UNIVERSITY of York

This is a repository copy of Integrated modelling for economic valuation of the role of forests and woodlands in drinking water provision to two African cities.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: <u>https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/131212/</u>

Version: Accepted Version

#### Article:

Ashagre, Biniam, Platts, Philip John orcid.org/0000-0002-0153-0121, Njana, Marco et al. (4 more authors) (2018) Integrated modelling for economic valuation of the role of forests and woodlands in drinking water provision to two African cities. Ecosystem Services. pp. 50-61. ISSN 2212-0416

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2018.05.004

#### Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

#### Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

# Integrated modelling for economic valuation of the role of forests and woodlands in drinking water provision to two African cities

3

Biniam B. Ashagre <sup>1</sup>, Philip J. Platts <sup>2,3</sup>, Marco Njana <sup>4</sup>, Neil D. Burgess <sup>5,6</sup>, Andrew Balmford<sup>7</sup>, Kerry
 Turner <sup>8</sup>, Marije Schaafsma <sup>9\*</sup>

- 6
   7 <sup>1</sup> Centre for Water Systems, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4QF, UK
- 8 <sup>2</sup> Environment Department, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5NG, UK
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Biology, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK
- <sup>4</sup> National Carbon Monitoring Centre, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania
- <sup>5</sup> UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK
- <sup>6</sup> CMEC, The Natural History Museum, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
- <sup>7</sup> Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3EJ, UK
- <sup>8</sup> School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK
- <sup>9</sup> Geography and Environment, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK
- 16 \* corresponding author: M.Schaafsma@soton.ac.uk

#### 18 Abstract

17

- 19 Rapidly growing economies often have high population growth, resulting in agricultural expansion in
- 20 rural areas and increased water demand in urban areas. Conversion of forests and woodlands to
- 21 agriculture may threaten safe and reliable water supply in cities. This study assesses the regulating
- 22 functions and economic values of forests and woodlands in meeting the water needs of two major
- cities in Tanzania and proposes an integrated modelling approach with a scenario-based analysis to
- estimate costs of water supply avoided by forest conservation. We use the process-based
- 25 hydrological Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) to simulate the role of woody habitats in the
- regulation of hydrological flow and sediment control. We find that the forests and woodlands play a
- significant role in regulating sediment load in rivers and reducing peak flows, with implications for
  the water supply from the Ruvu River to Dar es Salaam and Morogoro. A cost-based value
- assessment under water treatment works conditions up to 2016 suggests that water supply failure
- 30 due to deforestation would cost Dar es Salaam USD 4.6-17.6 million per year and Morogoro USD 308
- 31 thousand per year. Stronger enforcement of forest and woodland protection in Tanzania must
- 32 balance water policy objectives and food security.

# 3334 Keywords

- 35 Ecosystem services, SWAT, Tanzania, soil erosion, urban water demand, land use
- 36

39

40

# 3738 Highlights

- Forests and woodlands help to regulate seasonal flow and water provision
- We integrate hydrological and economic models to assess the value of water regulation
- Uncontrolled deforestation would result in higher household costs especially for poorer
   people
- 43 Conservation of forests would help meet water demand in Tanzania's large cities

#### 44 **1. Introduction**

45 Africa has experienced a rapid increase in urban population in the last 20 years (Brikké and 46 Vairavamoorthy 2016), driven by the combined effects of natural increase and rural-to-urban 47 migration (Anderson et al. 2013, Dos Santos et al. 2017). It is expected that by 2040, 50% of the 48 African population will live in cities (AfDB et al. 2014). In addition, economic growth is likely to 49 increase water demand by a rate higher than population growth alone (Cole 2004). These 50 developments will create significant pressure on existing, aging infrastructure and services including 51 water (Larsen et al. 2016). Many cities depend on natural habitat and climatic conditions in 52 upstream areas to deliver water through river systems (McDonald et al. 2013). At the same time, this 53 urbanisation process puts additional pressure on catchments and regional natural habitats 54 (Cumming et al. 2014). For example, many citizens in Sub-Saharan Africa still rely on catchment 55 forests as their main source of energy, charcoal, creating a negative feedback effect on their water 56 supply.

57

58 These dynamic urban-rural linkages, furthermore found in the supply of food, timber and other 59 goods and the exchange and movement of people and information, call for a catchment approach to 60 sustainable land-use planning. Land management has often aimed to improve services other than 61 water quality or quantity, sometimes resulting in problems of supply and pollution (Brauman 2015). 62 Modelling how land-use change affects downstream ecosystem services flows under different 63 scenarios helps to anticipate and mitigate unintended consequences (Haase and Tötzer 2012). 64 Although the impact of forests and woodlands on water quantity has been heavily debated 65 (Bruijnzeel 2004, Sahin and Hall 1996), it has been argued that the removal of these woody habitats 66 from upslope catchments and their replacement by agriculture affects flow patterns and water 67 quality downstream, varying with the biophysical characteristics of the forests (Ponette-Gonzalez et 68 al. 2015, Salman and Martinez 2015). For example, reduced river flow in the dry seasons can affect 69 ecosystem services benefits such as drinking water and hydropower provision, while higher flow 70 rates in the wet seasons can increase the risk of flooding and soil erosion (Cui et al. 2007, Ellison et 71 al. 2012). The potentially higher proportion of direct overland runoff in the absence of woody 72 vegetation can affect water supply as it increases sedimentation rates (Cunha et al. 2016); the 73 additional sediment fills up reservoirs, and higher sediment loads in the rivers force water 74 companies to turn off their pumps. Sedimentation can, therefore, impose a significant cost on 75 citizens downstream, who will need to cope with lower water volumes or impaired water quality, 76 especially in the dry seasons, with knock-on effects for their health and wellbeing and increased 77 costs of water treatment (Keeler et al. 2012, Rozario et al. 2016). 78

79 The quantitative assessment of the impact of upstream forest loss on urban populations requires 80 understanding of the location where the service is supplied, the spatial and temporal flows of the 81 water ecosystem services, the demand and actual use of the services (or disservices) by 82 beneficiaries, and features in the landscape that affect the flows (Bagstad et al. 2014, Villamagna et 83 al. 2013). Timing, place, quantity and quality of water supply regulation are affected by landscape 84 and ecosystem changes (Ponette-González et al. 2015), and are often felt off-site, but predicting 85 hydrological responses to land-use change is challenging (Bagstad et al. 2014, Guswa et al. 2014, 86 Villamagna et al. 2013). Integrated modelling provides an understanding of the link between natural 87 woody habitats and water-related ecosystem services relevant to human wellbeing (Lele 2009). 88 However, the lack of integrated approaches and over-simplification of hydrological processes is one 89 of the main limiting factors for accurately valuing these services (Dennedy-Frank et al. 2016, Sharps 90 et al. 2017). Existing ecosystem assessment tools such as Co\$tingNature, ARIES and INVEST do not 91 typically use local data or disaggregated land cover categories, are less applicable at smaller spatial 92 scales, and often fail to account for seasonal variation in hydrological flows (Pandeya et al. 2016, 93 Vigerstol and Aukema 2011).

- Morever, forests and woodlands do not produce water *per se*, and so valuation of the total annual
   volume of water supplied has very limited policy relevance for understanding forest-related water
- 97 services beneficial to people (Lele 2009). Valuing the cost or benefit of a *change* in a specific service
- provision throughout the year resulting from a *change* in forest quality or quantity is a more useful
   approach when aiming to value forest ecosystem services (Balmford et al. 2011, Daily et al. 2009).
- 99
- 100101 Many previous studies, particularly in data-poor settings, have abstained from providing economic
- 102 values for water-related services, or from linking economic values to changes in land use and
- subsequent forest functioning (Campbell and Tilley 2014, Maes et al. 2012, Terrado et al. 2014).
- 104 Existing monetary valuation evidence is limited; for example, the TEEB (The Economics of
- Ecosystems and Biodiversity) valuation database (Van der Ploeg and De Groot 2010) provides only eight references and ten value estimates from primary studies for water-related benefits provided
- 107 by tropical forests, of which none are from Africa. The value of landscape management for water
- 108 related ecosystem services is hard to determine because of the lack of understanding of the
- 109 dynamics of water ecosystems and interactions between land and water systems, and because the
- preferred quantity and quality depend on water users and time of year, and crucially; more water is
- 111 not always better (Brauman 2015, Schaafsma et al. 2015).
- 112
- The aim of this paper is to (a) assess to what extent the presence of forests and woodlands regulates the availability of water throughout the year in two major African cities, and (b) provide an estimate of the economic value of this regulation service. We tackled these aims by linking the outputs of the process-based model, the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), to an economic valuation of the regulation service of woodland and forest ecosystems. Through a comparison of scenarios with and
- 118 without tree-dominated ecosystems, we provide estimates of the monetary value of water
- regulation by forests and woodlands, and the distribution of benefits among different socio-
- 120 economic groups. We demonstrate that our methodology is applicable to data scarce areas with a
- 121 case study on the Ruvu catchment in Tanzania (Figure 1).

# 122 **2. Case study area**

- World Bank urban development data show that the percentage of the population in Tanzania living in cities increased from 22% in 2000 to 31% in 2014. Dar es Salaam, with a population approaching 5 million (> 3000 persons per km<sup>2</sup> (Office of the Chief Government Statistician 2013), is expected to see a further 85% increase in population between 2010 and 2040. This will increase water demand in a city where the water companies already struggle to meet the water required by the existing population (Nganyanyuka et al. 2014, Reweta and Sampath 2000).
- 129

At the same time, the principal supplies of water to Dar es Salaam and Morogoro are at risk from 130 131 upstream deforestation (Ngana et al. 2010, Nobert and Skinner 2016). Dar es Salaam city (the 132 commercial capital and largest urban area in the country) and Morogoro town (the capital of 133 Morogoro region) depend mainly on the Ruvu River for their surface water supply (Yanda and 134 Munishi 2007). This river originates in the Uluguru Mountains, part of the Eastern Arc Mountains 135 (Figure 1) – a mountain chain of global significance for its exceptional concentrations of rare and 136 endemic plants and animals (Burgess et al. 2007, Rovero et al. 2014). Despite conservation efforts 137 over many years, the conversion of forests to farmland has continued to the point where less than 138 30% of the original forest extent remains (Hall et al. 2009, Newmark 2002, Platts et al. 2011). The 139 rate of forest loss has slowed in recent years, with almost no forest lost within reserves in the past 140 decade. However, the frontier of forest conversion has reached the reserve boundaries, and 141 woodlands – which are largely unprotected – continue to be rapidly converted to agriculture (Green 142 et al. 2013). More subtle degradation of both protected and unprotected forests from illegal timber 143 harvesting, charcoal production and firewood collection also continues to threaten biodiversity, 144 carbon sequestration and hydrological services.

#### 145

The Ruvu catchment covers an area of 14,390 km<sup>2</sup> and lies mainly in Morogoro Region, with small parts located in Pwani Region. Forest and woodland cover 35% of the catchment, while crops such as maize, African beans, rice, sesame, pineapple and sisal cover 10% (Swetnam et al. 2011). The remainder is mainly grassland and bushland. In the west of the catchment are the Uluguru Mountains, covering 3057 km<sup>2</sup>, of which 309 km<sup>2</sup> is moist tropical forest (Platts et al. 2011). The soils in these mountains are mainly Luvisols with a sandy clay loam texture (Msanya et al. 2001), making them highly susceptible to erosion (Kimaro et al. 2008).

153

Three major rivers flow into the main Ruvu River: the Mgeta River flowing from the south-west of the catchment, the Upper Ruvu River flowing from the east side of the Uluguru Mountain, and the Ngerengere River flowing from the westside of the Uluguru Mountains. The main Ruvu River in this catchment is the principle source of fresh water to citizens of Dar es Salaam, and the Ngerengere River to citizens of Morogoro via the Mindu Dam. These two rivers, the Ruvu and Ngerengere, are the focus of this study.

160



161

2 Figure 1: Ruvu catchment map with important features (rivers, reservoir, important towns)

162 163

In the 2000s it was estimated that 88% of the total water used in Dar es Salaam comes from the 164 165 Ruvu River, with the other 12% coming from groundwater sources (Kjellén 2006). Piped water for 166 Dar es Salaam came (and still comes) from three different water treatment works (WTW): Mtoni, 167 Upper Ruvu, and Lower Ruvu. Our analysis focuses on the Upper Ruvu WTW located in Mlandizi, 168 which receives its water only from the Ruvu River and is therefore fully and immediately dependent on the Uluguru Mountains area and its forest and woodland. The impact of deforestation on the 169 170 Lower Ruvu WTW is not assessed in this study due to insufficient river flow data for model 171 calibration and validation at the Lower Ruvu WTW water off-take point. Mtoni WTW is not assessed 172 in this study, because its source location, the Kzinga river, lies outside the Ruvu catchment, and its 173 contribution, 9,000 m<sup>3</sup>/day, is much lower than the Upper Ruvu WTW with 80,000 m<sup>3</sup>/day (Kjellén

2006). Our study uses landcover change information and these water distribution figures in the
2000s. The potential increase of water treatment costs due to erosion caused by upstream changes
in land cover are beyond the scope of this study, as we do not have sufficient information to assess

the treatment process, such as the use of polymers or alum used to remove suspended solids, or

178 time series data of suspended solids (Cunha et al. 2016, Holmes 1988, Sthiannopkao et al. 2007,

- 179 Spellman 2008, Vogl et al. 2017).
- 180

181 At the Morogoro Bridge, along the Dar es Salaam-Morogoro road (1H8, see Figure 1), water from the 182 Ruvu River is pumped to the Upper Ruvu WTW and then conveyed to the Kimara reservoirs. The 183 design treatment capacity of the Upper Ruvu WTW was 82,000 m<sup>3</sup>/day (Kjellén 2006). However, the 184 WTW was often unable to operate at full capacity, primarily because siltation of the Ruvu River 185 caused pump failure, leading to regular water restrictions or rationing in Dar es Salaam (Gondwe 2000, Kjellén 2006). Past maintenance work commissioned to solve siltation problems was not 186 187 successful (Gondwe 2000), including the Tanzanian Shillings (TZS) 300 million (USD 140 thousand) 188 spent to replace existing pumps (Africa Time 2015)<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, water supply from the rivers was 189 frequently insufficient. As a result, the Kimara reservoirs, with a total capacity of 34,200 m<sup>3</sup>, were 190 never full and often ran dry after the morning peak demand (Kjellén 2006). Illegal abstraction and 191 leakage due to excess pressure within the distribution system were very common: of the total inflow 192 at the pump, 47% was estimated to be either wasted, used illegally (primarily for agriculture) or lost 193 at off-takes. In addition, an estimated 8% of the total inflow was leaked along the transmission line 194 between the WTW and the reservoirs, and 14% fulfilled the legitimate demand for towns and 195 villages along the transmission (Kjellén 2006). Only an estimated 32% of the potentially treated 196 water, i.e. 26,240 m<sup>3</sup>/day at full capacity, reached the service reservoir.

197 The Ngerengere River, which flows into the Ruvu River, supplies water to Morogoro via the Mindu 198 Dam and reservoir. The Mindu Reservoir is located about 10 km south-west of Morogoro town. The 199 main source of water to the Mindu Reservoir are the seasonal and perennial streams flowing from 200 the forest and woodland reserve of the Uluguru Mountains situated at the eastern side of the 201 reservoir (Ngonyani and Nkotagu 2007).

202

203 The Mindu reservoir supplies 80-85% of the water for Morogoro town, equivalent to 6,927,000 204 m<sup>3</sup>/year, but this is only sufficient to meet 64% of the total water demand (MORUWSA 2009). The 205 dam was constructed in 1983 (JICA 2013). However, within the last 30 years, the reservoir has lost 206 22% of its capacity due to siltation (AAW 2012). There have been no siltation removal operations 207 since the dam was built (AAW 2012). Although the consultancy report (AAW 2012) also suggested 208 various feasible dredging options, the Morogoro Urban Water and Sewerage Authority 209 (MORUWASA) chose to raise the dam height by 2.5 m (MORUWASA 2017). Therefore, we analysed 210 the cost of siltation based on the authority's strategy.

