

The effects of upstream water abstraction for commercial export farming on drought risk and impact of agropastoral communities in the drylands of Kenya

Ileen N. Streefkerk^{1*}, Jeroen C.J.H. Aerts^{1,2}, Jens de Bruijn^{1,3}, Khalid Hassaballah⁴, Rhoda A. Odongo¹,
5 Teun Schrieks¹, Oliver Wasonga⁵, and Anne F. Van Loon¹

¹ Institute for Environmental Studies (IVM), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

² Deltares, Delft, Netherlands

³ International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria

⁴ IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC), Nairobi, Kenya

10 ⁵ University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

Correspondence to: Ileen. N. Streefkerk (ileen.streefkerk@vu.nl)

Abstract. In the Horn of Africa Drylands (HAD) conflicts over water and vegetation are prominent. Additionally, large-scale land acquisitions (LSLAs) are increasing the competition of water, putting local communities at greater risk. A key impact of increasing LSLA's is the decrease in water and land availability for vulnerable agropastoral communities. Despite recent
15 studies, there is still a lack of research that includes the influence of upstream-downstream dynamics on drought risk and impacts of agropastoralists. Therefore, this study further develops an agent-based model (ADOPT-AP) to investigate how upstream large-scale commercial farms influence downstream drought risk and impact of agropastoralists in the Upper Ewaso Ng'iro catchment in Kenya. After the model has been calibrated, we assess how commercial exporting farms affect drought risk and impact of downstream communities by simulating different scenarios where the farms are replaced by agropastoral
20 communities or forests. Our results show how both drought hazard characteristics and impacts differ among these scenarios. The analysis shows that in the scenarios where these farms are replaced by forests or communities, drought conditions are alleviated by increasing soil moisture, streamflow, and groundwater tables during dry periods. These changes are linked to reduced water abstraction and increased infiltration, benefiting downstream communities by decreasing the distance to household water, and increasing crop production in times of dry periods. However, compared with the impact of drought
25 hazard itself these differences are very small.

1 Introduction

Drought poses a threat in the already existing water challenges in the Horn of Africa Drylands (HAD) (Solomon et al., 2018). Drought hazard and risk are, however, not merely a natural phenomenon driven by rainfall deficits and other hydrometeorological processes. Droughts are also shaped by human behaviour and interventions (Van Loon et al., 2016). For
30 example, large-scale land acquisitions (LSLAs) for commercial farms that use large quantities of (ground-) water are further

increasing the competition of water, putting local farmers and communities at increased risk to droughts (Chiarelli et al., 2022). These LSLA's may be in the form of large private ranches, industry, and commercial export farms (Mkutu & Mdee, 2020). A key impact of increasing LSLA's is the decrease in water and land availability for vulnerable agropastoral communities (Lanari et al., 2018). Agropastoralism is the main source of livelihood to millions of people in Kenya accounting for 10-44% GDP (Nyariki and Amwata, 2019). For such communities, drought adaptation is key to anticipate current- and future drought risk (Pörtner et al., 2022).

To support drought adaptation for agropastoralists, it is important to understand the factors that influence adaptation behaviour they can take themselves, and how this behaviour interacts with large-scale water users (such as commercial farms) and governmental policies (Alam et al., 2022; Reckien et al., 2023). There is an emerging literature that captures the factors influencing drought risk management by agropastoral communities in Kenya and what policy interventions may stimulate drought adaptation. For example, Wens et al. (2021), show that mistrust in drought forecasting (-29%) serves as a barrier to adaptation, while experience with past adaptation decisions (+44%) stimulates the intention to adopt new drought adaptation measures. Streefkerk et al. (2023) found, for a case study in Kenya, that low levels of wealth and long distance to wells have a large effect on water availability. Furthermore, a recent study by Schrieks et al. (2023) shows that the likelihood that agropastoralists implement adaptation measures is positively influenced by, among others, the perceived efficacy of adaptation measures and confidence in their ability to adapt (perceived self-efficacy). Other factors influencing drought adaptation by agropastoralists are gender, education level, access to financial resources, and access to government support or aid.

Understanding the factors that influence local drought adaptation can inform (governmental policy) interventions that enhance the uptake of drought adaptation strategies. For example, Wens et al. (2022) highlight that ex-ante cash transfers and timely extension services can improve adaptation uptake. However, less is known about how large-scale commercial farms affect drought conditions for downstream agropastoralists, and which policies can best support risk reduction and the equitable water distribution (e.g. Giger et al., 2022). Studies have shown that drought risk tends to increase downstream due to water storage and abstraction in upstream areas (Van Oel et al., 2018; Veldkamp et al., 2017). Water abstraction by commercial horticulture farms may contribute in upstream – downstream water conflicts, with large farms already exceeding minimum water river flow requirements during the dry season (Lanari et al., 2018). In the longer term, this may lower groundwater tables and increase drought risk across the entire region, affecting all water users (e.g. Castilla-Rho et al., 2015).

