

# **Using adaptive management and modelling to improve nitrogen and water use efficiency in crop production: A case study using annual ryegrass**

by

**Melake Kessete Fessehazion**

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree PhD  
(Agronomy) in the faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences  
University of Pretoria  
Pretoria**

**Supervisor: Professor JG Annandale  
Co-supervisors: Professor CS Everson  
Professor RJ Stirzaker**

**December 2011**

## CONTENTS

<b>List of Figures .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations .....</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>Acknowledgments .....</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>Declaration.....</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>xviii</b>
<b>Chapter 1: General introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Rationale .....	1
1.2 Irrigated pasture production in South Africa.....	3
1.2.1 Irrigation guideline .....	4
1.2.2 Water use efficiency .....	5
1.2.3 Nitrogen guideline .....	6
1.2.4 Effects of excessive nitrogen applications .....	7
1.2.5 Nitrogen use efficiency .....	8
1.3 How can nitrogen and irrigation water use efficiency be improved?.....	9
1.3.1 Irrigation scheduling .....	9
1.3.2 Allowances for nitrogen mineralisation and carryover .....	11
1.3.3 Adaptive management.....	12
1.3.4 Modelling.....	13
1.4 Hypotheses and objectives .....	14
<b>Chapter 2: Improving nitrogen and irrigation water use efficiency of annual ryegrass     through adaptive management .....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	17
2.2 Materials and methods.....	18
2.2.1 Site description and crop management .....	18
2.2.2 Treatments .....	21
2.2.2.1 <i>Fixed nitrogen application rates</i> .....	22
2.2.2.2 <i>Nitrogen mass balance</i> .....	22
2.2.2.3 <i>Adaptive nitrogen</i> .....	24
2.2.2.4 <i>Adaptive water</i> .....	25
2.2.3 Data collection and calculations .....	28
2.2.4 Statistical analysis .....	29

2.3 Results and discussion .....	29
2.3.1 Forage yield and quality .....	29
2.3.2 N rate and nitrogen use efficiency .....	32
2.3.3 Water use efficiency .....	34
2.3.4 Potential leaching .....	35
2.4 Conclusions .....	38

**Chapter 3: Nitrogen application and critical soil solution nitrate concentrations for optimum yield and quality of annual ryegrass .....39**

3.1. Introduction .....	39
3.2 Materials and methods .....	40
3.2.1 Site description and crop management .....	40
3.2.2 Treatments .....	42
3.2.3 Plant Sampling and quality analysis .....	42
3.2.4 Soil nitrate sampling and analysis .....	43
3.2.5 Calculations and statistical analysis.....	43
3.3 Results and discussion.....	44
3.3.1 Forage yield .....	44
3.3.2 Forage quality .....	46
3.3.2.1 Crude protein, true protein and non-true protein .....	46
3.3.2.2 Fibre .....	49
3.3.2.3 Metabolisable energy.....	50
3.3.3 Critical soil solutions nitrate concentrations for yield and quality.....	52
3.3.4 Nature of the trade-off between yield and quality parameters .....	55
3.4 Conclusions.....	58

**Chapter 4: Improving water management of irrigated annual ryegrass using SWB-Pro model .....60**

4.1 Introduction .....	60
4.2 Model description .....	63
4.3 Materials and methods .....	64
4.3.1 Site description and crop management .....	64
4.3.2 Treatments .....	65
4.3.2.1 Irrigation strategies .....	65
4.3.2.2 Evapotranspiration measurement using the shortened energy balance method .....	66
4.3.3 Data collection.....	67

4.3.4 Model reliability test.....	68
4.3.5 Model application .....	68
4.4 Results and discussion .....	70
4.4.1 Model calibration .....	70
4.4.2 Model validation .....	73
4.4.2.1 Forage yield and leaf area index.....	75
4.4.2.2 Soil water deficit .....	77
4.4.2.3 Evapotranspiration .....	79
4.4.3 Model application .....	80
4.4.3.1 Water requirement .....	80
4.4.3.2 Irrigation calendars .....	82
4.5 Conclusions.....	87