# 3. Methodology

# 212 3.1 Integrated Modelling and Scenarios

Forests and woodlands regulate the distribution of surface water across time and space and thus 213 214 affect soil erosion. Estimating the water supply benefits of regulation of sedimentation by forests 215 and woodlands is a multi-step process from land conversion together with weather patterns, to run-216 off and river sedimentation, distributed using man-made capital to the final beneficiaries, whose 217 values differ. This complex process requires a scenario-based analysis to understand what would happen to urban water supply benefits if forest and woodland cover was lost to agriculture. 218 219 Therefore, we modelled the response of Ruvu River flow in two extreme scenarios, representing the 220 WTW conditions up to 2016. The first is a 'conversion' scenario, where due to uncontrolled

\_\_\_\_\_

- agricultural expansion all forests and woodlands in the Ruvu catchment are converted to cropland
- 222 (maize and beans). The second is a 'conservation' scenario, where forest and woodland cover in the
- Ruvu catchment is assumed to remain at the same level as in the year 2000. By comparing the
- results of these scenarios, we quantified the role of woody habitats in the regulation of hydrological
- flow and sediment control, and their impact on domestic water supply to urban residents of
- 226 Morogoro and Dar es Salaam.
- 227

As elsewhere in the Eastern Arc Mountains, woodlands in the Ruvu catchment are largely

- 229 unprotected, and the majority forests outside reserve boundaries have already been cleared (Green
- et al. 2013). Our conversion scenario represents a case where funding is withdrawn, and conversion
- continues into the Uluguru Nature Reserve, which contains most of the forest in the catchment
- 232 (Burgess et al. 2002), until all forests and woodlands are lost from the Ruvu catchment. In contrast,
- the conservation scenario reflects that management of the Uluguru Nature Reserve is effective in stopping conversion, and assumes similar levels of protection are extended to the woodlands.
- 235
- 236 We used SWAT to examine how changes in sedimentation affect the capacity of the Mindu Reservoir
- and the functioning of the pumps supplying Dar es Salaam (see Section 3.2). For the assessment of
- economic consequences in Dar es Salaam and Morogoro, we related sedimentation levels to the
- resulting water supply problems (see Section 3.5).
- 240

# 241 *3.2 Hydrological model*

242 In this study, we chose to use the SWAT model to simulate the Mindu reservoir water level and its 243 sediment deposition, and the operations of the pumps that deliver water from the Ruvu River to the 244 Upper Ruvu WTW. We chose the SWAT model because of it flexibility, longevity and – crucially - its 245 capability to model sediment rates at daily time steps, which is necessary to assess the pump 246 shutdown events that depend on short-term sediment levels (rather than longer-term average water 247 quality indicators). SWAT is a freely available physical process-based model that can simulate 248 continuous-time catchment scale processes (Neitsch et al. 2011). Once the model is setup, different 249 management strategies and changes such as land use/cover can be assessed easily without excessive 250 investment of time and resources (Ashagre 2009, Baker and Miller 2013). Since the model is 251 integrated with a GIS interface it is convenient to analyse and present spatial variations (Easton et al. 252 2010).

252

254 SWAT addresses various water-related processes at watershed scale (Francesconi et al. 2016). It can 255 be used to identify runoff sources, areas of high soil loss, and the downstream consequences of the 256 land cover change. Its application has been successful at various temporal and spatial scales, in data-257 scarce catchments, in both temperate and sub-tropical catchments. Although the model can be data 258 demanding, it has been used in data scarce areas with satisfactory accuracy (Betrie et al. 2011, 259 Ndomba et al. 2008, Nyeko 2015). Several studies have used SWAT to quantify provisioning and 260 regulating services, but very few peer-reviewed publications have used SWAT for valuing ecosystem 261 services (Francesconi et al. 2016), let alone in a Sub-Saharan context (Vogl et al. 2017). SWAT has 262 been applied in Tanzania to assess the impact of land management practices and land cover changes 263 on the watershed water balance (Ashagre et al. 2014, Dessu and Melesse 2013, Mango et al. 2011, 264 Natkhin et al. 2015, Ndomba et al. 2008, Notter et al. 2012, van Griensven et al. 2013, Wambura et 265 al. 2015), but never in combination with valuation.

266

Applying a process-based hydrological modelling tool, such as SWAT, in data-scarce catchments is a
 challenge (Baker and Miller 2013, Dile and Srinivasan 2014, Ndomba et al. 2008, Nyeko 2015),

- 269 mainly due to the need for detailed model parameters and input variables such as rainfall, solar
- 270 radiation, plant growth, leaf area index, local soils, representative soil profiles, hydraulic properties
- of soils, soil erodibility factors, land-use, irrigation management, crop management, and water

272 abstraction. Because of the non-linear nature of hydrological processes and the uncertainties in 273 measured parameters, it is important to evaluate model performance against measured data, 274 commonly done by using river flow and sediment load in rivers. However, these data are scarce in 275 catchments like the Ruvu, and due to infrequent maintenance of the few guaging stations, the 276 measured data can show significant error. In this study, we used various techniques to fill gaps and 277 reduce uncertainty in measured data. For example, we used literature to develop a crop database 278 for plants that are not listed in the original SWAT database (See Appendix 1, Table A1.3), and we 279 adapted the SWAT model to account for leaf shed in the dry season of forests and woodlands in the 280 catchment. This leaf fall contributes to the nutrient pool and allows for forest growth (see Appendix 2). We incorporated these modifications into a freely available version of the SWAT model 281

282 (http://swat.tamu.edu/).

283

284 In the model development, we assimilated rainfall data from 19 stations but only data from 16 285 stations were suitable for use in setting up the model. Out of the 16 stations only seven have reliable 286 data for the period 1995 – 2004, with some gaps. The rainfall datasets from the other nine stations 287 either have no data for the period 1995 – 2004 or have several days of missing data points. Most 288 climate stations fell apart in the early 1990s after the economy collapse in 1980 and have not been 289 restored since. We filled these data gaps using the WXGEN weather generator model (Williams and 290 Singh 1995) by using the strong historical dataset before 1995 (see Appendix 1 – rainfall data). We 291 adopted the land cover map from Swetnam et al. (2011) which is based on a 2000 land cover map 292 with some updates. For soils, we georeferenced the map of Hathout (1983) (see Appendix 1, Figures 293 A1.1 and A1.2), which identifies 16 major soil types in the catchment, based on texture and the 294 number of soil layers. We took representative soil profiles, for each soil type, from (Kimaro et al. 295 2001, Mbogoni et al. 2005, Msanya et al. 2001, Spooner and Jenkin 1966). Other data included soil 296 depth and other soil hydrological properties, agricultural management practices and water 297 extraction – for further details, see Ashagre (2009) and Easton et al. (2010).

298

The SWAT model uses the Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) to calculate daily surface soil erosion and sediment concentration in the streams (Neitsch et al. 2011). Due to the scarcity of data on sediment concentration or total suspended load, we used turbidity as a proxy measure in this study. Based on correlation estimates from Grayson et al. (1996) for a comparable catchment, we estimated the suspended soil to be a factor 0.9 of turbidity for values lower than 1000 NTU (Nephelometric Turbidity Units); for turbidity values higher than 1000 NTU, total suspended solid is about 2.7 times the turbidity.

306

### 307 3.3 SWAT calibration and validation

308 We calibrated SWAT using daily rainfall data from the 16 weather stations spanning the years 1995 – 309 2000 with a model warming-up period of five years, 1990 - 1995. We calibrated the model for flow 310 estimation mainly using flow data from two points: Kibungo (gauge 1H5) and Morogoro Bridge (1H8, 311 see Figure 1). The intake point at Morogoro Road Bridge (1H8) is the outlet of the Ruvu catchment in 312 this study. It was not possible to use statistical tests to assess model performance at the catchment 313 outlet, 1H8, due to insufficient data points within the calibration and validation period. Instead, we 314 used the flow point at 1H5, which is a sub-basin outlet on the Uluguru Mountains, to test the model 315 accuracy during the calibration process using three goodness-of-fit recommended by Moriasi et al. 316 (2007): the model R<sup>2</sup>, the percentage bias (PBIAS) of -11.8% and the Nash-Sutcliffe Coefficient (NSE). 317 The NSE has a value of 1 for perfect model fit, 0-1 when the model is better than taking an average 318 value, and <0 for very low model fit (Coffey et al. 2004). We transferred the calibrated parameters 319 over the whole catchment and used the available data at 1H8 to fine-tune the model by using a 320 visual/graphical approach. Although parameter transfer can reduce model performance, previous 321 applications of SWAT have shown that transferring parameter values within the catchment performs 322 reasonably well (Heuvelmans et al. 2004, Huisman et al. 2003). We validated the model using flow

data at 1H5 for the period of four years, 2001-2004, the details of which we discuss in the Resultssection.

325

We further calibrated the SWAT model for sediment concentration in the streams by comparing the modelled river sediment concentration to the sediment concentration estimated using the turbidity data at 1H8 from Lopa et al. (2012). Additionally, we calibrated the model for sediment load and reservoir volume at the Mindu dam, using information on dam capacity, operation and loss of capacity due to siltation. We could not validate the model for its accuracy in simulating sediment concentration in the Ruvu River, because daily sediment data or turbidity data for the validation period were unavailable.

332 333

# 334 3.4 Scenario analysis

Both scenarios assume the same rainfall and climatic conditions that are measured and used for the model calibration period, 1995 – 2000. Comparing the scenario results thus indicates how flow and sediment concentrations would be altered if the forests and woodlands in the Ruvu catchment were replaced with the two most dominant crops: maize and beans (Green et al. 2013). We ran the two scenarios at a catchment scale and analysed them at catchment and sub-basin scale where the Mindu Reservoir is located.

341

For Morogoro, in the absence of measured records of the outflow from the Mindu reservoir, we estimated the outflow in the SWAT model by using a storage target: the principal volume of the reservoir. We simplified the spill control from the dam reservoir and assumed that any water coming into the reservoir above this volume overflows to downstream areas (this has no material impact on our results). No measures are taken in the scenarios to reduce sedimentation in the Mindu reservoir,

347 so that soil erosion-induced sedimentation results in the reduction of reservoir capacity.

348

349 For Dar es Salaam, we based the analysis of the value of water-regulation services provided by 350 forests and woodlands of the Ruvu catchment on the incidence of pump failure due to 351 sedimentation at the Upper Ruvu WTW offtake point at Morogoro Bridge (1H8) in the two scenarios. 352 It has been reported on several occasions that the Upper Ruvu WTW offtake-pumps, located at 353 Morogoro Bridge (1H8), have stopped operating due to the high concentration of sediment in the 354 river. The Dar es Salaam Water and Sewerage Corporation (DAWASCO) were said to switch off their 355 pumps at NTU values above 1500, sometimes multiple times per day (M. Cadman, pers. comm.), but 356 we could not corroborate this information with DAWASCO documentation. This NTU level is well 357 above safety standards for drinking water quality (<5 NTU) and turbidity levels that can cause pump 358 problems >10NTU (Uhrich and Bragg 2003). Data on the number of days and hours that the pumps 359 have been turned off due to sediment problems were unavailable. Therefore, we used the slope of 360 the exceedance curve of the conversion scenario to determine the minimum sediment 361 concentration in the river that causes pump failure or deliberate cut-off to protect pumps from failure (see Appendix 3). The range of interest is below this maximum percentage, where the 362 363 exceedance curve is gradual and sediment concentrations are high. For this range, where a major 364 increase in sediment concentration leads to a small increase in the probability of sediment 365 exceedance, we estimated the frequency and costs of pump cut-off under both scenarios.

366

# 367 3.5 Monetary valuation

A range of valuation methods is available for valuing (urban) ecosystem services, and avoided expenditure and replacement cost methods are most often used for regulation services (Gómez-Baggethun et al. 2013). We adopted cost-based approaches to value the changes in water supply to Morogoro and Dar es Salaam. Benefit transfer was impossible, because relevant studies on the monetary value for water-related benefits provided by tropical forests were unavailable. Specific studies or data for Tanzania on the costs of damages to approximate the value of supply changes,

- 374 such as health problems or time lost to increased water collection time were unavailable. The
- budget of the study was too limited to collect primary data with methods requiring large samples.
- 376

We therefore adopted a cost-based valuation approach to relate the annual sedimentation of the
Mindu reservoir to the (avoided) costs of increasing the Mindu Dam height to maintain the reservoir
capacity, and thereby the water supply to Morogoro, using information from a recent consultancy

380 report on the dam (AAW 2012).

381

382 For the valuation of impacts on the water supply to Dar as Salaam, we used market pricing and 383 substitute cost methods and developed a set of rule-based assumptions based on existing studies of 384 the water market in the city, as presented in Section 4.4. The main price information for substitute 385 water sources was obtained from secondary data: public websites, the DAWASCO website, and 386 published reports (see Table A3.3). In a small survey, we collected additional primary data on 387 substitute costs in three districts of Dar es Salaam in April 2015 (see Appendix 4). We interviewed 36 388 kiosks, 22 pushcart vendors, and six trucks to obtain price information for different water sources, 389 during dry and wet seasons, and during water rationed and non-rationed periods.

# 390 **4. Results and discussion**

# 391 4.1 Model Accuracy

392 The SWAT model achieved good agreement between measured (dark blue) and simulated (light

blue) river flows at 1H5 and 1H8, except for over-estimation of the base flow in some years (Figure
2ab). The model accuracy in the calibration process, simulating flow at 1H5 as compared to the
measured flow, had a coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) of 0.45, an NSE of 0.25, and a PBIAS of 11.8%.

- 397 We used the estimated sediment concentration from measured turbidity data (panel c in Figure 2), 398 which exhibited considerable uncertainty, to guide the sediment calibration process. When the 399 measured data exhibit significant uncertainty, calibration of models using goodness-to-fit measures 400 can misinform the modeller. Hence, we use the sediment data derived from turbidity data only for 401 guidance purposes. With the current parameters set, comparing model outputs with measured data 402 (turbidity) showed that the model did not overestimate the sediment concentration in the river, 403 suggesting that our estimates of soil loss were conservative, and the model fit for purpose. The 404 calibrated model showed that highest soil erosion occurs in November to January (see Figure 2c). 405 Sediment load is high from September to December, even though rainfall is highest in March and 406 April, probably because the higher vegetation cover in the March to May period reduces surface 407 runoff and subsequent soil erosion. Later in the year (September to December), following the long 408 dry season (June to September/October), the ground is bare and moderate rainfall can cause 409 significant erosion, especially in areas that are burnt in preparation for the planting season
- 410 (Heckmann 2014, Itani 1998, Kato 2001).

411 During the calibration period, in terms of stream flow simulation, the model slightly but consistently 412 overestimated the flow rate during the dry season, which resulted in a low NSE value and a negative

413 PBIAS. The R<sup>2</sup> was high showing a good collinearity between the simulated and the measured data.

- Based on suggested model performance grade by Moriasi et al. (2007), the model performed almost
- satisfactory according to the R<sup>2</sup> and NSE, and satisfactory based on the PBIAS. The model did neither
- 416 overestimate flow nor sediment. The conservative model results during the high flow season are
- 417 important for the use of sediment concentration outcomes as the determining factor for pump
- 418 shutdown at the WTW.
- The model validation, run for the period 2001 2004, resulted in a similar model accuracy to that of
   the calibration period although 2003 has a different rainfall pattern than the other years. During

validation, the model's goodness-of-fit measures are: an R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.40, an NSE coefficient of 0.20,
and a PBIAS of -20.3%. The model showed a slight delay in flow in post-rain season periods, which is
mainly due to slower recession in ground water flow and lateral flow in the model, which is also
observed during the calibration period. The simulated flow showed a good correlation with the
lower flows and the high flow events (see Figure 2d), and we hence deemed the model performance

426 in simulating the surface runoff sufficient to perform further analysis.



427

Figure 2: a) Daily measured (dark blue lines) and simulated (light blue lines) flow of Ruvu River at
Morogoro Bridge during calibration (1H8); b) Daily measured and simulated flow of Ruvu River at
Kibungu (1H5) during calibration; c) Monthly average simulated sediment concentration and the
sediment concetration estimated based on measured turbidity data at the outlet of the Ruvu subbasin during calibration (1H8); d) Daily measured and simulated flow of Ruvu River at Kibungu (1H5)
during validation;

#### 435 4.2 Sediment source areas under the conservation and conversion scenarios

In the conservation scenario, we estimate the mean annual rate of soil loss in the Mindu Catchment
to be 4.43 tonnes/ha, but this rate varies across the catchment (Figure 3ab). The main sources of
erosion are where agriculture (mainly maize and other annual crops) on steep slopes on the Uluguru
Mountains (Figure 3a). Agricultural lands on shallower slopes do not show significant soil loss.

440

441 Under the conversion scenario, the highest sediment yields are generated from forest and woodland
442 areas that are cleared for agriculture (Figure 3b), particularly in the mountains, where steeply
443 sloping land and Luvisol soils have high potential for soil erosion. The mean annual rate of soil loss
444 more than doubles, compared to the conservation scenario, to 10.50 tonnes/ha. The additional
445 sediment from erosion due to land cover change totals 187,000 tonnes/yr across the 30,800 ha

- 446 upstream catchment of Mindu Reservoir.
- 447





- 449 Figure 3: Comparison of rates and patterns of soil erosion under our conservation and conversion
- 450 scenarios; a) soil erosion in Ruvu Catchment and Mindu Sub-catchment under the conservation
- 451 scenario; b) soil erosion in Ruvu Catchment and Mindu sub-catchment under the conversion scenario.