What remains lacking in previous studies is a systematic assessment of upstream-downstream interactions and an evaluation of drought adaptation options for agropastoralists affected by upstream commercial farming (Kiteme et al., 2021). The main goal of this paper is, therefore, to develop a coupled hydrological and agent-based model (ADOPT-AP) to investigate the influence of upstream large-scale commercial export farms on downstream drought risk and adaptation by agropastoralists. We apply and test the ADOPT-AP model for the Ewaso Ng'iro north catchment in Kenya. The key novelty of our method is the ability to capture heterogeneous and dynamic drought-human interactions (including different water users) in a spatially-explicit manner. After the model has been calibrated, we test how commercial exporting farms affect drought risk and impact of downstream communities.

65 2 Case Study Area

The Ewaso Ng'iro North catchment, spanning 210,000 km², sources its water primarily from Mount Kenya and the Aberdare Range (Kiteme et al., 2021). These main water towers, located to the south of the catchment, contribute to the varied climatic zones observed in the region (Figure 1). The upstream areas exhibit a humid climate with an altitude up to 5000 m and mean annual rainfall of 1500 mm, transitioning to semi-arid and arid conditions downstream with a minimum altitude of 500 m and mean annual rainfall of 350 mm (Mungai et al., 2004). This climatic gradient is essential in determining land use and the livelihoods of the local population.




Figure 1: Study area: aridity zones (Gichuki et al., 2002), rivers, commercial export farms in the Upper Ewaso Ng'iro catchment.

The upstream regions, characterized by higher rainfall and more stable water supplies, are dominated by cropland and forests. This area supports large commercial export farms, particularly horticulture and floriculture, which benefit from the favourable year-round climate and abundant water resources (Lanari et al., 2018, Wiesmann et al. 2000). They are indicated in red, southeast of the catchment, in Figure 1. These farms are primarily concentrated in sub-catchments 1 and 2, with greenhouse operations spread throughout these areas. Sub-catchment 3 has similar conditions but only upstream, while sub-catchment 4 houses open farms, such as those cultivating wheat. Conversely, the downstream regions (sampling area), marked by arid conditions and covered in grassland and shrubs, support agropastoralism and pastoralism. Local livelihoods here are heavily dependent on livestock herding due to the scarce water resources. Schrieks et al. (2023) highlight in their survey of the local

farmers and agropastoralists, that in the humid to semi-humid and semi-arid zones, crop farming and agropastoralism prevails, respectively. While in the arid zones, pastoralism is the dominant livelihood (Kiteme et al., 2021).


85 The expansion of commercial export farms has dual impacts: they create employment opportunities but also lead to conflicts over water resources with local agropastoral communities (Kiteme et al. 2021). The intensive water use by these farms, especially for irrigation in horticulture, has been shown to reduce streamflow by up to 32% (Lanari et al., 2018). This significant reduction in water availability exacerbates the challenges faced by local communities, who already struggle with limited water resources.

90 Water resource management in Kenya has evolved over the years. The Water Resources Authority (WRA) is responsible for regulating and managing water resources at a national level. However, the governance structure has been increasingly decentralized, promoting more local participation (Dell Angelo et al., 2016). The Water Resource Users Associations (WRUAs), established following the 2012 Water Act, play a critical role in local water management, including monitoring and enforcing water abstraction permits and implementing conservation programs (Baldwin et al., 2016). Despite these efforts, equitable water distribution remains a challenge (Lesrima et al., 2021).

95 The Ewaso Ng'iro North Development Authority is tasked with coordinating regional development initiatives within the basin, i.e., the case study area (Kiteme et al., 2021). Although the decentralized governance structure marks an improvement over the central governance model of the 2002 Water Act, disparities in water distribution persist, as noted by Dell Angelo et al. (2016).

3 Data and methods

100 Figure 2 briefly describes our approach by further developing the ADOPT-AP model (Streefkerk et al., 2023), which integrates (1) Hydrology: the DRYP hydrological model (Quichimbo et al., 2021) with (2) an agent-based decision model (ABM), which simulates adaptation decisions by agropastoralists. These two parts are connected through (3) Socio-hydrological interactions. These interactions are modelled as rules that describe the feedback between decision making and the hydrological system.



105 **Figure 2: ADOPT-AP modelling framework, consisting of three modules; hydrology, human decision-making, and socio-hydrological interactions.**

This coupled model allows for assessing how the main water users ('agents') respond to drought. In the model 15,000 agropastoralists are simulated that grow crops and tend livestock to sustain their livelihood. They can take six adaptation measures to cope with droughts to meet their water demand and required grass/crop yields. Adaptation decisions by agropastoralists are made following the Protection Motivation Theory (PMT), which is based on (a) the perceived threat of drought risk and (b) their perceived coping capacity to implement drought adaptation measures. The coupled model has a daily timestep (see Section 3.1), and agropastoralists exhibit daily to yearly decision making. Water is abstracted at the nearest available location, either at the river or groundwater well, for domestic, livestock and irrigation purposes. Irrigation decisions, following simple rule-based, are made every day during the growing season depending on soil moisture and available water.

