

**Seasonal Maize Yield Simulations for South Africa using a
Multi-Model Ensemble System**

by

Noelien le Roux

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in the

Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

University of Pretoria

April 2009

Seasonal Maize Yield Simulations for South Africa using a Multi-Model Ensemble System

Noelien le Roux

Supervisor: Prof. W.A. Landman
Co-supervisor: Dr. F.A. Engelbrecht
Department: Department of Geography, Geoinformatics and Meteorology
Faculty: Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University: University of Pretoria
Degree: Master of Science

ABSTRACT

Agricultural production is highly sensitive to climate and weather perturbations. Maize is the main crop cultivated in South Africa and production is predominantly rain-fed. South Africa's climate, especially rainfall, is extremely variable which influences the water available for agriculture and makes rain-fed cropping very risky. In the aim to reduce the uncertainty in the climate of the forthcoming season, this study investigates whether seasonal climate forecasts can be used to predict maize yields for South Africa with a usable level of skill. Maize yield, under rain-fed conditions, is simulated for each of the magisterial districts in the primary maize producing region of South Africa for the period from 1979 to 1999. The ability of the CERES-Maize model to simulate South African maize yields is established by forcing the CERES-Maize model with observed weather data. The simulated maize yields obtained by forcing the CERES-Maize model with observed weather data set the target skill level for the simulation systems that incorporate Global Circulation Models (GCMs). Two GCMs produced the simulated fields for this study, they are the Conformal Cubic Atmospheric Model (CCAM) and the ECHAM4.5 model. CCAM ran a 5 and ECHAM4.5 a 6-member ensemble of simulations on horizontal grids of $2.1^\circ \times 2.1^\circ$ and $2.8^\circ \times 2.8^\circ$ respectively. Both models were forced with observed sea-surface temperatures for the period 1979 to 2003. The CERES-Maize model is forced with each ensemble member of the CCAM-simulated fields and with each ensemble member of the ECHAM4.5-simulated fields. The CERES-CCAM simulated maize yields and CERES-ECHAM4.5 simulated maize yields are combined to form a Multi-Model maize yield ensemble system. The simulated yields are verified against actual maize yields. The CERES-Maize model shows significant skill in simulating South Africa maize yields. CERES-Maize model simulations using the CCAM-simulated fields produced skill levels comparable to the target skill, while the CERES-ECHAM4.5 simulation system illustrated poor skill. The Multi-Model system presented here could therefore not outscore the skill of the best single-model simulation system (CERES-CCAM). Notwithstanding, the CERES-Maize model has the potential to be used in an operational environment to predict South African maize yields, provided that the GCM forecast fields used to force the model are adequately skilful. Such a yield prediction system does not currently exist in South Africa.



I declare that the thesis that I hereby submit for the degree at the University of Pretoria is my own work and has not previously been submitted by me for degree purposes at any other university or institution.

SIGNATURE

DATE

PREFACE

Agricultural production is highly sensitive to climate and weather perturbations (Podesta *et al.*, 1999; Chimeli *et al.*, 2002; Cantelaube and Terres, 2005; Sivakumar, 2006). Rainfall as such, can be considered as the atmospheric variable with the largest limiting effect on crop growth and development (Taljaard, 1986; DoA, 2007), which makes rain-fed agriculture particularly vulnerable to extreme weather events that significantly influences water availability. In South Africa, crop production is predominantly rain-fed, with only about 1% of the total cultivated area being irrigated (Chenje and Johnson, 1994). Due to the extreme variability of South Africa's climate, crop production is exceptionally risky. Therefore, the climate can be seen as one of the main factors responsible for year-to-year variations in South African crop yields.

