# ASSESSMENT OF TELUGU GANGA PROJECT IN NELLORE DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA BASED ON IRRIGATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

**ABSTRACT**

A study was conducted to assess the effect of rainfall and canal water on paddy and groundnut yield in Nellore under Telugu Ganga Project (TGP) command in Andhra Pradesh. The evaluation was made using different indicators namely crop condition, inventory, calendar, irrigation potential, irrigation scheduling and yield. Optimization was done to identify suitable rainfall and canal water levels for maximizing the yield. Paddy area significantly increased by 129.2% (78688 to 180351 ha) due to supply of canal water, while groundnut area decreased by 54.1% (35181 to 16152 ha)over years. Based on NDVI, in *kharif* maximum paddy area of52% and *rabi* 56% was under 'very good' category in 2018. In Nellore, mean equity of 60.3% (CV of 55%), uniformity of 69% (CV of 44.5%), irrigation intensity of 72.1% (CV of 62.7%), consumed ratio/efficiency of 50.9% (CV of 53.3%), adequacy of 159% (CV of 24.5%) and yield of 5552 kg/ha (CV of 25.6%)were observed.

The area under TGP in Nellore, rainfall changed with rate of change of 1.5929 mm/year ($R^2$ of 0.001) compared to -3.664 mm/year ($R^2$ of 0.02) in the TGP command. The canal releases are compared in the Nellore district under the command with entire TGP command. The mean water released in the Nellore district was 323.8 Mcum (CV of 67.9%) and compared to 58.49- 1020.17 Mcum (CV of 72.4%) in TGP command. The rate of change of canal water was 19.933 Mcum/year in Nellore($R^2$ of 0.3924) compared to 71.511 Mcum/year in TGP command($R^2$of 0.4681).Significant correlations of 0.825 for paddy and 0.762 for groundnut yield with canal water were observed. Regression model gave rate of change of 78.823 kg/ha/year for paddy ($R^2$ of 0.2402), compared to 16.308 kg/ha/year ($R^2$of 0.092) for groundnut.

Paddy yield was significantly influenced by the canal water ($R^2$ 0.772) compared to groundnut yield (0.600) based on quadratic model. The pre-monsoon level had a mean of 39.0 m (CV of 6.4%), compared to post-monsoon mean of 34.5 m (CV of 5.8%) with rise of 4.7 m (CV of 17.5%) in the groundwater level. The pre-monsoon level had a rate of change of 0.6709 m ($R^2$ of 0.6657) compared to post-monsoon level with 0.4406 m ($R^2$ of 0.4475), while rise in groundwater level had rate of change of 0.2382 m ($R^2$ of 0.7825) over years.

Maximum paddy yield of 5440 kg/ha was attained at mean canal water of 1768.3 Mcum and rainfall of 1151 mm, while groundnut yield of 2195 kg/ha was attained at mean canal water of 1822.6 Mcum and rainfall of 1040.7 mm. Since TGP command is drought prone, farmers can cultivate efficient and less water requiring crops for attaining maximum yield with canal water supply.

***Key words**: Telugu Ganga Project, NDVI, Canal water, Rainfall, Performance indicators, Correlation and Regression*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

UNDER PEER REVIEW

The Telugu Ganga irrigation project is an inter-state project formulated to irrigate 5.75 lakh ac in drought prone areas of Rayalaseema region comprising of Chittoor, Kadapa, Kurnool and uplands of Nellore in Andhra Pradesh by utilising 29 TMC of water from Krishna flood flows, and 30 TMC of water from Pennar river flood flows. With a view to provide drinking water facility to Chennai in Tamil Nadu, the three Krishna basin states of the former combined Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra have agreed to spare 5 TMC water each from their shares of Krishna river water for meeting the drinking water requirements. In 1977, the project was approved after reaching an agreement between Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Karnataka. Based on the agreement, each state would contribute 5 billion cubic feet ($140\times10^6$ $m^3$ ) of water annually, for total supply of 15 billion cubic feet ($420\times10^6$ $m^3$ ). Subsequently, this quantity of water was reduced and revised to 12 billion cubic feet ($340\times10^6$ $m^3$ ) in 1983 after considering seepage and evaporation losses.

## 1.1 Study Area

### 1.1.1 Telugu Ganga Project Jurisdiction

The study area of Telugu Ganga Project (TGP) is shown in Fig. 1. The command area lies between the Northern Latitudes of $14^0$ 54' and $16^0$ 18' and Eastern Longitudes of $76^0$ 58' and $79^0$ 34'.The TGP main canals covering part of the four districts viz., Chittoor (05 mandals), Nellore (08 mandals), Kurnool (09 mandals), and Kadapa (13 mandals) and total TGP command area covering about 33 mandals.



Figure1. Study Area of Telugu Ganga Project

The annual rainfall of TGP command ranged from 675 to 933 mm compared to normal rainfall of 1134 mm. Every year, the South-West monsoon contributes 70% of the total rainfall, while the remaining three seasons contribute 30% of rainfall. The normal rainfall of South-West monsoon is about 525 mm, which is 70% of the annual rainfall and would play a vital role on the crop production during *kharif* season. The North-East monsoon would account for the remaining 25 to 30% of annual rainfall.

Ramana (2007) evaluated the canal irrigation systems using remote sensing and GIS for Krishna Western Delta (KWD) with performance indicators of crop condition, crop inventory, crop calendar, yield estimation, irrigation intensity, adequacy and equity distribution of water. Paddy was grown in 90% area, while annual crops were grown in the remaining area. NDVI indicated that 52% crop came under good category in 2005 compared to 7% in 1998. Irrigation intensity exceeded 90% in all canal commands, while irrigation efficiency was 42% due to excess water availability. Cultivators are increasingly arranging innovative high technical and scientific estimation to enhance sustainability, effectiveness and plant health. RS may provide framework to systematically consider these issues of smart farming technology to embed high-tech agriculture better. The impact is beneficial depending on how data mining, imagery technologies and analysis are applied.