115 Major decisions are based on the psychological theories (see Section 3.2), and are made once a year (see Table 1). The agents have a heterogeneous and unique set of characteristics (e.g. location, income, age, etc.) at a spatial resolution of 1x1 km². This means each grid cell has one agropastoralist agent, representing multiple households (depending on population density and household size). In addition, commercial export farms are represented through water management rules defining the required

storage and abstraction of water. We run the model for three scenarios and assess the effect of each scenario using drought and
120 impact metrics.

3.1 Hydrology

DRYP is a process-based distributed hydrological model developed to simulate hydrological processes in dryland regions
(Quichimbo et al., 2023). Precipitation and potential evapotranspiration are the main parameters where precipitation is divided
into infiltration and surface runoff, depending on soil moisture conditions. Runoff is generated using a routing routine based
125 on elevation. Groundwater is discharged into the streams as baseflow above a certain channel stream stage threshold value.
Water from groundwater aquifers and surface streams can be abstracted by users. In addition, irrigation water can be applied
to the land (modelled as additional rainfall). Human-induced land use changes are included by altering the crop coefficient
(k_c), saturated hydrological conductivity (K_{sat}), vegetation cover, rooting depth, influencing hydrological processes such as
interception, actual evaporation and infiltration. A more detailed description of the hydrological model can be found in
130 Quichimbo et al. (2021, 2023).

Additional variables are added to the interception component of the hydrology component to enable simulating adaptation by
individual agropastoralists and commercial farms. The monthly soil adjusted vegetation Index (SAVI) is obtained from
Sentinel-2, and the fraction of vegetation cover is from Copernicus Global Land Service. The biome specific coefficient is
taken from Kergoat (1998). Discharge is used for calibration and verification of the model and provided by the Centre of
135 Training and Integrated research in ASAL Development (CETRAD).

3.2 Human decision-making

Following the Overview, Design Concepts and Details + Decisions (ODD+D) protocol (Müller et al., 2013), a detailed
overview of the modelling structure and scheduling is given in Supplement S1. We here briefly summarize the main
procedures.

140 Each year, agents decide whether to adopt an adaptation measure. Depending on the adaptation measure, agents decide whether
to adopt a specific measure at different moments throughout the year (Table 1). They spend income on adaptation measures
and the height of these expenditures is depending on their herd- and farm size. Income is determined by the crop and milk
production remaining after consumption. Agropastoralists can take six drought adaptation measures at different moments in
the year (numbered 1-6 in Figure 3 and Table 1). Four of these have been described by Streefkerk et al. (2023): (1) change
145 crop type, (2) apply irrigation, (3) change livestock type, and (4) migrate with livestock. In this paper we expand the model
with two additional adaptation measures (Table 1): (5, Figure 3) water harvesting and (6, Figure 3) soil conservation
techniques. These two additional measures have been selected as they are widely applied in the Isiolo area as described by
Schrieks et al. (2023). Both have an influence on the environment (i.e. modify properties in the hydrological model when
adopted) (see Table 2). Adaptation costs for the six measures are obtained from the World Overview of Conservation
150 Approaches and Technologies (Kentainers, 2024; Keynaseed, 2024; WOCAT, 2024).



Figure 3: All adaptation measures implemented in the model. Adaptation measures water harvesting (5), and soil moisture conservation (6) are added compared to Streefkerk et al. (2023).

Table 1: Adaptation measures added to ADOPT-AP.

Adaptation measure	Description	Duration	Timing
Change crop type	Plant drought resilience crops (cassava instead of maize). This measure affects the crop yield (based on the ratio between actual and potential evapotranspiration).	1 year	Beginning of October (start rainy season)
Apply irrigation	Apply irrigation over crop season. Water is abstracted from groundwater or river and is applied as additional rainfall on the soil in the DRYP model	20 years	Beginning of October (start rainy season)
Change livestock type	Change from cows to goats. With this change, less water and grass are needed. This has an effect on grass availability and water demand	20 years	End May (start dry season)
Migrate livestock	Migrate herd to other location. Affects grass availability and water demand	1 year	End May (start dry season)
Soil conservation	Soil conservation techniques such as agroforestry, half-moons, terraces, etc. Increases vegetation cover and interception. This influences soil moisture content and grass yields which in turn affect crop and livestock yield.	20 years	Begin October (start rainy season)
Water harvesting	Install a water harvesting structure that captures precipitation (max 50m ²) and runoff. Capacity of 5 m ³ . Used for irrigation or livestock water in times of dry conditions. Affects crop and livestock yields.	20 years	End May (start dry season)

155

The behavioral theory Protection Motivation Theory (PMT) (Eq. 1) is applied to simulate whether an agent implements an adaptation measure (m) (Maddux and Rogers, 1983). In this theory, the $IntentionToAdapt_{t,m}$ is the variable that determines whether an agent will implement a specific measure. Its value is compared with a probabilistic threshold based on the measure's lifespan (see Supplement S1). Crop-related adaptation measures (Table 1) are implemented at the beginning of October (the start of the long (main) rainy season). Livestock-related decisions are made at the end of May, before the long dry season. The $IntentionToAdapt_{t,m}$ is based on two other components:

160

$$IntentionToAdapt_{t,m} = \alpha \cdot RiskAppraisal_t + \beta \cdot CopingAppraisal_{t,m}, \quad (1)$$

Risk appraisal includes the perceived probability of the drought risk by the farmers. The perception is high just after a drought event, and then decreases over time. Therefore, risk appraisal increases in relation to drought loss but decreases if no drought

165 loss occurs. Drought loss is computed as the relative loss from decreasing livestock or crop production in a specific year compared to the average production of the previous 10 years (Di Baldassarre et al., 2013).