Agriculture represents one of the main pillars of the economy of South Africa as a developing country, not only in terms of crop production and the main source of food, but also in terms of employment (Oram, 1989; Sivakumar, 2006; DoA, 2007). In a country like South Africa, where rain-fed agriculture dominates, a good rainy season normally results in good crop production, whereas a season with insufficient rain or the occurrence of a natural disaster (drought or flood) can result in crop failure (Arndt *et al.*, 2002; Sivakumar, 2006). This vulnerability of crop production to fluctuations in the climate, which consequently leads to variable yields, can cause the economy of the entire country to suffer (Cantelaube and Terres, 2005; Sivakumar, 2006). Southern Africa is a region subject to climate extremes (Tyson, 1986; Reason *et al.*, 2006a) and as a result often faces threats of food shortages (Devereux, 2000). The world's population is expected to exceed 8 billion by the year 2020, which places even more pressure on the agricultural sector in terms of food security (Sivakumar, 2006).

To ensure food security, excellent crop management is of utmost importance. This is a complicated practice, as weather is the primary source of uncertainty in crop management (Vossen, 1995). From the start of the season and right through, farmers have to make critical land and water management decisions which are primarily based on climatic conditions (Sivakumar, 2006). These decisions are often made weeks to months in advance of a specific weather event, like for instance the onset of the rainfall. Since unexpected climatic extremes can have detrimental effects on the yield, there is a need to investigate ways by which the uncertainty in the expected climate regime of the forthcoming season can be reduced. Seasonal climate forecasts provide insight into the expected mean

weather conditions of the approaching season, but farmers can benefit more from information when it is presented in terms of production outcomes.

In this study a maize yield forecast system is constructed using a crop model and two Global Circulation Models (GCMs) that aims to produce useable maize yield predictions for South Africa which will allow farmers to take advantage of probable good seasons and reduce unwanted impacts in probable poor seasons.

The hypotheses that will be tested are:

1. that the crop model has skill in simulating South African maize yields when forced with observed weather data;
2. that crop model-GCM based maize yield simulation systems can produce skill levels comparable to the target skill level set by forcing the crop model with observed weather data;
3. that the skill of a simple Multi-Model maize yield ensemble system outcores that of the best crop model-GCM based maize yield simulation system.

The steps required to test these hypotheses are to:

1. run the crop model for each of the magisterial districts in the primary maize producing area of South Africa for the period 1979/80 to 1998/99 with observed weather data;
2. quantify the skill of the crop model by comparing the simulated maize yields to actual maize yields and so that a target skill level can be set;
3. use the GCM-simulated fields as forcing in the crop model and perform the same crop model runs as done with the observed weather data;
4. combine the simulated maize yields from the two crop model-GCM based simulation systems to form a simple Multi-Model maize yield ensemble system;

5. verify the simulated maize yields obtained from the crop model-GCM based systems and from the Multi-Model maize yield ensemble system against actual maize yields and against the target skill level.

This dissertation consists of four chapters. Chapter 1 describes the growth stages of the maize plant, the factors influencing South Africa's climate, the seasonal predictability of South African rainfall, seasonal climate forecasting, ensemble and multi-model forecasting as well as an overview of crop yield forecasting worldwide. The data and models used and set up of the maize yield simulation experiments are detailed in Chapter 2. The methods used to verify the simulated maize yields are also described in this chapter. Chapter 3 discusses the maize yield simulation results. The simulated maize yields are verified spatially, inter-seasonally and probabilistically. The results are summarized and conclusions are made in Chapter 4.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks and appreciation to:

- First and most importantly the Lord, who gave me the strength and ability to complete this study.
- Prof. W.A. Landman (Chief Scientist, Seasonal Forecasting, South African Weather Service) for his enthusiasm, advice and support during the course of the study.
- Dr. F.A. Engelbrecht (University of Pretoria) for supplying the CCAM-simulated fields, assistance (especially related to the programming involved in this study), valuable inputs and willingness to help.
- Mr. Asmerom Beraki (SAWS) for supplying ECHAM4.5-simulated fields, for his hard work in getting the data into the correct format and for some of the skill calculations.
- Dr. J.F. Eloff, Mr. T. Dohse, Dr. D. Beukes, Dr. D. Turner and Mrs. M. van der Walt from the Agricultural Research Council, Institute for Soil, Climate and Water for their assistance in the soil component of this study.
- Matthew Jones from SASRI and Wiltrud Du Rand from the Agricultural Research Council – Grain Crops Institute who assisted me with DSSAT problems.
- Talita Germishuyse (ARC-ISCW) for assistance with actual maize yield figures.
- Rejaene van Dyk, the Librarian of ARC-ISCW for helping with the quest to find articles, sometimes in a rush.
- Christien Engelbrecht (ARC-ISCW) for the patching of weather station data.
- Philip Beukes (ARC-ISCW) for assistance with many GIS problems.
- The ARC-ISCW who funded this MSc. Thank you for the opportunity.
- My family and friends who supported me, encouraged me and prayed for me throughout the study.
- Brendan, vir jou geduld, ondersteuning, woorde van moed en gebede! Baie, baie dankie!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Declaration	iv
Preface	v
Acknowledgements	viii

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 AGRICULTURE IN SOUTH AFRICA	1
1.2 THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MAIZE PLANT	2
1.2.1 Stage 0 – From planting to seed emergence	2
1.2.2 Stage 1 – Four leaves completely unfolded	2
1.2.3 Stage 2 – Eight leaves completely unfolded	3
1.2.4 Stage 3 – Twelve leaves completely unfolded	3
1.2.5 Stage 4 – Sixteen leaves completely unfolded	3
1.2.6 Stage 5 – Silk appearance and pollen shedding	3
1.2.7 Stage 6 – Green maize stage	4
1.2.8 Stage 7 – Soft dough stage	4
1.2.9 Stage 8 – Hard dough stage	4
1.2.10 Stage 9 – Physiological maturity	4
1.2.11 Stage 10 – Biological maturity	4
1.3 SOUTH AFRICAN CLIMATE	5
1.4 OCEAN-ATMOSPHERE INTERACTIONS AND THE VARIABILITY IN SUMMER RAINFALL OVER SOUTH AFRICA	6
1.5 SOUTH AFRICAN MAIZE YIELDS AND CLIMATE VARIABILITY	8
1.6 THE SEASONAL PREDICTABILITY OF SOUTH AFRICAN RAINFALL	10
1.6.1 Statistical Forecasting	12
1.6.2 Multi-tiered Forecasting	13
1.6.3 Dynamical Forecasting	14
1.7 ENSEMBLE AND MULTI-MODEL FORECASTING	16
1.8 OPERATIONAL SEASONAL FORECASTING AT SAWS AND UP	19
1.9 CROP YIELD FORECASTING	20
1.9.1 Yield Predictions in Europe	22
1.9.2 Yield Predictions in the United States of America	23
1.9.3 Yield Predictions in Asia	24
1.9.4 Yield Predictions in Australia	25

1.9.5	Yield Predictions in South America.....	26
1.9.6	Yield Predictions in Southern Africa.....	26
1.10	AIMS AND APPROACH OF RESEARCH	28
1.11	SUMMARY	29
DESIGN OF THE YIELD SIMULATIONS OVER SOUTH AFRICA.....		30
2.1	INTRODUCTION	30
2.2	AREA OF INTEREST	30
2.3	WEATHER DATASETS.....	31
2.3.1	Observed Data.....	31
2.3.2	Simulated Fields	33
2.3.2.1	CCAM	33
2.3.2.1.1	Model Description	33
2.3.2.1.2	Design of Simulations	34
2.3.2.2	ECHAM4.5.....	34
2.3.2.2.1	Model Description	34
2.3.2.2.2	Design of Simulations	35
2.4	CROP GROWTH SIMULATION MODEL	35
2.4.1	Model Description	36
2.4.2	Agricultural Inputs	37
2.4.2.1	Soil Inputs	37
2.4.2.2	Cultivar Inputs	50
2.4.2.3	Management Inputs	51
2.4.2.3.1	Plant Dates	51
2.4.2.3.2	Planting Depth	52
2.4.2.3.3	Row Spacing & Plant Population	52
2.4.2.3.4	Irrigation.....	53
2.4.2.3.5	Fertilizer.....	53
2.4.2.3.6	Harvest.....	53
2.4.2.3.7	Other Assumptions	54
2.4.3	Incorporating the Weather Data into the CERES-Maize Model	54
2.4.3.1	Observed Data.....	54
2.4.3.2	Simulated Fields	55
2.4.3.2.1	CCAM.....	55
2.4.3.2.2	ECHAM4.5.....	56
2.4.4	Set up of CERES-Maize Model Experiments.....	56
2.5	VERIFICATION OF THE SIMULATED MAIZE YIELDS	59