## **Chapter 5: Simulating water and nitrogen balances of annual ryegrass with the SWB-**

<b>Sci model.....</b>	<b>89</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	89
5.2 Model description .....	90
5.2.1 Crop nitrogen uptake.....	91
5.2.2 Organic matter turnover.....	92
5.2.3 Inorganic nitrogen transformations .....	92
5.3 Materials and methods .....	93
5.3.1 Site and treatments description .....	93
5.3.2 Treatments .....	93
5.3.2.1 Cedara .....	94
5.3.2.2 Hatfield .....	95
5.3.3 Data collection.....	95
5.3.3.1 Weather.....	95
5.3.3.2 Soil analysis.....	95
5.3.3.3 Soil water content .....	96
5.3.3.4 Crop growth, yield and nitrogen uptake.....	96
5.3.3.5 Soil solution nitrate concentration .....	97
5.3.4 Model parameterisation and testing.....	97
5.4 Results and discussion.....	98
5.4.1 Model calibration .....	98
5.4.2 Model validation .....	102
5.4.2.1 Forage yield .....	102
5.4.2.2 Leaf area index.....	106

5.4.2.3 Forage nitrogen uptake .....	108
5.4.2.4 Soil water content .....	111
5.4.2.5 Soil nitrate concentrations .....	113
5.5 Conclusions.....	117
<b>Chapter 6: Exploring potential irrigation management strategies for annual ryegrass using the SWB-Sci model.....</b>	<b>118</b>
6.1 Introduction .....	118
6.2 Materials and methods .....	120
6.2.1 Model description .....	120
6.2.2 Model modification .....	120
6.2.3 Model input parameters.....	120
6.2.4 Model output parameters.....	121
6.2.5 Scenarios simulation analyses .....	122
6.3 Results and discussion.....	126
6.3.1 Forage yield and water use .....	126
6.3.2 Water and irrigation use efficiency .....	132
6.3.3 Nitrogen leaching .....	135
6.4 Conclusions.....	139
<b>Chapter 7: General conclusions and recommendations .....</b>	<b>141</b>
7.1 Overview of the study .....	141
7.2 Balancing forage yield and quality using adaptive N and water management .....	141
7.3 Estimating water requirements and developing irrigation calendars using simple web-based SWB-Pro model.....	143
7.4. Exploring potential N and water management strategies using SWB-Sci model.	144
7.5 Recommendations .....	146
<b>References .....</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>162</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2.1** Monthly N mineralisation estimates based on organic carbon collected at the beginning of the season .....24
- Figure 2.2** Mean nitrate concentrations of wetting front detectors installed at all depths in treatments which received 30 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>30</sub>) and 60 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>60</sub>) in 2007 (dotted horizontal line represents nitrate threshold level).....25
- Figure 2.3** Nitrate concentrations of wetting front detectors installed at a) 0.30 m and b) 0.45 m in treatments which received 30 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>30</sub>) and 60 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>60</sub>) in 2007 (dotted horizontal line represents nitrate threshold level).....27
- Figure 2.4** Rainfall plus irrigation for N mass balance (N<sub>MB</sub>) and adaptive water (N<sub>water</sub>) treatments in 2008 (upward arrows show cancellation of irrigation events and downward arrows reduced irrigation amount) .....34
- Figure 2.5** Soil solution nitrate concentrations collected from 0.15 (◇), 0.30 (■) and 0.45 (x) m deep wetting front detectors installed in the a) 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>20</sub>), b) 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>40</sub>), c) 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>60</sub>), d) N mass balance (N<sub>MB</sub>), e) adaptive N (N<sub>soil</sub>) and f) adaptive water (N<sub>water</sub>) treatments in 2008.....36
- Figure 2.6** Soil nitrate concentrations (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) collected from soil cores in September (solid line) and November (dotted line) for the a) 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>20</sub>), b) 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>40</sub>), c) 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> (N<sub>60</sub>), d) N mass balance (N<sub>MB</sub>), e) adaptive N (N<sub>soil</sub>) and f) adaptive water (N<sub>water</sub>) treatments in 2008.....37
- Figure 3.1** Long-term (85 years), 2007 and 2008 total monthly rainfall and mean maximum and minimum temperatures for Cedara .....41
- Figure 3.2** Forage yield of annual ryegrass under a range of N application rates for eight growth cycles in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>30</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) and seven growth cycles in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>20</sub>, N<sub>40</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>).....45