The perceived ability to adapt (Coping appraisal) is determined by three components: (a) the household's confidence in their ability to implement an adaptation measure (the perceived self-efficacy), which depends on household characteristics such as education level, household size, age, network and gender. (b) the households believe about the relative costs ('perceived adaptation costs') (Van Duinen et al., 2015), and (c) the perceived degree to which the adaptation options are likely to have an effect (perceived adaptation efficacy). The perceived adaptation efficacy, in the model, depends on whether an agent receives information about? extension services or not. If an agent does not have access to external adaptation information, they learn from what happens in their neighbors' field or within their neighbors' herd. Neighbors are the agents in the neighboring cells depending on the radius-settings in the model (8-connected if radius = 1).

175 The adaptation behavioral rules are informed by the survey data from Schrieks et al. (2023). The survey dataset contains information from 502 pastoral and agropastoral households in Isiolo county, Kenya ('Sample area', Figure 1), and has been collected in May 2022. The dataset contains questions on the intention to adapt for all adaptation measures that are included in the model. The survey also addressed the underlying components of drought risk and coping appraisal of the Protection Motivation Theory. Using survey data and other data sources, we parametrized the model as follows:

180 • **Household characteristics:** Household characteristics (age, income, etc.) for agents are determined per climate zone (Figure 1). We initialize agents (crop farmers) located in climate zones I-IV using data of the Tegemeo Institute (2010). Agents in climate zone V (agropastoral communities) and VI and VII (pastoral communities) are initialized with data by Schrieks et al. (2023). These initial socio-economic characteristics of agents are based on the best-fitted statistical distribution (e.g. gamma distribution) of the sampled data.

185 • **Self-efficacy:** We used the household survey data to assess the influence of socio-economic variables (age, gender, etc.) on perceived self-efficacy. For this we estimated Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions models (one for each adaptation measure) with as dependent variables the perceived self-efficacy score from the survey and as independent variables the socio-economic variables. We estimate the regression models with multiple different socio-economic variables and included the variables in the model that provided the best Aike's Information Criteria (AIC) scores (Cavanaugh and Neath, 190 2019). Supplement S2 gives a description and descriptive statistics of the variables that are used and Supplement S3 provides the regression tables.

• **PMT weights:** To estimate the weights of the PMT variables in the model, we estimated a logistic regression model with clustered standard errors as in Schrieks et al. (2023). We created composite variables for the coping appraisal variables by taking the average of all adaptation measures in the dataset and we used the binary variable for intention to adapt for all adaptation measures as dependent variables (Schrieks et al., 2023). In Supplement S2 we included a table with an overview of 195 all survey questions that have been used in the regression models.

3.3 Socio-hydrological interactions

Agropastoral households have livestock and cropland. By implementing an adaptation measure to fulfil domestic, agricultural or livestock purposes, they change the environment (water availability and land use). Water can be abstracted directly from a river or through groundwater abstraction points for all three purposes on a daily basis. Fulfilling domestic water demand is prioritized in the model, followed by livestock water demand, and lastly irrigation water demand.

3.3.1 Domestic

The domestic water demand for households in each cell is calculated for each (daily) time step. It is assumed that households abstract water from the nearest available source: either surface water from a river or groundwater from an abstraction point. Domestic water demand is calculated by multiplying the number of people in a grid cell by the daily water requirement per person (50 L/day per person) in rural areas (Oageng and Mmopelwa,2014). Actual water abstraction is limited by the water available in the nearest (non-dry) water source (either river or well). Depending on the season, farmers have to pay for water (Mattijssen, 2022) if there is no water available in their neighbourhood (at walking distance).

3.3.2 Livestock and agriculture

210 *Water demand*

Water demand for irrigation is based on the soil moisture deficit (SMD; Equation 2) during the crop growing season, calculated as follows:

$$\text{SMD} = D_{\text{root}} \cdot (\theta_{\text{fc}} - \theta) \quad (2)$$

where D_{root} is the rooting depth (mm), θ is the volumetric water content (m^3/m^3) and θ_{fc} is the volumetric water content at field capacity (m^3/m^3). Irrigation demand is derived by multiplying the SMD by the sum of the irrigated land area for each household in a cell. The agricultural field size and whether a household has adopted irrigation techniques is initialised based on the initialisation procedures of household characteristics (see section 3.2). If an agent adopts an irrigation measure during the simulation period, land will be converted from rainfed to irrigated land. Irrigation water demand is compared to Jeptum et al. (2018) to confirm the correct calibration ranges of the irrigation factor.