2.5.1	Verification Data.....	59
2.5.2	Verification Methods	60
2.5.2.1	<i>Spatial Verification</i>	61
2.5.2.2	<i>Inter-Seasonal Variability Verification</i>	62
2.5.2.2.1	<i>Subjective Validation</i>	62
2.5.2.2.2	<i>Objective Validation</i>	63
2.5.2.3	<i>Probability Distributions</i>	65
2.5.2.3.1	<i>Subjective Validation</i>	65
2.5.2.3.2	<i>Objective Validation</i>	67
2.6	SUMMARY	68
VERIFICATION OF THE YIELD SIMULATIONS OVER SOUTH AFRICA		69
3.1	INTRODUCTION	69
3.2	SPATIAL VERIFICATION RESULTS	69
3.3	INTER-SEASONAL VARIABILITY VERIFICATION RESULTS	81
3.3.1	Subjective Validation.....	81
3.3.1.1	<i>Dry/Warm Western Region</i>	81
3.3.1.1.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	81
3.3.1.1.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	83
3.3.1.1.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	84
3.3.1.2	<i>Temperate Eastern Region</i>	88
3.3.1.2.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	89
3.3.1.2.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	90
3.3.1.2.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	91
3.3.1.3	<i>Wet/Cool Eastern Region</i>	95
3.3.1.3.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	96
3.3.1.3.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	97
3.3.1.3.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	98
3.3.2	Objective Validation	102
3.3.2.1	<i>Actual Maize Yield vs. CERES-Observed Weather Maize Yield</i>	102
3.3.2.2	<i>Actual Maize Yield vs. CERES-CCAM Ensemble Mean Maize Yield</i>	105
3.3.2.3	<i>Actual Maize Yield vs. CERES-ECHAM4.5 Ensemble Mean Maize Yield</i>	109
3.3.2.4	<i>Actual Maize Yield vs. Multi-Model Ensemble Mean Maize Yield</i>	109
3.4	PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION RESULTS	113
3.4.1	Subjective Validation.....	113

3.4.1.1	<i>Dry/Warm Western Region</i>	113
3.4.1.1.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	113
3.4.1.1.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	114
3.4.1.1.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	115
3.4.1.2	<i>Temperate Eastern Region</i>	117
3.4.1.2.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	117
3.4.1.2.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	118
3.4.1.2.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	120
3.4.1.3	<i>Wet/Cool Eastern Region</i>	121
3.4.1.3.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	121
3.4.1.3.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	122
3.4.1.3.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	124
3.4.2	Objective Validation	125
3.4.2.1	<i>Dry/Warm Western Region</i>	125
3.4.2.1.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	125
3.4.2.1.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	126
3.4.2.2	<i>Temperate Eastern Region</i>	129
3.4.2.2.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	129
3.4.2.2.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	130
3.4.2.2.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	131
3.4.2.3	<i>Wet/Cool Eastern Region</i>	132
3.4.2.3.1	<i>Short Season Maize</i>	132
3.4.2.3.2	<i>Medium Season Maize</i>	133
3.4.2.3.3	<i>Long Season Maize</i>	134
3.5	SUMMARY	136
	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	137
	REFERENCES	143