- Figure 3.3** Cumulative forage yield of annual ryegrass under a range of N application rates for eight growth cycles in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>30</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) and seven growth cycles in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>20</sub>, N<sub>40</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>)....46
- Figure 3.4** Crude protein (CP) concentrations of annual ryegrass under a range of N application rates for eight growth cycles in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>30</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) and seven growth cycles in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>20</sub>, N<sub>40</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) .....47
- Figure 3.5** Crude protein (CP), true protein (TP) and non-true protein (NTP) concentrations of annual ryegrass under a range of N application rates for four growth cycles in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>30</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) and three growth cycles in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>20</sub>, N<sub>40</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) ..... 48
- Figure 3.6** Neutral detergent fibre (NDF) of annual ryegrass under a range of N application rates for eight growth cycles in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>30</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) and seven growth cycles in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>20</sub>, N<sub>40</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>). Horizontal line is minimum NDF requirement for dairy cows..... 50
- Figure 3.7** Metabolisable energy (ME) content of annual ryegrass under a range of N application rates for eight growth cycles in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>30</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) and seven growth cycles in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> cycle<sup>-1</sup> for N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>20</sub>, N<sub>40</sub>, N<sub>60</sub>) .....51
- Figure 3.8** Critical soil solution nitrate concentration for biophysical optimum forage yield, optimum (CP<sub>opt</sub>) and maximum (CP<sub>max</sub>) crude protein concentrations using Cate-Nelson model. Critical soil solution nitrate concentration (CL), coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>), number of observations (n = 43), error I upper left side of the quadrant (I) and error II lower right side of the quadrant (II) .....53
- Figure 3.9** Exponential equation used to show the relationship between N application rates and mean soil solution nitrate concentrations. Data pooled from range of N

application rates in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> cycle <sup>-1</sup> for N <sub>0</sub> , N <sub>30</sub> , N <sub>60</sub> ) and in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> cycle <sup>-1</sup> for N <sub>0</sub> , N <sub>20</sub> , N <sub>40</sub> , N <sub>60</sub> ) .....	55
<b>Figure 3.10</b> Cumulative metabolisable energy (ME) of annual ryegrass under a range of N application rates for eight growth cycles in 2007 (0, 30, 60 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> cycle <sup>-1</sup> for N <sub>0</sub> , N <sub>30</sub> , N <sub>60</sub> ) and seven growth cycles in 2008 (0, 20, 40 60 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> cycle <sup>-1</sup> for N <sub>0</sub> , N <sub>20</sub> , N <sub>40</sub> , N <sub>60</sub> ) .....	56
<b>Figure 3.11</b> Critical crude protein concentration (%) for biophysical optimum relative forage yield (%) using Cate-Nelson model. Critical crude protein concentration (CL), coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ), number of observations, error I upper left side of the quadrant (I) and error II lower right side of the quadrant (II) .....	57
<b>Figure 4.1</b> Monthly long-term means (1950-2000) of reference evapotranspiration (ET <sub>o</sub> ) and precipitation in four ryegrass growing areas .....	69
<b>Figure 4.2</b> Simulated (lines) and measured data (symbols) of above ground dry matter for a) growth cycles and b) from whole season, c) leaf area index and d) soil water deficit to field capacity for model calibration of ryegrass at Cedara during the 2008 growing season (Vertical bars are the standard deviation of measured data).....	72
<b>Figure 4.3</b> Simulated (solid lines) and measured (symbols) forage yield for individual growth cycles for the well watered (W1) and water stressed (W2 for Cedara; W3 for Hatfield) treatments during the 2007 growing season.....	75
<b>Figure 4.4</b> Simulated (solid lines) and measured (symbols) seasonal cumulative forage yield for the well watered (W1) and water stressed (W2 for Cedara; W3 for Hatfield) treatments during the 2007 and 2008 growing seasons .....	76
<b>Figure 4.5</b> Simulated (solid lines) and measured (Symbols) leaf area index for the well watered (W1) and water stressed (W2 for Cedara; W3 for Hatfield) treatments during the 2007 growing season .....	77