#### 452 4.3 Mindu reservoir siltation and costs of water supply to Morogoro

453 Annual sedimentation is estimated at 0.157 million m<sup>3</sup>/year and has reduced the capacity from 20.7 454 million m<sup>3</sup> at design to 16.0 million m<sup>3</sup> by 2012 (AAW 2012). Assuming all surface erosion from the

455 Mindu catchment enters the Mindu Reservoir (i.e. with no sediment deposition in streams and

456 depressions within the catchment), we estimated that on average the reservoir volume lost per year

457 increases from 0.156 million m<sup>3</sup> (1% of reservoir volume) in the conservation scenario to 0.280

- 458 million m<sup>3</sup> (1.75% of reservoir volume) in the conversion scenario. If no action is taken to remove 459 siltation, based on the conversion siltation rate, it would take 57 years to fill up the reservoir instead
- 460 of 102 years based on the conservation scenario.
- 461

462 MOROWASA estimated that increasing the dam height and constructing upstream check dams to 463 regain the design capacity (AAW 2012), i.e. the volume of water storage, would cost TZS 14 billion (~ 464 USD 6.55 million) (MOROWASA water engineer, pers. comm., September 2015). Based on this figure, 465 we estimated the cost of siltation at TZS 496 million per year (~USD 218,273) in the conservation 466 scenario, equivalent to an annual cost of TZS 3750/tonne (USD 1.65/tonne) of sediment (see 467 Appendix 4 for details). The conversion of forests and woodlands to cropland would result in an 468 additional cost of TZS 700 million per year (~USD 308,103).

469

#### 470 4.4 Water supply to Dar es Salaam

471 Using the SWAT results on sedimentation levels, combined with rules on the maximum

472 sedimentation that the pumps can deal with, we defined the number of days that the pumps were

473 not functional due to high turbidity (see 4.4.1). Next, we estimated the number of downstream

474 people affected by pump failure at the Upper Ruvu offtake point (see 4.4.2). We related pump

475 failure to substitution behaviour (i.e. people switching to alternatives for tap water), and estimated

476 the costs of these substitution options using water price data (see 4.4.3). Finally, we estimated the

477 increase in water costs incurred because of upstream loss of woody landcover (see 4.4.4).

478

#### 479 4.4.1 Pump failure at Upper Ruvu offtake point

480 Figure 4 shows that the modelled sediment concentration at Morogoro Bridge (1H8) in the

481 conversion scenario is, on average, 340% higher than in the conservation scenario.

482



483

Figure 4: Sediment concentration at Morogoro Bridge (1H8) in conservation and conversion 484 485 scenarios.

486

487 Using the exceedance curves, we estimated the number of days that pumps are turned off due to 488 high sediment concentrations for 0.25% to 2.0% of the year, one to seven days a year respectively.

489 The choice of this range is described in more detail in Appendix 3. Combined with the SWAT

- 490 sediment estimates for the conservation scenario, this range suggested that the pumps are turned
- 491 off at sediment concentrations of 1885-4357 mg/L (Table 1 and Appendix 3, Table A3.1 and Figure
- 492 A3.2). The minimum sediment concentration level to cause pump cut-off (1885 mg/L resulting in

- 493 seven days of pump cut-off per year) is above the suggested operational pumping cut-off level of
- 494 1500 NTU. The SWAT sediment estimates for the conversion scenario in turn suggest that conversion
- of the Ruvu catchment's forests and woodlands would cause tap water to be unavailable in Dar es
- Salaam on 20 to 51 days each year (depending on the exact cut-off level, see final column of Table
- 1). Our results suggest that pump failure due to high sedimentation in the Ruvu River would not only
- lead to more frequent but also longer periods of pump outage in Dar es Salaam (see Appendix 4,Table A4.1 versus A4.2).
- 500
- Table 1. Number of days of that pumps are stopped under conservation and conversion scenario fordifferent assumptions of cut-off sedimentation concentration levels.

Percentage of time pumps stopped	Number of days per year pumps	Cut off sediment	Percentage of time pumps	Number of days per year pumps
due to sediment	are stopped	concentration	stopped	stopped
(Conservation)	(Conservation)	mg/L (NTU)	(Conversion)	(Conversion)
0.25%	0.9	4357 (1614)	5.45%	19.9
0.50%	1.8	3495 (1294)	6.85%	25.0
0.75%	2.7	2812 (1041)	8.70%	31.8
1.00%	3.7	2491 (923)	10.05%	36.7
1.25%	4.6	2282 (845)	11.40%	41.6
1.50%	5.5	2106 (780)	12.20%	44.5
1.75%	6.4	2029 (751)	12.90%	47.1
2.00%	7.3	1885 (698)	13.89%	50.7

503

### 504 4.4.2 Number of water consumers affected

505 Rates of household access to safe water sources in Dar es Salaam cannot be determined with 506 certainty (Bayliss and Tukai 2011); hence the volume of tap water used by households is unknown. 507 About 60% of the total demand for water in Dar es Salaam is domestic, 10% commercial, 10% 508 industrial and 20% institutional (WaterAid-Tanzania and Tearfund 2003). Although commercial, 509 industrial, and institutional demand is more likely to be fulfilled by tap water compared to domestic 510 use, we assumed that these percentages hold true for allocation of Upper Ruvu water. Hence, we 511 assumed that 60% of the 26,240 m<sup>3</sup>/day that reaches the Kimara service reservoirs from Upper Ruvu 512 (Kjellén 2006), i.e. 15,744 m<sup>3</sup>/day (15.7 million litres), is available for domestic use (see Table 2). This 513 assumption may overestimate the available water for domestic use as it ignores further leakage 514 from the distribution system (*ibid*.). Households that are supplied by the Upper Ruvu WTW are not 515 provided with tap water from other sources in the water distribution network, for example, from the 516 Lower Ruvu WTW (Bayliss and Tukai 2011). We hence assumed that stopping pumps results in an 517 immediate stop in the supply of piped water to the Upper Ruvu supply area. The storage capacity 518 reported by DAWASCO in 2012/13 was much lower than the demand, with a storage capacity 519 duration of just 3.4 hours; an Energy and Water Utilities Regulatory Authority report (EWURA 2013) 520 shows that there was hardly any buffer at all, which justified this assumption.

521

522 DAWASCO estimated that the average per capita consumption is 40 litres per day, which is expected 523 to apply to connected households (EWURA 2013). Tanzania's National Water Policy (2002) objective 524 is to ensure the provision of 25 litres of potable water per capita per day. Ease of access tends to 525 lead to higher per capita use of water among households with their own taps, compared with other 526 households. These figures are lower than of the total water use per household in Rostapshova et al. 527 (2014). The difference in water consumption lies mainly in drinking water use; for cooking, washing, 528 and cleaning non-piped sources are more prevalent among those without taps at home 529 (Rostapshova et al. 2014). We used these volumes per capita to estimate the number of households 530 that receive water from the Upper Ruvu: 40 litres for households with easy access via a tap, and 25 531 litres of piped water per day for other households, who buy DAWASCO water from their neighbours,

- kiosks or vendors. We assumed that households use non-piped water to fulfil further non-drinkingwater demand based on (Bayliss and Tukai 2011).
- 533 534

Around 62% of people in Dar es Salaam get their water from a tap (National Bureau of Statistics
2009), but only 8% have a tap at home. Others get piped water through neighbours (38%), or kiosks
or vendors (16%). These groups also tend to vary in wealth and substitution behaviour. Therefore,
we disaggregated the benefits of water supply by these groups in subsequent steps.

From these figures, we allocated the total volume provided by the Upper Ruvu to the different user
groups, and estimated the number of people within each user group (Table 2). We inferred that an

542 estimated 584,508 people depend on Upper Ruvu water. Their domestic water consumption is

543 affected each day that the pumps are shut down due to excessive sedimentation.

544

	C	0/	D'us a dissistant and a se	Line of Direct Consults	#
545	Table 2. Piped water	use from Upper Ruv	u, volume (in litres)	) and number of users	per water source

ply # people	
users)	
420	
247	
341	
0	
508	

<sup>546</sup> 547

#### 548 4.4.3 Substitution options and costs

549 Because of frequent rationing of water in Dar es Salaam, households use multiple sources of water. 550 Alternative sources include groundwater, rainwater, surface water (streams, rivers) and water from 551 other areas brought in by water trucks. Access to one's own tap water is skewed towards the richer 552 population: only 3% of the poorest quintile are connected to a public network tap compared to 24% 553 of the wealthiest quintile, and 18% of the poorest quintile obtain drinking water mainly from vendors (Rostapshova et al. 2014). Different groups opt for different substitutes. Water vendors are 554 555 the most used alternative (Nganyanyuka et al. 2014, Thompson et al. 2000), but richer households 556 sometimes buy in bulk from tanker trucks or use privately owned tanks or reservoirs (Bayliss and 557 Tukai 2011). Based on this information, we developed a set of rules for water substitution to 558 pushcarts, trucks or bottled water, depending on the source of piped water and the number of 559 consecutive days of pump failure (see Table A4.3). For households with taps at home, we assumed 560 that they would reduce their usage to 30 litres if water rationing lasted three or more days, but for 561 other groups we assumed that they would not cut back the volume used based on Rostapshova et al. (2014) and Bayliss and Tukai (2011). 562

563

According to our primary data, prices of these substitute water sources vary across vendors, water

565 sources and between rationed and non-rationed days (see Table A4.4). The primary data and

566 existing data from Kjellén (2006), DAWASCO (2013), and Mwakalila (2007) show that piped tap

- water is cheapest. Water prices at kiosks, although officially set at TZS 20 per 20 litres (~USD 0.01),
   increase significantly when tap water is cut off or rationed (Uwasi 2010).
- 569

### 570 4.4.4 Net costs of removing forest and woodland

571 We used the price variation and substitution behaviour information to estimate the increase in

572 water costs incurred because of upstream loss of woody land covers. The estimated costs associated

573 with a normal, non-rationed day for people depending on the Upper Ruvu WTW for their piped

- 574 water are approximately TZS 90 million per day (USD 42 thousand), equivalent to ~ TZS 154 per
- 575 person per day (USD 0.07) in 2015 prices (see Table 3). Our survey data showed that an increase in

- 576 prices, especially for those households who normally depend on the relatively cheap taps of
- 577 neighbours, occurs when pumps fail. If pumps also fail the next day, costs of richer households
- 578 depending on piped water at home would increase, as we assumed that their buffer would be
- by depleted and they would buy expensive, high-quality alternatives. On the third and each consecutive
- day, another sharp daily price increase is expected for those who depend on neighbours' taps. The
- richest households would be able to reduce their costs compared to the second day because they
- 582 would arrange water truck deliveries.583
- Table 3. Costs per user group of piped water for normal and pump failure days (in millions of
- 585 TZS/day for first four rows)

Source	normal day	1st day failure	2nd day failure	3rd+ day failure
Tap at home	3	9	266	232
Tap from neighbours	29	214	231	1,073
Kiosk, pushcart vendor	59	90	90	90
Total	90	306	587	1,395
Mean cost person/day (TZS)	154	524	1004	2386

586

587 From this, we estimate that the annual costs associated with increased pump failure under the 588 conversion scenario compared with the conservation scenario vary from TZS 9.8 billion (using a cut-

off level of 4357 mg/L from Table 1) to TZS 37.5 billion (for a cut-off of 1885 mg/L; Table 4 and full

details in Table A4.5), equivalent to USD 4.6-17.6 million per year. Per capita estimates of these
 losses vary from TZS 16,824 up to TZS 64,241 per year (USD 7.87-30.05).

591 loss 592

593 Table 4. Annual cost of cut-off events resulting from increased sedimentation in Upper Ruvu

594 (conversion minus conservation scenario) (in millions of TZS)

Cut-off levels	4357	3495	2812	2491	2282	2106	2029	1885
	mg/L							
Total cost								
(in million TZS)	9,834	12,891	19,062	23,344	27,879	31,216	32,667	37,550
Mean per capita								
costs (in TZS)	16,824	22,054	32,612	39,939	47,696	53,405	55,887	64,241

595

### 596 4.5 Discussion

597 While the importance of sustainable management of hydrological services and its relation to poverty 598 alleviation, food security, habitat management, and urbanisation are well recognised worldwide, 599 their accurate assessment is challenging, especially in the tropics. The analysis of this paper focuses 600 on the delivery of potable water to households via the Upper Ruvu pump system to the population 601 of Dar es Salaam and via the Mindu Reservoir to the urban dwellers of Morogoro. The results of the 602 integrated modelling exercise presented here suggest that maintaining the forests and woodlands in 603 the Ruvu catchment, and particularly in the Uluguru Mountains, is important for water provision in 604 downstream cities, and the costs of converting to agriculture is substantial. Forest and woodland 605 conservation would avoid between 20 to 51 days per year of water supply limitations to Dar es 606 Salaam and thereby substitution costs to users, as well as considerable dam investments costs for 607 Morogoro.

608

609 We see as the main contribution to the literature our integrated modelling approach applied in a

data scarce area using a scenario-based approach to estimate the effect of forest cover change to

611 downstream domestic water supply. Integrated catchment studies are essential to deal with the

612 interlinked challenges of water provision, especially in countries that happen to be data-poor. Our

613 paper demonstrates a possible approach, but considerable uncertainties and challenges remain, as 614 we outline below.

615

First of all, in 2016 the water supply system for Dar es Salaam changed and new, larger pumps were installed, but we could not incorporate this in the modelling because there are no comparable data from the 2010-2016 period to enable this modification. Without any public information on the sensitivity of the new pumps to sediment rates, we cannot tell whether our quantified outcomes for Dar es Salaam still hold, but the qualitative findings would be expected to remain relevant and it does not require altering our methodological approach. The modification of the system has no effect on the value of water provision to Morogoro.

623

624 While we needed a tool like SWAT that can relate changes in land-use to downstream changes in 625 water quality and quantity at a fine spatial and temporal scale, such tools are often data demanding. 626 Due to data scarcity, of which most pressing are data for the hydrological model setup and 627 calibration, pump management in response to sedimentation, and substitution behaviour of tap 628 water users our methodological approach relied on a series of assumptions based on available 629 statistics and other evidence. We considered the SWAT model estimates of the suspended sediment 630 concentration sufficiently robust to use the outputs for value assessment. The model accuracy in the 631 simulation of sediment concentration and yield can be improved by monitoring sediment 632 concentration for an extended period, and estimation of a turbidity-to-sediment-concentration-633 curve (Fisher et al. 2017). A recommendation following from our study would be to invest in data 634 monitoring. The SWAT model consistently over-estimated soil erosion for the month of January, potentially because of the minimum assumed uniform USLE management factor, a model parameter 635 636 for soil conservation due to different practices or crop cover (Wischmeier 1979). Our estimated 637 mean soil loss rate in the Mindu Catchment of 4.43 tonnes/ha/yr on average is lower than the 638 average figure estimated in AAW (2012) of 6.5 tonnes/ha/yr. The lower soil loss estimation in the 639 model is mainly because our analysis only covers soil loss from surface erosion and excludes other 640 types of erosion, such as gully erosion, for which data were unavailable (Ashagre 2009). This means 641 that our ecosystem service estimates are probably conservative.

642

643 In addition, we did not consider climate change projections in the scenario analysis. Conway et al. 644 (2017) studied future climate and trends using 34 general circulation models. Two-thirds of these 645 models indicated more frequent extreme rainfall events in Tanzania, i.e. higher likelihood of intense 646 rainfall and prolonged dry spells. In addition, the model ensemble rainfall predictions by GLOWS-FIU 647 (2014) suggested that the existing seasonality in the Ruvu catchment will be preserved under future 648 climate scenarios with an increase in rainfall during March and April. Higher intensity rainfall is 649 usually associated with higher soil erosion and flooding (Arnaud et al. 2002, De Risi et al. 2018, 650 Römkens et al. 2002). Therefore, the impact of removing woody habitats from upstream catchments 651 could result in higher rates of soil loss and peak discharges than reported here. Similarly, the level of 652 water scarcity in this study could be under-estimated (climate projects suggests longer dry spells). 653 Hence, our conclusions regarding the value of forests and woodlands for water-related services 654 would likely be reinforced by considering future climate change scenarios.

655

Another challenge relates to linking hydrological models and economic valuation. We demonstrate that to understand how forest and woodland cover changes affect the benefits of water-related services, a comparison of two situations or scenarios with different land-use patterns and therefore water quantity and quality is a useful and feasible approach. Data availability and budget limitations meant that only a limited set of valuation methods was possible. Our estimates are probably cautious because we did not assess the non-financial health costs of reduced water use or substitution. Water consumers, especially poorer households who cannot afford to buy an equal 663 amount of water when prices increase under water shortages, may either have to resort to other 664 sources, often of lower quality, or buy less water; Bayliss and Tukai (2011) found that they opt to 665 spend more as they cannot cut down further. We did not include the costs of obtaining substitutes, 666 such as longer walking distances, or the health costs or using less or low-quality water, e.g. Collier et 667 al. (2012), Dupont and Jahan (2012), Zivin et al. (2011). In many of the informal settlements in Dar es 668 Salaam, piped water infrastructure is not available and these areas rely to a great extent on 669 groundwater resources (Bayliss and Tukai 2011). However, the groundwater table is decreasing, and 670 salinity due to increased industrial expansion and uncontrolled drilling is already a problem in 671 several areas (Meena and Sharif 2008, Mtoni et al. 2012, Van Camp et al. 2014). Due to salinization, 672 in combination with pit latrine contamination, the quality of both groundwater and vendor water is 673 not of safe standards (Kalugendo 2008). Our water valuation methodology ignores price elasticity 674 effects on water demand, but available elasticity estimates for other developing countries tend to 675 show that demand for domestic water demand, and especially for potable water, is inelastic, albeit 676 not perfectly (Nauges and Whittington 2010, Noll et al. 2000). However, any upward bias in our 677 value estimates from ignoring price elasticity of demand is expected to be offset by the substitution 678 cost components that we excluded. Furthermore, we did not include the impacts of changing water 679 flows on illegal users of Upper Ruvu water, water losses in the distribution system, impacts on 680 commercial, public and industrial sectors, and impacts on water use outside the urban areas, 681 including hydropower and irrigation. Costs associated with river water quality deterioration resulting 682 from deforestation were beyond the scope of this paper. Finally, impacts of deforestation on riverine 683 flooding in these cities have not been assessed, but they are known to occur and lead to casualties, 684 emergency displacements, and serious public health problems (De Risi et al. 2018, IFRC 2011). 685

Whilst our analysis supports forest and woodland conservation arguments, the opportunity costs of 686 687 conservation include agricultural yields foregone and any one-off revenues from clearing forest 688 cover, as well as the management costs of forest protection (Green et al. 2012). Importantly, this 689 trade-off involves vulnerable people in urban and rural areas: conservation may help to deliver safe 690 water to urban dwellers downstream, but may limit food security of the rural population upstream 691 (Fisher et al. 2011). One option to address this trade-off would be to set up a payments for 692 ecosystem/watershed services scheme, where urban beneficiaries, or the intermediate water supply 693 companies, pay rural populations for improved forest maintenance. Existing pilots of such schemes 694 in Tanzania provide mixed results: after two pilots in the Uluguru Mountains (Lopa et al. 2012), the 695 attempts have lapsed, but the two pilot periods in the East Usambara Mountains have resulted in 696 some continuation of payments from the Tanga water company to upstream stakeholders (Kaczan et 697 al. 2011).