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1:** The area harvested in 2008 for each of the main crops cultivated in South Africa (BFAP, 2008).
- Figure 1.2:** Historical maize yield figures for South Africa compared to Oceanic Nino Index values averaged over the growing season (OND, NDJ, DJF, JFM and FMA).
- Figure 2.1:** The study area and the three identified maize production regions.
- Figure 2.2:** The distribution of the identified weather stations (black dots) within the study area compared to the distribution of quaternary catchments within the study area.
- Figure 2.3:** The magisterial districts eliminated from the study due to the lack of soil data (light purple colour).
- Figure 2.4:** Flow diagram of the simulations performed with the CERES-Maize model.
- Figure 2.5:** Flow diagram of the simulations performed with the CERES-Maize model when forced with each of the 5 ensemble members of the CCAM-simulated fields.
- Figure 2.6:** Flow diagram of the simulations performed with the CERES-Maize model when forced with each of the 6 ensemble members of the ECHAM4.5-simulated fields.
- Figure 3.1:** Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 1 (short season maize planted on plant date 1) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.
- Figure 3.2:** Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 2 (short season maize planted on plant date 2) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.
- Figure 3.3:** Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 3 (short season maize planted on plant date 3) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.

Figure 3.4: Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 4 (medium season maize planted on plant date 1) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.

Figure 3.5: Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 5 (medium season maize planted on plant date 2) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.

Figure 3.6: Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 6 (medium season maize planted on plant date 3) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.

Figure 3.7: Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 7 (long season maize planted on plant date 1) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.

Figure 3.8: Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 8 (long season maize planted on plant date 2) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.

Figure 3.9: Actual maize yield index and simulated maize yield indices for scenario 9 (long season maize planted on plant date 3) averaged over the 19 seasons from 1980/81 to 1998/99. (a) Actual maize yield index, (b) CERES-Observed weather yield index, (c) CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index, (d) CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index and (e) Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index.

Figure 3.10: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Dry/Warm Western Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). Graphs (a) to (d) represent scenarios 1 to 4, as described in Table 2.8.

Figure 3.11: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Dry/Warm Western Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). Graphs (e) to (h) represent scenarios 5 to 8, as described in Table 2.8.

Figure 3.12: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Dry/Warm Western Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). This graph represents scenario 9, as described in Table 2.8.

Figure 3.13: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Temperate Eastern Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). Graphs (a) to (d) represent scenarios 1 to 4, as described in Table 2.8.

Figure 3.14: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Temperate Eastern Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). Graphs (e) to (h) represent scenarios 5 to 8, as described in Table 2.8.

Figure 3.15: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Temperate Eastern Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). This graph represents scenario 9, as described in Table 2.8.

Figure 3.16: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Wet/Cool Eastern Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). Graphs (a) to (d) represent scenarios 1 to 4, as described in Table 2.8.

Figure 3.17: Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Wet/Cool Eastern Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). Graphs (e) to (h) represent scenarios 5 to 8, as described in Table 2.8.