220 Households own livestock, which they usually herd at home. However, livestock can graze in a different location when insufficient grass or water is available at home. The decision on where to migrate to is solely based on the maximum grass availability in the neighbourhood of the agent. Grass is consumed on a first-come first-serve basis. Due to the random activation order of the agents, the agent who is activated first has most grass available. At the destination location, livestock drink water and graze, thereby influencing each other's water and grass availability by consumption of these resources by livestock.

225 Livestock water demand is calculated by multiplying the number of livestock in a grid cell by the daily water requirement per livestock type (see Streefkerk et al., 2023).

Crop and grass yield

Crop and grass yield is calculated based on the ratio between the crop's actual (AET) and potential evapotranspiration (PET) (Ratio_{crop_yield}; see Supplement S1). This calculation follows Siebert and Döll (2010): if the ratio is 1 (AET = PET), crop yield is at its maximum, while a lower AET reduces crop yield. The crop coefficient k_c in the DRYP model, with the reference evapotranspiration, determines a crop's PET. This indicates how much the crop would evaporate assuming it is healthy and well-watered. The crop coefficient depends on the crop type and its development stage (Allen et al., 1998). We used crop factors for maize and cassava from Siebert and Döll (2010). For determining grass yield, we used crop characteristics of fodder. Actual evapotranspiration indicates how much the crop evaporates based on the current water availability. Crop and grass yield (Yield_{crop}) is then calculated by multiplying Ratio_{crop_yield} with the maximum (irrigated) yield (Yield_{crop_max}) for those two crop types and fodder, following Siebert and Döll (2010):

$$\text{Yield}_{\text{crop}} = \text{Ratio}_{\text{crop_yield}} * \text{Yield}_{\text{crop_max}} \quad (3)$$

Income from livestock and crops

We translate crop yield in a year to income by multiplying the yield with market prices of the crops. We address market fluctuations of crops prices by scaling the production of the year to the average production of the last ten years (Wens et al., 2020). We calibrated and verified the simulated maize crop production with data from Kenya's National Information Dashboard on Food Security and Nutrition (KNBS, 2024) of the counties within the model domain, and weighted accordingly. Livestock production (number of animals) is a function of grass yield and calculated on daily basis (Lopez, 2008; Pande and Savenije, 2016). In addition to these rules, we assume a birth rate and that livestock dies if they don't have water for a certain period: for cattle this is four days, while goats can last maximum eight days without water (King, 1983). Income from livestock is generated by selling livestock or milk. Livestock prices are fluctuating by scaling the current livestock production to the average livestock production of the last ten years. Livestock is only sold when a household does not have sufficient income to pay expenses. Milk production is calculated by multiplying the number of animals by the number of litres produced by the type of livestock. For goats this is 1.5 L/day and for cows 3 L/day (Mattijssen, 2022; Otte et al., 2002). Based on Tegemeo Institute (2010) and Mattijssen (2022) region-specific milk and animal prices during different seasons and drought conditions are defined. Simulated milk production of the model is calibrated and verified with milk production data of Laikipia county of the National Drought Management Authority.

3.3.4 Commercial export farms

Commercial export farms are included in the model as water and land users in the upstream areas of the catchment (Figure 1). Each farm has specific characteristics including: number of grid cells they occupy; a greenhouse roof surface for rainwater harvesting; a reservoir to store water (from roof, river and groundwater); type of farm (flowers or vegetables/other); water abstraction limit (per water source). Commercial farms do not follow the PMT theory for their adaptation decisions, but they follow deterministic rules to meet their water demand by using water in the following order: (1) rainwater, (2) open water from rivers, and (3) groundwater. We differentiate between horticulture and crop farm types with the following decision rules:

260 • *Commercial horticulture farms*: Commercial farms have a reservoir and a greenhouse. Greenhouses are modelled as ‘closed systems’. We assume all water added as irrigation is transpired by the flowers, so irrigation and transpiration balance each other out. However, as the greenhouses do not cover the entire grid cells, we take into account the percentage of coverage of a grid cell and calculate evaporation and transpiration for the part of the grid cell not occupied by greenhouses. Water is used on daily basis from the reservoir to fulfil irrigation requirements, set at 40 m³/hectare/day for flowers (de Hoog, 2001).

265 ▪ To fill the reservoir with rainwater, greenhouses catch water on their roofs and store it for later use.

 ▪ If the reservoir is not full and there is water in the river, the reservoir is filled with river water.

 ▪ If there is not enough water in the reservoir and the farm has a permit, then it is filled with groundwater.

• *Commercial crop farms*: Commercial crop farms are modelled similarly to community crop farms in ADOPT-AP, including the season in which crops are grown (OND season) (Streefkerk et al., 2023), but it is assumed that these farm types

270 grow wheat. The farms have no rainwater harvesting from greenhouses but can store river and groundwater in a reservoir. They can also directly irrigate from river and groundwater if they have a permit.