# 698 **5. Conclusion**

699 Dar es Salaam's population is rapidly increasing. This urbanisation process will further exacerbate 700 the already stressed water situation in the city. Population growth combined with an expected 701 increase in the number of middle-income households will increase demand for piped water, which 702 will put even more pressure on the Government's obligation to provide potable water. Our analysis 703 has demonstrated that the poorest households are most affected by failure to provide reliable tap 704 water. Richer families not only enjoy the cheaper piped water, but they also have access to less 705 expensive substitutes in case of short water supply failure. The poorest families are unlikely to be 706 able to absorb the price hikes that occur when water is rationed, which would account for a 707 considerable portion of annual income (Smiley 2013). They may therefore be forced to use lower 708 quality water sources or less water.

709

Our study shows that sustainable management of catchment forests and woodlands, especially in
 the mountains, is crucial for the health and wellbeing of people living downstream. Our integrated
 modelling approach considers the seasonal variation of rainfall in the Ruvu catchment, showing that

- voody habitats play a significant role in regulating sediment load in rivers and reducing peak flows in
- high rainfall events. This has implications for the reliability of public water supply to Dar es Salaam
- and Morogoro from the Ruvu River. Retaining the forest and woodlands can help avoid costly
- deterioration in the public water supply to these two cities. This message aligns with the results of
   De Risi et al. (2018), who find that to avoid flood damages in Dar es Salaam, rehabilitation of the
- 718 Msimbazi River catchment would have higher net benefits and a shorter payback period than other
- 719 mitigation measures. Based on a combination of SWAT modelling and cost-based valuation, we find
- 720 that the estimated cost savings of forest conservation under water treatment work conditions up to
- 721 2016 amount to USD 4.6-17.6 million per year for Dar es Salaam's population. An estimated
- additional cost saving of USD 308 thousand per year for maintenance of the Mindu Dam, which
- provides potable water to the population of Morogoro, could be realised by conservation of Ruvu's
- 724 forests and woodlands.
- 725
- 726
- 727

#### 728 Acknowledgements

- This work formed part of the Valuing the Arc programme, which was supported by the Leverhulme
- 730 Trust (UK) and the Packard Foundation (USA). Additional funding was provided by the Eastern Arc
- 731 Mountains Conservation Endowment Fund (EAMCEF). The authors wish to honour the memory
- 732 Professor Sue White, who sadly passed away during the programme.
- 733

#### 734 **References**

735 AAW, 2012. Mindu Dam Design Report: Improvement of Water Supply and Sewerage Services in 736 Morogoro Municipality. Morogoro Tanzania: AAW Consulting Engineers. 737 738 AfDB, OECD, UNDP (African Development Bank, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and 739 Development and United Nations Development Programme), 2014. African economic 740 outlook 2014. Global value chains and Africa's industrialisation. 741 742 Africa Time, 2015. Water pumps valued at USD140000 to reduce Dar City water rationing. Available: 743 http://en.africatime.com/articles/water-pumps-valued-usd140000-reduce-dar-city-water-744 rationing. [Accessed 11/05/2017] 745 746 Anderson, P. M., Okereke, C., Rudd, A., Parnell, S., 2013. Regional assessment of Africa, in: Elmqvist, 747 T., Fragkias, M., Goodness, J., Güneralp, B., Marcotullio, P.J., McDonald, R.I., Parnell, S., 748 Schewenius, M., Sendstad, M., Seto, K. C. and Wilkinson, C. (Eds), Urbanization, biodiversity 749 and ecosystem services: Challenges and opportunities: a global assessment. Springer, 750 Dordrecht, pp. 453-459. 751 752 Arnaud, P., Bouvier, C., Cisneros, L., Dominguez, R., 2002. Influence of rainfall spatial variability on 753 flood prediction. Journal of Hydrology, 260(1), 216-230. 754 755 Arnold, J., Kiniry, J., Srinivasan, R., Williams, J., Haney, E., Neitsch, S., 2011. Soil and Water 756 Assessment Tool input/output file documentation: Version 2009. Texas Water resources 757 institute technical report, 365. 758 759 Ashagre, B.B., 2009. SWAT to identify watershed management options: Anjeni watershed, Blue Nile 760 basin, Ethiopia. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Cornell University, Cornell. 761 762 Ashagre, B.B., White, S., Balmford, A., Burgess, N., Matalo, F., Mwakalila, S., Platts, P., Schaafsma, 763 M., Smith, C., Swetnam, R., 2014. Water to Everyone. The Arc Journal, (29), 15-18. 764 765 Bagstad, K., Villa, F., Batker, D., Harrison-Cox, J., Voigt, B., Johnson, G., 2014. From theoretical to 766 actual ecosystem services: mapping beneficiaries and spatial flows in ecosystem service 767 assessments. Ecology and Society, 19(2). 768 769 Baker, T.J., Miller, S.N., 2013. Using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) to assess land use 770 impact on water resources in an East African watershed. Journal of Hydrology, 486, 100-111. 771 772 Balmford, A., Fisher, B., Green, R.E., Naidoo, R., Strassburg, B., Turner, R.K., Rodrigues, A.S., 2011. 773 Bringing ecosystem services into the real world: an operational framework for assessing the 774 economic consequences of losing wild nature. Environmental and Resource Economics, 775 48(2), 161-175. 776 777 Bayliss, K., Tukai, R., 2011. Services and supply chains: The role of the domestic private sector in 778 water service delivery in Tanzania. United Nations Development Programme. 779 780 Betrie, G.D., Mohamed, Y.A., van Griensven, A., Srinivasan, R., 2011. Sediment management 781 modelling in the Blue Nile Basin using SWAT model. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 782 15(3), 807. 783

784 785 786	Brauman, K.A., 2015. Freshwater, in: Potschin, M., Haines-Young, R., Fish, R., Turner, R.K. (Eds.), Routledge Handbook of Ecosystem Services. Routledge, pp. 374-382.
787 788 789	Brikké, F., Vairavamoorthy, K., 2016. Managing Change to Implement Integrated Urban Water Management in African Cities. <i>Aquatic Procedia</i> , 6, 3-14.
790 791 792	Bruijnzeel, L.A., 2004. Hydrological functions of tropical forests: not seeing the soil for the trees? Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 104(1), 185-228.
793 794 795	Burgess, N., Doggart, N., Lovett, J.C., 2002. The Uluguru Mountains of eastern Tanzania: the effect of forest loss on biodiversity. <i>Oryx</i> , <i>36</i> (2), 140-152.
796 797 798 799 800	Burgess, N.D., Butynski, T.M., Cordeiro, N.J., Doggart, N.H., Fjeldså, J., Howell, K.M., Kilahama, F.B., Loader, S.P., Lovett, J.C., Mbilinyi, B., Menegon, M., Moyer, D.C., Nashanda, E., Perkin, A., Rovero, F., Stanley, W.T., Stuart, S.N., 2007. The biological importance of the Eastern Arc Mountains of Tanzania and Kenya. <i>Biological Conservation, 134</i> (2), 209-231.
801 802 803	Campbell, E.T., Tilley, D.R., 2014. Valuing ecosystem services from Maryland forests using environmental accounting. <i>Ecosystem Services</i> , 7, 141-151.
804 805 806 807	Coffey, M.E., Workman, S.R., Taraba, J.L., Fogle, A.W., 2004. Statistical procedures for evaluating daily and monthly hydrologic model predictions. <i>Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, 47</i> (1), 59-68.
808 809	Cole, M.A., 2004. Economic growth and water use. Applied Economics Letters, 11, 1-4.
810 811 812 813	Collier, S., Stockman, L., Hicks, L., Garrison, L., Zhou, F., Beach, M., 2012. Direct healthcare costs of selected diseases primarily or partially transmitted by water. <i>Epidemiology &amp; Infection</i> , 140(11), 2003-2013.
814 815 816 817	Committee (on Standardization of Reference Evapotranspiration), 2002. The ASCE standardized reference evapotranspiration equation. <i>Environmental and Water Resources Institute of The American Society of Civil Engineers</i> .
817 818 819 820	Conway, D., Mittal, N., Vincent, K., 2017. Future Climate Projections for Tanzania. Future for Climate Africa.
821 822 823	Cui, X., Graf, H.F., Langmann, B., Chen, W., Huang, R., 2007. Hydrological impacts of deforestation on the southeast Tibetan Plateau. <i>Earth Interactions</i> , <i>11</i> (15).
824 825 826 827	Cumming, G.S., Buerkert, A., Hoffmann, E.M., Schlecht, E., von Cramon-Taubadel, S., Tscharntke, T., 2014. Implications of agricultural transitions and urbanization for ecosystem services. <i>Nature, 515</i> , 50.
828 829 830 831	Cunha, D.G.F., Sabogal-Paz, L.P. and Dodds, W.K., 2016. Land use influence on raw surface water quality and treatment costs for drinking supply in São Paulo State (Brazil). <i>Ecological Engineering, 94</i> , 516-524.
832 833 834	<ul> <li>Daily, G.C., Polasky, S., Goldstein, J., Kareiva, P.M., Mooney, H.A., Pejchar, L., Ricketts, T.H., Salzman, J., Shallenberger, R., 2009. Ecosystem services in decision making: time to deliver. <i>Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment</i>, 7(1), 21-28.</li> </ul>

835	
836	DAWASCO (Dar es Salaam Water and Sanitation Corporation), 2013. DAWASCO Water Tarrifs,
837	Available: <a href="http://www.dawasco.com/tarrifs.php">http://www.dawasco.com/tarrifs.php</a> [Accessed 09/10 2015].
838	
839	De Risi, R., De Paola, F., Turpie, J., Kroeger, T., 2018. Life Cycle Cost and Return on Investment as
840	complementary decision variables for urban flood risk management in developing countries.
841	International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 28, 88-106.
842	
843	Dennedy-Frank, P.J., Muenich, R.L., Chaubey, I., Ziv, G., 2016. Comparing two tools for ecosystem
844	service assessments regarding water resources decisions. Journal of Environmental
845	Management, 177, 331-340.
846	
847	Dessu, S.B., Melesse, A.M., 2013. Impact and uncertainties of climate change on the hydrology of the
848	Mara River basin, Kenya/Tanzania. Hydrological Processes, 27(20), 2973-2986.
849	
850	Dile, Y.T., Srinivasan, R., 2014. Evaluation of CFSR climate data for hydrologic prediction in data-
851	scarce watersheds: an application in the Blue Nile River Basin. JAWRA Journal of the
852	American Water Resources Association, 50(5), 1226-1241.
853	
854	Dos Santos, S., Adams, E. A., Neville, G., Wada, Y., de Sherbinin, A., Mullin Bernhardt, E. and Adamo,
855	S. B. (2017) Urban growth and water access in sub-Saharan Africa: Progress, challenges, and
856	emerging research directions. Science of The Total Environment, 607-608, pp. 497-508.
857	
858	Dupont, D.P., Jahan, N., 2012. Defensive spending on tap water substitutes: the value of reducing
859	perceived health risks. Journal of Water and Health, 10(1), 56-68.
860	
861	Easton, Z., Fuka, D., White, E., Collick, A., Ashagre, B., McCartney, M., Awulachew, S., Ahmed, A.,
862	Steenhuis, T., 2010. A multi basin SWAT model analysis of runoff and sedimentation in the
863	Blue Nile, Ethiopia. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 14(10), 1827-1841.
864	
865	Ellison, D., N Futter, M., Bishop, K., 2012. On the forest cover–water yield debate: from demand-to
866	supply-side thinking. Global Change Biology, 18(3), 806-820.
867	
868	EWURA, 2013. Water Utilities Performance Report 2012/13: Regional Water Utilities and DAWASCO
869	Energy and Water Utilities Regulatory Authority (EWURA). Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
870	
871	Fisher, B., Lewis, S.L., Burgess, N.D., Malimbwi, R.E., Munishi, P.K., Swetnam, R.D., Turner, R.K.,
872	Willcock, S., Balmford, A., 2011. Implementation and opportunity costs of reducing
873	deforestation and forest degradation in Tanzania. Nature Climate Change, 1(3), 161.
874	
875	Fisher, J.R.B., Acosta, E.A., Dennedy-Frank, P.J., Kroeger, T., Boucher, T.M., 2017. Impact of satellite
876	imagery spatial resolution on land use classification accuracy and modeled water quality.
877	Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation, 1-13.
878	
879	Francesconi, W., Srinivasan, R., Pérez-Miñana, E., Willcock, S.P., Quintero, M., 2016. Using the Soil
880	and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) to model ecosystem services: A systematic review.
881	Journal of Hydrology, 535, 625-636.
882	
883	GLOWS-FIU, 2014. Climate, Forest Cover, and Water Resources Vulnerability: Wami/Ruvu Basin,
884	Tanzania. Miami, Florida, USA: Florida International University.
885	

886 887 888 889 890	<ul> <li>Gómez-Baggethun, E., Gren, Å., Barton, D.N., Langemeyer, J., McPhearson, T., O'Farrell, P.,</li> <li>Andersson, E., Hamstead, Z., Kremer, P., 2013. Urban ecosystem services, in: Elmqvist, T.,</li> <li>Fragkias, M., Goodness, J., Güneralp, B., Marcotullio, P.J., McDonald, R.I., Parnell, S.,</li> <li>Schewenius, M., Sendstad, M., Seto, K.C., Wilkinson, C. (Eds), Urbanization, biodiversity and</li> <li>ecosystem services: Challenges and opportunities. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 175-251.</li> </ul>
891 892 893 894	Gondwe, E., 2000. Sediment Transport of Ruvu River in Tanzania. <i>Discovery and Innovation, 12</i> (3-4), 118-127.
895 896 897 898	Grayson, R.B., Finlayson, B.L., Gippel, C.J., Hart, B.T., 1996. The Potential of Field Turbidity Measurements for the Computation of Total Phosphorus and Suspended Solids Loads. Journal of Environmental Management, 47(3), 257-267.
899 900 901 902	Green, J.M., Burgess, N.D., Green, R.E., Madoffe, S.S., Munishi, P.K., Nashanda, E., Turner, R.K., Balmford, A., 2012. Estimating management costs of protected areas: a novel approach from the Eastern Arc Mountains, Tanzania. <i>Biological Conservation</i> , <i>150</i> (1), 5-14.
903 904 905 906	<ul> <li>Green, J.M., Larrosa, C., Burgess, N.D., Balmford, A., Johnston, A., Mbilinyi, B.P., Platts, P.J., Coad, L., 2013. Deforestation in an African biodiversity hotspot: Extent, variation and the effectiveness of protected areas. <i>Biological Conservation</i>, 164, 62-72.</li> </ul>
907 908 909 910	Guswa, A.J., Brauman, K.A., Brown, C., Hamel, P., Keeler, B.L., Sayre, S.S., 2014. Ecosystem services: Challenges and opportunities for hydrologic modeling to support decision making. <i>Water</i> <i>Resources Research, 50</i> (5), 4535-4544.
911 912 913 914	Haase, D., Tötzer, T., 2012. Urban–rural linkages—analysing, modelling, and understanding drivers, pressures, and impacts of land use changes along the rural-to-urban gradient. <i>Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design</i> , <i>39</i> ,194-197.
915 916 917 918	Hall, J., Burgess, N.D., Lovett, J., Mbilinyi, B., Gereau, R.E., 2009. Conservation implications of deforestation across an elevational gradient in the Eastern Arc Mountains, Tanzania. <i>Biological Conservation</i> , 142(11), 2510-2521.
918 919 920	Hathout, S.A., 1983. Soil atlas of Tanzania. Tanzania Publishing House.
921 922 923	Heckmann, M., 2014. Farmers, smelters and caravans: Two thousand years of land use and soil erosion in North Pare, NE Tanzania. <i>Catena, 113,</i> 187-201.
924 925 926 927	Heuvelmans, G., Muys, B., Feyen, J., 2004. Evaluation of hydrological model parameter transferability for simulating the impact of land use on catchment hydrology. <i>Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C, 29</i> (11), 739-747.
928 929 930	Holmes, T.P., 1988. The offsite impact of soil erosion on the water treatment industry. <i>Land Economics, 64</i> (4), 356-366.
931 932 933 934	Huisman, J., Breuer, L., Eckhardt, K., Frede, HG., 2003. Spatial consistency of automatically calibrated SWAT simulations in the Dill catchment and three of its sub-catchments, in: <i>Proceedings of the 2nd International SWAT Conference</i> , pp. 1-4.
935 936	Hutchinson, M., 1999. ANUSPLIN User Guide Version 4.0 Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies. Australian National University, Canberra.