- Figure 3.18:** Maize yield index time-series (1980/81 – 1998/99) for the Wet/Cool Eastern Region. Actual maize yield index (AYI), CERES-Observed weather yield index (COYI), CERES-CCAM ensemble mean yield index (CCYI), CERES-ECHAM4.5 ensemble mean yield index (CEYI) and Multi-Model ensemble mean yield index (MMYI). This graph represents scenario 9, as described in Table 2.8.
- Figure 3.19:** Spearman rank correlations calculated between the actual maize yields and CERES-Observed weather maize yields over the 20 year period from 1980 to 1999. (a) Short season maize plant date 1, (b) Short season maize plant date 2, (c) Short season maize plant date 3, (d) Medium season maize plant date 1, (e) Medium season maize plant date 2, (f) Medium season maize plant date 3, (g) Long season maize plant date 1, (h) Long season maize plant date 2 and (i) Long season maize plant date 3. Magisterial districts with statistically significant correlations at the 95% confidence level are indicated in bold.
- Figure 3.20:** Spearman rank correlations calculated between the actual maize yields and CERES-CCAM ensemble mean maize yields over the 20 year period from 1980 to 1999. (a) Short season maize plant date 1, (b) Short season maize plant date 2, (c) Short season maize plant date 3, (d) Medium season maize plant date 1, (e) Medium season maize plant date 2, (f) Medium season maize plant date 3, (g) Long season maize plant date 1, (h) Long season maize plant date 2 and (i) Long season maize plant date 3. Magisterial districts with statistically significant correlations at the 95% confidence level are indicated in bold.
- Figure 3.21:** Spearman rank correlations calculated between the actual maize yields and Multi-Model ensemble mean maize yields over the 20 year period from 1980 to 1999. (a) Short season maize plant date 1, (b) Short season maize plant date 2, (c) Short season maize plant date 3, (d) Medium season maize plant date 1, (e) Medium season maize plant date 2, (f) Medium season maize plant date 3, (g) Long season maize plant date 1, (h) Long season maize plant date 2 and (i) Long season maize plant date 3. Magisterial districts with statistically significant correlations at the 95% confidence level are indicated in bold.
- Figure 3.22:** Simulated short season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.
- Figure 3.23:** Simulated medium season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield

(red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.24: Simulated long season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.25: Simulated short season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.26: Simulated medium season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.27: Simulated long season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.28: Simulated short season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM45 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.29: Simulated medium season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.30: Simulated long season maize yield probabilities. CERES-CCAM yield (CC), CERES-ECHAM4.5 yield (CE) and Multi-Model yield (MM). The actual maize yield (red) and CERES-Observed weather yield (grey) are denoted as A (above-normal), N (near-normal) or B (below-normal) at the top of the graph.

Figure 3.31: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated short season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.32: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated medium season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.33: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated long season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.34: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated short season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.35: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated medium season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.36: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated long season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.37: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated short season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.38: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated medium season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

Figure 3.39: ROC curves for above-normal, near-normal and below-normal simulated long season maize yields. (a) CERES-CCAM maize yield simulation system, (b) CERES-ECHAM4.5 maize yield simulation system and (c) Multi-Model maize yield simulation system.

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 2.1:** Genetic coefficients for maize as required by the CERES-Maize model (Jones *et al.*, 2003).
- Table 2.2:** The soils selected for each magisterial district and the corresponding soil profile data (Soil Survey Staff, 2008) as used as input for the CERES-Maize model.
- Table 2.3:** Cultivar coefficients for the selected cultivars used in the CERES-Maize model simulations performed for the magisterial districts under investigation.
- Table 2.4:** The range of possible plant dates selected for the cultivars in Table 2.3.
- Table 2.5:** The planting depths selected for each of the selected cultivars in Table 2.3.
- Table 2.6:** The quaternary catchments either completely or partially within the magisterial districts under investigation.
- Table 2.7:** The range of possible scenarios resulting from different combinations of input data.
- Table 2.8:** The 9 scenarios for which results are discussed.
- Table 2.9:** The resultant 3 scenarios obtained when averaging over the different plant dates.
- Table 3.1:** ROC scores for the simulated short season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.2:** ROC scores for the simulated medium season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.3:** ROC scores for the simulated long season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.4:** ROC scores for the simulated short season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.5:** ROC scores for the simulated medium season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.6:** ROC scores for the simulated long season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.7:** ROC scores for the simulated short season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.8:** ROC scores for the simulated medium season maize yield probabilities.
- Table 3.9:** ROC scores for the simulated long season maize yield probabilities.