Molden and Gates (1990) developed performance measures for analysis of irrigation water delivery systems in terms of adequacy, efficiency, dependability and equity of the water delivery. These measures could be incorporated in a regular monitoring program which would provide frame work for making assessment of alternatives for system improvement. Bos *et al*. (1994) suggested indicators that are related to the performance of (i) water delivery system, (ii) environment and (iii) irrigated agricultural system. The frame work of indicators includes environment sustainability features to evaluate long-term effects of irrigation on environment like changes in the groundwater table. In order to make an effective performance oriented approach, it is necessary to retrofit new techniques and approaches to existing management practices. Evaluation of efficiency of irrigation water use has under gone major modifications during last 35 years (Bos and Nugteren, 1974).

Bastiaanssen and Bos (1999) assessed the irrigation performance indicators based on remote sensing data. The AET, soil water content and crop growth reflect overall water utilization up to field level. Crop evapotranspiration includes water originating from irrigation supply, water from precipitation, groundwater and water withdrawn from unsaturated zone. Hence, this is a refinement in spatial scale compared to classically collected flow measurements and describes depletion from all water resources.

Rodriguez *et al*. (2008) developed a methodology to assess performance indicators of 9 irrigation districts in Andalusia in Spain. The methodology is based on cluster analysis which enabled the districts to be classified into homogeneous groups. Districts were ranked based on an index which aggregates all aspects of the proposed methodology. Cakmak *et al*. (2009) evaluated irrigation system performance of water user associations in Asartepe irrigation scheme in Turkey. The amount of water delivered to command area, irrigated area and relative water supply were determined, apart from assessing financial, productive and water delivery performances. Gomez and Gomez (1984) described on the computation and testing of correlation between variables. Correlation analysis is carried out to assess the type of relationship viz., positive or negative relationship, apart from the magnitude of relationship and its significance.

**2.1 MATERIAL AND METHODS**

A study was conducted with the objective to assess the performance of Telugu Ganga project(TGP) in Nellore district and compared with the over-all performance in the entire TGP command comprising of 4 districts of Chittoor, Nellore, Kurnool and Kadapa in Andhra Pradesh during 1997 to 2018. Observations were collected on the rainfall, canal water releases for irrigation, cropping pattern, NDVI, crop area and yield of paddy and groundnut, shifting of crop calendar or sowing of crops. The data were analyzed for assessing the variability, relationships, changes occurred over years and effects of parameters on crop yield, and evaluation was made based on different performance indicators.

The main crop seasons in the TGP command are *kharif* (June–September), *rabi*(October–December) and summer (January–April). The rice-based cropping systems are predominant in the TGP command grown during *kharif*, while groundnut, black gram, green gram, jowar, cotton and chilies are grown in the rice fallows during *rabi* with under residual moisture condition. Sugarcane is grown throughout the year. Rice is mostly grown by the traditional method of growing the nursery and transplanting in the main field with continuous flooding of irrigation water. Nellore has a command area of 98270 ha with 8 mandals in the TGP command viz., Venkatagiri, Balayapalli, Pellakuru, DV Satram, Tada, Naidupeta, Chittamuru and Vakadu. The entire TGP command has 33 mandals with an area of 230000 ha in the project. We have evaluated the impact of TGP command on the performance of crops before (1997) and after (2018) completion of the TGP in Andhra Pradesh.

Paddy is the major crop (around 80% of total crop area), while remaining 20% area is on sugarcane, groundnut, cotton, bajra, jowar, cotton, sunflower and chilies. Since the objective of this study is to map different paddy stages with respect to the lag period in different transplantation stages, one classification approach may not give a desired result.

**2.1.1 Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)**

One of the widely used indices for vegetation monitoring is the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index(NDVI). Spectral reflectance represented by digital number in satellite image is the ratio of energy that is reflected from an object to the energy incident on the object. Spectral reflectance of a crop differs considerably in the near infrared region (λ=700-1300 nm) and in visible red range (λ=550-700 nm) of the electromagnetic spectrum (Kumar *etal*., 2004). Plants have a low reflectance in the blue and red portion of the spectrum because of chlorophyll absorption, with a slightly higher reflectance in the green, so plants appear green to our eyes. Near infrared radiant energy is strongly reflected from the plant surface and the amount of this reflectance is determined by the properties of leaf tissues. The live green plants appear relatively dark in PAR and bright in near infrared (David Gates, 1980).

NDVI is calculated from the individual measurements as follows:

$$NDVI = \frac{(\rho_{NIR}-\rho_{RED})}{(\rho_{NIR}+\rho_{RED})} \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_{NIR}$ = reflectance of band at NIR (0.87 µm); $\rho_{RED}$ = reflectance of band at RED (0.66 µm).

**2.1.2Assess surface water resources for irrigation purpose**

FOR REVIEW

Estimates of crop water requirement of paddy and groundnut were derived using CROPWAT 8.0 software. CROPWAT is a program that uses modified Penman-Monteith method for determining reference crop evapotranspiration. The parameters required to get the crop water requirement are rainfall, crop, soil and cropping patterns. The data of periodical weather parameters were collected from the Automatic Weather Station (AWS) located in Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh and used for determining the crop water demand viz.,

(a) Annual rainfall (mm), maximum and minimum temperature (°C), relative humidity (%), wind speed (km/hr) and solar radiation (No. of sun shine hours);

(b) Mandal-wise cropping pattern of Nellore district;

(c) Water discharge data (collected from TGP office);

(d) Groundwater table fluctuation data of pre-monsoon and post-monsoon seasons (collected from Ground Water Department, Vijayawada).