937	
938 939 940	IFRC (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies), 2011. <i>Disaster relief emergency fund (DREF) Tanzania: floods</i> , Available: <u>http://www.ifrc.org/docs/appeals/11/MDRTZ013.pdf</u> [Accessed 11 October 2015].
941 942 943 944	IPS (Inter Press Service), 2009. <i>TANZANIA: Solutions to Dar's Water Problems in the Pipeline</i> , Available: <u>http://www.ipsnews.net/2009/08/tanzania-solutions-to-dar39s-water-problems- in-the-pipeline/ [Accessed 09/10/2015].</u>
945 946 947	Itani, J. (1998) Evaluation of an Indigenous Farming Systems in the Matengo Highlands, Tanzania, and Its Sustainability.
948 949 950 951 952	JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency), 2013. <i>The Study on Water Resource Management and Development in Wami/Ruvu Basin in the United Republic of Tanzania</i> : Japan International Cooperation Agency.
953 954 955	Kaczan D., Swallow B., Adamowicz W.L., Vihemäki H., 2012. Designing an incentive programme to reduce on-farm deforestation in the East Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. ICRAF Working Paper no 145, Nairobi, World Agroforestry Centre.
956 957 958 959	Kalugendo, P., 2008. Impacts of climate variability on ground water in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. in: Proceedings of the International Conference Groundwater and Climate in Africa, Kampala, Uganda, pp 52.
960 961 962	Kato, M., 2001. Intensive cultivation and environment use among the Matengo in Tanzania. <i>African Study Monographs, 22</i> (2), 73-92.
963 964 965 966 967 968	Keeler, B.L., Polasky, S., Brauman, K.A., Johnson, K.A., Finlay, J.C., O'Neill, A., Kovacs, K., Dalzell, B., 2012. Linking water quality and well-being for improved assessment and valuation of ecosystem services. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> , 109(45), 18619- 18624.
969 970 971 972 973	Kimaro, D., Msanya, B., Mwango, S., Kimbi, G., Kileo, E., 2001. <i>Soils and Land Resources Report of Morogoro Urban District, Tanzania</i> . Land resources inventory and suitability assessment for the production of the major crops in the eastern part of Morogoro rural district, Tanzania. Department of Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Sokoine University of Agriculture.
974 975 976 977	Kimaro, D.N., Poesen, J., Msanya, B.M., Deckers, J.A., 2008. Magnitude of soil erosion on the northern slope of the Uluguru Mountains, Tanzania: Interrill and rill erosion. <i>Catena, 75</i> (1), 38-44.
978 979 980	Kjellén, M., 2006. From public pipes to private hands: Water access and distribution in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Unpublished.
981 982 983	Larsen, T. A., Hoffmann, S., Lüthi, C., Truffer, B. and Maurer, M. (2016) Emerging solutions to the water challenges of an urbanizing world. <i>Science</i> , <i>352</i> (6288), pp. 928-933.
984 985 986	Lele, S., 2009. Watershed services of tropical forests: from hydrology to economic valuation to integrated analysis. <i>Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability</i> , 1(2), 148-155.

987	Lopa, D., Mwanyoka, I., Jambiya, G., Massoud, T., Harrison, P., Ellis-Jones, M., Blomley, T., Leimona,
988	B., van Noordwijk, M., Burgess, N.D., 2012. Towards operational payments for water
989	ecosystem services in Tanzania: a case study from the Uluguru Mountains. Oryx, 46(01), 34-
990	44.
991	
992	Lundgren, B., 1978. Soil conditions and nutrient cycling under natural and plantation forests in
993	Tanzanian hiahlands. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.
994	
995	Maes, J., Egoh, B., Willemen, L., Liquete, C., Vihervaara, P., Schägner, J. P., Grizzetti, B., Drakou, F.G.,
996	La Notte, A., Zulian, G., 2012, Mapping ecosystem services for policy support and decision
997	making in the European Union <i>Ecosystem Services</i> 1(1) 31-39
998	
999	Mango I M Melesse A M McClain M F Gann D Setegn S G 2011 Hydro-meteorology and
1000	water budget of the Mara River Basin under land use change scenarios in: Melesse A M
1000	(Ed.) Nile Piver Pasin: Hydrology, Climate and Water Use, Springer, 20-68
1001	(Lu.), Mile River Bushi, Hydrology, Chinate and Water Ose. Springer, 55-08.
1002	Mhagani L. Kwasha L. Urassa C. Nyaki A. 2005 Suitability Assassment of Sails and Climate for
1005	Wibogolli, J., Kwacila, J., Olassa, G., Nyaki, A., 2005. Sullability Assessibility of Solis and Climate Joi
1004	Production off rende Passsion fruit at Mphi Parmi Kibana District, Coast Region. Tanga,
1005	Tanzania. Minigano Agricultural Research Institute.
1005	McDanald D.L. Marastullia, D.L. Günavala, D. 2012, Urbanization and alphal transfer in his diversity
1007	McDonaid, R.I., Marcotullio, P.J., Guneralp, B., 2013. Orbanization and global trends in biodiversity
1008	and ecosystem services, in: Eimqvist, T., Fragkias, M., Goodness, J., Guneralp, B.,
1009	Marcotullio, P.J., McDonaid, R.I., Parnell, S., Schewenius, M., Sendstad, M., Seto, K.C.,
1010	Wilkinson, C. (Eds), Urbanization, biodiversity and ecosystem services: Challenges and
1011	opportunities: a giobal assessment. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 31-52.
1012	
1013	Meena, H., Sharif, S., 2008. Analysis of Technical and Policy Options for Adaptation to Consequences
1014	of Climate Change for Tanzania. Gender, Poverty, and Food Security in Relation to Climate
1015	Change Impact and Adaptation, a case of Kilimanjaro Region. Netherlands Climate Change
1016	Assistance Programme (NCAP), Tanzania, 432-468.
1017	
1018	Moriasi, D.N., Arnold, J.G., Van Liew, M.W., Bingner, R.L., Harmel, R.D., Veith, T.L., 2007. Model
1019	evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations.
1020	Transactions of the ASABE, 50(3), 885-900.
1021	
1022	MORUWASA (Morogoro Urban Water and Sewerage Authority), 2017. MORUWASA'S Strategic Plan
1023	Matrix for 2007/2008 – 2021/2022, Available:
1024	http://moruwasa.go.tz/downloads/Moruwasa%20Stategic%20Plan%20Matrix%20form.pdf
1025	[Accessed 12/12 2017].
1026	
1027	MORUWASA (Morogoro Urban Water and Sewerage Authority), 2009. Annual Progress Report July
1028	2008 to June 2009. Morogoro Urban Water and Sewerage Authority, Morogoro, Tanzania.
1029	
1030	Msanya, B., Kimaro, D., Kileo, E., Kimbi, G., Munisi, A.M., 2001. Soils and Land Resources Report of
1031	Morogoro Urban District, Tanzania. Land resources inventory and suitability assessment for
1032	the production of the major crops in the eastern part of Morogoro rural district, Tanzania:
1033	Department of Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Sokonie University of Agriculture.
1034	
1035	Mtoni, Y.E., Mjemah, I., Msindai, K., Van Camp, M., Walraevens, K., 2012. Saltwater intrusion in the
1036	Quaternary aquifer of the Dar es Salaam region, Tanzania. Geologica Belgica, 15(1-2), 16-25.
1037	

1038	Mwakalila, S., 2007. Residents' perceptions of institutional performance in water supply in Dar es
1039	Salaam. Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C, 32(15), 1285-1290.
1040	
1041	National Bureau of Statistics, 2009. Household Budget Survey 2007 - Final Report. National Bureau of
1042	Statistics, Tanzania.
1043	
1044	National Water Policy, 2002. Ministry of Water and Livestock Development. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
1045	
1046	Natkhin, M., Dietrich, O., Schäfer, M.P., Lischeid, G., 2015. The effects of climate and changing land
1047	use on the discharge regime of a small catchment in Tanzania. Regional Environmental
1048	Change, 15(7), 1269-1280.
1049	
1050	Nauges, C., Whittington, D., 2010. Estimation of water demand in developing countries: An
1051	overview. The World Bank Research Observer, 25(2), 263-294.
1052	
1053	Ndomba, P., Mtalo, F., Killingtyeit, A., 2008. SWAT model application in a data scarce tropical
1054	complex catchment in Tanzania. Physics and Chemistry of the Earth. Parts A/B/C. 33(8), 626-
1055	632
1056	002.
1057	Neitsch S Arnold I Kiniry I Williams I King K 2005 Soil and water assessment tool theoretical
1058	documentation Grassland Soil and Water Research Laboratory Temple TY
1050	documentation. Grassiand. Son und Water Research Laboratory, Temple, TX.
1059	Noitech S.L. Arnold J.C. Kininy J.P. Williams J.P. 2011 Soil and water assessment tool theoretical
1000	decumentation version 2000 Town Weter Descurses lastitute
1061	accumentation version 2009. Texas water Resources Institute.
1062	No. 2010 2002 Constanting the discription of Action Constants of Action Action
1063	Newmark, W.D., 2002. Conserving blodiversity in East African forests: a study of the Eastern Arc
1064	Mountains. Springer Science & Business Media.
1065	
1066	Ngana, J., Mahay, F., Cross, K., 2010. <i>Ruvu Basin: A situation analysis,</i> IUCN.
1067	
1068	Nganyanyuka, K., Martinez, J., Wesselink, A., Lungo, J.H., Georgiadou, Y., 2014. Accessing water
1069	services in Dar es Salaam: Are we counting what counts? <i>Habitat International, 44</i> , 358-366.
1070	
1071	Ngonyani, C.J., Nkotagu, H.H., 2007. Study of nutrient pollutants and their impacts on the water
1072	quality of the Mindu reservoir at Morogoro. College of Engineering and Technology
1073	University of Dar es Salaam, pp. 139.
1074	
1075	Nicholson, S.E., 1996. A review of climate dynamics and climate variability in Eastern Africa, in:
1076	Johnson, T.C., Odada, E.O., <i>The limnology, climatology and paleoclimatology of the East</i>
1077	African lakes. Gordon and Breach Publishers, pp. 25-56.
1078	
1079	Nobert, J., Skinner, J., 2016. Meeting future demand for drinking water supply in Dar es Salaam:
1080	Hydrological modelling of the Ruyu River and assessment of flows. IIED Working Paper.
1081	London: IIED.
1082	
1083	Noll, R., Shirley, M.M., Cowan, S., 2000, Reforming urban water systems in developing countries, in
108/	Krueger $\Delta \cap$ (Ed.) Economic nolicy reform: The second stage on 2/2-280
1025	Macger, n.o. (Ea.), Economic policy rejoint. The second stage, pp. 245-205.
1005	Notter B. Hurni H. Wiesmann II. Abhasnour K. 2012 Modelling water provision as an ecosystem
1000	service in a large East African river basin. Hudrology and Easth System Sciences (16/1), 60.96
1007	service in a large last Annean river basin. Hydrology und Eurth System Sciences, 10(1), 09-00.
T000	

1089 1090	Nyeko, M., 2015. Hydrologic modelling of data scarce basin with SWAT model: capabilities and limitations. <i>Water Resources Management, 29</i> (1), 81-94.
1091	
1092	Office of the Chief Government Statistician, 2013. Population and Housing Census: Population
1093	Distribution by Administrative Units; Key findings. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: National Bureau
1094	of Statistics (NBS) and Office of the Chief Government Statistician.
1095	
1096	Ogallo, L., 1989. The spatial and temporal patterns of the East African seasonal rainfall derived from
1097	principal component analysis. International Journal of Climatology, 9(2), 145-167.
1098	
1099	Pandeya, B., Buytaert, W., Zulkafli, Z., Karpouzoglou, T., Mao, F., Hannah, D., 2016. A comparative
1100	analysis of ecosystem services valuation approaches for application at the local scale and in
1101	data scarce regions. Ecosystem Services, 22, 250-259.
1102	
1103	Platts, P. J., Burgess, N.D., Gereau, R.E., Lovett, J.C., Marshall, A.R., McClean, C.J., Pellikka, P.K.E.,
1104	Swetnam, R.D., Marchant, R., 2011. Delimiting tropical mountain ecoregions for
1105	conservation. Environmental Conservation, 38(3), 312-324.
1106	
1107	Ponette-González, A.G., Brauman, K.A., Marín-Spiotta, E., Farley, K.A., Weathers, K.C., Young, K.R.,
1108	Curran, L.M., 2015. Managing water services in tropical regions: From land cover proxies to
1109	hydrologic fluxes. Ambio, 44(5), 367-375.
1110	
1111	Reweta, W., Sampath, R., 2000. Performance evaluation of urban water supply in Tanzania: the case
1112	of Dar es Salaam city. International Journal of Water Resources Development, 16(3), 407-
1113	421.
1114	
1115	Römkens, M.L. Helming, K., Prasad, S., 2002, Soil erosion under different rainfall intensities, surface
1116	roughness, and soil water regimes. <i>Catena</i> , 46(2), 103-123
1117	
1118	Rostanshova, O., Roumis, D., Duthie, M., Alwang, L. 2014, Impacts of an urban water system
1119	investment on health well-being and noverty in: 11 <sup>th</sup> Annual IWREC Meeting, World Bank
1120	Headquarters Washington D C
1120	neudquarters, washington b.e.
1122	Rovero E. Menegon M. Fieldså I. Collett I. Doggart N. Leonard C. Norton G. Owen N.
1122	Perkin A Spitale D 2014 Targeted vertebrate surveys enhance the faunal importance and
1123	improve evplanatory models within the Eastern Arc Mountains of Kenya and Tanzania
1124	Diversity and Distributions 20(12) 1428-1449
1125	Diversity und Distributions, 20(12), 1438-1449.
1120	Peraria D.F. Oduar D. Katahman L. Kangas M. 2016. Quantifying Spatiatemporal Change in
1127	Rozano, P.F., Oduor, P., Koloninan, L., Kangas, W., 2010. Quantifying Spatiolemporal Change in
1128	Landuse and Land Cover and Accessing Water Quality. A Case Study of Missouri Watershed
1129	James Sub-Region, North Dakota. Journal of Geographic Information System, 8(06), 663.
1130	Cabin V, Hall MJ, 4000. The offerstand of offerentiation and deferentiation an unstanyields. Journal of
1131	Sanin, V., Hall, M.J., 1996. The effects of afforestation and deforestation on water yields. <i>Journal of</i>
1132	Hydrology, 178(1), 293-309.
1133	
1134	Salman, M., Martinez, A., 2015. Water for agriculture and energy, in: Martin-Ortega, J., Ferrier, R.C.,
1135	Gordon, I.J. and Khan, S. (Eds.), Water Ecosystem Services: A Global Perspective. Cambridge
1136	University Press, pp. 35-45.
1137	
1138	Schaarsma, IVI., Ferrini, S., Harwood, A. R., Bateman, I.J., 2015. The first United Kingdom's national
1138	ecosystem assessment and beyond, in: Martin-Ortega, J., Ferrier, R.C., Gordon, I.J. and Khan,