Data to characterize the commercial export farms is based on various sources. Dam greenhouse sizes are calculated through Google images. Farm sizes and crop types are obtained from the respective farm websites online. Furthermore, water abstraction limits and permits are specified per commercial farms and are based on abstraction permit data from the Kenya’s

275 Water Resources Authority.

3.4 Calibration and model performance

Calibration of parameters in all model components is performed using the Distributed Evolutionary Algorithms in Python (DEAP) software (Fortin et al, 2012), which makes use of the Non-Dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm known as NSGA-II (Deb et al., 2002). Discharge at the outlet of the catchment, milk production, and crop production are the variables used for

280 calibration. The difference between simulated and observed results is evaluated using a modified Kling-Gupta efficiency (KGE) score for discharge (Kling et al., 2012) and the bias ratio (BR; McEvoy et al., 2022) for milk and crop production. The hydrological model has a spin-up period of 11 years (1990-2000). The entire period after the spin-up period is available for calibration (Shen et al., 2022). The calibration algorithm DEAP initiates model runs in the first ‘generation’, which consists of 60 parameter sets (‘individuals’). The values in these sets range as indicated in Table 2. The 10 best performing parameters

285 sets are selected and are either combined (‘mated’) or altered (‘mutated’) – with a probability of 0.7 and 0.3 respectively. 12 new ‘individuals’ are created in the process, and the model is run for these parameter sets. This procedure is repeated 10 times (‘generations’). Of all generations, the best performing individual is selected and run to calculate the performance scores (De Bruijn et al., 2023). Table 2 gives an overview of the parameters which are included in the calibration procedure and the factor values used in the selected model after calibration. Note that the hydrology-related parameters are factors that in the model are

290 multiplied by the actual values of the physical parameters (Quichimbo et al., 2023). The sensitivity of the hydrological parameters is assessed in Quichimbo et al. (2021), while the other parameters have been assessed by Streefkerk et al., (2023).

The results of the sensitivity analysis showed that irrigation (demand) is the most influential variable for drought adaptation and hazard. An exception is the ‘intention to behaviour’ parameter, which is newly added in this study.

Table 2: Overview of parameters included in calibration procedure.

Component	Parameters	Factor ranges [Unit]	Factor values after calibration
Hydrology	Recession time	0.15 - 0.55 [-]	0.23
	Channel saturated hydraulic conductivity	0.2 - 1.0 [-]	0.37
	Saturated hydraulic conductivity (unsaturated zone)	0.1 - 0.5 [-]	0.28
	Rooting depth	0.6 - 2.0 [-]	1.59
	Specific yield	0.01 - 0.2 [-]	0.05
	Saturated hydraulic conductivity (saturated zone)	5.0 - 35.0 [-]	19.29
Socio-hydrological interactions	Distribution abstraction points	0.1 - 0.9 [-]	0.1
	Irrigation factor SMD	0.1 - 2.0 [-]	0.32
	Neighborhood radius	1.0-10.0 [km]	3.63
Human decision-making	Intention to behavior	0.1-1.0 [-]	0.68
	Alpha	0.33-0.66 [-]	0.57
	Costs measures	0.5-5 [-]	2.68

295 3.5 Scenario analysis

Three scenarios are run to study the effects of the water and land use of commercial export farms of downstream users:

- *Scenario 1 ‘Baseline Commercial export farms’*: This scenario is the baseline scenario and includes the current commercial export farms and their operational water management rules (Section 3.1.1).

- *Scenario 2 ‘Commercial as forest’*: This scenario assumes that the commercial export farms are no longer present, and instead there is a natural forest area. This implies that there is no human water abstraction, and the land use is changed from crop land to forest. To accommodate this in the model, the parameters related to interception (SAVI, fraction vegetation cover and biome specific coefficient), and infiltration capacity (K_{sat}) are increased in the DRYP model (Ellison et al, 2017; Iacob et al., 2017; Mwangi et al., 2016).

- *Scenario 3 ‘Commercial as agropastoral communities’*: In this scenario, the commercial export farms are converted into agropastoral communities, similarly to other grid cells, to simulate water and land use during the time before commercial farming was introduced.

We use different drought hazard and impact metrics to assess the effects of the three scenarios. Drought metrics include soil moisture, discharge and groundwater levels. Drought impact metrics include crop production, milk production, and livestock distance to water of agropastoral communities. To assess the effects of randomness in the initialization procedure of the model (which generates the heterogeneous agent population), we generate set of 10 randomness initialisations. For every run, a member of the set is run for the three scenarios to allow for comparison between scenarios.


However, among the three scenarios the initialization is the same to allow for comparison between scenarios.

4 Results

4.1 Performance of model

315 The model performance is tested by comparing observed and simulated values of three variables (Figure 4); discharge at the outlet of the catchment, milk production, and crop production (maize). The KGE score of discharge is ~ 0.54 (composed of a bias ratio of 0.8, variance ratio of 0.74 and Pearson correlation of 0.67), and the BR is ~ 0.63 for crop production and ~ 0.62 for milk production. The simulated crop production in the best performing parameter set is lower than the observed production, and has a high variability within the ten best performing parameter sets obtained from the genetic calibration method (Section 3.4). The simulated milk production has a higher variability than the observed milk production. However, it follows the timing of the observed peaks very well. During the last period withing the 2020/23 drought the model simulated a lower milk production than was observed.