**2.1.3 Assessment of groundwater resources using water table fluctuation method**

Water Table Fluctuation (WTF) method is based on the premise that raises in groundwater levels in unconfined aquifers are due to recharge water arriving at the water table (Healy and Cook, 2002).Recharge is calculated as

$R= S_y\, dh/dt$

Where R is recharge, $S_y$

is specific yield, h is water-table height, and 't' is time. WTF represents spatially averaged recharge. Determining representative values of $S_y$ is difficult to apply this method. Another difficulty lies in ensuring that the fluctuations in water levels are due to recharge and not due to changes in atmospheric pressure, presence of entrapped air or pumping.

PEER REVIEW

**2.1.4Assessment of water delivery system using performance indicators**

**Intensity of irrigation**

The intensity of irrigation (I) can be expressed as a percentage value. It is defined as an area of a particular season with respect to the culturable command area.

I = [Total area irrigated X 100]/[Culturable command area] ……………..(3)

**Uniformity index**

The Uniformity index indicates about how best the water could be distributed among different canal commands within a large irrigation system. It is estimated based on (i) depth of water applied in the individual command; and (ii) depth of water applied in the entire TGP command level.

Uniformity index = $[(A_x)/(V_x)] / [(A_t)/(V_t)]$ ………………(4)

Where$A_x$ =Irrigated area in the individual command x; $V_x$= Volume of water applied to the individual command x; $A_t$ =Irrigated area in the individual command t; $V_t$= Volume of water applied to the individual command t.

**Overall consumed ratio**

The overall consumed ratio (efficiency) indicates about the degree to which the crop irrigation requirement is met by the irrigation water(Bos and Nugteren, 1974).The ratio is given as

Overall consumed ratio = $(ET_p - P_e)/Vi$ ………………..(5)

Where $ET_p$=Potential evapotranspiration ($m^3$); $P_e$=Effective precipitation ($m^3$);

$V_i$=Volume of irrigation water applied to the command i ($m^3$)

**Equity**

Equity is defined as the actual flow per unit irrigated area. It is nothing but a measure to assess the temporal variability of the available water within each command.

Equity = Vi/Ai …………….(6)

Where $V_i$ = Volume of irrigation water ($m^3$)applied to command i; $A_i$ = Irrigated area of command 'i'.

**Adequacy/Relative irrigation supply**

The Adequacy/Relative irrigation supply is the ratio of irrigation water supplied to the irrigation water demand including deep percolations (Molden *et al.,* 1998).

Adequacy/Relative irrigation supply=[Irrigation water supplied]/ [Irrigation water demand]

$=(V_i + R_f)/(ET_p—D_p)$……………(7)

Where $V_i$=water supplied (mm);$R_f$=Rainfall (mm); $ET_p$=Potential Evapotranspiration (mm);

$D_p$=Deep percolation losses (mm).

**Productivity**

The performance indicators listed here relate the output to unit land and water. The indicators provide a basis for comparing the irrigated agricultural performance. If water is a constraint, output per unit of water would become important.1998). The yield per unit area is given as

Yield per unit area = [Total yield (kg)]/[Total area (ha)] ………………(8)

Yield per unit area = [Total yield (kg)]/[Total water supplied ($m^3$)] ……………..(9)

The yield per unit of water consumed is given as

Yield per unit of water consumed = [Total yield (kg)]/[Total water consumed (ETp)] …………..(10)

In order to assess the crop yield ratio (CYR), it should be related to the intended crop yield. The yield attained could be taken from different pilot areas and crop yield ratios could be determined (Molden *et al.,* 1998). The cropping practices adopted by the farmers under different commands could be considered (Molden and Sakthi Vadivel, 1999).

CYR = [Yield attained in the command]/[Maximum yield attained in research station] …………(11)

**3.1.1 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The area of paddy and groundnut were collected in the TGP command during *kharif* and *rabi* seasons and derived total area (ha) used for growing crops during 1997 and 2018. The area (ha) of crops observed during *kharif* and *rabi* 1997 and 2018 and the percentage change in area of crops over years in the TGP command are given in Table 1. The Descriptive statistics of NDVI of paddy and groundnut in Nellore and TGP command during 1997 and 2018 are shown in table 2.

The Changes in NDVI of paddy and groundnut in Nellore and TGP command during 1997 and 2018 is depicted in Figure 2.

**Table 1. Area (ha) of crops in *kharif* and *rabi*1997 and 2018 in TGP command**

| Crops | 1997 | 2018 | Change (%) |
|---|---|---|---|

| | *Kharif* | *Rabi* | **Total** | *Kharif* | *Rabi* | **Total** | *Kharif* | *Rabi* | **Total** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paddy | 53674 | 25014 | 78688 | 85138 | 95213 | 180351 | 58.62 | 280.64 | 129.20 |
| Groundnut | 16055 | 19126 | 35181 | 4368 | 11784 | 16152 | -72.79 | -38.39 | -54.09 |
| Total | 69729 | 44140 | 113869 | 89506 | 106997 | 196503 | 28.36 | 142.40 | 72.57 |

**Table2 . Descriptive statistics of NDVI of paddy and groundnut in Nellore and TGP command during 1997 and 2018**

| **Statistic** | **Paddy** | | **Groundnut** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1997** | **2018** | **1997** | **2018** |
| ***Nellore*** | | | | |
| Minimum | 0.324 | 0.475 | 0.282 | 0.489 |
| Maximum | 0.396 | 0.547 | 0.404 | 0.552 |
| Mean | 0.362 | 0.510 | 0.328 | 0.516 |
| Standard deviation | 0.024 | 0.021 | 0.042 | 0.022 |
| CV (%) | 6.6 | 4.2 | 12.7 | 4.3 |
| ***TGP command*** | | | | |
| Minimum | 0.324 | 0.475 | 0.282 | 0.489 |
| Maximum | 0.616 | 0.811 | 0.653 | 0.867 |
| Mean | 0.503 | 0.650 | 0.526 | 0.667 |
| Standard deviation | 0.088 | 0.110 | 0.118 | 0.106 |
| CV (%) | 17.6 | 16.9 | 22.5 | 15.9 |