1140 1141	S. (Eds.), Water Ecosystem Services: A Global Perspective. Cambridge University Press, pp. 73-81.
1142	Chamber A.N. Milliams J.D. 1000 EDIC English /Durdustivity Juneart Calculatory Technical bulletin
1143	Sharpley, A.N., Williams, J.R., 1990. EPIC, Erosion/Productivity impact Calculator. <i>Technical bulletin</i>
1144	(USA).
1145	Channel K. Massarta D. Thannes A. Jackson D. Cashy D. Francett D. James J. 2017. Comparing
1146	Sharps, K., Masante, D., Thomas, A., Jackson, B., Cosby, B., Emmett, B., Jones, L., 2017. Comparing
1147	strengths and weaknesses of three ecosystem services modelling tools in a diverse UK river
1148	catchment. Science of The Total Environment, 584-585, 118-130.
1149	Carilley, C.L. 2012, Consulty the efforts and a construction of Calegory, Tennenia, Applied Consumpty, 41
1150	Smiley, S.L., 2013. Complexities of water access in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Applied Geography, 41,
1151	132-138.
1152	
1153	Speliman, F. R. (2008) Handbook of water and wastewater treatment plant operations, CRC Press.
1154	Conserver, D. Jankin, D.N. 1000. The development of the Javan Marste Diver Anne of the United
1155	Spooner, R., Jenkin, R.N., 1966. The development of the lower Nigeta River Area of the United
1156	Republic of Tanzania. Land Resources Division, Directorate of Overseas Surveys, England.
1157	
1158	Stniannopkao, S., Takizawa, S., Homewong, J., Wirojanagud, W., 2007. Soli erosion and its impacts on
1159	water treatment in the northeastern provinces of Thailand. Environment International,
1160	33(5), 706-711.
1161	
1162	Swetnam, R., Fisher, B., Mbilinyi, B., Munishi, P., Willcock, S., Ricketts, T., Mwakalila, S., Balmford, A.,
1163	Burgess, N., Marshall, A., 2011. Mapping socio-economic scenarios of land cover change: A
1164	GIS method to enable ecosystem service modelling. Journal of Environmental Management,
1165	92(3), 563-574.
1166	
1167	Terrado, M., Acuna, V., Ennaanay, D., Tallis, H., Sabater, S., 2014. Impact of climate extremes on
1168	hydrological ecosystem services in a heavily humanized Mediterranean basin. <i>Ecological</i>
1169	Indicators, 37, 199-209.
1170	
11/1	Inompson, J., Porras, I.I., Wood, E., Tumwine, J.K., Mujwanuzi, M.R., Katui-Katua, M., Jonnstone, N.,
11/2	2000. Walting at the tap: Changes in urban water use in East Africa over three decades.
11/3	Environment and Urbanization, 12(2), 37-52.
11/4	
11/5	Unrich, M.A., Bragg, H.M., 2003. Monitoring instream turbiaity to estimate continuous suspendea-
11/6	sealment loads and yields and clay-water volumes in the upper North Santiam River Basin,
11//	Oregon, 1998-2000.
11/8	
11/9	Uwasi, 2010. Water prices in Dar es Salaam Do Water klosks comply with official tariffs? Policy brief
1180	12.09/2010E. Released September 2010. Owasi, Dar es Salaam, Tanzahla.
1181	
1182	Van Camp, M., Mtoni, Y., Mjemah, I.C., Bakundukize, C., Walraevens, K., 2014. Investigating
1183	seawater intrusion due to groundwater pumping with schematic model simulations: The
1184	example of the Dar es Salaam coastal aquifer in Tanzania. Journal of African Earth Sciences,
1185	96, /1-/8.
1186	
1187	van der Ploeg, S., De Groot, R., 2010. The TEEB Valuation Database–a searchable database of 1310
1188	estimates of monetary values of ecosystem services. <i>Foundation for Sustainable</i>
1189	Development, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
1190	

1191 1192	van Griensven, A., Popescu, I., Abdelhamid, M., Ndomba, P.M., Beevers, L., Betrie, G.D., 2013. Comparison of sediment transport computations using hydrodynamic versus hydrologic
1193	models in the Simiyu River in Tanzania. <i>Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C, 61</i> ,
1194	12-21.
1195	
1196	Vigerstol, K.L., Aukema, J.E., 2011. A comparison of tools for modeling freshwater ecosystem
1197	services. Journal of Environmental Management, 92(10), 2403-2409.
1198	NULL AND AND A CONTRACTOR DE DES CONTRACTOR AND A CONTRAC
1199	Villamagna, A.M., Angermeier, P.L., Bennett, E.M., 2013. Capacity, pressure, demand, and flow: A
1200	conceptual framework for analyzing ecosystem service provision and delivery. <i>Ecological</i>
1201	Complexity, 15, 114-121.
1202	
1203	Vogl, A.L., Bryant, B.P., Hunink, J.E., Wolny, S., Apse, C., Droogers, P., 2017. Valuing investments in
1204	sustainable land management in the Upper Tana River basin, Kenya. Journal of
1205	Environmental Management, 195, 78-91.
1206	
1207	Wambura, F.J., Ndomba, P.M., Kongo, V., Tumbo, S.D., 2015. Uncertainty of runoff projections under
1208	changing climate in Wami River sub-basin. Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies, 4, 333-
1209	348.
1210	
1211	WaterAid-Tanzania, Tearfund, 2003. Water reforms and PSP in Dar es Salaam: New Rules, New
1212	Roles: Does PSP Benefit the Poor? WaterAid-Tanzania.
1213	
1214	Williams, J.R., Singh, V., 1995. The EPIC model. <i>Computer models of watershed hydrology</i> , 909-1000.
1215	
1216	Wischmeir, W.H., 1965. Predicting Rainfall-Erosion Losses from Cropland East of the Rocky
1217	Mountain, Guide for Selection of Practices for Soil and Water Conservation. Agricultural
1218	handbook, 282.
1219	
1220	Yanda, P.Z., Munishi, P., 2007. Hydrologic and land use/cover change analysis for the Ruvu River
1221	(Uluguru) and Sigi River (East Usambara) watersheds. WWF/CARE Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
1222	
1223	Zivin, J. G., Neidell, M., Schlenker, W., 2011, Water quality violations and avoidance behavior:
1224	Evidence from bottled water consumption. American Economic Review 101(3) 448-53
1005	
1225	

## 1226 Appendix 1. Soil, land cover and rainfall data

1227

#### 1228 Soil data

1229 The Ruvu catchment (Figure 1) lies between 37<sup>o</sup> 16' E – 38<sup>o</sup> 57' E and 7<sup>o</sup> 48' S - 6<sup>o</sup> 26' S. The Ruvu

1230 catchment has 16 different types of soils (Hathout 1983); much of the catchment has a sandy clay

loam soil texture that covers almost the entire Uluguru Mountains, while the lower elevation with a

- 1232 gentle slope in the catchment has a loamy fine sand texture. Most soil types are sensitive to soil
- 1233 erosion due to their texture. The Mindu Reservoir is located located 500 m above sea level, between
- latitudes 6°51' S to 6°52' S and longitudes 37°30' E to 37°40' E, southeast of the Ngerengere River.
   The drainage area to Mindu Reservoir measures 30,800 ha and is largely mountainous with a slope
- 1235 The drainage area to Mindu Reservoir measures 30,800 ha and is largely mountainous with a slope 1236 greater than 15% covering 46% of the area, and areas with a slope less than 6% covering 37% of the
- 1237 area.



12381239 Figure A1.1: Soil map of the Ruvu catchment based on Hathout (1983)

1239

Table A1.1. Ruvu soil map and profile details based on Hathout (1983), Kimaro et al. (2001), Lundgren (1978). Msanva et al. (2001) 

Soil	Number of	Soil maximum	Soil texture of each layer	Soil hydrologic
name	soil layers	depth		group
Edb1	4	850	C-C-C-C	D
Eea1	4	1200	SCL-CL-C-C	С
Lba2	5	1100	SL-SL-SL-SL	А
Lba4	3	700	SL-SCL-SCL	В
Lbc6	6	1900	SL-SCL-SCL-CL-CL-L	В
Ldc2	4	1050	SC-SC-SC-SC	С
Paa4	3	900	SL-SCL-SCL	В
Saa2	5	1200	LS-LS-LS-LS	Α
Sba5	5	1100	SCL-SC-C-C	В
Sbc2	6	2000	LS-LS-SL-SL-SL-SL	В
Sbc4	6	1200	LS-LS-LS-LS-LS	Α
Sbd5	6	1260	LS-SL-SL-SL-SCL-SL	Α
Scc1	6	1340	CL-SL-CL-L-CL-SL	В
Uda4	7	1300	SCL-SC-SC-C-C-SC-SCL	С
Zba6	5	1100	SL-SL-SCL-SCL	В

C=clay, S=sandy, and L=loamy - Based on Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil classification

Soil infiltration rate when thoroughly wet: A - high, B - moderate, C - slow, D - very slow

#### 1248 Land cover data



1249

- 1250 Figure A1.2: Land use map of the Ruvu catchment based on Swetnam et al. (2011).
- 1251

#### 1252 Rainfall data

There were 19 rainfall stations within the Ruvu catchment (see Fig. A1.3), out of which only seven stations have a significant amount of data for the period 1995 – 2005 (see Table A1.2). The period 1995 -2005 was of most interest in this study since the land use map available for use was

- 1256 representative for the year 2000 (Swetnam et al. 2011).
- 1257

1258 These seven stations provided insufficient data, however, to run the model due to the highly spatial 1259 variation of rainfall pattern and amount (Nicholson 1996, Ogallo 1989). Hence, we used the WXGEN 1260 weather generator incorporated in SWAT (Neitsch et al. 2011) to generate rainfall data for those 1261 stations which have solid historical rainfall data but no data in the period 1995 – 2004. We also used 1262 the weather generator to fill gaps in the data from the seven stations.

- 1264 We used daily minimum and maximum temperature data from the Morogoro Hydro-meteorological 1265 station and Dar es Salaam Meteorology head office, together with extra-terrestrial radiation, to
- 1266 estimate the solar radiation using a similar approach as Hargreaves-Samani as presented in
- 1267 Committee (2002).
- 1268

1269 We generated further daily climatic data using the WXGEN weather generator. The input for the WXGEN weather generator include average monthly precipitation, monthly maximum and minimum 1270 temperatures along with their standard deviations, and monthly precipitation with its standard 1271 1272 deviation, skewness, wet day/dry day probabilities taken from the grid surface developed by Texas 1273 A&M University. The grid surface was developed using climate data from the World Meteorological 1274 Organization (WMO) database for Eastern Africa for the period of 1975 to 2001. These datasets were 1275 used to derive coefficients for parameterizing the WXGEN weather generator using the WXPARM 1276 program developed by TAMU Blacklands Research Centre (Sharpley and Williams 1990). The WXGEN coefficients were entered into the ANUSPLIN software to create gridded surfaces of each coefficient 1277 1278 (Hutchinson 1999).





1280

1281 Figure A1.3: Measured data availability for Ruvu Catchment

#### 1282

1283 Table A1.2. Rain fall stations used in SWAT model setup

Rainfall Stations with significant amount of data for the period 1995 - 2004	Rainfall stations with solid historical data	Stations with very few data
Kibungu Maji	Chenzema	Mikula Magogoni
Matombo Primary School	Duthumi Estate	Neghesse Utari bridge
Mondo	Kikeo Mission	Singiza Mission
Mongwe	Kisaki Mission	
Kingolwira Prison	Madugiki Primary School	
Morogoro Hydmet	Mvuha	
Morningside		

