

Repository Istituzionale dei Prodotti della Ricerca del Politecnico di Bari

Improving grey water footprint assessment: Accounting for uncertainty

This is a pre-print of the following article

Original Citation:

Improving grey water footprint assessment: Accounting for uncertainty / Maria De Girolamo, Anna; Miscioscia, Pierluigi; Politi, Tiziano; Barca, Emanuele. - In: ECOLOGICAL INDICATORS. - ISSN 1470-160X. - STAMPA. - 102:(2019), pp. 822-833. [10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.03.040]

Availability: This version is available at http://hdl.handle.net/11589/190813 since: 2022-06-09

Published version DOI:10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.03.040

Publisher:

Terms of use:

(Article begins on next page)

07 May 2024

1	IMPROVING GREY WATER FOOTPRINT ASSESSMENT: ACCOUNTING FOR
2	UNCERTAINTY
3	Anna Maria De Girolamo ^{*1} , Pierluigi Miscioscia ² , Tiziano Politi ² , Emanuele Barca ¹
4 5 6 7	¹ Water Research Institute, National Research Council, Bari, Italy; ² Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy Corresponding author: Anna Maria De Girolamo; annamaria.degirolamo@ba.irsa.cnr.it

8 Abstract

9 The grey water footprint (GWF) refers to the amount of freshwater required to dilute pollutants to meet water-quality standards. The aim of this paper was to estimate the GWF and its uncertainty 10 for crop production at the basin scale. The proposed approach was tested in the Rio Mannu Basin 11 12 (Sardinia, Italy) for durum wheat production. The fraction of nutrients flowing into the river and groundwater was evaluated using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool model that was calibrated 13 with in-stream monitoring data. A bootstrap technique coupled with Monte Carlo simulations was 14 used to estimate the uncertainty of the GWF due to the variability of the primary input data and the 15 unknown natural background level of nutrients in the waters. The GWF for total phosphorus (TP) 16 17 input (3284 m³ t⁻¹) was higher than that for dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) (275 m³ t⁻¹), despite the lower rate of phosphorus fertiliser application. The uncertainty was found to be relevant for 18 both DIN (60%) and TP (18%). The environmental sustainability of durum wheat production was 19 assessed throughout the water pollution level. This showed that the TP load exceeded the 20 21 assimilation capacity at the reach scale, and that further analyses are needed to assess the 22 environmental sustainability at the basin scale.

23 Keywords: Grey water, nitrogen and phosphorus export, SWAT model, uncertainty analysis, water pollution level

24 **1 INTRODUCTION**

Freshwater is a fundamental social and environmental resource and constitutes the most important 25 productive factor in all economic sectors. For a long time, the question of whether water is an 26 27 economic good, a universal need or a human right has been debated. In 2000, the United Nations (UN) World Water Forum declared water to be a basic need, and in 2002, the UN Committee on 28 Economic, Social and Cultural Rights defined the access to water to be a human right that should be 29 guaranteed by governments for all members of society. In several regions around the world, 30 freshwater availability is not adequate to satisfy all human or ecosystem requirements (UN World 31 Water Assessment Program, 2018). Currently, two-thirds of the world's population lives in areas 32 affected by water scarcity at least one month per year, and this percentage is expected to increase 33 (Zhuo et al., 2014). In the future, water resources availability could be reduced further due to 34 35 climate change (De Girolamo et al., 2017a), while demand for freshwater is expected to increase by 36 nearly one-third by 2050 due to demographic growth and economic development (UN World Water

37 Assessment Program, 2018). To safeguard the quantity and quality of water resources for future generations, it is necessary to study and evaluate how current water use can influence its availability 38 in the future (Pellicer-Martínez and Martínez-Paz, 2016a). To this end, Arjen Hoekstra, in 2002, 39 introduced the concept of the water footprint (WF), an indicator that quantifies freshwater use as a 40 productive factor, taking into consideration not only its direct use by producers and consumers, but 41 also its indirect use. The WF of a product is therefore defined as the total volume of freshwater used 42 43 to produce a product, measured by considering the entire production chain (Hoekstra et al., 2011). With the introduction of the standard, UNI 14046, which was intended to harmonise the calculation 44 45 of the WF and simplify the exchange of information about the environment, the WF has become the most important international reference for estimating the impact of products, services, processes and 46 47 organisations on water resources (Hoekstra, 2016; Chapagain, 2017). The WF is divided into three components - blue, green and grey. The blue WF refers to the amount of groundwater or surface 48 49 water required to produce a product. The green WF refers to the amount of rainwater used to produce a product. The grey WF (GWF) refers to the amount of freshwater required to dilute 50 51 pollutants in a body of water in order to meet particular water-quality standards (i.e. standards set by the US Clean Water Act; Franke et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2017). The water polluted during the 52 production process must be considered to be water directly consumed by the production because, if 53 the quality of the surface or groundwater becomes unacceptable, it can no longer be used for other 54 55 purposes.

56 For agricultural products, several studies have been published that have estimated the WF at the

57 global scale (Chapagain and Hoekstra, 2011; Mekonnen and Hoekstra, 2011), for the EU countries

58 (Vanham and Bidoglio, 2013), at the national level (Cazcarro et al., 2016), and at basin

59 (D'Ambrosio et al., 2018a, b) and local (Lamastra et al., 2014; Pellegrini et al., 2016) scales.

60 However, in the majority of cases of these published studies, the GWF has been neglected or

61 considered only partially. This is due to the complexity of its computation and to the fact that its

62 estimation is made difficult by the lack of field data (Gil et al., 2017).

63 The GWF plays an important role in the WF assessment of crop production because agriculture is 64 the main source of diffuse pollution. Fertilisers and pesticides, largely used in crop production, can severely impair the water in streams and lakes, causing eutrophication and structural changes in the 65 66 ecosystem (Grizzetti et al., 2008). At the basin scale, for each crop, GWF estimation needs data concerning the specific agricultural practice, crop yield (production per hectare) and the amount of 67 68 a pollutant that percolates into the aquifer or flows into a river as a result of the production of a 69 single crop. The amount of chemicals entering into water bodies cannot be directly measured, as it 70 is a diffuse source and, even if measures of pollutant loads are taken in some river sections or at the outlet of a river basin, it is very difficult to apportion a measured load to a particular source. For this

reason, the amount of a pollutant is generally estimated by using simple or complex models

73 (Hoekstra et al., 2011).

In Mediterranean basins, agronomic practices and field characteristics (i.e. soil type, slope, climate, 74 etc.) vary widely within a basin. This peculiarity, in addition to the fact that farmers generally do 75 not participate actively in the interviews that provide reliable data, makes it difficult to map every 76 77 single field within the basin with local information. Consequently, modelling applications are made 78 difficult for those basins. Local data used to estimate the GWF, even if accurately collected, may be 79 affected by uncertainty (De Girolamo et al., 2017b), enhanced by natural background pollution in 80 the water bodies and the amount of pollutant that percolates into the aquifer or flows into the river. 81 Despite that its relevance has been recognised, few studies have focused on uncertainty analysis in GWF estimation (Zhuo et al., 2014; Gil et al., 2017). Therefore, experimental studies are needed to 82 83 improve existing methodological approaches to estimate the GWF in Mediterranean basins in which water management is a challenge, especially in the global change perspective (Nikolaidis et al., 84 85 2013).

86 In this context, the first aim of the present study was to estimate the GWF for durum wheat

87 production at the basin scale. The second aim was to quantify the uncertainty due to the variability

of input data, such as fertiliser management schemes, environmental characteristics influencing the

crop yield and nutrient export, and the unknown natural background level of nutrients in the water

bodies. Finally, the environmental sustainability of the GWF was assessed throughout the water

91 pollution level (WPL), an indicator defined as the ratio between the GWF and runoff (Hoekstra et

al., 2011). The methodological approach was tested in the Rio Mannu Basin (Sardinia, Italy) on

durum wheat production. Field data and the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model wereused to estimate the apportionment of the nutrient loads.

The methodology can be exported to other basins to improve assessment of the GWF and WPL, andcan contribute to sustainable watershed management.