REVIEW




**Figure 2. Changes in NDVI of paddy and groundnut in Nellore and TGP command during 1997 and 2018**

**3.1.2 Assessment of crops based on NDVI**

A comparison of changes occurred in the area of crops and crop condition during *kharif* a

nd *rabi* 1997 and 2018 was made using the pooled data of NDVI under TGP command. It is possible to assess and map the crop condition on a quantitative basis. Based on the location specific crop condition, the reasons for poor condition could be ascertained and interventions could be made. The crop condition was monitored in the TGP during *rabi* 1997 and 2018 based on a detailed qualitative analysis. The spatial variation of crop condition in terms of the qualitative condition viz., very good, good and average was made with a high accuracy.

In *kharif* season, maximum area of 44%was under 'good' category, followed by 37% under 'very good' category in 1997, compared to 52% area under 'very good' and 32% area under 'good' categories in 2018. During *rabi* season, maximum area of 51% was under 'good' category, followed by 34% under 'average' category in 1997, while 56%was under 'very good' category, followed by 28% under 'good' category during 2018. The changes occurred due to change in the crop calendar, management practices and adoption of short duration varieties by farmers. The crop condition through NDVI like average, good, very good and area (ha and %)observed in Nellore and TGP command during 1997 and 2018 in *kharif* and *rabi* seasons are given in Table 3.

**Table3.Crop condition based on NDVI in Nellore and TGP command during 1997 and 2018**

| Crop condition | ***Kharif 1997*** | | ***Rabi 1997*** | | ***Kharif 2018*** | | ***Rabi 2018*** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Area (ha)** | **%** | **Area (ha)** | **%** | **Area (ha)** | **%** | **Area (ha)** | **%** |
| ***Nellore*** | | | | | | | | |
| Average | 11676 | 45.0 | 9584 | 55.0 | 13743 | 37.0 | 8052 | 10.0 |
| Good | 11576 | 45.0 | 20046 | 27.0 | 18082 | 49.0 | 19248 | 35.0 |
| Very good | 2459 | 10.0 | 6523 | 18.0 | 5383 | 14.0 | 27948 | 55.0 |
| ***TGP*** | | | | | | | | |
| Average | 42680 | 30.7 | 54095 | 36.3 | 42714 | 23.0 | 43666 | 13.5 |
| Good | 100287 | 42.5 | 80951 | 44.5 | 84665 | 36.0 | 80010 | 26.5 |
| Very good | 84941 | 26.7 | 23250 | 19.3 | 139888 | 41.0 | 159742 | 60.0 |

***3.1.3 Assessment of water resources for irrigation in TGPcommand***

The quantity of surface and groundwater would carry maximum importance in terms of deciding about the feasibility for irrigation of any crop grown in the TGPcommand. Before estimating the quantity of surface water, observations of rainfall received during 1997 to 2018 werecollected and analyzed.

**3.1.4 Effective rainfall and crop water demand**

Under CROPWAT model, derivations were made after computerizing the rainfall and crop water demand on seasonal basis(*kharif* and *rabi)*. The estimates of effective rainfall derived for the TGP command are given in Table 4. This information will be used for calculating the performance indicators of paddy grown in the study area.

**Table 4.Mean monthly and effective rainfall received in Nellore and TGP command during 1997 to 2018**

| **Month** | **Effective rainfall (mm)** | | **Rainfall (mm)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

UNDER PEER REVIEW

| | Nellore | Entire TGP | Nellore | Entire TGP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| January | 15.7 | 7.6 | 16.1 | 7.8 |
| February | 14.5 | 7.2 | 14.9 | 7.4 |
| March | 17.1 | 10.0 | 17.6 | 10.2 |
| April | 37.7 | 25.5 | 40.3 | 26.8 |
| May | 31.3 | 35.9 | 33.0 | 38.3 |
| June | 51.8 | 67.5 | 57.0 | 78.7 |
| July | 73.7 | 87.3 | 85.4 | 106.2 |
| August | 94.2 | 105.0 | 115.5 | 134.9 |
| September | 80.8 | 93.0 | 95.4 | 114.7 |
| October | 150.2 | 124.9 | 252.3 | 187.1 |
| November | 151.6 | 98.0 | 266.4 | 157.2 |
| December | 94.7 | 52.3 | 122.5 | 65.0 |
| *Total* | *813.4* | *714.2* | *1110.4* | *932.8* |
| *Minimum* | *14.5* | *7.2* | *14.9* | *7.4* |
| *Maximum* | *151.6* | *124.9* | *266.4* | *187.1* |
| *Mean* | *67.8* | *59.5* | *93.0* | *77.9* |
| *SD* | *48.7* | *42.0* | *86.5* | *62.1* |
| *CV (%)* | *71.8* | *70.6* | *92.9* | *79.8* |

**3.1.5 The crop water demand in the TGP command**

The crop-wise and total area (ha), crop water requirement (mm), crop water demand (Mcum) in *kharif* and *rabi* seasons of different crops are given in Table 5. The crop water demand (Mcum) of paddy and groundnut in Nellore and TGP command during *kharif*, *rabi* and total (*kharif + rabi*) for 1997 and 2018were derived using CROPWAT software model.