#### SWAT crop database

#### Table A1.3 Crop database for SWAT

PNPL         6         Pine-pile         2         0.55         6.8         0.14         0.19         0.44         0.83         0.99         1.2         0.85         25.0         9         0.0078         0.0016           SSME         4         Sesare         30         0.14         3.5         0.11         0.15         0.5         0.75         0.99         12         2.4         2.7         15         0.013         0.005           CSHW         7         Cashew         2.3         0.14         3.5         0.1         0.15         0.5         0.75         0.99         15         3         2.7         15         0.019         0.0004           CSHW         7         Chrus trees         15         0.55         0.1         0.1         0.55         0.75         0.99         10         2.5         10         0.002         0.002         0.55         0.75         0.99         10         2.5         9         0.0015         0.0003         0.002         0.55         0.4         0.95         0.99         10         2         2.5         9         0.0015         0.0003         0.003         0.6         2         2.5         9         0.0015 <td< th=""><th>CPNM</th><th>IDC (</th><th>CROPNAME</th><th></th><th></th><th>BIO_E</th><th>HVSTI</th><th>BLAI</th><th>FRGRW1</th><th>LAIMX1</th><th>FRGRW2</th><th>LAIMX2</th><th>DLAI</th><th>CHTMX</th><th>RDMX</th><th>T_OPT</th><th>T_BASE</th><th>CNYLD</th><th>CPYLD</th></td<>	CPNM	IDC (	CROPNAME			BIO_E	HVSTI	BLAI	FRGRW1	LAIMX1	FRGRW2	LAIMX2	DLAI	CHTMX	RDMX	T_OPT	T_BASE	CNYLD	CPYLD
SSME       4       Sesame       20       0.44       0.15       0.14       0.44       0.8       0.74       1.42       2.4       2.7       1.5.6       0.06       0.003         NMGO       7       Margo       23       0.14       3.5       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2.7       10       0.013       0.005         PSSF       7       Passion fruit       15       0.05       4       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2.5       25       10       0.032       0.002         VDCL       7       Dense Woodland       16.1       0.045       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.95       0.99       18       3.7       23       9       0.0015       0.0002         VDCL       7       Dense Woodland       16.1       0.045       5.5       0.15       0.02       0.5       0.4       0.95       0.99       18       3.7       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         CKIS       6       Sisla       3       0.15       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.016	PNPL	6 F	Pineapple			22	0.55	6.8	0.14	0.19	0.45	0.93	0.99	1.2	0.85	29.5	9	0.0078	0.0016
NNGQ       7       Mago       23       0.14       3.5       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       27       10       0.013       0.003         CSHW       7       Cashew       21       0.08       3.5       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2       23       2       0.0013       0.005         PSFF       7       Passion fruit       15       0.05       4       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2.5       25       10       0.032       0.0005         VDCL       7       Dense Woodland       16.1       0.055       5       0.15       0.02       0.5       0.8       0.9       10       2.5       25       10       0.032       0.0015         CSIS       6       Sisal       27       16.1       0.05       4       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       0.05       0.003       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       0.015       0.003         BSH       7       Plantation Forest       30       0.01       6.05       0.1       0.3 </td <td>SSME</td> <td>4 5</td> <td>Sesame</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>30</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>4.4</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>0.44</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>0.74</td> <td>1.42</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>27</td> <td>15.6</td> <td>0.06</td> <td>0.009</td>	SSME	4 5	Sesame			30	0.49	4.4	0.15	0.11	0.44	0.8	0.74	1.42	2.4	27	15.6	0.06	0.009
CSHW       7       Cashew       21       0.08       3.5       0.1       0.15       0.75       0.99       15       3       27       15       0.013       0.003         PSF       7       Rassion fruit       15       0.05       4       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2       23       2       0.0019       0.0024         VDCL       7       Dense Woodland       16.1       0.045       5.5       0.11       0.75       0.99       10       2.5       25       10       0.0015       0.002         SIS       6       Sisal       5.5       0.15       0.02       0.5       0.8       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0015       0.0003         SIL       7       Bushland       16.1       0.05       4       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0015       0.0003         SIL       7       Plantation Forest       30       0.01       6       0.05       0.1       0.30       0.8       0.9       1       2       25       9       0.015       0.0003       0.90       16       2 <td>MNGO</td> <td>7 1</td> <td>Mango</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>23</td> <td>0.14</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.75</td> <td>0.99</td> <td>20</td> <td>6</td> <td>27</td> <td>10</td> <td>0.013</td> <td>0.005</td>	MNGO	7 1	Mango			23	0.14	3.5	0.1	0.15	0.5	0.75	0.99	20	6	27	10	0.013	0.005
PSSF       7       Passion fruit       15       0.05       4       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2       23       2       0.0019       0.0004         CTRS       7       Citrus trees       18       0.3       4       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2.5       10       0.032       0.002         CSIS       6       5isI       25       0.55       5       0.15       0.02       0.5       0.88       0.99       10       2.5       30       16       0.043       0.003         SBH       7       Bushiand       16.1       0.05       4       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0015       0.0003         BSH       7       Bushiand       16.1       0.05       4       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.015       0.0003         BCH       7       Plantation Forest       30       0.01       6       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       28       15       0.0016       0.002       0.0016	CSHW	7 (	Cashew			21	0.08	3.5	0.1	0.15	0.5	0.75	0.99	15	3	27	15	0.013	0.005
CTRs       7       Citrus trees       18       0.3       4       0.1       0.15       0.5       0.75       0.99       10       2.5       25       10       0.032       0.002         WDCL       7       Dense Woodland       16.1       0.0045       5.5       0.15       0.02       0.5       0.8       0.99       18       3.7       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         CSIS       6       Sisal       25       0.55       5       0.15       0.02       0.5       0.8       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0015       0.0003         BRH       7       Bushland       16.1       0.05       4       0.05       0.04       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0115       0.003         PRGL       6       Dry Grassland       34       0.9       3.5       0.05       0.1       0.3       0.8       0.6       2       28       15       0.0368       0.0046         FUMN       7       Upper Montane Forest       18       0.0016       6.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       15       6       15       4	PSSF	7 F	Passion fruit			15	0.05	4	0.1	0.15	0.5	0.75	0.99	10	2	23	2	0.0019	0.0004
WDCL         7         Dense Woodland         16.1         0.0045         5.5         0.1         0.7         0.4         0.95         0.99         18         3.7         23         9         0.0015         0.0033           CSIS         6         Sisal         25         0.55         5         0.15         0.02         0.5         0.8         0.9         5         2         30         16         0.04         0.0033           FPLT         7         Bushland         16.1         0.05         4         0.05         0.4         0.95         0.99         10         2         25         9         0.0015         0.0003           DRGL         6         Dry Grassland         34         0.9         3.5         0.5         0.1         0.3         0.8         0.9         1         2         25         9         0.016         0.002           ABEN         1         African Bean         25         0.3         3         0.15         0.01         0.5         0.99         15         6         15         0.0035         0.003           FMNT         7         Montane Forest         18         0.0016         6.5         0.1         0.7	CTRS	7 (	Citrus trees			18	0.3	4	0.1	0.15	0.5	0.75	0.99	10	2.5	25	10	0.032	0.002
CSIS       6       Sisal       25       0.55       5       0.15       0.02       0.5       0.8       0.9       5       2       30       16       0.04       0.0033         BSHL       7       Bushland       16.1       0.05       4       0.05       0.05       0.4       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0015       0.0003         DRGL       6       Dry Grassland       34       0.9       3.5       0.05       0.1       0.3       0.8       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.016       0.0023         DRGL       6       Dry Grassland       34       0.9       3.5       0.05       0.1       0.3       0.8       0.99       1       2       25       9       0.016       0.0023         ABEN       1       African Bean       25       0.3       3       0.15       0.01       0.5       0.99       0.8       0.6       2       28       15       0.0368       0.0046         FUMN       7       Montane Forest       16       0.0013       6.8       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       6       23       9       <	WDCL	7 [	Dense Woodla	nd		16.1	0.0045	5.5	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.95	0.99	18	3.7	23	9	0.0015	0.0003
Image: Normal basis       16.1       0.05       4       0.05       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0015       0.0003         FPLT       7       Plantation Forest       30       0.01       6       0.05       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       10       2       25       9       0.0015       0.0003         DRGL       6       Dry Grassland       34       0.9       3.5       0.05       0.1       0.3       0.8       0.9       1       2       25       9       0.016       0.0023         ABEN       1       African Bean       25       0.3       3       0.15       0.01       0.5       0.95       0.8       0.6       2       28       15       0.016       0.003         FMNT       7       Montane Forest       18       0.0016       6.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       12       4       21       4       0.0015       0.0003         FMNT       7       Montane Forest       15       0.0027       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5       23       9 <td>CSIS</td> <td>6 5</td> <td>Sisal</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>25</td> <td>0.55</td> <td>5</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>30</td> <td>16</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>0.0033</td>	CSIS	6 5	Sisal			25	0.55	5	0.15	0.02	0.5	0.8	0.9	5	2	30	16	0.04	0.0033
IPPLT       7       Plantation Forest       30       0.01       6       0.05       0.05       0.4       0.95       0.99       20       3.5       28       8       0.0015       0.0023         DRGL       6       Dry Grassland       34       0.9       3.5       0.05       0.1       0.3       0.8       0.9       1       2       25       9       0.016       0.0022         ABEN       1       African Bean       25       0.3       3       0.15       0.01       0.5       0.95       0.8       0.6       2       28       15       0.0368       0.0046         FUMN       7       Upper Montane Forest       18       0.0018       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       15       6       15       4       0.0015       0.0003         FMN       7       Montane Forest       16       0.0013       6.8       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       6       22       6       0.0015       0.0003         FMN       7       Sub-Montane Forest       15       0.003       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30	BSHL	7 E	Bushland			16.1	0.05	4	0.05	0.05	0.4	0.95	0.99	10	2	25	9	0.0015	0.0003
DRGL       6       Dry Grassland       34       0.9       3.5       0.05       0.1       0.3       0.8       0.9       1       2       25       9       0.016       0.0022         ABEN       1       African Bean       25       0.3       3       0.15       0.01       0.5       0.95       0.8       0.6       2       28       15       0.0368       0.0046         FUMN       7       Upper Montane Forest       18       0.0016       6.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       12       4       21       4       0.0015       0.0003         FMNT       7       Montane Forest       16       0.0013       6.8       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       6       22       6       0.0015       0.0003         FMSC       7       Mosaic Forest       15       0.0027       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5       23       9       0.0015       0.0033         FMSC       7       Mosaic Forest       15       0.003       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5 </td <td>FPLT</td> <td>7 F</td> <td>Plantation Fore</td> <td>st</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>6</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.95</td> <td>0.99</td> <td>20</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>28</td> <td>8</td> <td>0.0015</td> <td>0.0003</td>	FPLT	7 F	Plantation Fore	st		30	0.01	6	0.05	0.05	0.4	0.95	0.99	20	3.5	28	8	0.0015	0.0003
ABEN       1       African Bean       25       0.3       3       0.15       0.01       0.5       0.95       0.8       0.6       2       28       15       0.0368       0.0046         FUMN       7       Upper Montane Forest       20       0.0018       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       15       6       15       4       0.0015       0.0003         FMNT       7       Montane Forest       18       0.0016       6.8       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       6       22       6       0.0015       0.0003         FLD       7       Montane Forest       15       0.0027       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       6       22       6       0.0015       0.0003         FLD       7       Mosaic Forest       15       0.003       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         WDOP       7       Open Woodland       16.1       0.003       0.55       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.95       0.99       15 <th< td=""><td>DRGL</td><td>6 [</td><td>Dry Grassland</td><td></td><td></td><td>34</td><td>0.9</td><td>3.5</td><td>0.05</td><td>0.1</td><td>0.3</td><td>0.8</td><td>0.9</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>25</td><td>9</td><td>0.016</td><td>0.0022</td></th<>	DRGL	6 [	Dry Grassland			34	0.9	3.5	0.05	0.1	0.3	0.8	0.9	1	2	25	9	0.016	0.0022
FUMN       7       Upper Montane Forest       20       0.0018       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       15       6       15       4       0.0015       0.0003         FMNT       7       Montane Forest       18       0.0016       6.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       21       4       21       4       0.0015       0.0003         FMNT       7       Montane Forest       16       0.0013       6.8       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       6       22       6       0.0015       0.0003         FMNC       7       Mosaic Forest       15       0.003       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         WDOP       7       Open Woodland       16.1       0.003       4.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       15       3.7       24       9.5       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0015       0.0016       0.101       0.10 </td <td>ABEN</td> <td>1 /</td> <td>African Bean</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>25</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.95</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>2</td> <td>28</td> <td>15</td> <td>0.0368</td> <td>0.0046</td>	ABEN	1 /	African Bean			25	0.3	3	0.15	0.01	0.5	0.95	0.8	0.6	2	28	15	0.0368	0.0046
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	FUMN	7 l	Jpper Montan	e Forest		20	0.0018	6	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.99	0.99	15	6	15	4	0.0015	0.0003
FSMN       7       Sub-Montane Forest       16       0.0013       6.8       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       6       22       6       0.0015       0.0003         FLD       7       Lowland Forest       15       0.0027       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       42       6       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         FMSC       7       Mosaic Forest       15       0.003       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         WDOP       7       Open Woodland       16.1       0.0093       4.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.95       0.99       15       3.7       24       9.5       0.0015       0.0015       0.0003         WDV       BN1       BN2       BN3       BP1       BP2       BP3       WSYF       USLE_C       GSI       VPDR       FRGMAX       WAVP       CO2HI       BIOEHI         PNPL       0.016       0.0148       0.01       0.0012       0.00128       0.265       0.17       0.0014       4       0.75       7       66	FMNT	7 [	Montane Fores	t		18	0.0016	6.5	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.95	0.99	21	4	21	4	0.0015	0.0003
FLD       7       Lowland Forest       15       0.0027       6       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       42       6       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         FMSC       7       Mosaic Forest       15       0.003       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         WDOP       7       Open Woodland       16.1       0.003       4.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       15       3.7       24       9.5       0.0015       0.0015       0.003         WDOP       7       Dpen Woodland       0.01       0.0015       0.0128       0.265       0.17       0.014       4       0.75       6       660       27.5         SSME       0.035       0.0132       0.01       0.0012       0.0018       0.265       0.17       0.0014       4       0.75       7       660       660       27.5         SSME       0.031       0.01       0.0012       0.0018       0.06       0.12       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       35       660       35	FSMN	7 5	Sub-Montane F	orest		16	0.0013	6.8	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.99	0.99	30	6	22	6	0.0015	0.0003
FMSC       7       Mosaic Forest       15       0.003       5.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.99       0.99       30       5       23       9       0.0015       0.0003         WDOP       7       Open Woodland       16.1       0.0093       4.5       0.1       0.7       0.4       0.95       0.99       15       3.7       24       9.5       0.0015       0.0003         VDOP       7       Open Woodland       0.01       0.0015       0.0128       0.265       0.17       0.0014       4       0.75       6       660       27.5         SSME       0.035       0.013       0.01       0.0019       0.0012       0.0018       0.22       0.39       0.011       4       0.75       7       660       35         MNGO       0.04       0.013       0.01       0.0019       0.0012       0.001       0.01       0.12       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       30         CSHW       0.004       0.0013       0       0.00019       0.0012       0.001       0.12       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       25         PSSF       0.006       0.002	FLLD	7 l	owland Forest	:		15	0.0027	6	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.99	0.99	42	6	23	9	0.0015	0.0003
WDOP         7         Open Woodland         16.1         0.0093         4.5         0.1         0.7         0.4         0.95         0.99         15         3.7         24         9.5         0.0015         0.0003           CPNM         BN1         BN2         BN3         BP1         BP2         BP3         WSYF         USLE_C         GSI         VPDFR         FRGMAX         WAVP         CO2HI         BIOEHI           PNPL         0.016         0.0148         0.01         0.004         0.0015         0.00128         0.265         0.17         0.0014         4         0.75         6         660         27.5           SSME         0.035         0.013         0.01         0.0023         0.0018         0.2         0.39         0.011         4         0.75         7         660         35           MNGO         0.04         0.013         0.01         0.0012         0.001         0.11         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         30           CSHW         0.004         0.0013         0         0.00012         0.0001         0.11         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660	FMSC	۲ ۲	Mosaic Forest			15	0.003	5.5	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.99	0.99	30	5	23	9	0.0015	0.0003
CPNMBN1BN2BN3BP1BP2BP3WSYFUSLE_CGSIVPDFRFRGMAXWAVPCO2HIBIOEHIPNPL0.0160.01480.010.0040.00150.001280.2650.170.001440.75666027.5SSME0.0350.01320.010.00620.00230.00180.20.390.01140.75766035MNGO0.040.0130.010.00190.0010.00080.060.120.00740.75366030CSHW0.0040.001300.000190.00120.0010.010.120.00740.75366025PSSF0.0060.00200.00070.00040.0030.220.00740.75366023WDCL0.0060.00200.00070.00120.080.120.00740.75366023WDCL0.0060.00200.00070.00040.0030.0100.00440.75866018CSIS0.0480.02940.030.00230.40.20.00540.751066033	WDOP	7 (	Open Woodlan	d		16.1	0.0093	4.5	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.95	0.99	15	3.7	24	9.5	0.0015	0.0003
CPNM<BN1BN2BN3BP1BP2BP3WSYFOSEE_CGS1VPDFRPRGMAXWAVPCO2H1BIOEH1PNPL0.0160.01480.010.0040.00150.001280.2650.170.001440.75666027.5SSME0.0350.01320.010.00620.00230.00180.20.390.01140.75366035MNGO0.040.0130.010.00190.0010.00080.060.120.00740.75366025PSSF0.0060.00200.000190.000120.0010.010.120.00740.75366020CTRS0.0080.0030.00150.00120.080.120.00740.75366023WDCL0.0060.00200.00070.00040.0030.0100.00440.75866018CTRS0.0060.00200.00070.00040.0030.0100.00440.75866018WDCL0.0060.00200.0040.00230.40.20.00540.751066033CTRS0.0480.02940.030.00240.00230.40.20.00540.751066033	CDNIA	DNI1	DNI2	DND	DD1	002		202			661	VDDED	FROM	A.V.   14//		602111	DIOFUI	1	
PNPL         0.016         0.0148         0.01         0.004         0.0013         0.00128         0.265         0.17         0.0014         4         0.75         6         660         27.5           SSME         0.035         0.0132         0.01         0.0062         0.0023         0.0018         0.2         0.39         0.011         4         0.75         7         660         35           MNGO         0.04         0.013         0.01         0.0019         0.001         0.008         0.06         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         35           CSHW         0.004         0.013         0         0.0019         0.0012         0.001         0.01         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         25           PSSF         0.006         0.002         0         0.00015         0.0012         0.08         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         23           CTRS         0.008         0.033         0         0.0012         0.08         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         23           WDCL <td></td> <td>BINI</td> <td>BIN2</td> <td>BN3</td> <td>BP1</td> <td>BPZ</td> <td>1</td> <td>323</td> <td>WSYF</td> <td>USLE_C</td> <td>0.0014</td> <td>VPDFK</td> <td></td> <td>AX VVA</td> <td>4VP</td> <td>C02HI</td> <td>BIOEHI</td> <td></td> <td></td>		BINI	BIN2	BN3	BP1	BPZ	1	323	WSYF	USLE_C	0.0014	VPDFK		AX VVA	4VP	C02HI	BIOEHI		
SNRE       0.035       0.0132       0.01       0.0062       0.0023       0.0018       0.2       0.39       0.011       4       0.75       7       660       35         MNGO       0.04       0.013       0.01       0.0019       0.001       0.0008       0.06       0.12       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       30         CSHW       0.004       0.0013       0       0.00019       0.0012       0.001       0.01       0.12       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       25         PSSF       0.006       0.002       0       0.0007       0.0004       0.003       0.03       0.22       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       25         PSSF       0.006       0.002       0       0.0003       0.033       0.22       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       20         CTRS       0.008       0.003       0       0.0012       0.08       0.12       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       23         WDCL       0.006       0.002       0       0.0004       0.0023       0.01       0       0.005       4       0.75		0.016	0.0148	0.01	0.004	0.00	15	2.00128	0.265	0.17	0.0014	4	0.75	0		660	27.5		
ININGO         0.04         0.013         0.01         0.0019         0.001         0.0008         0.06         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         30           CSHW         0.004         0.0013         0         0.00019         0.00012         0.001         0.01         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         25           PSSF         0.006         0.002         0         0.0007         0.0004         0.003         0.03         0.22         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         25           PSSF         0.008         0.003         0         0.0015         0.0012         0.08         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         20           CTRS         0.008         0.03         0         0.0015         0.0012         0.08         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         23           WDL         0.006         0.002         0         0.0004         0.0023         0.01         0         0.005         4         0.75         8         660         18           CSIS <t< td=""><td>SSIVIE</td><td>0.035</td><td>0.0132</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.0062</td><td>0.00</td><td>23</td><td>2.0018</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.39</td><td>0.011</td><td>4</td><td>0.75</td><td>/</td><td></td><td>660</td><td>35</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	SSIVIE	0.035	0.0132	0.01	0.0062	0.00	23	2.0018	0.2	0.39	0.011	4	0.75	/		660	35		
CSHW       0.004       0.0013       0       0.00019       0.00012       0.001       0.01       0.12       0.007       4       0.73       3       660       23         PSSF       0.006       0.002       0       0.0007       0.0004       0.003       0.03       0.22       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       20         CTRS       0.008       0.003       0       0.0015       0.0012       0.08       0.12       0.007       4       0.75       3       660       23         WDCL       0.006       0.002       0       0.0007       0.0004       0.003       0.001       0       0.004       4       0.75       8       660       18         CSIS       0.048       0.0294       0.03       0.0024       0.0023       0.4       0.2       0.005       4       0.75       10       660       33		0.04	0.013	0.01	0.0019	0.00	012	0.0008	0.06	0.12	0.007	4	0.75	3		660	30		
CTRS         0.006         0.002         0         0.003         0.0015         0.0012         0.08         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         000         20           CTRS         0.008         0.003         0         0.0003         0.00015         0.00012         0.08         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         660         23           WDCL         0.006         0.002         0         0.0007         0.0004         0.001         0         0.004         4         0.75         8         660         18           CSIS         0.048         0.0294         0.03         0.0023         0.4         0.2         0.005         4         0.75         10         660         33		0.004	0.0013	0	0.00019	0.00	012	2.0001	0.01	0.12	0.007	4	0.75	2		660	20		
CHS         0.003         0.003         0         0.0013         0.0012         0.003         0.12         0.007         4         0.75         3         000         23           WDCL         0.006         0.002         0         0.0007         0.0004         0.001         0         0.004         4         0.75         8         660         18           CSIS         0.048         0.0294         0.03         0.0023         0.4         0.2         0.005         4         0.75         10         660         33		0.000	0.002	0	0.0007	0.00	04	00012	0.03	0.22	0.007	4	0.75	2		660	20		
WDCL         0.000         0.002         0         0.0004         0.0003         0.001         0         0.004         4         0.75         3         000         16           CSIS         0.048         0.0294         0.03         0.0024         0.0023         0.4         0.2         0.005         4         0.75         10         660         33	WDCI	0.008	0.003	0	0.0003	0.00	015	00012	0.08	0.12	0.007	4	0.75	0		660	19		
	CSIS	0.000	0.002	0.02	0.0007	0.00	24	00003	0.001	0.2	0.004	4	0.75	10		660	22		
	RSHI	0.048	0.0234	0.03	0.0049	0.00	04	0.0023	0.4	0.2	0.003	4	0.75	10		660	18		
BHT 0.006 0.002 0 0.0007 0.0004 0.0003 0.01 0 0.004 4 0.75 8 660 10	EDIT.	0.000	0.002	0	0.0007	0.00	04	0003	0.01	0	0.004	4	0.75	8		660	31		
DRG         0.002         0.012         0.01         0.0014         0.0007         0.9         0.15         0.005         4         0.75         10         660         39	DRGI	0.000	0.002	0.01	0.0014	0.00	1	0007	0.001	0.15	0.005	4	0.75	10		660	39		
ABEN 0.004 0.003 0 0.0035 0.003 0.0015 0.22 0.4 0.005 4 0.75 5 660 34	ABEN	0.02	0.012	0.01	0.0014	0.00	3	0015	0.22	0.15	0.005	4	0.75	5		660	34		
	FLIMN	0.004	0.003	0	0.0005	0.00	04	00013	0.03	0.4	0.003	4	0.75	8		660	20		
EMNT 0.006 0.002 0 0.0007 0.0004 0.0003 0.03 0 0.000 4 0.075 8 660 19	EMNT	0.006	0.002	0	0.0007	0.00	04	0003	0.03	0	0.002	4	0.75	8		660	19		
FSMN 0.006 0.002 0 0.0007 0.0004 0.0003 0.03 0 0.002 4 0.75 8 660 18	FSMN	0.006	0.002	0	0.0007	0.00	04	0003	0.03	0	0.002	4	0.75	8		660	18		
FILD 0.006 0.002 0 0.0007 0.0004 0.0003 0.06 0 0.002 4 0.75 8 660 17	FLLD	0.006	0.002	0	0.0007	0.00	04	0.0003	0.06	0	0.002	4	0.75	8		660	17		
EMSC 0.006 0.002 0 0.0007 0.0004 0.0003 0.01 0 0.002 4 0.75 8 660 16	EMAC	0.000	0.002		5.0007	0.00			0.00	-	0.002	+	0.75						
	LEIVISC	0.006	0.002	0	0.0007	0.00	04	0.0003	0.01	0	0.002	4	0.75	X		660	16		