**Figure 4.6** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (symbols) of the soil water deficit for the well watered (W1) and water stressed (W2) treatments for Cedara during the 2007 and 2008 growing seasons.....78

**Figure 4.7** Simulated (lines) and measured (symbols) evapotranspiration of ryegrass for the Cedara site during the 2008 growing season for well watered conditions.....79

**Figure 4.8** Simulated mean long-term daily water use of ryegrass for major milk producing areas of South Africa (points show individual season simulated water use) .....80

**Figure 4.9** Mean monthly vapour pressure deficit (VPD) for long-term (1950-2000) for major milk producing areas of South Africa .....82

**Figure 4.10** Example monthly recommended irrigation intervals (25 mm per event) for milk producing areas of South Africa (points show long-term irrigation intervals)..... 86

**Figure 5.1** Schematic representation of the organic matter and inorganic N dynamics ..... 91

**Figure 5.2** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (points) a) above ground forage biomass for growth cycles and b) the whole season, c) above ground forage N uptake for growth cycles and d) the whole season, e) leaf area index and f) soil water deficit to field capacity during model calibration under well watered (W1), N non-limiting ( $N_{60}$ ) treatment at Cedara during 2008 (Vertical bars represent the standard error)..... 100

**Figure 5.3** Simulated and measured mobile soil solution nitrate concentrations for the well watered (W1), N non-limiting ( $N_{60}$ ) treatment at Cedara site during 2008..... 101

**Figure 5.4** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (points) forage yield for growth cycles under a range of N rate ( $N_0$ : 0 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>;  $N_{30}$ : 30 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>;  $N_{60}$ : 60 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) and water (W1: under well watered; W3: water stressed) treatments for Hatfield during the 2007 annual ryegrass growing season..... 103

**Figure 5.5** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (points) seasonal cumulative forage yield of ryegrass for well watered (W1) and water stressed (W2 and W3) under range of N application rate treatments for Cedara and Hatfield during 2007 and 2008 seasons ..... 104

**Figure 5.6** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (points) of leaf area index for a range of N rate treatments under well watered (W1) and water stressed (W3) treatments for Hatfield during the 2007 growing season ..... 107

**Figure 5.7** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (points) forage N uptake of growth cycles for range of N rate treatments under well watered (W1) and water stressed (W2) conditions for Cedara during 2007 and 2008 seasons..... 109

**Figure 5.8** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (points) seasonal cumulative forage N uptake of annual ryegrass for range of N rate treatments under well watered (W1) and water stressed (W2) treatments for Cedara site during 2007 (N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>30</sub> and N<sub>60</sub>) and 2008 (N<sub>0</sub>, N<sub>20</sub> and N<sub>40</sub>) seasons..... 110

**Figure 5.9** Simulated (solid lines) and measured (points) soil water deficit to field under a range of N rates and irrigation regimes data collected from Cedara during 2007 season ..... 112

**Figure 5.10** Simulated (O) and measured data (▲) soil nitrates concentrations at the depths of 0.15, 0.30, 0.45 m for well watered and range of N application treatments for Cedara site during 2007 season ..... 115

**Figure 5.11** Simulated (O) and measured data (▲) soil nitrates concentrations at the depths of 0.15, 0.30, 0.45 and 0.60 m for well watered and range of N application treatments for Cedara site during 2008 season..... 116