**Table 5.The crop water demand of paddy and groundnut in TGP command**

| Year | Crop | ***Kharif*** | | | ***Rabi*** | | | **Total** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Area (ha)** | **CWR (mm)** | **CWD (Mcum)** | **Area (ha)** | **CWR (mm)** | **CWD (Mcum)** | **Area (ha)** | **CWD (Mcum)** | **Canal water released (Mcum)** |
| 1997 | Paddy | 53674 | 516 | 277 | 25014 | 544 | 136 | 78688 | 413 | 101 |
| | Groundnut | 16055 | 341 | 55 | 19126 | 344 | 66 | 35181 | 121 | |
| | Total | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | Paddy | 85138 | 533 | 454 | 95213 | 554 | 527 | 180351 | 981 | 959 |
| | Groundnut | 4368 | 329 | 14 | 11784 | 349 | 41 | 16152 | 55 | |
| | Total | | | | | | | | | |

**3.1.6 Assessment of canal water released in Nellore and TGP command**

The details of canal water releasedin Nellore district and the entire TGP command during 1996 to 2019are given in Table 6. The Changes in canal water released in Nellore and entire TGP command during 1996 to 2019 Figure 3

**Table6. Canal water released in Nellore and TGPcommandduring 1996 to 2019**

| **Year** | **Canal water release ( Mcum)** | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Nellore** | **Total TGP** |
| 1996 | 78.75 | 78.75 |
| 1997 | 100.87 | 100.87 |
| 1998 | 121.69 | 125.07 |
| 1999 | 79.75 | 81.97 |
| 2000 | 367.84 | 378.07 |
| 2001 | 86.35 | 88.75 |
| 2002 | 126.00 | 129.50 |
| 2003 | 56.91 | 58.49 |

UNDER PEER REVIEW

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2004 | 122.35 | 1020.93 |
| 2005 | 103.29 | 1134.64 |
| 2006 | 328.94 | 1931.60 |
| 2007 | 180.57 | 1398.46 |
| 2008 | 525.03 | 2201.35 |
| 2009 | 549.82 | 1351.69 |
| 2010 | 371.98 | 1805.69 |
| 2011 | 626.90 | 1931.85 |
| 2012 | 375.46 | 1147.49 |
| 2013 | 710.00 | 1780.00 |
| 2014 | 614.00 | 1591.00 |
| 2015 | 337.00 | 573.00 |
| 2016 | 412.00 | 1375.00 |
| 2017 | 522.00 | 1272.00 |
| 2018 | 0 | 959.00 |
| 2019 | 650.00 | 1969.00 |
| *Total* | *7447.49* | *24484.17* |
| *Minimum* | *56.91* | *58.49* |
| *Maximum* | *710.00* | *2201.35* |
| *Mean* | *323.80* | *1020.17* |
| *SD* | *219.92* | *739.08* |
| *CV(%)* | *67.9* | *72.4* |




**Figure 3. Changes in canal water released in Nellore and entire TGP command during 1996 to 2019**

**3.1.7 Crop water demand andcanal water released for crops during 1997 and 2018**

The details of CWD (Mcum) and canal water released (Mcum) for paddy and groundnut during 1997 and 2018 are given in Table 7.

**Table 7.Crop water demand and canal water released during1997and 2018**

| Year | Crop | CWD (Mcum) | Canal water release (Mcum) | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1997 | Paddy | 754 | | |
| | Groundnut | 176 | | |
| | Total | 930 | 101 | Deficit of 829Mcum |
| 2018 | Paddy | 1435 | | |

UNDER REVIEW

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Groundnut | 69 | | |
| | Total | 1504 | 959 | Deficit of 545Mcum |

**3.1.8 Performance indicators of Nellore district**

The performance indicators determined for the Nellore district andthe values of equity (%), uniformity (%), irrigation intensity (%), over-all consumed ratio/efficiency (%), adequacy (%), yield (kg/ha), yield (kg/m$^3$), yield (kg/m$^3$) of $ET_o$, crop yield ratio and other parameters observed during 2013 to 2019 are given in *Table 8*. The equity ranged from 0-100% with mean of 60.3% (CV of 55%), while uniformity ranged from 0-85% with mean of 69% (CV of 44.5%). The irrigation intensity ranged from 0-146.5% with mean of 72.1% (CV of 62.7%), while over-all consumed ratio/efficiency ranged from 0-78% with mean of 50.9% (CV of 53.3%) and adequacy ranged from 110-220% with mean of 159% (CV of 24.5%). The yield ranged from 4025-6924 kg/ha with mean of 5552 kg/ha (CV of 25.6%), compared to 0-0.19 kg/m$^3$ with mean of 0.09 kg/m$^3$ (CV of 69.0%) and 0-0.25 kg/m$^3$ of $ET_o$ with mean of 0.15 kg/m$^3$ (CV of 55.9%), while crop yield ratio ranged from 0.58-0.99 with mean of 0.83 (CV of 21.6%).The analysis indicated that the performance in Nellore was better for (i) irrigation intensity, (ii) uniformity and (iii) equity. The performance in Nellore was poor when efficiency of 50.86%was considered. This implied that 49.14% of irrigation water drained into sea through seepage, evaporative and open drainage. This carried the applied fertilizers with it, apart from causing soil erosion during rainy days. Similarly, adequacy of 189%implied that water was excessively available in the district by about 89%.The water quantity of 412.57Mcumcould be better utilised in the upper reaches or more area could be brought under cultivation.