97 2 STUDY AREA

98 The Rio Mannu (Sardinia, Italy) is a tributary of the Flumini Mannu River that drains into the 'S. 99 Gilla' brackish coastal pond, designated as an important wetland site for southern Europe under the 100 Ramsar Convention for its great variety of Mediterranean vegetation and bird species. The basin, 101 which covers an area of 488 km², has a Mediterranean climate, with very high temperatures in 102 summer, often exceeding 40°C, and low rainfall (~500 mm, average annual value from 1996 to 103 2006). The rainfall mainly occurs from November to April, while during the dry season (June to

- October), the rainfall occurs over small areas as short, but intense, events. The streamflow regime changes rapidly with the seasonal patterns of wet and dry conditions. In summer, flash floods are quite common, with consequences for erosion, the sediment regime and nutrient delivery. The mean elevation for the watershed is 292 m, ranging from 0 to 962 m a.s.l.
- 108 Following the US Natural Resources Conservation Service classification, the major soil series in the
- 109 basin have a moderate or slow infiltration rate. The main economic activity in the area is intensive
- agriculture. Durum wheat (47%), olive trees (7%), winter pasture (3.3%), alsike clover (1.4%) and
- vineyards (1%) are the main crops cultivated, while minor land uses include alfalfa (1%), corn
- silage (0.5%), vegetables (0.1%) and orchards (0.2%). In the area, natural forest (1%), range brush
- 113 (34%) and range grasses (2.7%) are also present, and the residential areas (0.8%) are limited to
- small villages (De Girolamo and Lo Porto, 2012).
- 115 In recent decades, the wetland has suffered severe impacts due to agricultural activities and several
- small urban wastewater treatment plants (14000 IE) that discharge their sewage into the river.
- 117



119 Figure 1. Study area: Rio Mannu River Basin (Sardinia, Italy).

120

121 3 MATERIALS AND METHODS

122 **3.1** Grey water footprint accounting

Hoekstra et al. (2011) defined the GWF of a crop production as the volume of water needed to 123 dilute pollutants to such an extent that the quality of the water remains above fixed water-quality 124 standards. The authors reported a three-tiered approach for calculating diffuse pollution delivered to 125 126 a water body. The accuracy of the load estimate increases from Tier 1 to 3, but the data requirement 127 increases and, consequently, the feasibility decreases. Tier 1, which can be considered to be a first rough estimate, calculates the pollutant entering into water bodies as a fraction of the amount of 128 chemicals applied to the soil. In this approach, pollutant loads entering into waters can be derived 129 from the existing literature, being, for instance, 10% or 7% (Chapagain et al., 2006; Stathatou et al., 130 2012). Tier 2 is based on a simple model approach based on data concerning the properties of the 131 specific pollutant (i.e. nitrogen, phosphorus, chemicals) and the characteristics of the environment 132 (rainfall, soil hydraulic conductivity, agronomic practices) (Gil et al., 2017). Tier 3 is based on 133 complex models, water sampling and analytical determination of the pollutants in water bodies. The 134 GWF is calculated separately for each chemical substance, and the overall GWF is assumed to be 135 equal to the largest value among the specific GWFs found for each pollutant involved (Hoekstra et 136 al., 2011). 137

In this work, a Tier 3 approach was tested, coupling a hydrological and water-quality model at basin
scale with field data (agronomic practices from farmer interviews and measured nutrient
concentrations in the stream).

- Following the methodology described in *The Water Footprint Assessment Manual* by Hoekstra et al. (2011), the GWF ($m^3 t^{-1}$, equivalent to L kg⁻¹) related to fertilisers was calculated using the
- 143 equation:

144
$$_{\text{GWF}} = \frac{\alpha \cdot AR}{Y(C_{max} - C_{nat})} \text{ [volume } \times \text{mass}^{-1}\text{]}$$
 Eq. 1

145 , where C_{max} is the maximum acceptable concentration (kg m⁻³), C_{nat} is the natural background 146 concentration (kg m⁻³), *Y* is crop yield (t ha⁻¹), *AR* is the application rate of fertilisers per year (or 147 crop cycle; kg ha⁻¹) and α is the nutrient export coefficient (dimensionless, ranging from 0 to 1). 148 The nutrient load adducted to the river (α ·*AR*) divided by *Y* was estimated by the SWAT model, as 149 described in this text. We computed the GWF for dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) and total 150 phosphorus (TP); the highest value among these values was assumed to be the final GWF.

3.1.1 Maximum acceptable concentration

The ambient water-quality standards for TP and DIN (NO₂-N+NO₃-N+NH₄-N) in surface waters were fixed on the basis of Italian legislation (Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare, 2010), which implements the Water Framework Directive (WFD) of the European Parliament and of the Council (EC, 2000) and fixes threshold values for certain physical and chemical parameters for supporting the ecological status determination. The maximum acceptable concentration was fixed at Level 2 (good) of the above-mentioned decree, for which the *C_{max}* DIN was fixed at 1.26 mg L⁻¹ and the *C_{max}* TP was fixed at 0.1 mg L⁻¹.

3.1.2 Natural background concentration (C_{nat})

159

The natural background concentration is defined as the value of a pollutant in a water body that 160 occurs in the absence of anthropogenic impacts. For human-made chemicals (i.e. pesticides), and 161 for substances estimated to be low in concentration, C_{nat} is assumed to equal zero (Mekonnen and 162 163 Hoekstra, 2010; Zeng, et al., 2013), although nutrients can also be present in water bodies in the absence of human pressures as a result of natural processes. Due to the variability of environmental 164 characteristics and the complexity of processes that determine the background level of a nutrient in 165 a water body, there is no value that is valid always and everywhere (European Environment 166 Agency, 2004). On the other hand, in the majority of river basins, this value cannot be measured 167 because of human disturbance. Thus, C_{nat} is generally derived from existing literature that reports 168 background values expressed in terms of different compounds (i.e. total nitrogen [TN], NO₃-N or 169 DIN and TP or PO₄-P). Liu et al. (2017), in their review, reported values of C_{nat} for TN in surface 170 water and groundwater ranging from 0 mg L^{-1} to 1.5 mg L^{-1} , and from 0 mg L^{-1} to 0.52 mg L^{-1} for 171 TP. Koukal et al. (2004) assumed C_{nat} values for phosphate in surface water ranging from 0.005 mg 172 L^{-1} to 0.05 mg L^{-1} . Dabrowski et al. (2009) assumed C_{nat} equal to 0.62 mg L^{-1} and 0.06 mg L^{-1} for 173 TN and TP, respectively. Because of the relevance of the C_{nat} value in GWF assessment, we 174 assumed a range of likely values, instead of a unique fixed value, and we included the variability of 175 this factor in the uncertainty analysis. On the basis of the above literature, we assumed a C_{nat} for 176 DIN in surface water of 0 to 0.9 mg L⁻¹ and a C_{nat} for TP in surface water of 0 to 0.03 mg L⁻¹. 177

178 **3.2 MODELLING NUTRIENT LOAD**

The SWAT model (Arnold et al., 1998) was used to evaluate the fraction of fertilisers reaching the surface waters (α ·*AR* in Eq. 1) and the crop yield (*Y* in eq. 1) for each parcel of land under durum wheat production. This model is widely used in river-basin management for hydrological regime analyses (De Girolamo et al., 2017c), for assessing the effectiveness of agricultural conservation practices (Dechmi et al., 2012; Strauch et al., 2013; Brouziyne et al., 2018), for estimating climate

- change impacts on water (De Girolamo et al., 2017a; Vetter et al., 2017), and to quantify sediment
 yield (Abdelwahab et al., 2018; Ricci et al., 2018) and pollutant loads (Glavan et al., 2013).
- 186 A detailed description of the application of the model to the study area (set-up, input data, model
- 187 calibration) can be found in De Girolamo and Lo Porto (2012). The surface runoff was estimated
- using the Soil Conservation Service's Curve Number procedure (US Department of Agriculture–
- 189 Soil Conservation Service, 1972), and the potential evapotranspiration was calculated using the

190 Hargreaves–Samani method (Hargreaves and Samani, 1985).

- 191 Data concerning the agronomic practices adopted in the area for each crop were collected in the
- study area through farmer interviews and included in the input files needed by the model (De
- 193 Girolamo and Lo Porto, 2012). Regarding the durum wheat, most of the farms in the basin were
- under traditional tillage methods (40 cm deep), while a minor number of the farms had adopted
- 195 conservation tillage. From the farmer interviews (2006), it was found that a uniform application per
- 196 year of 32–40 kg ha⁻¹ N and 80–100 kg ha⁻¹ P_2O_4 (generally as 18–46–00) was applied with the 197 seeds. In addition, post-plant N was supplied as urea (80–120 kg ha⁻¹). The timing of the seeding 198 was the end of November or the beginning of December. In the model simulation, fertiliser amounts 199 were applied to each hydrological response unit (HRU – the unique combination of land cover, soil
- and slope distributed in the basin) in the range of the above-mentioned amounts.
- The basin was divided into 29 subbasins and 185 HRUs (multiple HRUs with thresholds of 7 and 10% for land use and soil type, respectively). The model was run on a daily time-step for 11 years (1996–2006). This period included both wet and dry years, with a very different crop yield for each production. Because streamflow measurements were unavailable for this period, although monthly flow data were available from 1922 to 1967 (Ente Autonomo Flumendosa, 1996), we adopted a regional parameter estimation approach, as described in De Girolamo and Lo Porto (2012). This
- 207 approach is based on the assumption that catchments with similar characteristics show a similar
- hydrological behaviour (Bárdossy, 2007), and it is possible to transfer parameters if the model
- 209 performance for the donor catchment is satisfactory. We used modelling results from the Rio
- 210 Mulargia (donor catchment; Figure 1; De Girolamo et al., 2008), which is similar to the Rio Mannu
- catchment in terms of climate, topography, land use and soil properties. We assumed a transposition
- of the hydraulic soil parameters, groundwater parameters and curve numbers for the same
- combination of soil type, land use and agricultural practices from the donor basin (Rio Mulargia) to
- the Rio Mannu Basin (Table I). The results can be considered satisfactory if the simulated monthly
- streamflows fall within the interval of natural variation defined by ± 1 standard deviation from the
- 216 mean of the measured streamflows from 1922 to 1967 (Richter et al., 1996), which are the only
- available data (De Girolamo and Lo Porto, 2012).