**Figure 6.1** Main annual ryegrass growing areas of South Africa used to develop site specific and general irrigation calendars ..... 123

**Figure 6.2** Growth cycle forage yield of annual ryegrass (average long-term simulation for seven irrigation strategies and dryland) in four major milk producing areas of South Africa. .... 127

**Figure 6.3** Growth cycle irrigation applications of annual ryegrass (long-term simulation for seven irrigation strategies) in four major milk producing areas of South Africa. X-axis bracketed values represent the number of the cutting cycle..... 128

**Figure 6.4** Deep percolation from annual ryegrass growth cycles (long-term simulation for seven irrigation strategies and dryland) in four major milk producing areas of South Africa. .... 132

**Figure 6.5** Growth cycle N leaching ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) below the active root zone (0.6 m) of annual ryegrass (long-term simulation of seven irrigation strategies and dryland) in four major milk producing areas of South Africa ..... 137

**Figure 6.6** Leaching of mobile soil nitrate ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) concentrations simulated using the model for a range of irrigation strategies for the KwaZulu-Natal Midlands..... 138

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 2.1</b> Monthly mean minimum and maximum temperature, and total precipitation recorded during the 2007 and 2008 growing seasons, Cedara, South Africa.....	19
<b>Table 2.2</b> Selected soil physical and chemical properties of the experimental site.....	20
<b>Table 2.3</b> Treatments in 2007 and 2008: fixed N application rates ( $N_0$ , $N_{20}$ , $N_{30}$ , $N_{40}$ , $N_{60}$ ), N application based on mass balance calculation ( $N_{MB}$ ), adaptive N management ( $N_{soil}$ ) and adaptive water management ( $N_{water}$ ) .....	26
<b>Table 2.4</b> Forage yield ( $t\ ha^{-1}$ ), crude protein (CP: $g\ kg^{-1}\ DM$ ), total N application rates ( $kg\ ha^{-1}$ ), fertiliser N use efficiency (NUE: $kg\ DM\ kg^{-1}\ N$ ), irrigation (I: mm), evapotranspiration (ET: mm), irrigation use efficiency (IUE: $kg\ DM\ ha^{-1}\ mm^{-1}$ ) and water use efficiency (WUE: $kg\ DM\ ha^{-1}\ mm^{-1}$ ) of annual ryegrass under a range of fixed N rate (0, 30, 60 $kg\ ha^{-1}\ cycle^{-1}$ for $N_0$ , $N_{30}$ , $N_{60}$ ) treatments in 2007.....	30
<b>Table 2.5</b> Forage yield ( $t\ ha^{-1}$ ) and crude protein (CP: $g\ kg^{-1}\ DM$ ) of annual ryegrass under a range of fixed N rates (0, 20, 40, 60 $kg\ ha^{-1}\ cycle^{-1}$ for $N_0$ , $N_{20}$ , $N_{40}$ , $N_{60}$ ), N mass balance ( $N_{MB}$ ), and adaptive N ( $N_{soil}$ ) and water ( $N_{water}$ ) treatments in 2008 .....	31
<b>Table 2.6</b> Total N application rates ( $kg\ ha^{-1}$ ), fertiliser N use efficiency (NUE: $kg\ DM\ kg^{-1}\ N$ ), irrigation (I: mm), evapotranspiration (ET: mm), irrigation use efficiency (IUE: $kg\ DM\ ha^{-1}\ mm^{-1}$ ) and water use efficiency (WUE: $kg\ DM\ ha^{-1}\ mm^{-1}$ ) of annual ryegrass and soil solution nitrate concentrations ( $mg\ L^{-1}$ ) under a range of fixed N rates (0, 20, 40, 60 $kg\ ha^{-1}\ cycle^{-1}$ for $N_0$ , $N_{20}$ , $N_{40}$ , $N_{60}$ ), N mass balance ( $N_{MB}$ ), and adaptive N ( $N_{soil}$ ) and water ( $N_{water}$ ) treatments in 2008.....	33
<b>Table 4.1</b> Treatments used for calibration and validation of the SWB model .....	66
<b>Table 4.2</b> Specific crop input parameters of ryegrass used for SWB model calibration.....	71
<b>Table 4.3</b> Statistical parameters used for evaluation of model performance of predicted forage yield, leaf area index, soil water deficit during calibration .....	73