When different factors pertaining to yield were compared, 5.56 t/ha of yield was attained in Nellore. Similarly, productivity of0.09 kg/cum of water was derived and 0.15 kg/cum of water was consumed, while crop yield ratio of 0.58 was attained. This indicated that there is a large scope for researchers to improve the yield by developing efficient agronomic practices.Only the managerial aspects should be improved in order to meet shortage of canal water, apart from improving the irrigation efficiency. Higher efficiency could be achieved by an appropriate scientific management of irrigation water inflows from time to time.Nellore has an area of 98270 ha. The irrigation water supplied ranged from 0-710 m$^3$ with mean of 432.5 m$^3$ (CV of 58.0%), while the water consumed ETp (m$^3$) ranged from 0-407.4 m$^3$ with mean of 258.3 m$^3$ (CV of 53.0%). Paddy yield of 6975 kg/ha was attained at research station, while yield/unit water supplied ranged from 0-19.9 kg/m$^3$ with mean of 10.1 kg/m$^3$ (CV of 72.2%). The yield/unit of water consumed ranged from 0-25.5 kg/m$^3$ with mean of 15.4 kg/m$^3$ (CV of 59.4%), while crop yield ratio ranged from 0.58-0.99 with mean of 0.83 (CV of 23.7%).

**Table 8. Performance indicators of Nellore during 2013 to 2019**

| Year | Equity (%) | Uniformity (%) | Irrigation intensity (%) | Over-all consumed ratio/ efficiency (%) | Adequacy (%) | Yield (kg/ha) | Yield (kg/ m$^3$) | Yield (kg/ m$^3$) of ETo | Crop yield ratio | Irrigation water supplied (m$^3$) | Water consumed ETp (m$^3$) | Yield/ water supplied (kg/m$^3$) | Yield/ water consumed (kg/m$^3$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2013 | 49 | 76 | 146.5 | 43 | 189 | 4051 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.58 | 710 | 305.2 | 5.7 | 13.3 |
| 2014 | 83 | 82 | 74.3 | 50 | 173 | 4025 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.58 | 614 | 306.7 | 6.6 | 13.1 |
| 2015 | 42 | 85 | 81.3 | 78 | 220 | 6711 | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.96 | 337 | 262.9 | 19.9 | 25.5 |
| 2016 | 100 | 82 | 41.5 | 65 | 110 | 6341 | 0.15 | 0.24 | 0.91 | 412 | 267.8 | 15.4 | 23.7 |
| 2017 | 78 | 74 | 67.1 | 78 | 118 | 6924 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.99 | 522 | 407.4 | 13.3 | 17.0 |

UNDER PEER REVIEW

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 144 | 6760 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2019 | 70 | 84 | 93.7 | 42 | 159 | 4051 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Minimum* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *110* | *4025* | *0* | *0* | *0.58* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| *Maximum* | *100* | *85* | *146.5* | *78* | *220* | *6924* | *0.19* | *0.25* | *0.99* | *710* | *407.4* | *19.9* | *25.5* |
| *Mean* | *60.3* | *69* | *72.1* | *50.9* | *159* | *5552* | *0.09* | *0.15* | *0.83* | *432* | *258.3* | *10.1* | *15.4* |
| *SD* | *33.2* | *30.7* | *45.2* | *27.1* | *39* | *1423* | *0.07* | *0.08* | *0.18* | *251* | *136.8* | *7.3* | *9.2* |
| *CV (%)* | *55.0* | *44.5* | *62.7* | *53.3* | *24.5* | *25.6* | *69.0* | *55.9* | *21.6* | *58.0* | *53.0* | *72.2* | *59.4* |

***Comparison of performance indicators of TGP during 1997 and 2018***

The details of indicators viz., equity (%), uniformity (%), irrigation intensity (%), over-all consumed ratio/efficiency (%), adequacy (%) and crop yield ratio (%) of TGP command observed in 1997 and 2018 are given in Table 9.There was a better performance in 2018 compared to 1997 as indicated by the higher percentage of values. The equity increased from 55.85% to 124.25%, while uniformity increased from 65.75% to 81.75%during 1997 to 2018. The irrigation intensity increased from 18.15% to 79.6%, while the over-all consumed ratio/efficiency increased from 22.87% to 54%over years. The adequacy increased from 32.1% in 1997 to 84.9% in 2018, while the crop yield ratio increased from 57% to 85%over years.

**Table 9.Comparison of performance indicators for TGP during 1997 and 2018**

| Year | Equity (%) | Uniformity (%) | Irrigation intensity (%) | Overall consumed ratio/efficiency (%) | Adequacy (%) | Crop yield Ratio (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1997 | 55.85 | 65.75 | 18.15 | 22.87 | 32.1 | 57 |
| 2018 | 124.25 | 81.75 | 79.6 | 54 | 84.9 | 85 |

**Conclusion :**

A study was conducted to assess the effect of rainfall and canal water on paddy and groundnut yield during 1997 to 2018 in Nellore under Telugu Ganga Project (TGP) command in Andhra Pradesh. Assessment was made using 9 performance indicators at micro and macro level at the start (1997) and end of the study (2018). An evaluation of TGP was made for assessing the crop condition, inventory, calendar, irrigation potential, irrigation scheduling and yield attained in the command. Optimization was done to identify rainfall and canal water at which maximum yield could be attained. Paddy area significantly increased by 129.2% (78688 to 180351 ha) during 1997 to 2018 due to improvement of canal water supply, while groundnut area decreased by 54.1% (35181 to 16152 ha) over years. At Nellore, mean NDVI of 0.362 (CV of 6.6%) was observed in 1997 compared to 0.510 (CV of 4.2%) in 2018for paddy, while NDVI of 0.328 (CV of 12.7%) was observed in 1997 compared to 0.516 (CV of 4.3%) in 2018 for groundnut. In TGP command, mean NDVI of 0.503 (CV of 17.6%) was observed in 1997 compared to 0.650 (CV of 16.9%) in 2018 for paddy, while NDVI of 0.526 (CV of 22.5%) was observed in 1997 compared to 0.667 (CV of 15.9%) in 2018 for groundnut.Based on NDVI, maximum *kharif* paddy area of 44% was under 'good' category in 1997, while 52% was under 'very good' category in 2018. Maximum *rabi* paddy area of 51% was in 'good' category in 1997, while 56% was under 'very good' category in 2018. The changes were due to change in the crop calendar, management practices and adoption of short duration varieties. In Nellore, mean equity of 60.3% (CV of 55%), uniformity of 69% (CV of 44.5%), irrigation intensity of 72.1% (CV of 62.7%), consumed ratio/efficiency of 50.9% (CV of 53.3%), adequacy of 159% (CV of 24.5%) and yield of 5552 kg/ha (CV of 25.6%) were observed. Adequacy of 189% implied that water was excessively available in the district by about 89%. This quantity of 412.57 Mcumcould be better utilised in either the upper reaches or more area could be brought under cultivation.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