- The water quality calibration was performed at the outlet of the Rio Mannu for TP and TN from 218 219 2006 to 2007, when discrete measurements of the nutrients were taken (two per month). We changed the default values to the following parameters: nitrogen percolation coefficient, residue 220 decomposition coefficient and biological mixing efficiency (De Girolamo and Lo Porto, 2012) in 221 order to find the best set able to meet both the water quality and crop yield (Table I). The latter was 222 compared with official data at the province level (ISTAT, 2008) and at the farm level, with data 223 collected from farmer interviews. For water quality, the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE) and the 224 percent bias (PBIAS) were used to evaluate the model's efficiency. Model simulation can be 225 226 considered satisfactory if the NSE > 0.5, and the PBIAS is \pm 70 for TN and TP (Moriasi et al., 2007). SWAT provides a number of output files that report the total nutrient loads delivered at the 227 228 outlet, and the load per hectare of nutrient at the basin, subbasin and HRU levels.
- 229

230 Table I. Parameters used for the SWAT model simulation.

Parameter	Description	Actual value used	Range
CN	Curve number	68-86 ^a	35-98
ESCO	Soil evaporation compensation factor	0.815	0-1
GWQMN	Threshold depth of water in the shallow aquifer	1000	0-5000
	required for return flow to occur [mm H ₂ O]		
CH_N	Manning's roughness coef. "n" for channel	0.025	0-1
SOL_K	Saturated hydraulic conductivity [mm/hr]	0.5-22 ^a	0-2000
SOL_AWC	Available water capacity [mm H ₂ O/mm soil]	0.09-0.13 ^a	0-1
ALFA_BF	Baseflow alfa factor [days]	0.75	0-1
NPERCO	Nitrogen percolation coefficient	1	0-1
BIOMIX	Biological mixing efficiency	0.2	0-1
RSDCO	Residue decomposition coefficient	0.04	0-0.05
SLOPE	Average slope steepness [m/m]	0.03-0.25 ^b	0-0.6

^a value varies according to input data (soil, land use)

234 **3.3** UNCERTAINTY IN GWF ACCOUNTING

The predictive models, M, are generally structured as follows: $M = \{I, B, R\}$, where I is the input

matrix, B is the data-processing mechanism (also known as the 'actual model') and R is the

- 237 response vector. Since uncertainty affects the input data, the model structure and its parameters, it
- 238 consequently also affects the response.
- In the following, the uncertainty of the GWF has been analysed accounting for the variability of the
- inputs, but assuming that the structure of the model is correct. The uncertainty affecting the input
- data is mainly due to the variability, both in space and time, of the crop yield and of the nutrient
- fractions that flow into the river as a result of the production of a single crop. The level of natural
- 243 background nutrients in the watercourse is a further element of uncertainty.

^b value was adapted in HRUs by GIS analysis

²³³

- If only the available input information is considered, at the end of the computational GWF process,
- the outcome will be a single number without any uncertainty. Therefore, to garner a measure of
- uncertainty, a distribution of GWF values should be constructed. To reach this goal, many input
- 247 datasets are needed, with similar properties in terms of averages, variability, etc., but that are
- slightly different from each other. In this way, a GWF value for each dataset can be computed, and
- then a distribution is attained. We defined a procedure, detailed in the following, which is a
- combination of the bootstrap and Monte Carlo methods.
- As input data, we used the fractions of nutrients per hectare (kg ha⁻¹) reaching the surface waters
- and the crop yields provided by SWAT for all the HRUs. A total number of 185 HRUs were
- identified within the basin, of which 65 were being cultivated with durum wheat. We obtained 715
- values (65 HRUs \times 11 years) for the ratio between a HRU nutrient load and the yield, called L_i
- $255 \qquad (L_i = \alpha \cdot AR_i/Y_i).$
- Starting from that dataset of L_i , the bootstrap method a conditional simulation technique that uses
- real observations as the basis of the simulations was applied, that generated 5000 artificial
- subsamples (L'_i). Each subsample consists of 715 data that are random samplings with replacement
- from the original data. The data related to the observations were analysed, and the most
- representative central parameter was chosen. In the case of a symmetrical distribution, this
- 261 parameter is the mean; in the case of a asymmetric distribution, this is preferably the median for its
- insensitivity to extreme values. For each L'_i generated by the bootstrap, the most representative
- parameter (median or mean, according to the previous step) was computed, called \hat{L}_j , with j=1,
- 264 ...5000. It was verified that the bias (the difference between the original sample and the
- corresponding bootstrap sample) was negligible, using the 'rule of thumb' defined by Efron and
 Tibshirani (1993); bias divided by standard error <0.25).
- The Monte Carlo simulation generated a set of 5000 random values of the $C_{nat,q}$ parameter within the interval defined above (0.00–0.90 mg L⁻¹ for DIN, 0.00–0.09 mg L⁻¹ for TP), making the assessment of the impact of the parameter variability on the response computation possible. To obtain the GWF, the 5000 values of \hat{L}_j were divided by the difference between C_{max} , which is a
- fixed value, and $C_{nat,q}$ (with q = 1, 2, ...5000). In this way, two series of values for the GWF were
- obtained for DIN and TP, respectively. These data were then analysed by using the most
- 273 representative parameter (mean or median), and the final value of the GWF was assumed to be the
- highest value between the two nutrients. Figure 2 shows the scheme of the methodology. An R
- script, reported in Appendix A, was created to perform all the operations described in the
- 276 methodology summarized in Figure 2 (R Development Core Team, 2008; RStudio Team, 2015).
- 277



279

Figure 2. Scheme of the methodological approach used for estimating GWF uncertainty.

280

281 **3.4** Assessing Environmental sustainability

In the Rio Mannu Basin, the environmental sustainability of the GWF for durum wheat production was assessed throughout the WPL. The WPL is an indicator, developed by Hoekstra et al. (2011), to express the effect of the GWF on the water quality in a basin. It shows the fraction of the waste assimilation capacity in a river basin that has been consumed (Mekonnen and Hoekstra, 2015). It is defined as the ratio of the total GWF (m³) to the total water yield (TWY, m³). The TWY was estimated by using the results of the SWAT model simulations that provide its value at the HRU

- level. Desirable values for the WPL should be within the range of 0 to 1 (Mekonnen and Hoekstra,
- 289 2015). If the WPL is greater than 1, the GWF is not sustainable because there is not enough water to
- dilute the pollutant load to maintain the concentration of the pollutant to below the maximum
- acceptable concentration (Liu et al., 2012).

292 **4 RESULTS**

293 4.1 MODELLING HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

294 The results of the hydrological and water-quality calibrations obtained using the transposition of hydrological parameters from the Rio Mulargia Basin to the Rio Mannu Basin were satisfactory, 295 296 following the criteria reported by Moriasi et al. (2007), as reported by De Girolamo et al. (2008). As Figure 3 shows, the mean monthly streamflow simulated at the outlet falls within the interval of the 297 standard deviations of the mean historical measured streamflow. It seems that the rainfall regime 298 299 has changed in recent decades, both in winter, when a consistent reduction in the amount has been recorded, and in late summer, when an increase in the average monthly rainfall has occurred. These 300 changes in the rainfall regime have had implications for the overall flow regime. Thus, the 301 simulated streamflow is generally higher than the historical values from April to December, except 302 303 in June and July, while it is lower than the historical values in the rest of the year, especially in March. 304

305 The hydrological regime of the Rio Mannu shows a high interannual variability, mainly due to the rainfall regime. The total annual rainfall over the 11-year simulation period ranges from 267 306 307 mm to 692 mm (501±138 mm), and the simulated TWY from 39 mm to 228 mm (120±57 mm). The simulated streamflow varies significantly, and in severe drought years, is nearly zero from June to 308 309 October. The annual potential evapotranspiration ranges from 1120 mm to 1250 mm (1190 ± 40 mm), confirming data from the literature (Ravelli, 2009). At the basin scale, the water balance is 310 dominated by the actual evapotranspiration (327±35 mm), which constitutes about 60% of the total 311 annual precipitation. 312

- 313
- 314
- 315
- 316

317



Figure 3. Measured (Qobs) and simulated (Qsim) mean monthly streamflow at the outlet (Monastir gauge).
 Error bars correspond to the standard deviation of the historical observed monthly streamflow from 1922 to
 1964. Mean monthly rainfall: historical (Pcp his) and recent measured data from the Rio Mannu Basin (Pcp cur).
 323

The model was also calibrated for water quality, in terms of concentrations, and the performance of the model was satisfactory, as the PBIAS is 6.51 and 28.59 for TN and TP, respectively, and the NSE is 0.92 for TN and 0.64 for TP (Moriasi et al., 2007). However, we are conscious that the measured data were limited, and that using additional data (i.e. flood events, dry and wet years), a better calibration could be made.