<b>Table 4.4</b> Statistical evaluation between observed and predicted values of forage yield and leaf area index during model validation in 2007 and 2008 seasons .....	74
<b>Table 4.5</b> Statistical evaluation between observed and predicted values of soil water deficit to field capacity and evapotranspiration during model validation in the 2007 and 2008 seasons .....	79
<b>Table 4.6</b> Seasonal forage yield, irrigation application and irrigation use efficiency (IUE) for the long-term simulation for four major milk producing areas of South Africa.....	81
<b>Table 4.7</b> Simulated site specific irrigation calendars for a sandy soil for four major ryegrass growing areas of South Africa.....	83
<b>Table 4.8</b> Simulated site specific irrigation calendars for a sandy loam soil for four major ryegrass growing areas of South Africa .....	84
<b>Table 4.9</b> Simulated site specific irrigation calendars for a clay soil for four major ryegrass growing areas of South Africa.....	85
<b>Table 5.1</b> Irrigation and N application rate treatments used for SWB-Sci model calibration and validation of annual ryegrass during 2007 and 2008 growing seasons .....	94
<b>Table 5.2</b> Specific crop input parameters of annual ryegrass used for SWB-Sci model for calibration and validation .....	98
<b>Table 5.3</b> Statistical parameters for SWB-Sci model calibration ( $r^2$ : coefficient of determination; D: Willmott index of agreement; MAE: mean absolute error) for optimally growing annual ryegrass.....	99
<b>Table 5.4</b> Statistical evaluation between observed and predicted values of forage yield during model validation, Cedara 2007 and 2008 seasons .....	105
<b>Table 5.5</b> Statistical evaluation between observed and predicted values of leaf area index during model validation, Hatfield 2007 and 2008 seasons .....	106
<b>Table 5.6</b> Statistical evaluation between observed and predicted values of forage N uptake during model validation, Cedara 2007 and 2008 seasons .....	108

<b>Table 5.7</b> Statistical evaluation between observed and predicted values of deficit water content to field capacity during model validation, Cedara 2007 and 2008 seasons.	113
<b>Table 5.8</b> Statistical evaluation between observed and predicted values of soil solution nitrate concentration during model validation, Cedara and Hatfield 2007 and 2008 seasons .....	114
<b>Table 6.1</b> Irrigation management scenarios tested in four major milk producing regions of South Africa.....	122
<b>Table 6.2</b> Long-term (1950-2000) monthly mean minimum ( $T_{\min}$ ) and maximum temperature ( $T_{\max}$ ), vapour pressure deficit (VPD) and total precipitation for the major annual ryegrass growing areas of South Africa .....	124
<b>Table 6.3</b> Seasonal forage yield ( $t\ ha^{-1}$ ) for the long-term simulation for seven irrigation strategies in four major milk producing areas of South Africa .....	126
<b>Table 6.4</b> Seasonal rainfall and irrigation application (long-term simulation for seven irrigation strategies) in four major milk producing areas of South Africa .....	129
<b>Table 6.5</b> Seasonal water loss due to drainage plus runoff (mm) for the long-term simulation of seven irrigation strategies and dryland in four major milk producing areas of South Africa .....	131
<b>Table 6.6</b> Seasonal water use efficiency (WUE: $kg\ ha^{-1}\ mm^{-1}$ ) for a long-term simulation of seven irrigation strategies and dryland in four major milk producing areas of South Africa.....	133
<b>Table 6.7</b> Seasonal marginal irrigation use efficiency (MIUE: $kg\ ha^{-1}\ mm^{-1}$ ) for a long-term simulation of seven irrigation strategies in four major milk producing areas of South Africa .....	135
<b>Table 6.8</b> Seasonal N leaching ( $kg\ ha^{-1}$ ) for long-term simulations of seven irrigation strategies and dryland in four major milk producing areas of South Africa .....	136