The managerial aspects should be effectively improved in order to meet any shortage of canal water, apart from improving the irrigation efficiency. Higher efficiency could be achieved by efficient management of irrigation water inflows over years. In Nellore, rainfall had a rate of change of 1.5929 mm/year ($R^2$ of 0.001) compared to -3.664 mm/year ($R^2$ of 0.02) in TGP command. The canal water released ranged from 56.9 Mcum (2003) to 710.0 Mcum (2013) with mean of 323.8 Mcum (CV of 67.9%), compared to 58.49 Mcum(2003) to 2201.35 Mcum (2008) with mean of 1020.17 Mcum (CV of 72.4%) in TGP command. The rate of change of canal water was 19.933 Mcum/year ($R^2$ of 0.3924) in Nellore compared to 71.511 Mcum/year ($R^2$ of 0.4681) in TGP command. Mean paddy yield of 4244 kg/ha (CV of 24.6%) and groundnut yield of 1687 kg/ha (CV of 20.7%) were attained. There was a significant correlation of 0.825 for paddy and 0.762 for groundnut with canal water, while yield had no significant correlation with rainfall over years. The regression model gave maximum rate of change of 78.823 kg/ha/year for paddy ($R^2$of 0.2402) and 16.308 kg/ha/year for groundnut ($R^2$of 0.092).The pre-monsoon level had a mean of 39.0 m (CV of 6.4%), compared to post-monsoon mean of 34.5 m (CV of 5.8%) with rise in the groundwater level of 4.7 m (CV of 17.5%). In 2010, the rise of groundwater level was minimum of 3.2 m at rainfall of 845 mm and canal water release of 100.9 Mcum compared to maximum of 5.9 m at rainfall of 790 mm and canal water release of 1969 Mcum in 2019. The pre-monsoon groundwater level had a rate of change of 0.6709 m ($R^2$ of 0.6657), while post-monsoon level had a rate of change of 0.4406 m ($R^2$ of 0.4475) and rise in groundwater level had a rate of change of 0.2382 m ($R^2$ of 0.7825). Grouping of rainfall, canal water, paddy and groundnut yields into 3 groups was made using mean and SD to identify optimum rainfall and canal water at which maximum yield could be attained. Maximum mean rainfall and canal water were observed in 3rd groupof more than (Mean+SD), while maximum of 13 years each fell in the 2nd group of (Mean-SD) to (Mean+SD) for both crops. Maximum paddy yield of 5440 kg/ha was attained at mean canal water of 1768.3 Mcum and rainfall of 1151 mm, while maximum groundnut yield of 2195 kg/ha was attained at mean canal water of 1822.6 Mcum and rainfall of 1040.7 mm in 3rd group. Since TGP command is affected by drought every year, with canal water supply, the farmers could cultivate less water requiring crops for attaining maximum yield. The results based on the study could be extended to other irrigation commands under similar conditions.

**REFERENCES**

Abdelhadi, A.W., Hata, T., Tanakamaru, H., Tada, A and Tariq, M.A. 2000. Estimation of crop water requirements in arid region using Penman-Monteith equation with derived crop coefficients: A case study on Acala cotton in Sudan Gezira irrigated scheme. *Journal of Agricultural Water Management*, 45(2):203-214.

Ahmad, T., Sahoo, P.M. and Jally, S.K. 2016. Estimation of area under agroforestry using high resolution satellite data. *Agro-forestry Systems,* 90(1):289–303.

Arunadevi, K. 2017. Comparison of Reference Evapotranspiration in Semi-Arid region. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences,* 975-3710.

Bastiaanssen, W.G.M. and Bos, M.G. 1999. Irrigation performance indicators based on remotely sensed data: a review of literature. *Irrigation and Drainage Systems,* 13:291-311.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Bhandarkar, D.M., Dhakad, S.S., Reddy, K.S and Singh, R. 2004. Estimation of crop water requirement for important field and vegetable crops in Bhopal region. *Proceedings of XXXVI ISAE Annual Convention & Symposium, BSKKV, Dapoli*, 16-18 January: 61.

Bos, M.G., Murray, R.D.H., Merry, D., Jonson, H.G. and Snellers, W.B. 1994. Methodologies for assessing performance of irrigation and drainage management. *Irrigation and Drainage Systems,* 7:231-261.

Bos, M.G., and Nugteren, J. 1974. On Irrigation Efficiencies. Publication 19, ILRI, Wageningen, Netherlands.

Cakmak, B., Polat, H.E., Kendirli, B and Gokalp, Z. 2009. Evaluation of irrigation performance of Asartepe irrigation association: Case study from Turkey. *Irrigation and Drainage,* 22(1):1-8.

Chwenming, Y., and Muhrong, S. 1998. Analysis of spectral characteristics of rice canopy under water deficiency. 21st Asian Conference on Remote sensing, 4-8 December, Taipei. *http:// www.gis.deveopement.net/aars/acrs/1998*

Draper, N.R. and Smith, H. 1998. Applied regression analysis. *John Wiley Inc*., New York.

Ganesh, B.R., Veeranna, J., Kumar, R.K.N. and Rao, B.I. 2014. Estimation of water requirement for different crops using CROPWAT model in Anantapur region. *Asian Journal of Environmental Science,* 9 (2):75-79.