In the study period, the surveys showed mean concentrations of TP close to 0.25 mg L⁻¹, while the corresponding modelled values slightly underestimated the TP concentrations (0.19 mg L⁻¹). The values were higher than the limit value, fixed at 0.1 mg L⁻¹ for Level 2 (good) by the Italian Ministerial Decree (Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare, 2010; (Figure 4a). At the Monastir site, the TN concentrations simulated by the SWAT model ranged from 2.84 to 18.72 mg L⁻¹ (Figure 4b). The observed (mean value 3.53 mg L⁻¹) and simulated NO₃-N concentrations (mean value 3.47

mg L^{-1}) were found to be higher than the limit value (1.2 mg L^{-1}) fixed for Level 2 in the surface waters. The NO₃-N is correlated with the magnitude of the peak flow; it depends on the applications of fertiliser (rate and timing) and on the previous hydrological conditions (soil moisture).





³⁴¹ outlet (Monastir).

339

318

343 4.2 NUTRIENT EXPORT AND CROP YIELD

Table I shows the main components of the water balance and the specific nutrient loads at the

basin scale. As a result of the high interannual variability in annual rainfall (from 267 mm to 692
mm), the water balance components and nutrient loads differ from year to year. Nutrient load
assumes the lowest values in dry years and the highest in wet years. As Table II shows, specific
loads differ among the years.

349

Table II. Main components of the water balance at the basin scale: precipitation (PREC), total water yield
 (TWY), percolation (PERC), actual evapotranspiration (Et). Specific nutrient loads (kg ha⁻¹) in surface waters,
 NO₃-N, soluble phosphorus (Sol P), organic phosphorus (Org P), and NO₃-N leached from soil profile to
 groundwater (Leac).

					NO ₃ -N	NO ₃ -N	Sol P	Org P
Year	PREC (mm)	TWY (mm)	PERC (mm)	Et (mm)	Water (Kg/ha)	Leac (Kg/ha)	(Kg/ha)	(Kg/ha)
1006	602	162	121	106	1 76	2.10	0.10	1 15
1990	092 518	105	95	329	2.02	2.19	0.10	0.89
1998	341	59	40	310	0.95	0.95	0.04	0.46
1999	388	62	31	309	2.05	1.00	0.04	0.40
2000	454	94	63	294	1.26	1.77	0.08	1.10
2001	267	38	36	273	0.61	0.56	0.02	0.23
2002	559	116	69	363	1.28	1.52	0.07	0.79
2003	639	181	149	339	1.66	2.10	0.14	0.93
2004	682	228	176	328	1.93	2.50	0.20	1.56
2005	512	136	123	313	1.61	1.86	0.09	0.79
2006	457	110	62	333	1.33	1.29	0.10	0.81
Mean	501	120	88	327	1.50	1.60	0.09	0.83
SD	138	57	49	35	0.46	0.60	0.05	0.38

355 356

357 The crop yield predicted by the model was found to be in agreement with the durum wheat yield declared by the local farmers. Due to the water scarcity, which characterises the basin, and to the 358 359 monoculture scheme adopted for durum wheat cultivation, the average production in the basin was lower than for national production (Istituto Nazionale di Economia Agraria, 2013). As Figure 5 360 shows, the crop yield varies from year to year and within each year among the HRUs of the basin. 361 The production ranges between 1.6 t ha⁻¹ and 3.5 t ha⁻¹, tending to be higher in wet years. In each 362 year, crop production variability differs among the HRUs to varying degrees, mainly depending on 363 factors such as climate (rainfall and temperature) and soil characteristics (texture, depth, organic 364 365 matter).



366

Figure 5. Yield (t ha⁻¹) estimated by SWAT for all the HRUs under durum wheat production. The horizontal
 line in the boxplot indicates the median, the boundaries of the box indicate the 25th and 75th percentiles and the
 whiskers indicate the 1st and 99th percentiles of the values.

370

Over the study period, the average export coefficient was estimated as 10% and 2% of the N and 371 P application rate, respectively, computed to include all the HRUs under durum wheat production. 372 About 1% of the nitrogen application rate was estimated to leach from the soil profile into the 373 groundwater, in the form of NO₃-N. Specific nutrient loads (kg ha⁻¹) vary among HRUs, and differ 374 from year to year, as Figures 6 and 7 illustrate. The specific DIN load ranges from 0.06 to 5.41 kg N 375 ha⁻¹ among the HRUs within the basin. The minor variability and the lower values were recorded in 376 dry years. The average specific TP load was estimated as 0.86 kg ha⁻¹, ranging from 0.02 kg ha⁻¹ to 377 6.5 kg ha⁻¹, recorded in a dry and wet year, respectively. The NO₃-N leached from the soil into the 378 groundwater was, on average, 0.91 kg ha⁻¹, ranging from 0.00 to 24.60 kg ha⁻¹ (Figure 8). 379







Figure 6. DIN load (kg ha⁻¹) estimated by SWAT for the HRUs under durum wheat production. The
 horizontal line within the boxplot indicates the median, the boundaries of the box indicate the 25th and 75th
 percentiles and the whiskers indicate the 1st and 99th percentiles of the values.

385



Figure 7. TP load (kg ha⁻¹) estimated by SWAT for the HRUs under durum wheat production. The horizontal
 line within the boxplot indicates the median, the boundaries of the box indicate the 25th and 75th percentiles and
 the whiskers indicate the 1st and 99th percentiles of the values.

386



391



395 4.3 GREY WATER FOOTPRINT FOR DURUM WHEAT: ACCOUNTING FOR 396 UNCERTAINTY

- From the SWAT results, both the load of DIN and the yield were extracted for each HRU and for
- each year, producing a dataset of 715 values of $L_i(\alpha \cdot AR_i/Y_i)$, which constituted the original sample
- for the bootstrap. The same operation was performed for the TP load, giving a second dataset of 715 values of L_i .
- 401 A asymmetric distribution was found for the observed dataset of L_i computed for both the DIN and
- 402 TP loads. Hence, the median and the interquartile range (IQR) were selected as being representative
- 403 parameters. The median values (\hat{L}_i) of the generated subsamples (L'_i) and the IQR for DIN were
- 404 found to equal to those of the original samples, as Table III shows.
- 405 The median value of the GWF was 275 m³ t⁻¹ and the IQR was 167 m³ t⁻¹. The uncertainty,
- 406 explained as the ratio between the IQR and the median value, was about 60%.
- 407 The difference between the median value of the original sample $(0.278 \text{ kg t}^{-1})$ and the corresponding
- 408 bootstrap subsample (0.276 kg t⁻¹) was negligible for TP (Table III), as well as for the 1^{st} (0.002)
- and 3^{rd} (0.001) quartiles. The median value of the GWF was 3284 m³ t⁻¹ and the IQR was 586 m³ t⁻¹

- 410¹. The uncertainty (IQR/median value) was estimated at 18%. The GWF estimated for TP was
- 411 assumed to be the GWF of durum wheat because the result was higher than that obtained for DIN.

	412	Table III. Results of	f the bootstrap	resampling for	TP and DIN
--	-----	-----------------------	-----------------	----------------	-------------------

	TP		DIN	
Parameter	Estimation	Estimation (Bootstrap)	Estimation	Estimation (Bootstrap)
Mean	0.696	0.697	0.549	0.548
Variance	3.734	3.747	3.355	3.340
SD	1.932	1.916	1.832	1.786
Median	0.278	0.276	0.221	0.221
1 st Quartile	0.119	0.121	0.125	0.124
3 rd Quartile	0.513	0.514	0.369	0.372
Var. Coeff.	2.776	2.739	3.337	3.229
SE of Mean	0.072	0.072	0.069	0.067
Med. Abs. Dev.	0.174	0.173	0.115	0.114
95 th Percentile	1.902	2.074	1.679	1.665

414

415

416 4.4 ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY OF THE GWF

417 In a river basin, the effect of the total GWF depends on the total runoff available for pollutant assimilation. The results of the present work show that both the variables GWF and TWY vary over 418 419 time and space. Hence, the WPL assumes diverse values, depending on the time intervals considered in the calculations (intra- and interannual), and it also varies among subbasins. In the 420 present work, we performed an overall evaluation of the WPL for the Rio Mannu Basin over a study 421 period of 11 years. To do that, the median value of the annual GWF related to the TP load (3284 m³ 422 t⁻¹) was estimated for the entire wheat production on a yearly basis (53 066 t) for the entire study 423 area. The value of the GWF multiplied by the total wheat production was then divided by the 424 median annual total runoff (19 587 237 m³) provided by the SWAT model for the 65 HRUs. The 425 WPL (8.8) was greater than 1. This result indicates that the pollution assimilation capacity has been 426 fully consumed at the HRU level. Hence, locally and periodically, pollution problems can be 427 428 expected.