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADF	Acid detergent fibre
asl	Above sea level
ANOVA	Analyses of variance
CEC	Cation exchange capacity
CL	Critical level
CP	Crude protein
CP <sub>max</sub>	Maximum crude protein
CP <sub>min</sub>	Minimum crude protein
CP <sub>opt</sub>	Optimum crude protein
D	Index of agreement
DAP	Days after planting
Dr	Deep drainage
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
ET <sub>o</sub>	Reference evapotranspiration
FAO	Food and Agriculture organization
FC100	Common scientific practice
FC80	Irrigated 80% of FC100 - deficit irrigation
FC60	Irrigated 60% of FC100 - deficit irrigation
G	Soil heat flux
GDD	Growing degree day
Gen-cal	General irrigation guideline
H	Sensible heat flux
I	Irrigation
IUE	Irrigation use efficiency
LAI	Leaf area index
LSD	Least significant difference
MAE	Mean absolute error of measured values
ME	Metabolisable energy
MIUE	Marginal irrigation use efficiency
N <sub>c</sub>	Critical nitrogen concentration
NDF	Neutral detergent fibre
NEWSWB	New Soil Water Balance
NNI	Nitrogen nutrition index
NUE	Fertiliser nitrogen use efficiency



$N_{MB}$	Nitrogen mass balance
$N_{init}$	Initial soil inorganic nitrogen
$N_{min}$	Mineralisable nitrogen
NPN	Non-protein nitrogen
NTP	non-true protein
$N_{fer}$	Nitrogen input from fertiliser
$N_{up}$	Above ground crop nitrogen uptake
$N_{soil}$	Adaptive nitrogen
$N_{water}$	Adaptive water
P	Precipitation
R	Runoff
$r^2$	Coefficient of determination
Rn	Net irradiance
RR20	Leaving 20 mm deficit
SOM	Soil organic matter
VPD	Vapour pressure deficit
Site-cal	Site specific calendar
SWBPro	Soil Water Balance irrigator/consultant version
SWB-Sci	Soil Water Balance scientific version
TDR	Time domain reflectometer
NSC	Total non-structural carbohydrates
TP	True protein
$T$	Sonic temperature
WFD	Wetting front detector
WUE	Water use efficiency
WK25	Common farmers practice of 25 mm
$\Delta Q$	Soil water storage
$\varepsilon$	Wind direction
$u$	Horizontal wind velocity
$v$	Vertical wind velocity
$w$	Vertical wind velocity
$z$	Rooting depth
$\theta$	Soil water content



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To God almighty, whose help and wisdom can never be repaid, I thank You for providing me guidance and for making the completion of this dissertation possible.

I would like to thank the Water Research Commission for initiating, managing and funding the research project (WRC K5/1650) of which this study is emanated.

I gratefully acknowledge my supervisors for their advice and guidance provided to me during this study.

I would like to thank Prof John Annandale for his inspiration, encouragement, insightful ideas and his readiness for consultation over a range of ideas during the course of my study. I am sincerely indebted for his arrangement of funding through the Water Research Commission, without his continuous support I would not have gone this far.

I would like to thank Prof Colin Everson for his valuable advice and technical support during the field work. I would also like to thank him for his mentorship in a range of soil water and micrometeorological measuring tools.

I would like to thank Prof Richard Stirzaker for his inputs during experimental setup and guidance throughout data collection. I would also like to thank him for his quick email response, constrictive comments, encouragement and making me took my data closely through different angles.

Dr Wayne Truter and Amanuel Abraha, members of the project team, for their consistent support and allowing me to use their data from Hatfield for model validation.