David M.Gates, 1980. Biophysical Ecology. Springer New York. XXIV, 611. *https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-6024-0*.

Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A. 1984. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. *John Wiley Inc.,* New York.

Richard W.Healy., and Peter Cook, G. 2002. Using groundwater levels to estimate recharge.*Hydrogeology Journal*. 10:91–109.

Karim Ennouri and Abdelaziz Kallel. 2019. Remote Sensing as An Advanced Technique for Crop Condition Assessment. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering,* 10:1-8.

Kumar, Y., Jitendra, S., Kumar, Kiran and Shashi. 2004. Probabilistic irrigation water requirement of major crops of Udham Singh Nagar district of Uttaranchal State. *Proceedings of XXXVI ISAE Annual Convention and Symposium,* BSKKV, Dapoli, 16-18 January.

Mahtsente, T. and Birhanu, Z. 2015. Water demand analysis and irrigation requirement for major crops at Holetta catchment, Awash subbasin, Ethiopia. *Journal of Natural Sciences Research,* 5:1224-1236.

Maruthi Sankar, G.R. 1986. On screening of regression models for selection of optimal variable subsets. *Journal of Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics,*38 (2):161–168.

Mehanuddin, H., Nikhitha, G.R., Prapthishree, K.S., Praveen, L.B., and Manasa, H.G. 2018. Study on water requirement of selected crops and irrigation scheduling using CROPWAT 8.0. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology,* 7 (4):2473-2485.

Mishra, A.K., Sarkar, T.K., and Bhattacharya, A.K. 2000. Estimation of actual crop evapotranspiration ($ET_c$) using continuous crop coefficient ($K_C$) functions. *Indian Journal of Soil Conservation,* 28:117-125.

Molden, D.J., and Gates, T.K. 1990. Performance measures for evaluation of irrigation–water delivery systems. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering,* 116 (6):804-823.


UNDER PEER REVIEW

Molden, D.J., Sakthivadivel, R., Perry, C.J., Fraiture, C., and Kloezen, W.R. 1998. Indicators for comparing performance of irrigated agricultural systems. *Research report, 20.* International Water Management Institute, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Molden, D.J., Sakthivadivel, R.1999. Water accounting to assess use and productivity of water. *International Journal of Water Resources Development,* 15:55-71.

Naik, B.R. 2016. Optimal crop water requirement for Araniar Reservoir basin. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology,* 3(6).

Pritha, B., Tiwari, N.K and Subodh, R. 2014. Comparative crop water assessment using CROPWAT. *International Journal of Sustainable Materials, Processes & Eco Efficient,* 1 (3):1-9.

Pushpalatha, R., Sunitha, S. A., George, J., Rajan, S., and Gangadharan, B. 2020. Development of optimal irrigation schedules and crop water production function for cassava: study over three major growing areas in India. *Irrigation Science*. *https://doi.org/10.1007/s00271-020-00669-0.*

Ramana, M.V. 2007. Performance evaluation of canal irrigation systems using remote sensing and GIS. *Ph.D. Thesis*. Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, India.

Ramesh, S.H. and Dennis, G.D. 1995. Identification and mapping of irrigated vegetation using NDVI-climatological modeling. 16th Asian Conference on Remote sensing, 20-24 November, Thailand. *http:// www.gis.deveopement .net/aars/acrs/1995*.

Rao, B.K, and Rajput, T.B.S. 2008. Rainfall Effectiveness for different crops in canal command areas. *Journal of Agro-meteorology*, 10:328-332.

Rao, B.K., and Rajput, T.B.S. 2009. Decision support system for efficient water management in canal command areas. *Current Science,* 97(1):90-98.

Rodriguez, J.A., Camacho, P.E., Lopez, L.R., and Perez, U.L. 2008. Benchmarking and multivariate data analysis techniques for improving the efficiency of irrigation districts: *An application in Spain. Agricultural Systems,* 96:250-259.

Shakthivadivel, R., Charlotte De Fraiture., David J. Molden., Christopher Perry., and Wim Kloezen. 1999. Indicators of Land and Water Productivity in Irrigated Agriculture. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 15 (1-2):161-179. *https://doi.org/10.1080/07900629948998.*

Salam, H., Ewaid, S.A.A., and Nadhir, A. 2019. Crop Water Requirements and Irrigation Schedules for Some Major Crops in Southern Iraq. *Water,11*(4):756. *https://doi.org/10.3390/w11040756.*

Singandhupe, R.B., and Sethi, R.R. 2005. Estimation of reference evapotranspiration and crop coefficient in wheat under semi-arid environment in India. *Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science,* 51 (6):619-631.

Thazin, K. 2019. Irrigation water requirements of different crops by using CROPWAT Software in Taungdwingyi township. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journal,* 3 (4):191-197.

Usman, M., Abbas, A., and Saqib, Z.A. 2016. Conjunctive use of water and its management for enhanced productivity of major crops across tertiary canal irrigation system of Indus basin in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Science,* 53(1):257-264.

Vedula, S., and Mujumdar, P.P. 1992. Optimal reservoir operation for irrigation of multiple crops. *Water Resource Research,* 28(1):1-9.

Wolters, W. 1992. Influence on the efficiency of irrigation water use. *Ph.D Thesis, Delft University of*

*Technology*, 150-155.

Zhiming, F., Dengwei, L., and Zang, Y. 2007. Water requirements and irrigation scheduling of spring maize using GIS and Crop Water model in Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei region. *Chinese Geographical Science,* 17:56-63.

Zhou, H and Zhao, W.Z. 2019. Modeling soil water balance and irrigation strategies in a flood irrigated wheat-maize rotation system. A case in dry climate, China. *Agricultural Water Management.* 221:286–302.

UNDER PEER REVIEW