429 **5 DISCUSSION**

430 5.1 MODELLING THE LEACHING-RUNOFF NUTRIENT FRACTION AND CROP YIELD

The results of the present study show that the SWAT model is able to simulate the growing cycle of durum wheat, estimate the crop yield and quantify the fraction of nutrients entering the soil at HRU level that reaches the surface waters or percolates into the groundwater. The model thus proved to be a suitable tool for WF assessment. SWAT, as with most of the complex models 435 operating at the basin scale, requires a huge amount of data for its set-up, and field measurements

- 436 for calibrating the streamflow and water quality. In basins with data scarcity, such as the Rio
- 437 Mannu, specific strategies are needed to estimate the model parameters when flow data are
- unavailable (Bárdossy, 2007). The method adopted in this work was based on the transposition of
- parameters from a similar basin, in which the model was calibrated and validated (Bárdossy, 2007;
- 440 De Girolamo and Lo Porto, 2012). This approach allows the paucity of measured flow data to be
- overcome and calibration of the model, and even if the set of parameters is not the best, it is still a
- reliable way of estimating water balance and nutrient load apportionment.

443 5.2 IMPROVING GREY WATER FOOTPRINT ASSESSMENT

The crucial points in GWF assessment are: (i) the fraction of pollutants that leach from the soil to 444 445 the groundwater and run off to the surface water; (ii) the water-quality standards and natural background level of pollutants in the waters; and (iii) the crop yield. In previous studies, the TN 446 447 leaching-runoff fraction has been roughly estimated to be 0.10 of the TN fertiliser application (Hoekstra and Chapagain, 2008; Pellegrini et al., 2016). In more detailed studies, the runoff and 448 449 leaching fractions have been differentiated on the basis of the characteristics of the area (physical, hydraulic, agricultural practices; Franke et al., 2013). In the latter case, the leaching and runoff 450 451 fractions were defined as being in the range of 0.01–0.25 and 0.000–0.05 for TN and TP, respectively. Few studies have been based on field measurements (McFarland and Hauck, 2001; 452 453 D'Ambrosio et al., 2018a). Such studies have demonstrated that the leaching and runoff fractions are site specific, and that a unique and static value does not allow correct estimation of the GWF at 454 the local scale (Brueck and Lammel, 2016; D'Ambrosio et al., 2018a). 455 In the present study, the average value of the export coefficient was estimated as being 10% and 456

2% of the TN and TP application rate, respectively, computed by including all the HRUs under durum wheat production, as provided by the SWAT model. About 1% of the TN application was estimated to leach from the soil profile to the groundwater in the form of N-NO₃. Nutrient loads (kg ha⁻¹) reaching the surface and groundwater differed among the HRUs and from year to year. The leaching fraction, which is quite low in the Rio Mannu, could be much more relevant in basins with karstic areas bearing thin soils. Hence, caution is needed when transferring these factors to different areas.

464 The C_{max} and C_{nat} of pollutants are two factors that are extremely relevant in the GWF

465 computation. Despite several authors having already highlighted the need for standardising their

- settings (Dabrowski et al., 2009; Pellicer-Martínez and Martínez-Paz, 2016b; Liu et al., 2012,
- 467 2017), dissimilar values are currently assumed for both nitrogen and phosphorus compounds around

468 the world (Liu et al., 2017). The majority of the studies have fixed C_{max} at drinking-water standards

- 469 (Bulsink et al., 2010; Mekonnen and Hoekstra, 2010, 2011; Liu et al., 2017), with only a few
- 470 studies having used ambient water-quality standards (Pellegrini et al., 2016; Zhuo et al., 2016;

471 D'Ambrosio et al., 2018a, b). However, the fact that about two-thirds of the major rivers in the

- world are polluted to a level that exceeds their natural assimilation capacity (Liu et al., 2012) means
- 473 that this should no longer be neglected.
- In the present paper, for the DIN and TP in the surface water, we designated C_{max} as the 474 475 concentration fixed by national legislation for supporting a good ecological status, as required by 476 the WFD. Such environmental objectives constitute more stringent limits than those for drinking 477 water, and remain valid for groundwater (EC, 2006). Thus, the GWF based on environmental 478 standards assumes a higher value. Indeed, the aquatic ecosystem is the most sensitive user of water resources. The level of TP, which is not directly toxic to humans, NH₄-N and NO₃-N can have a 479 480 significant impact on the biota and river ecosystem (Prat et al., 2014). In EU countries, for surface waters, C_{max} should be fixed for environmental objectives, as required by the WFD, which aims at 481 482 achieving a good ecological status for all water bodies. Nevertheless, the standardisation remains an open problem because surface water-quality standards fixed by EU countries for TN and TP vary 483 484 substantially.
- 485 C_{nat} is generally assumed to be zero (Chapagain et al., 2006; Zeng et al., 2013), even if the usually 486 natural concentration of TN and TP in the surface water is greater than zero. To avoid 487 underestimation of the GWF that this assumption would produce, we designated C_{nat} as variable 488 within an interval from zero to a maximum value, fixed for each nutrient using values from the 489 literature, and we included such variability in the uncertainty analysis.
- 490 Based on the assumptions described above, our study shows that the GWF for TP inputs is the
- 491 highest for durum wheat production. TP is the principal nutrient related to the eutrophication
- 492 problem in riverine ecosystems, and is a more relevant pollutant than TN, despite the lower rate of
- 493 TP fertiliser application. This is also due to the fact that TP resides for longer in the environment.
- 494 Although a comparison of the GWF in numerical terms with previous studies cannot be done
- 495 without analysing the water-quality standards and natural background concentrations, similar results
- have been reported by Dabrowsky et al. (2009) and Gill et al. (2017), who found that the GWFs of
- 497 TN and pesticides were negligible compared to the results obtained for TP. Currently, most of the
- 498 studies on GWF assessment have only considered the TN and, generally, water-quality standards
- 499 for drinking water (Lovarelli et al., 2016), thus it is difficult to compare GWFs for crop production.
- Aldaya and Hoekstra (2010) reported a value of GWF for durum wheat in Italy of 301 m^3/t ,
- solution estimated for TN, using the US Environmental Protection Agency standards ($10 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \text{ of NO}_3\text{-N}$).

This value, which is in line with that estimated for DIN in this work, was about one order of 502 503 magnitude less than the final value of the GWF corresponding to TP. This study clearly 504 demonstrates that, by considering only the TN and using drinking-water standards, the GWF is underestimated, whereas, to obtain a reliable assessment of the GWF, a larger number of pollutants 505 should be included. The variability in crop yield also has a great influence on the GWF calculation. 506 Production varies among the years; in the Rio Mannu Basin, this was between 1.6 t ha⁻¹ and 3.5 t 507 ha⁻¹. These values tend to be higher in wet years. It is evident that the value of the crop yield to be 508 used in the GWF equation has to be selected with particular caution. From our analysis, it is clear 509 510 that several years (at least 10) should be considered so as to obtain a reliable estimation of the crop yield that allows for climate variability. 511

512 **5.3** ACCOUNTING FOR UNCERTAINTY

Although the relevance of uncertainty analysis in WF assessment has been well recognised (Zhuo et 513 al., 2014; Gil et al., 2017; D'Ambrosio et al., 2018a), it is rarely developed. The assessment of the 514 response uncertainty is currently an open problem, given its intrinsic complexity due to the 515 516 interdependence of the various types of uncertainty that propagate from the input to the response through the model (Refsgaard et al., 2007). A possible approach to the uncertainty issue starts from 517 518 a knowledge of the mathematical form of input data distribution and, based on the model structure, 519 a prediction about the response data distribution can be provided (Gill et al., 2017). Unfortunately, 520 in general, real-world data follow a complex mixture of distributions, the properties of which are very difficult to characterise, making the above approach unfeasible. Since the main uncertainty 521 descriptors are the statistical moments or the quantiles, rather than the whole distribution, an 522 alternative simple and effective approach to the uncertainty assessment is the simulation. As 523 proposed in this paper, by means of the simulation, it is possible to generate a set of responses from 524 which the usual uncertainty descriptors (standard deviations, interquartile range, etc.) can be 525 526 extracted. The approach, which is based on a combination of bootstrap and Monte Carlo 527 simulations, is conceptually easy, even if it might be computer-intensive. In fact, on one hand, a 528 large number of simulations guarantees high accuracy in the descriptors computation, but on the other, a too large number of simulations could be excessively time-consuming. To provide a 529 realistic and representative value of the GWF, we used 5000 runs and investigated 11 years' worth 530 531 of crop production. The high value of uncertainty found in this study demonstrates that it cannot be neglected. 532

