least above half-way between FC and WP)



6

Objectives

To provide a detailed spatial analysis of waterlogging, its limitations to crop production, and management alternatives by addressing the following research questions:

- How do waterlogging conditions (intensity and duration) vary across the RFA region, and which areas are the most prone?
- What is the yield loss associated with waterlogging?
- What is the potential yield gain through improved soil drainage and agronomic measures?

The assessment was carried out at 1km x 1km grid resolution considering 1981-2010 as a reference period





1) Root-zone water balance

a) Bucket hydrological model

 Rainfall-runoff partitioning was based on curve number method with simple calibration of the parameter CN

$$\begin{split} S(t) &= 254 \left(\frac{100}{CN(t)} - 1 \right) \checkmark \text{Surface storage parameter as a} \\ function of CN \\ Q(t) &= \begin{cases} \frac{(P(t) - 0.071S(t))^2}{(P(t) + 1.349S(t))}, & P(t) > 0.071S(t) \checkmark \text{Surface runoff} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

 $\Delta SM(t) = P(t) - Q(t) - ETa(t) - Dp(t)$

ETa(t) = Ks(t)ETo(t) <---- Actual evapotranspiration

$$Ks(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\theta(t)}{f(\theta_{FC} - \theta_{WP})}, & \theta(t) < f(\theta_{FC} - \theta_{WP}) & \text{where stress coefficient} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$Dp(t) = \begin{cases} 1440K_h, & \text{if clayey (i.e., clay>40\% and sand<45\%)} \\ 1000Zr(\theta(t) - \theta_{FC}), & \text{otherwise} & \checkmark \text{Deep percolation} \end{cases}$$

Change in daily soil moisture

1b) Adjustments for curve number (CN):

- Adjust for slope based on an empirical model (Williams et al., 2023)
- Calibration (scaling) using runoff data

$$S_{adj} = S\left(1.1 - \frac{\text{slope}}{\text{slope} + e^{(3.7 + 0.02117\text{slope})}}\right)$$
$$CN_{adj} = \frac{100}{\left(\frac{S_{adj}}{254} + 1\right)}$$



1c) Accounting for slope effects surface runoff and soil moisture on gentle to flat landscapes:

- Slope < 2% is generally considered undrainable (Erkossa et al., 2014; FAO, 2006)
- For undrainable landscapes Q was adjusted using linear weights such that:

Qadj = 0 if Slope = 0 (weight = 0) Qadj = Q if slope >= 2 (weight = 1)

1d) Accounting for clay content:

 Deep percolation in clayey soils was constrained by unsaturated hydraulic conductivity (Kh)

$$Dp(t) = \begin{cases} 1440K_h, & \text{if clayey (i.e., clay>40\% and sand<45\%)} \\ 1000Zr(\theta(t) - \theta_{FC}), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

• Kh was determined following (Zayani et., 1992)

 $K_h = 0.231(\theta(t) - \theta_r)^{7.6512}$

• Residual soil moisture was computed as a function of clay and organic carbon content (Poeplau et al., 2015)

 $\theta_r = 0.00145 + 0.00253soc + 0.00033clay$

2) Waterlogging impact analysis

2a) Daily root-zone oxygen deficit (ROD [%])

$$ROD(t) = \begin{cases} 100 \left(\frac{\theta(t) - \theta_{FC}}{\theta_{Sat} - \theta_{FC}}\right), & \theta(t) > \theta_{FC} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Impactful waterlogging events were identified as a condition where oxygen deficit is observed for at least three consecutive days (Githui et al., 2022; Shaw and Meyer, 2015)

2b) Mean annual impactful waterlogging intensity (WLI [mm day]) was calculated

 $WLI = 10 \times ROD \times Zr \left(\theta_{Sat} - \theta_{FC}\right) \times DUR \times N$

Zr = root-zone depth (top 60cm); DUR = mean duration of each waterlogging event [day]; N = number of waterlogging events per year





2c) Crop yield responses to waterlogging

Yield response analysis was based on envelope curve method (Wakjira et al., 2024)









1000

2000

3000

4000



0

Yield response function: Y = f(WLI)

Crop yields (Y) data for 9 major crops for the years 2000, 2003-2007, 2010 from the CSA agricultural sample survey (for 62 admin zones)



WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY

1000

2d) Crop yield losses under waterlogging

- The yield response functions were applied to each grid cell at 1km x 1km
- Yield loss was computed as the percentage of the nationally attainable yield ($\rm Y_{max})$

$$Y_{loss} = 100 \times \left(1 - \frac{Y}{Y_{max}}\right)$$

• Y_{max} corresponds to the threshold waterlogging intensity (WLI)

3) Evaluation of waterlogging management options

Naturally drainable (slope > 2 %) and nondrainable (slope <= 2%) landscapes were identified (Erkossa et al., 2014; FAO, 2006)

Two management options assessed by Erkossa et al., 2014 were re-evaluated at grid scale:

- Rice legume system intensification
- Improved soil drainage





3a) Rice-grass pea intensification

- Agroecological suitability for rice and legume fodder (grass-pea) were assessed using similarity analysis method (Ramirez-Villegas et al., 2011)
- The method is based on Euclidean distance between similarity features at the reference location (Xr) and the locations of interest (Xp) according to their weights (W)

Similarity =
$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} W_{ij} (X_r - X_p)^2\right)^{1/2}$$

 Four major rice producing locations (Fogera, Pawe, Chewaka and Tepi) were used as reference locations, considering climate aridity, soil texture and slope as similarity features Agroecological similarity maps for rice and grass pea





3b) Wheat yield gains under improved drainage

Empirical model of yield gains (%) under improved soils drainage, as a function of waterlogging intensity (mm day) was used