I would like to thank Drs Nico Benade, Eyob Tesfameraim for their help with the modelling work.

Solomon Ghezehie, Alistair Clulow, Michael Mengitsu Lulethu Sinuka, Joshua Xaba and Lucas Ngidi are also acknowledged for their technical assistance and support during field experiment in data collection.

I would also like to thank ARC- Animal Production Institute (especially Sigrun Ammann) for making their field available to conduct the field trials and provide technical assistance.

My thanks also due to fellow graduate students and staff of the Department of Plant Production and Soil Science, for their wonderful company, support and sharing of knowledge.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, brothers and sisters for their generous support and encouragement.

## DECLARATION

I, Melake Kessete Fessehazion, hereby declare that this dissertation for the degree PhD (Agronomy) at the University of Pretoria is my own work and has never been submitted by myself at any other University. The research work reported is the result of my own investigation, except where acknowledged.

MK Fessehazion

December 2011

## **Using adaptive management and modelling to improve nitrogen and water use efficiency in crop production: A case study using annual ryegrass**

by

Melake Kessete Fessehazion

Supervisor: Professor JG Annandale

Co-supervisors: Professor CS Everson  
Professor RJ Stirzaker

Degree: PhD Agronomy

### **Abstract**

Poor management of nitrogen (N) fertilisers and water in agro-ecosystems reduces yield, quality and N-use efficiency, and leads to pollution. The objective of this study was to improve irrigation and N management for planted pastures through adaptive management with simple tools and modelling. Field experiments were conducted in 2007 and 2008 at Cedara (KwaZulu Natal) and Hatfield (Gauteng) using annual ryegrass as a case study under a range of N and irrigation application strategies. Collected data sets were also used to calibrate and validate the SWB-Pro (simple) and SWB-Sci (detailed) model versions. After validation, the model was used to develop irrigation calendars and strategies, and estimate irrigation requirements for annual ryegrass.

The highest forage yields were produced when N application rates ranged between 30 to 60 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> for each growth cycle, except for the first 2-3 growth cycles when there was high soil N carryover from the previous season. The current farmers' recommendation (fixed N application rate of 50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> per growth cycle) maximised biomass but reduced pasture quality. Adaptive strategies based on nitrate concentration in wetting front detectors at different depths, reduced fertiliser N application by 28–32% and reduced potentially leachable residual soil N, while improving forage quality without yield reduction. The rate 30-40 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> per growth cycle provided a compromise between forage yield and quality.

The SWB model performed well in simulating ryegrass growth, leaf area index, forage yield, root zone soil water deficit, daily evapotranspiration, biomass N uptake and soil nitrate. Site specific and monthly variable irrigation calendars were developed using the SWB-Pro model, for four major milk producing areas of South Africa. The simpler monthly irrigation calendars can be used in the absence of irrigation monitoring tools or more accurate site specific

calendars. The SWB-Pro model requires relatively few and simple inputs. However, irrigation monitoring/scheduling with the aid of real time modelling or measurements is better than calendars developed using the SWB-Pro model with long-term historical weather data.

The SWB-Sci model showed ways of improving water use efficiency using ‘room for rain’ and ‘mildly deficit irrigation’ approaches in high rainfall areas. Scenario modelling demonstrated that the best management strategy of achieving maximum yield together with low N leaching is by integrating N and water management. This integrated management can be based on the wetness of the soil and nitrate concentration in the deep root zone using wetting front detectors. The model can be used to generate monitoring protocols such as depth of wetting front detector placement and selecting N thresholds to be used for adaptive management.

Setting approximate thresholds for wetting depth and nitrate concentration is a first step in implementing an adaptive management strategy. However, the challenge is to find monitoring tools which allow effective implementation of the strategy. In this study, the wetting front detector proved to be a robust, on-farm water and nitrate monitoring tool which is relatively simple and cost effective. Should it become widely adopted, farmers are expected to improve these thresholds as more experience is gained. The SWB model could also be used to evaluate alternative thresholds for adaptive N and water management.