533 **5.4 WATER POLLUTION LEVEL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Water scarcity and water pollution are the main problems affecting the Rio Mannu and most of 534 the basins in the Mediterranean region, where the most common waterways are intermittent streams 535 that are particularly sensitive to pollution levels (Shumilova et al., 2019). Their protection requires 536 537 new methods to better manage river basins (Nikolaidis et al., 2013; Leigh et al., 2016). The WF and the WPL are two relatively new indicators that can constitute valid supports for 538 watershed management, by means of which it is possible to evaluate the environmental 539 sustainability of crop production. In this work, the environmental sustainability of the GWF for 540 durum wheat production, assessed throughout the WPL, was found to be greater than the desirable 541 value. Hence, we can argue that the TP load exceeds the assimilation capacity at the reach scale. At 542 543 the basin scale, we are not able to evaluate the sustainability, as the assimilation capacity could be guaranteed or reduced, depending on all other land uses and anthropogenic activities present in the 544 545 basin. 546 Specific measures should be implemented to reduce the GWF of durum wheat production. These measures must be oriented towards reducing pollutants flowing into the river, but, at the same time, 547 such measures must offer a margin of profit for the farmers to be accepted and implemented. In this 548 difficult process of integration between environmental sustainability and economic competitiveness, 549 technological innovations will play a key role (Aldieri and Vinci, 2017; Hájek and Stejskal, 2018). 550 Indeed, precision agriculture (PA), which uses information technology, can contribute to meeting 551 552 the increasing demand for food, feed and raw materials, while ensuring the sustainable use of natural resources. Currently, the EU Common Agriculture Policy supports PA, providing 553 instruments and measures for EU member states (Joint Research Centre of the European 554 Commission, 2014). However, the adoption of PA in Europe encounters specific challenges, mainly 555

557 6 CONCLUSIONS

556

In the present paper, a new approach for improving GWF assessment and its uncertainty has been proposed, coupling the SWAT model and in-stream monitoring activities at the basin scale. The methodology was tested for the rain-fed durum wheat production in the Rio Mannu Basin, an area under water shortage.

562 The main conclusions derived from the study are:

due to the small size and diversity of farm structures.

SWAT is a useful tool for assessing the GWF and the sustainability of crop production
 because it is able to provide the main inputs for GWF computation, such as the fractions of

nutrients that leach from soil to groundwater or runoff to surface water and the crop yield, atthe HRU level with high accuracy.

- The GWF strictly depends on the water-quality standards applied. By using environmental standards instead of drinking water-quality standards for fixing C_{max} , the GWF assumes a higher value, as the environmental objectives constitute more stringent limits than those for drinking water. Assuming C_{nat} equals zero leads to an underestimation of the GWF. It is better to consider C_{nat} as variable within an interval of zero to a maximum value, fixed for each nutrient by values from the literature, including such variability in the uncertainty analysis. This study shows that a standardisation for fixing C_{max} and C_{nat} is needed.
- The GWF for TP inputs is the highest for durum wheat production, despite the phosphorus
 fertiliser application rate being lower than that of nitrogen. This study clearly demonstrates
 that, to obtain a reliable assessment of the GWF, a large number of pollutants should be
 included.
- GWF estimation is site and time specific. This result suggests that GWF accounting,
 especially for rain-fed crops, should be done over a long period of time to take into account
 the influence of climate on crop yield and nutrient export.
- The uncertainty analysis, based on the bootstrap coupled with Monte Carlo simulations, has
 proved to be an easy approach, able to provide a realistic and representative value for the
 GWF.
- The environmental sustainability of the GWF for durum wheat production, assessed
 throughout the WPL indicator, shows that, at the HRU level, there is not enough water to
 dilute the pollutant load to maintain the concentration of pollutants below the maximum
 acceptable concentration. At the same time, this study shows that further studies are needed
 to estimate the GWF and WPL at the basin scale, to include all anthropogenic activities
 existing in the area.

590 Acknowledgements

591 The field activities were supported by the EU FP6 Aquastress Project (Contr. no. 511231-2). The 592 authors gratefully acknowledge Domenico Usai for sharing his knowledge, and Massimo Aiello and 593 Stefania Zaccolo for collecting the agronomic data and organising the meetings with the farmers 594 and stakeholders. Thanks are also due to three reviewers for their valuable scientific comments and 595 recommendations. Lastly, a special thanks to Nicola Loconsole for creating the graphical abstract.

596 **REFERENCES**

Abdelwahab, O.M.M., Ricci, G.F., De Girolamo, A.M., Gentile, F., 2018. Modelling soil erosion in
 a Mediterranean watershed: Comparison between SWAT and AnnAGNPS models.

- Environmental Research 166, 363-376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.029 599 Aldaya, M.M., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2010. The water needed for Italians to eat pasta and pizza . 600 601 Agricultural Systems 103, 351–360. doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2010.03.004 Aldieri, L., Vinci, C.P., 2017. The Role of Technology Spillovers in the Process of Water Pollution 602 Abatement for Large International Firms. Sustainability 9(5), 868. doi:10.3390/su9050868 603 604 Arnold, J.G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R.S., Williams, J.R., 1998. Large area hydrologic modeling 605 and assessment-Part 1: Model development. Journal of the American Water Resources Association 34(1), 73-89. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752 - 1688.1998.tb05961.x 606 607 Bárdossy, A., 2007. Calibration of hydrological model parameters for ungauged catchments. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 11, 703-710. 608 Brouzivne, Y., Abouabdillah A., Hirich A., Bouabid R., Rashyd Z., Benaabidate L., 2018. 609 Modeling sustainable adaptation strategies toward a climate-smart agriculture in a 610 Mediterranean watershed under projected climate change scenarios. Agricultural Systems 162, 611 154-163 DOI:10.1016/j.agsv.2018.01.024 612 Brueck, H., Lammel, J., 2016. Impact of fertilizer N application on the grey water footprint of 613 614 winter wheat in a NW-European Temperate climate. Water 8(8), 356. https://doi.org/10.3390/w8080356 615 Bulsink, F., Hoekstra, A.Y. Booij M.J., 2010. The water footprint of Indonesian provinces related to 616 617 the consumption of crop products. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 14, 119-128. Cazcarro, I., Duarte, R., Sánchez Chóliz, J., Saraza, C., Serrano, A., 2016. Modelling regional 618 policy scenarios in the agri-food sector: a case study of a Spanish region. Journal Applied 619 620 Economics 48(16), 1463-1480. Chapagain, A.K., Hoekstra, A.Y., Savenije, H.H.G., Gautam, R., 2006. The water footprint of 621 cotton consumption: An assessment of the impact of worldwide consumption of cotton 622 623 products on the water resources in the cotton producing countries. Ecol. Econ. 60(1), 186-203. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.11.027 624 Chapagain, A.M., Hoekstra, A.Y. 2011. The blue, green and grey water footprint of rice from 625 production and consumption perspectives. Ecol. Econ. 70, 749-758. 626 Chapagain A.K., 2017. Water Footprint: State of the Art: What, Why, and How?, Editor(s): Martin 627 A. Abraham, Encyclopedia of Sustainable Technologies, Elsevier, 2017, Pages 153-163, ISBN 628 9780128047927, https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.10164-2. 629 Dabrowski, J.M., Murray, K., Ashton, P., Leaner, J. 2009. Agricultural impacts on water quality 630 and implications for virtual water trading decision. Ecol. Econ. 68, 1074-1082. 631 D'Ambrosio, E., De Girolamo, A.M., Rulli, M.C. 2018a. Assessing sustainability of agriculture 632 through water footprint analysis and in-stream monitoring activities. Journal of Cleaner 633 Production 200, 454-470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.07.229 634 D'Ambrosio, E., De Girolamo, A.M., Rulli, M.C., 2018b. Coupling the water footprint accounting 635 636 of crops and in-stream monitoring activities at catchment scale. MethodsX, 5, 1221-1240, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2018.10.003. 637 Dechmi F., Burguete J., Skhiri, A. 2012. SWAT application in intensive irrigation systems: Model 638 modification, calibration and validation. Journal of Hydrology, 470-471, 227-238. 639 De Girolamo, A.M., Bouraoui, F., Buffagni, A., Pappagallo, G., Lo Porto, A., 2017a. Hydrology 640 under climate change in a temporary river system: Potential impact on water balance and flow 641 regime. Riv. Res. Applic. 33(7), 1219-1232. doi:10.1002/rra.3165 642 De Girolamo, A.M., Balestrini, R., D'Ambrosio, E., Pappagallo, G., Soana, E., Lo Porto, A., 2017b. 643
 - Antropogenic input of nitrogen and riverine export from a Mediterranean catchment. The
 Celone, a temporary river case study. Agric. Water Manag. 187, 190–199.
 - 646 doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2017.03.025
 - De Girolamo, A.M., Barca, E., Pappagallo, G., Lo Porto, A. 2017c. Simulating ecologically relevant
 hydrological indicators in a temporary river system. Agric. Water Manag., 180 part B, 194–
 204 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2016.05.034
 - 649 204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2016.05.034