320



325 **Figure 4: Observed and simulated timeseries of streamflow at the outlet of the catchment (m^3/s), crop production ($\text{kg}/\text{hectare}$), and milk production ($\text{liters}/\text{month}$). The uncertainty ranges indicate the 10th and 90th percentile, resulting from the different parameter sets of the best ten performing runs.**

4.2 Scenarios: effect of commercial farming activities on drought risk and impact

Before discussing the effect of different scenarios, we first look at water use by commercial farms in the Baseline scenario. Here, on average, irrigation water use by commercial flower farms is supplied as follows: $\sim 75\%$ of their irrigation is obtained from water that is stored in dams and reservoirs (previously collected via rainwater harvesting on the greenhouse roofs), 7%

330

from river discharge, and 18% from groundwater sources. The irrigation water by commercial crop farms originates for ~35% from river discharge and the remaining ~65% from groundwater sources.

335 Next, we assess the effects of the three scenarios defined in Section 3.5: (1) Baseline commercial farms (2) Commercial farms converted into forest, and (3) Commercial farms converted in agropastoral communities. To allow for comparison, hazard and impact variables are simulated for two drought periods for each of the three scenarios, but limited to the the OND seasons of the drought periods: OND 2016/2017 for the ‘2016/17’ drought and OND 2021 and OND 2022 for the 2020/23 drought (in accordance with Odongo et al., 2025). The effects on drought hazard are quantified using the indicators soil moisture, discharge and groundwater elevation. Drought impacts are quantified using distance to water, crop- and milk production.

340 **4.2.1 Aggregated drought hazard and impact over the drought periods**

Figure 5 below shows the average of drought hazard and impact variables for the four sub-catchments where downstream agropastoral households are located, and also excludes the upstream area that was modified in the scenario.

When comparing drought hazard across the two drought periods and scenarios, we mostly see the difference between the two drought periods and less difference across the scenarios. The 2020/23 drought appears to be more severe in terms of soil 345 moisture (0.255, compared to 0.257) and streamflow (8.55 m³/s, compared to 15.5 m³/s), while groundwater level are similar in two drought periods. During both drought periods, the groundwater depth is the highest (i.e., lower water table) in commercial farms scenario (65.98 m in 2016/17 and 66.17 m in 2020/23). Overall, we can observe that drought hazard is slightly exacerbated in commercial export farms scenario compared to the other scenarios.

In terms of drought impacts, the crop production and milk production is higher in the 2016/17 drought compared to the 2020/23 350 drought. During the 2016/17 and 2020/23 drought crop production is 433 and 317 kg/hectare for crop production, with no significant variance among the runs. Milk production is 96.19 and 70.28 l/month for milk production, respectively. The distance to household water is shorter in the 2016/17 drought; around 2.8 km for all scenarios, compared to 3.0 km during the 2020/23 drought (with variations around 0.2 km among the various runs). Only in the distance to household water indicator we see notable differences among the scenarios, with the scenario of communities leading to a longer distance to household 355 (~0.1 km) water during the two drought events indicating that people need to travel further for drinking and sanitation.

While the differences across the scenarios are relatively small, note, however, that we here assess the average effect over a large area, and only look at two time periods. On the other hand, it can be seen that the severity of the drought has a greater impact on households than the difference in scenarios. In the next paragraphs we will have a closer look at the temporal and spatial differences among the scenarios.

360




Figure 5: Average of drought hazard (a) and impact (b) over the four sub-catchments for two drought periods in the three scenarios. The error bars show the 25th and 75th percentile of the runs.

4.2.2 Spatial and temporal drought hazard effects

365 In this section the three scenarios are assessed in terms of their drought hazard characteristics. Figure 6 shows the effects of the two drought periods by comparing the *forest* (2) and *communities* scenario (3) with the baseline *commercial farms* scenario (1). The figure shows data for the four sub-catchments, excluding the scenario area. Over time the drought hazard variables are positively influenced (i.e. drought hazard reduced) due to the absence of the commercial farms in the *forest* and *communities* scenario. Results show that over time, there is an increase in soil moisture and streamflow. The increase of soil moisture coincided with the timing of the cropping season (OND). Within the scenario area, soil moisture is decreased due to less irrigation. During the cropping season, less water is abstracted for irrigation in the *forest* and *communities* scenario compared to the *commercial farms* scenario. The higher peaks in soil moisture in the *communities* scenario (up to ~0.00025 difference) compared to the *forest* scenario (up to 0.0002 difference) can be explained by a higher evaporation rate and no irrigation at the scenario area leading to less runoff in the *forest* scenario (see Supplement S4). There are larger variations in

370 soil moisture levels among the *communities* scenarios, due to the heterogeneity of agents, leading to variations in behavior and water use. Streamflow at the outlet of the catchment is increased in the *community* scenario (up to 1.5 m³/s). This varies in the *forest* scenario, with both decreases and increases in streamflow, due to increased evaporation leading to decreased runoff.