CPNM	RSDCO_PL	OV_N	CN2A	CN2B	CN2C	CN2D	FERTFIELD	ALAI_MIN	BIO_LEAF	MAT_YRS	BMX_TREES	EXT_COEF	BM_DIEOFF
PNPL	0.06	0.14	43	58	68	74	1	5	0	0	0	0.65	0.1
SSME	0.099	0.14	67	77	83	87	1	0	0	0	0	0.65	0.1
MNGO	0.05	0.15	54	66	77	83	1	3	0.1	10	650	0.65	0.1
CSHW	0.05	0.15	54	66	77	83	1	3	0.1	6	500	0.65	0.1
PSSF	0.05	0.15	54	66	77	83	1	3	0.1	10	280	0.65	0.1
CTRS	0.05	0.14	43	63	73	79	1	3	0.1	6	380	0.65	0.1
WDCL	0.05	0.18	40	55	70	77	0	4.5	0.05	99	250	0.61	0.1
CSIS	0.099	0.14	62	73	81	84	1	3.5	0	0	0	0.65	0.1
BSHL	0.1	0.2	50	69	79	84	0	3	0.02	50	125	0.61	0.1
FPLT	0.099	0.1	64	75	83	86	0	4	0.001	40	150	0.45	0.1
DRGL	0.099	0.15	48	66	75	80	0	2	0	0	0	0.33	0.1
ABEN	0.05	0.14	63	73	78	82	0	0	0	0	0	0.65	0.1
FUMN	0.1	0.2	30	55	70	77	0	5	0.05	99	410	0.65	0.1
FMNT	0.1	0.2	30	52	66	73	0	5.5	0.05	99	460	0.65	0.1
FSMN	0.1	0.18	30	52	66	73	0	5.5	0.05	99	580	0.65	0.1
FLLD	0.1	0.18	30	55	70	77	0	5	0.05	99	420	0.65	0.1
FMSC	0.1	0.1	40	60	70	80	0	4.5	0.05	99	375	0.65	0.1
WDOP	0.1	0.1	54	69	78	82	0	3.5	0.05	99	120	0.61	0.1

For variable names and their explanation, we refer to (Arnold et al. 2011)

## Appendix 2. Adjusting SWAT for leaf fall in the tropics

The dormancy and continuous leaf shed of the forests and woodlands of the Arc Mountains were represented in the model as follows. In the tropics, forests and woodlands do not have a dormancy period and they do not shed their leaves in winter; rather, during the dry period, they shed some of their leaves. Shedding leaves in SWAT depends on the day length (Neitsch et al. 2005). If the day length is less than the threshold day length, plants other than warm season annuals stop growing and come out of dormancy once the day length is greater than the threshold. For areas located between 20° North and 20° South, the threshold day length is given a value equal to the value of the shortest day in the region (Neitsch et al. 2005). Hence, there is no dormancy in areas located between 20° North and 20° South, which is the case for Tanzanian forests. However, the woodlands shed their leaves in response to water stress in the dry season and the forests keep their leaves all year except they continually lose a small proportion of leaves. This continuous loss contributes to the nutrient pool for the trees (Lundgren 1978).

To simulate this continuous shedding of leaves and seasonally increased leaf loss for the woodlands, a harvest operation (loss of leaves) is set up that starts at the beginning of the dry season (June) and continues till end of September. There is no automatic leave fall code included in the SWAT model. Thus, based on data from Lundgren (1978), the woodlands are assumed to be harvested (leaf fall) each month in the dry season. 95% of the biomass harvested (estimate of leaf fall) is assumed to be left on the ground to become a residue. The amount of biomass harvested is defined by the coefficient of harvest index. The harvest index for optimal growing conditions defines the fraction of the aboveground biomass that is removed in a harvest operation (Neitsch et al. 2005).

## **Appendix 3. SWAT Exceedance curves**

#### Flow exceedance curve

The exceedance curve in Figure A3.1 supports the SWAT model fit for river flow. The comparison between the measured and the simulated exceedance shows that the model is relatively accurate in simulating low flows and high flows, except a slightly overestimation of flows in the range 10 - 20 mm.



Figure A3.1: Exceedance curve for measure and simulated flow at 1H5

#### Number of days of pump failure at offtake point

The Upper Ruvu WTW offtake pumps located at Morogoro Bridge (1H8) frequently stops operating due to high sediment concentration at water take-off point in the Ruvu River. We know from personal contacts and experience that this phenomenon occurred several times in the past, but we are not aware of any reports on the number of days that the pumps were turned off due to high sediment concentrations. No information is available on the minimum sediment concentration that triggers the pump cut-off.

Therefore, a statistical approach was used in this study to estimate the minimum cut-off sediment level, and instead of a specific value a range of values were selected. This range, the percentage time that the pumps was turned off due to high sediment concentration was estimated using an exceedance curve show in Figure A3.2. Visual inspection of the exceedance curve, based on the understanding that the flatter the curve is the rarer the event, showed that the slope of the curve starts getting less steep around 2%, but it was not possible to identify a specific value. Hence, we took a range of values varying from 0.25% to 2.0%, equivalent to one to seven days a year respectively, to represent the percentage of days that the pumps were turned off due to high sediment concentration in the river. We inferred the corresponding average daily sediment concentration levels that resulted in a frequency of pump cut-offs from the percentage exceedance curve (Figure A3.2) for the conservation scenario. Then, for the conversion scenario, we linked these sediment concentration levels to the exceedance percentages in Figure A3.3 and the corresponding number of days that the pumps fail in the Ruvu River. The number of days of cut-offs informed the estimation of the costs of failing to meet water demand on those days.



*Figure A3.2: Percentage exceedance curve for sediment concentration at Morogoro Bridge in conservation scenario* 



Figure A3.3: Percentage exceedance curve for sediment concentration at Morogoro Bridge in the conversion scenario

The results in Table A3.1 shows that the conversion scenario results in the total number of pump cut-off days varying from 20 to 56 days per year, depending on the cut-off sediment level.

Table A3.1 Equivalent cut off points to the selected % of pump failure times in the conservation scenario and identifying number of cut-off days in the conversion scenario based on cut-off points from the conservation scenario

Percentage of time that pumps stop due to high	Equivalent number of	Cut off point mg/L	Percentage of time that pump stop due	Number of days per year
sediment concentration	days per		to sediment cut-off	
(conservation)	year		point (Conversion)	
0.25%	0.9	4357	5.45%	19.9
0.50%	1.8	3495	6.85%	25
0.75%	2.7	2812	8.70%	31.8
1.00%	3.7	2491	10.05%	36.7
1.25%	4.6	2282	11.40%	41.6
1.50%	5.5	2106	12.20%	44.5
1.75%	6.4	2029	12.90%	47.1
2.00%	7.3	1885	13.89%	50.7

# Appendix 4. Monetary valuation

# 4.1 Mindu reservoir siltation and costs of water supply to Morogoro

We used an exchange rate of TZS 2,138 to USD 1 in this paper (August 2015).

MOROWASA has estimated that increasing the dam height and constructing upstream check dams to regain design capacity (AAW 2012) will cost TZS 14 billion (appr. USD 6.55 million) (MOROWASA water engineer, pers comm, September 2015). Based on this cost figure, we estimated the cost of siltation per year by distributing the total cost due to siltation over the last 30 years.

We estimated the current average cost of siltation per year to be USD 218,273 (USD 6.55 /30 years), equivalent to an annual cost of USD 1.648/tonne of sediment (USD 218,273 / (4.3 tonnes/ha/yr \* 30800 ha)).

The increase in sediment yield from the catchment of 6.07 tonnes/ha/yr leads to an increase in the annual cost of sedimentation by USD 308,103 /year (6.07 tonnes/ha/yr \* 30800 ha \* USD 1.648/tonne) due to the removal of forest and woodland from the Mindu catchment as in the conversion scenario.

#### 4.2 Modelled length of water rationing periods in Dar es Salaam

Table A4.1 shows the number and duration of pump failure due to excess sedimentation under the conservation scenario; Table A4.2 shows the results of the same analysis for the conversion (forest loss) scenario. Comparison of the numbers in these tables reveals that under the conversion scenario, pump failure due to high sedimentation in the Ruvu River will not only lead to more frequent but also longer periods of tap water restrictions in Dar es Salaam.

Table A4.1 Mea	in numb		on evenus	under the	conservatio	on scenario	at unierent	cut-on levels
Consecutive	4357	3495	2812	2491	2282	2106	2029	1885
Cut-off days	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
1	0.9	1.3	2.1	2.0	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.6
2		0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.0
3				0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
4					0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1
5								0.1

Table A4.1 Mean number of cut-off events under the conservation scenario at different cut-off levels

Table A4.2 Mean number of cut-off events per year under conversion scenario at different cut-off levels

Consecutive	4357	3495	2812	2491	2282	2106	2029	1885
Cut-off days	mg/L							
1	9.5	11.3	13.2	13.2	13.4	13.9	13.9	13.5
2	2.6	3.1	3.3	4.2	4.6	4.7	5.2	5.9
3	0.8	1.2	1.9	2.5	3	2.9	2.5	2.6
4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7	1	1.4	1.6	1.5
5	0	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	1
6	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
7			0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	4
8					0.1	0.1	0	1
9							0.2	0.2

# 4.3 Substitution options and costs

Richer households tend to rely more on protected reservoirs, vendors who come to their door with pushcarts, or they buy in bulk from tanker trucks (Bayliss and Tukai 2011, Rostapshova et al. 2014). Some rich households have invested in private water storage, e.g. underground water reservoirs or water tanks on top of roofs, which gives them some buffer to cope with the lack of water supply (*ibid*.). Bottled water is also increasingly used as drinking water.

We developed a set of substitution rules for the volume of piped water used per capita, depending on the number of consecutive days of pump failure (see Table A4.3). This reflects substitution of potable water, assuming that people will opt for another piped water source, brought in from other supply areas via vendors with pushcarts or trucks. We assumed that some households who depend on taps from neighbours would go for more expensive bottled water to avoid queues at the water kiosks after two days of pump failure.

Table A4.5 Kule baseu	assumptions for si	upstitution of piped v	valer in Opper Ruvi	a supply alea
Source	Piped water use (l/capita/day)	Substitutes 1 day pump failure	Substitutes 2 days pump failure	Substitutes 3+ days pump failure
Tap at home	40	Buffer	Pushcart (35L) Bottled (5L)	Tanker (10L) Pushcart (15L) Bottled (5L)
Tap from neighbours	25	Kiosk (15L) Pushcart (10L)	Kiosk (10L) Pushcart (15L)	Kiosk (10L) Pushcart (10L) Bottled (5L)
Kiosk, pushcart vendor	25	Kiosk (15L) Pushcart (10L)	Kiosk (15L) Pushcart (10L)	Kiosk (15L) Pushcart (10L)

Table A4.3 Rule based assumptions for substitution of piped water in Upper Ruvu supply area

#### Substitution costs

In a small survey conducted in April 2015, we collected additional primary data on substitute costs in Dar es Salaam which consist of three Districts i.e. Administrative areas. We aimed to interview at least 30 respondents for each water vendor type. In each of the three Districts and with the help of Area Executive Officer we identified water vendor types. Subsequently, using non-random sampling procedures we selected at least 10 respondents for each water vendor type for interviews. Accordingly, we interviewed 10, 43 and 11 water vendors from Ilala, Kinondoni and Temeke Districts making a total of 64 respondents. These included 36 kiosk, 22 pushcart, and six truck interviewed water vendors. The survey aimed to generate price information for different water sources, during dry and wet seasons, and during water rationed and non-rationed periods. Main water sources or suppliers in Dar es Salaam are water kiosk, pushcart and truck who sell water directly to consumers both during wet and dry seasons as well as during water and non-water rationing time. Therefore, respondents were asked to express water price during wet and dry season. Similarly, respondents we asked to specify whether there was water rationing or either during a given season.

We used data from the literature (Kjellén 2006, Mwakalila 2007) and our primary data to estimate the increased costs of water faced by households' dependent on the Upper Ruvu for domestic water. In addition, we used the relative prices between tap water and neighbour water of Kjellén (2006) to infer a price for piped water bought from neighbours for 2015, for which we could not obtain prices, as well as prices from the DAWASCO website for official domestic, kiosk and tanker truck prices. The results presented in Table A4.4 show that prices vary across type of vendors, water sources and between rationed and non-rationed days. Prices vary across sources with the cheapest option being tap water.

Our price data for kiosks and pushcarts selling DAWASCO surface water during rationed periods shows that prices increase significantly when tap water is cut off or rationed. This is in line with a news article from IPS (2009) which suggests that prices from vendors increase from TZS 13.75 per litre to TZS 20 per litre when there are water shortages. The report by (Uwasi 2010) would suggest that our figures for kiosks are conservative, suggesting that these are in reality much higher at TZS 107 per 20 litres, and TZS 68 per 10 litre jerrycans than the official TZS 20 per 20 litres. For trucks, we found a lower price during rationed times, but it is unclear if this is because of subsidies or a lack of sufficient observations. Our tanker prices are slightly higher than those of Bayliss and Tukai (2011), who find an average price of TZS 7-9 per litre.

Source		Kjellen (2006),	(DAWASCO	Inferred	Authors	Authors' own data, 2015			
		Mwakalila	2013)		Mean	Non-	Rationed		
		(2007)				rationed			
Tap at home		0.27	0.87						
Tap from		1		3.22					
neighbour									
Borehole (kiosk)					3.5				
Standpipe, kiosk	Official:		1						
(surface water)	Market:				17.9	14.2	20.1		
Pushcarts		5.4			24.4	17.6	29.5		
Tanker truck		6	1.19		13.2	15	12.8		
Bottled		100		500					

#### Table A4.4 Prices in TZS per litre per source

Note: prices in bold are used in the cost estimation.

#### Net cost of removing forests

Finally, we used the data from Tables A4.1 and A4.2, together with the assumptions on per capita use, substitution behavior (Table A4.3), prices (Table A4.4) and affected population (Table 2), to estimate the annual net cost of increased sedimentation at a range of cut-off levels. The results are presented in Table 4.5. Without further information on practical cut-off levels of sedimentation used to operate the pumps of the Upper Ruvu WTW, it is impossible to provide a more precise estimate of the costs.

Consecutive Cut-	4357	3495	2812	2491	2282	2106	2029	1885
off days	mg/L							
1	2,634	3,124	3,492	3,645	3,492	3,553	3,492	3,185
2	2,501	2,590	2,501	3,126	3,662	3,841	4,466	4,198
3	1,373	3,203	5,491	6,178	6,635	6,407	5,491	5,491
4	2,031	1,523	2,539	5,078	7,109	9,140	10,663	10,156
5	-	508	2,031	1,523	3,047	3,554	3,554	6,093
6	1,295	1,942	647	1,295	647	1,295	647	1,295
7	-	-	2,360	1,574	2,360	2,360	2,360	3,147
8	-	-	-	926	926	-	926	1,852
9	-	-	-	-	-	1,066	1,066	2,131
Total cost								
(in million TZS)	9,834	12,891	19,062	23,344	27,879	31,216	32,667	37,550
Mean per capita								
costs (in TZS)	16,824	22,054	32,612	39,939	47,696	53,405	55,887	64,241

Table A4.5 Annual cost of cut-off events resulting from increased sedimentation in Upper Ruvu (conversion minus conservation scenario) in millions of TZS