- be Girolamo A.M., De Luca F., Lo Porto A., Botti, P., Canè G., Diliberto L. 2008. Studio
 dell'inquinamento da fonti diffuse nel bacino del Rio Mulargia Applicazione del modello
 SWAT. L'Acqua
- De Girolamo, A.M., Lo Porto, A., 2012. Land use scenario development as a tool for watershed
 management within the Rio Mannu Basin. Land Use Policy 29(3), 691-701.
- Ente Autonomo Flumendosa, 1996. Studio dell'Idrologia Superficiale della Sardegna. Cagliari,
 http://pcserver.unica.it/web/sechi/Corsi/ Didattica /DatiSISS/index.htm
- EC, 2000. Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and the Council (2000). Directive
- establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy. Official Journal ofthe European Communities, Brussels, 22/12/2000.
- EC, 2006. Directive 2006/118/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December
 2006 on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration. Official Journal of
 the European Union 27/12/2006.
- European Environment Agency, 2004. Nitrogen and phosphorus in rivers, [Online]. Available:
 https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/nitrogen-and-phosphorus-in-rivers.
- Efron, B., Tibshirani, R.J., 1993. An introduction to the bootstrap, Chapman & Hall, New York
- Franke, N.A., Boyacioglu, H., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2013. Grey water footprint accounting: Tier 1
 supporting guidelines. Unesco-IHE, Delft.
- Gil, R., Bojacá, C.R., Schrevens, E., 2017. Uncertainty of the Agricultural Grey Water Footprint
 Based on High Resolution Primary Data. Water Resour. Manag. 31(11), 3389-3400.
 doi:10.1007/s11269-017-1674-x
- Glavan, M., Miličić, V., Pintar, M., 2013. Finding options to improve catchment water quality—
 Lessons learned from historical land use situations in a Mediterranean catchment in Slovenia.
 Ecological Modelling 261-262, 58-73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.04.004
- Grizzetti, B., Bouraoui, F., De Marsily, G., 2008. Assessing nitrogen pressures on European surface
 water. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 22, GB4023, 1-14. doi:10.1029/2007GB003085.
- Hájek, P., Stejskal, J.,2018. R&D Cooperation and Knowledge Spillover Effects for Sustainable
 Business Innovation in the Chemical Industry. Sustainability, 10(4), 1064;
 https://doi.org/10.3390/su10041064
- Hargreaves, G.H., Samani, Z.A., 1985. Reference crop evapotranspiration from temperature.
 Applied Engineering in Agriculture 1, 96-99.
- Hoekstra, A.Y., Chapagain, A.K., 2008. Globalization of Water: Sharing the Planet's Freshwater
 Resources. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.
- Hoekstra, A.Y., Chapagain, A.K., Aldaya, M.M., Mekonnen, M.M., 2011. The Water Footprint
 Assessment Manual. London Washington DC.
- Hoekstra, A.Y., 2016. A critique on the water-scarcity weighted water footprint in LCA. Ecol.
 Indic. 66, 564-573.
- ISTAT, 2008. Annual Crop Data. Italian National Institute of Statistics. http://agri.istat.it (accessed
 3.09.18)
- Istituto Nazionale di Economia Agraria, 2013. Istituto Nazionale di Economia Agraria.
 L'agricoltura in Sardegna. Caratteristiche strutturali e risultati aziendali. Report 2013.
 http://www.rica.inea.it/
- Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, 2014. Precision Agriculture: an opportunity for
 EU farmers-potential support with the CAP 2014-2010. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies
- Koukal, B., Dominik, J., Vignati, D., Arpagaus, P., Santiago, S. and Benaabidate, L. (2004)
 Assessment of Water Quality and Toxicity of Polluted Rivers Fez and Sebou in Region of Fez (Morocco). Environ. Pollut. 131, 163-170
- Krysanova, V., Hattermann, F.F., Huang, S.H., Hesse, C., Vetter, T., Liersch, S., Koch, H.,
 Kundzewicz, Z.W. 2015. Modelling climate and land-use change impacts with SWIM:
 Lessons learnt from multiple applications. Hydrol. Sci. J. 2015, 60, 606–635.
- Lamastra, L., Suciu, N.A., Novelli, E., Trevisan, M., 2014. A new approach to assessing the water

- footprint of wine: An Italian case study. Sci. Total Environ. 490, 748–756.
 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.05.063
- Leigh,C., Boulton, A.J., Courtwright, J.L., Fritz, K. May, C.L., Walker, R.H., Datry T. 2016.
 Ecological research and management of intermittent rivers: an historical review and future directions. Freshwater Biology 61, 1181–1199. doi:10.1111/fwb.12646
- Lovarelli, D., Bacenetti, J., Fiala, M., 2016. Water footprint of crop productions: A review. Science
 of The Total Environment 548-549, 236-251.
- Liu, C., Kroeze, C., Hoekstra, A.Y., Gerbens-Leenes, W., 2012. Past and future trends in grey water
 footprints of anthropogenic nitrogen and phosphorus inputs to major world rivers. Ecol. Indic.
 18, 42–49. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.10.005
- Liu, W., Antonelli, M., Liu, X., Yang, H., 2017. Towards improvement of grey water footprint
 assessment: With an illustration for global maize cultivation. J. Clean. Prod. 147, 1–9.
 doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.01.072
- McFarland, A.M.S., Hauck, L.M., 2001. Determining nutrient export coefficients and source
 loading uncertainty using in-stream monitoring data. J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc. 37, 223236. doi:10.1111/j.1752-1688.2001.tb05488.x
- Mekonnen, M.M., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2010. A global and high-resolution assessment of the green, blue
 and grey water footprint of wheat. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 14, 1259–1276. doi:10.5194/hess14-1259-2010
- Mekonnen, M.M., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2011. The green, blue and grey water footprint of crops and
 derived crop products. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 15, 1577-1600. doi:10.5194/hess-15-1577-2011
- Mekonnen, M.M., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2015. Global gray water footprint and water pollution levels
 related to anthropogenic nitrogen loads to fresh water. Environ Sci Technol 49(21), 12860–
 12868. DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.5b03191.
- Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare, 2010. DM. 260/10 del 08
 novembre 2010 n. 260. G.U. n. 30 del 7/02/2011, Suppl. Ordinario n. 31.
- Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare, 2015. [Online]. Available:
 http://www.minambiente.it/pagina/cose-la-water-footprint
- Moriasi, D.N., Arnold, J.G., Van Liew, M.W., Bingner, R.L., Harmel, R.D., Veith, T.L., 2007.
 Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed
 simulations. Transactions of the ASABE, 50(3): 885-900
- Nikolaidis, N.P., Demetropoulou, L., Froebrich, J., Jacobs, C., Gallart, F., Prat, N., ... Perrin, J.L.
 2013. Towards sustainable management of Mediterranean river basins: Policy
- recommendations on management aspects of temporary streams. Water Policy, 15, 830-849.
 <u>https://doi</u>. org/10.2166/wp.2013.158
- Pellegrini, G., Ingrao, C., Camposeo, S., Tricase, C., Contò, F., Huisingh, D., 2016. Application of
 water footprint to olive growing systems in the Apulia region: A comparative assessment. J.
 Clean. Prod. 112, 2407–2418. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.088
- Pellicer-Martínez, F., Martínez-Paz, J.M., 2016a. The Water Footprint as an indicator of
 environmental sustainability in water use at the river basin level. Sci. Total Environ. 571, 561–
 574. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.022
- Pellicer-Martínez, F., Martínez-Paz, J.M., 2016b. Grey water footprint assessment at the river basin
 level: Accounting method and case study in the Segura River Basin, Spain. Ecol. Indic. 60,
 1173-1183.
- Prat, N., Gallart, F., Von Schiller, D., Polesello, S., García-Roger, E.M., Latron, J., Rieradevall, M.,
 Llorens, P., Barberá, G.G., Brito, D., De Girolamo, A.M., Dieter, D., Lo Porto, A., Buffagni,
 A., Erba, S., Nikolaidis, N.P., Querner, E.P., Tournoud, M.G., Tzoraki, O., Skoukulidis, N.,
 Gómez, R., Sanchez-Montoya, M., Tockner, K., Froebrich, J., 2014. The MIRAGE
 TOOLBOX: an integrated assessment tool fortemporary streams. River Res. Appl. 30,
 1318–1334. DOI: 10.1002/rra
- Ravelli, F., 2009. In: Nozioni di idrologia agraria acqua per le colture. Howarth Ed. 429.