The model was derived from published field trials (at 10 locations) on paired comparisons of wheat yields under improved and traditional/no soil drainage



Results

Validation of simulated surface runoff and soil moisture



Observed soil moisture is the average of four independent global soil moisture products (ESA CCI, GLDAS 2.1, LPMR-TMI, and SGD-SM) over four climatic regions: semi-arid (sARD), dry sub-humid (dSHM), sub-humid (SHM), and humid (HMD)

Climatological of waterlogging characteristics and hotspot areas (1981-2010)

Waterlogging intensity [mm day] 6000 5400 4800 4200 3600 3000 2400 1800 1200 600 0

 $WLI = 10 \times ROD \times Zr \left(\theta_{Sat} - \theta_{FC}\right) \times DUR \times N$



Waterlogging characteristics

- About 10% of the RFA region experience root-zone oxygen of 50% with an average duration of about 67 days.
- Hyper-humid areas experience high soil oxygen deficit persisting throughout the growing season

Estimated mean annual yield losses (1981-2010) as percentage of the nationally attainable maximum yield

- Yield losses of up to 100% are observed, depending on the crop type and climate regime
- Chickpea, wheat, and barley are highly sensitive to waterlogging conditions
- Maize, sorghum, and millet are less affected, except in regions with a hyper-humid climate





Rice-grass pea intensification as an alternative measure to increase the productivity of waterlogging-prone areas

- One third of the RFA region is prone to waterlogging limitations of different severity level
- About 47% of the prone areas with naturally drainable slope condition are suitable for ricegrass pea system
- Over 60% of the non-drainable areas are suitable for rice production in rotation with grass pea



Natural drainability of agricultural landscapes as defined by slope





Improved drainage as a remedial measure:

- Improved drainage can increase wheat yield by up to 60% in dry sub-humid areas
- Under high waterlogging intensity in humid areas, improved drainage can the current yield by up to 250%





Conclusion

- The characteristics, limitations, and management strategies of waterlogging in Ethiopia's rainfed agriculture (RFA) region were analyzed
- Waterlogging of different intensities affects about 33% of croplands in the RFA region Ethiopia
- Major cereals (wheat and barley), and legumes (chickpea and faba bean) are highly sensitive to waterlogging across the study region
- An estimated 50% of the identified waterlogging-prone areas appear suitable for rice intensification in rotation with grass pea
- Improved soil drainage has significant potential to enhance the current yields—by up to 60% in sub-humid zones and up to 250% in humid agroecological zones.



Acknowledgement

This work is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF), Grant No. 222299 ("Agrohydrology of conservation agriculture")



References

Erkossa, T., Haileslassie, A., MacAlister, C., 2014. Enhancing farming system water productivity through alternative land use and water management in vertisol areas of Ethiopian Blue Nile Basin (Abay). Agricultural Water Management 132, 120–128. doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2013.10.007

Foster, T., Brozović, N., 2018. Simulating Crop-Water Production Functions Using Crop Growth Models to Support Water Policy Assessments. Ecological Economics 152, 9–21. doi:10.1016/307j.ecolecon.2018.05.019

Funk, C., Peterson, P., Landsfeld, M., Pedreros, D., Verdin, J., Shukla, S., Husak, G., Rowland, J., Harrison, L., Hoell, A., Michaelsen, J., 2015. The climate hazards infrared precipitation with stations - A new environmental record for monitoring extremes. Nature Scientific Data 2. <u>URL:www.nature.com/scientificdata</u>, doi:10.1038/sdata.2015.66.312

Githui, F., Beverly, C., Aiad, M., McCaskill, M., Liu, K., Harrison, M.T., 2022. Modelling Waterlogging Impacts on Crop Growth: A Review of Aeration Stress Definition in Crop Models and Sensitivity Analysis of APSIM. International Journal of Plant Biology 13, 180–200. doi:10.3183390/ijpb13030017.319

Poggio, L., De Sousa, L.M., Batjes, N.H., Heuvelink, G.B., Kempen, B., Ribeiro, E., Rossiter, D., 2021. SoilGrids 2.0: Producing soil information for the globe with quantified spatial uncertainty. Soil 7, 217–240. doi:10.5194/soil-7-217-2021.475

Ramirez-Villegas, J., Lau, C., Köhler, A.K., Signer, J., Jarvis, A., Arnell, N.W., Osborne, T.M., Hooker, J., 2011. Climate analogues: finding tomorrow's agriculture today. Working paper No. 12, 40

Shaw, R.E., Meyer, W.S., 2015. Improved empirical representation of plant responses to waterlogging for simulating crop yield. Agronomy Journal 107, 1711–1723. doi:10.2134/agronj14.0625.494

Wakjira, M.T., Peleg, N., Six, J., Molnar, P., 2024. Current and future cropland suitability for cereal production across the rainfed agricultural landscapes of Ethiopia. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 358, 110262. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2024.110262.

Wakjira, M.T., Peleg, N., Six, J., Molnar, P., 2025. Green water availability and water-limited crop yields under a changing climate in Ethiopia. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 29,529863–886. doi:10.5194/hess-29-863-2025.530

Williams, J.R., Izaurralde, R.C., Williams, C., Steglich, E.M., 2023. Agricul-541tural Policy / Environmental eXtender Model Theoretical Documentation Version 1501. URL: https://epicapex.tamu.edu/media/2mwdlhte/the-apex1501-theoretical-documentation-january-2023.pdf.

Zayani, K., Vachaud, G., Ennabli, N., 1992. Estimation of unsaturated hydraulic conductivity from inflow data. Journal of Hydrology 138, 503–514. doi:10.1016/0022-1694(92)90133-G.547



WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY WAGENINGEN UR