- Refsgaard, J.C., van der Sluijs, J.P., Højberg, A.L., Vanrolleghem, P.A., 2007. Uncertainty in the
 environmental modelling process-a framework and guidance. Environ. Model. Software 22,
 1543–1556.
- R Development Core Team, 2008. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Ricci, G., De Girolamo, A.M., Abdelwahab, O., Gentile, F. 2018. Identifying sediment source areas
 in a Mediterranean watershed using the SWAT model. Land Degrad. Dev. 29, 1233–1248.
 DOI: 10.1002/ldr.2889
- Richter, B.D., Baumgartner, J.V., Powell, J., Braun, D.P. 1996. A method for assessing hydrologic
 alteration within ecosystems. Conserv. Biol. 10, 1163–74.
- Shumilova, O., Zak, D., Datry, T., Von Schiller, D., et al. 2019. Simulating rewetting events in intermittent rivers and ephemeral streams: a global analysis of leached nutrients and organic matter. Global Change Biology. Doi: 10.1111/gcb.14537
- 765 RStudio Team, 2015. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA.
- Stathatou, P.-M.G., Tsoukala, V.K., Papadopoulou, M.P., Stamou, A., Spiliotopoulou, N., Theoxari,
 C., Papagrigoriou, S., 2012. An Environmental Approach for the Management and Protection
 of Heavily Irrigated Regions. Glob. NEST J. 14(3), 276-283.
- Strauch, M., Lima J.E.F.W., Volk M., Lorz C., Makeschin F., 2013. The impact of Best
 Management Practices on simulated streamflow and sediment load in a Central Brazilian
 catchment. Journal of Environmental Management 127, S24-S36.
- United Nations World Water Assessment Program, 2018. UN-Water. 2018. The United Nations
 World Water Development Report 2018: Nature-Based Solutions for Water. United Nations
 Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, France.
 http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002614/261424e.pdf
- US Department of Agriculture–Soil Conservation Service, 1972. In: National Engineering
 Handbook, Hydrology Section 4, 4-10. USDA Soil Conservation Service, Washington DC.
- Vanham, D., Bidoglio, G., 2013. A review on the indicator water footprint for the EU28. Ecol.
 Indic. 26, 61–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.10.021.
- Vetter, T., Reinhardt, J., Flörke, M., van Griensven, A., Hattermann, F., Huang, S.,. Koch, H.,
 Pechlivanidis, I.G., Plötner, S., Seidou, O., Su, B., Vervoort, R.W., Krysanova, V. 2017.
 Evaluation of sources of uncertainty in projected hydrological changes under climate change in
 12 large-scale river basins. Climatic Change 141(3), 419-433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584016-1794-y.
- Zeng, Z., Liu, J., Savenije, H.H.G., 2013. A simple approach to assess water scarcity integrating
 water quantity and quality. Ecol. Indic. 34, 441–449. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.06.012
- Zhuo, L., Mekonnen, M.M., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2014. Sensitivity and uncertainty in crop water
 footprint accounting: a case study for the Yellow River basin. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 18,
 2219–2234. doi:10.5194/hess-18-2219-2014
- Zhuo, L., Mekonnen, M.M., Hoekstra, A.Y., Wada, Y., 2016. Inter- and intra-annual variation of
 water footprint of crops and blue water scarcity in the Yellow River Basin (1961-2009). Adv.
 Water Resour., 87, pp. 21-41
- 793 794
- 795
- 796
- 797
- 798

799APPENDIX A: R script. The input file (.xlsx or .csv format) must contain in the first column load ($\alpha \cdot AR$; kg ha⁻¹)800for each HRU, in the second column crop yield (Y; t ha⁻¹), in the third column the ratio between $\alpha \cdot AR$ and801Y. Cmax (kg m⁻³) and Cnat (kg m⁻³) for each of the two analysed pollutants must be fixed by the user within802the script as indicated by the comments.

```
803
     804
     ****
805
     require(openxlsx)
806
     require(nortest)
     ****
807
808
     mydata <- as.data.frame(openxlsx::read.xlsx("D:/C DOCUMENTI/eman/annamariaDeG/PL/Dati
809
     per bootstrap per Eman.xlsx", 1))
810
     mydata.din <- na.omit(mydata[ , 3])</pre>
811
     #statistics and graphs
812
     hist(mydata.din)
813
     boxplot(mydata.din)
814
     p.value <- ad.test(mydata.din)$p.value # ANDERSON-DARLING GAUSSIAN TEST
815
     #resampling - SAMPLE WITH REPLACEMENT
816
     resamples <- lapply(1:5000, function(i) sample(mydata.din, replace = T))
817
     if (p.value > 0.05) {
818
     r.average <- sapply(resamples, mean)</pre>
819
     } else {r.average <- sapply(resamples, median)}</pre>
820
     *****
821
     mydata.din <- data.frame()</pre>
822
     mydata.din <- cbind(r.average)</pre>
     *****
823
824
     mydata <- as.data.frame(openxlsx::read.xlsx("D:/C DOCUMENTI/eman/annamariaDeG/PL/Dati
825
     per bootstrap per Eman.xlsx", 2))
826
     mydata.tp <- na.omit(mydata[ , 3])</pre>
827
     #statistics and graphs
828
     hist(mydata.tp)
829
     boxplot(mydata.tp)
830
     p.value <- ad.test(mydata.tp)$p.value</pre>
831
     #resampling
832
     resamples <- lapply(1:5000, function(i) sample(mydata.tp, replace = T))
833
     if (p.value > 0.05) {
      r.average <- sapply(resamples, mean)</pre>
834
835
     } else {r.average <- sapply(resamples, median)}</pre>
836
     *****
837
     mydata.tp <- data.frame()</pre>
     mydata.tp <- cbind(r.average)</pre>
838
839
     **********
840
     limit.inf <- 0.000
                       #INPUT BY USER
841
     limit.sup <- 0.00003 #INPUT BY USER</pre>
842
     \#MC generation based on uniform distribution
843
     cnat.tp <- runif(5000, limit.inf, limit.sup)</pre>
844
     cmax.tp <- 0.0001</pre>
                       #INPUT BY USER
845
     c.tp <- cmax.tp - cnat.tp</pre>
846
     mydata.tp <- cbind(mydata.tp, c.tp)</pre>
847
     limit.inf <- 0.000
                       #INPUT BY USER
848
     limit.sup <- 0.0009 #INPUT BY USER</pre>
849
     #MC generation based on uniform distribution
850
     cnat.din <- runif(5000, limit.inf, limit.sup)</pre>
     cmax.din <- 0.00126
851
                       #INPUT BY USER
852
     c.din <- cmax.din - cnat.din
853
     mydata.din <- cbind(mydata.din, c.din)</pre>
854
     *****
855
     res.tp <- as.numeric(vector())</pre>
856
     res.din <- as.numeric(vector())</pre>
857
     ******
858
     for (i in 1:5000) {
859
       num.din <- mydata.din[i, 1]</pre>
860
       num.tp <- mydata.tp[i, 1]</pre>
861
       #print(i)
862
       for (j in 1:5000) {
863
        denom.din <- mydata.din[i, 2]</pre>
864
        denom.tp <- mydata.tp[i, 2]</pre>
865
        res.din[(i -1) * 5000 + j] <- num.din/denom.din
        res.tp[(i -1) * 5000 + j] <- num.tp/denom.tp
866
```

```
867
        }# end loop i
868
      }# end loop j
869
       #statistics and graphs
870
      hist(res.din)
871
      boxplot(res.din)
872
      p.value <- ad.test(res.din)$p.value</pre>
873
      if (p.value > 0.05) {
874
875
       r.average <- mean(res.din)
        r.spread <- sd(res.din)</pre>
      876
877
878
      }
879
      print(r.average)
880
      print(r.spread)
881
       #statistics and graphs
882
      hist(res.tp)
883
      boxplot(res.tp)
884
      p.value <- ad.test(res.tp)$p.value</pre>
885
      if (p.value > 0.05) {
       r.average <- mean(res.tp)
r.spread <- sd(res.tp)</pre>
886
887
888
      } else {r.average <- median(res.tp)
889
      r.spread <- IQR(res.tp)</pre>
890
      }
891
      print(r.average)
892
      print(r.spread)
893
```