Groundwater tables are up to 1,2m higher in both the *forest* and *communities* scenarios. This effect is caused by the absence of abstraction of groundwater by the farms, and more infiltration because of the absence of greenhouses covering the land surface, causing less water taken out of the groundwater and an increase in groundwater recharge. In the *forest* scenario the evaporation is higher, leading to lower ($\sim 0.1\text{m}$) groundwater tables compared to the *communities* scenario at the end of the simulation period. In the *communities* scenario, wheat is grown at the open farms instead of maize or casava, which results in different water demands. Streamflow and soil moisture are hydrologically connected to the groundwater table, which can explain the same upward trend in all the three variables. Note that there is no increase in groundwater level in absolute terms, but the increase is relative to the commercial farms scenario, which has a decreasing trend due to abstraction. Absolute values of the hydrological variables can be found in Supplement S5.





Figure 6: Differences between baseline commercial farms (scenario 1), and forest (scenario 2) and communities scenario (scenario 3) in soil moisture (m^3/m^3), discharge (m^3/d) and groundwater level (m) aggregated over the four sub-catchments, excluding the scenario area. The spread indicates the 25th and 75th percentile over the different runs.

Figure 7 shows these effects spatially over the whole drought period of 2020–2023. The left panels show that the decrease in soil moisture (up to ~ 0.01) is largely at the location of the commercial farms in the *forest* (2)- and *communities* (3) scenarios during the whole drought. However, interestingly, there is an increase of soil moisture at some riparian zones downstream within the same sub-catchments (up to ~ 0.005), which is linked to the increase in streamflow (Figure 7, middle) downstream of the commercial farms. Maximum absolute increases of streamflow during the 2020–23 drought are at the outlet of the catchment, up to $6 \text{ m}^3/\text{d}$. Increases up to 20% can be observed over OND seasons with an average of 5.8% (between 2002 to 2012) in the Naru Moru river (see Figure S6), located in sub-catchment 2. Over the period of 2013 to 2023 the maximum increases over the OND season are 30%, with an average of 7.3%. Average streamflow differences in the Naru Moru river is an increase of 4.4% over the period of 2002–2023. Note that during the dry seasons differences are often zero, as most of the time there is zero-flow in both scenarios during the dry seasons. Some areas in the most Eastern sub-catchment have a reduction of streamflow (up to $-6 \text{ m}^3/\text{d}$). Furthermore, the figure shows that the increase of the groundwater table is mostly observed around commercial farms in both *forest* and *communities* scenario (around 5 meter over the 2020/23 period), as explained in

previous paragraph. The increase of the groundwater has an effect downstream: a rise of the groundwater table downstream of the scenario area (around 1 meter over the 2020/23 period). There is no significant difference between the *forest* and *communities* scenarios, indicating that the commercial farms are most influential in modifying drought hazard characteristics.



410 **Figure 7: Differences between commercial farms and forest scenario (2) and communities scenario (3) over the 2020-23 drought period using hazard indicators: soil moisture (m^3/m^3), discharge (m^3/d), and groundwater table (m).**

4.2.2 Spatial temporal drought impacts

The spatial and temporal effects of the three scenarios are assessed in terms of their drought impact characteristics. We zoom in to role of different agent types: effects on impacts are assessed separately for agents close to the river and those located further away. Of the total amount of agents, 24% are located close to the river.

415 Figure 8 shows the differences in crop production for *forest* scenario and *communities* scenario as compared to the baseline *commercial farms* scenario. Overall, crop production is more influenced in the *forest* and *commercial* scenario for agents located nearby a river stream, who are more affected by differences in streamflow. . This group of agents would have a lower crop production in the *forest* and *communities* scenario (up to -0.8%). However, in the drought periods at the end of the years 2010, 2016, and 2021 higher crop production is observed (up to 0.25%). Crop production shows less difference with the
 420 baseline in the *forest* scenario than in the *communities* scenario. Note that the percentage difference is relatively low (maximum of +0.4%).

Milk production is negatively affected by agents located near a river in both the *communities* and *forest* scenario. This decrease in milk production is not expected as there is an increase in soil moisture, streamflow and groundwater levels. However, agents can migrate and tend to migrate towards the riparian zones where grass production is higher. Therefore grass yields at riparian

425 areas are shared among more livestock, resulting in lower milk production. If there is more water and grass available at the
 rivers in the *communities* and *forest* scenarios, agents might be more likely to migrate there with livestock and thus negatively
 affect agents already located at the rivers. Milk production of agents who are not located at a rivers are on average less
 influenced by the *communities* and *forest* scenarios, between -0.5 and 0.5 % difference. Up to 2017 the *forest* and *communities*
 430 scenarios have a slight positive effect on milk production. However, in the *forest* scenario the milk production slightly
 decreases after 2017 (up to -0.5%).

The distance to household water is decreased in the *forest* and *communities* scenarios during the dry season (up to -2.5% for
 agents at the river, and -2% for agents not at the river). However, in the rainy season this distance increases compared to the
commercial scenario (up to 2.5% for agents at the river, and 2% for agents not at the river), which may be due to lower runoff
 435 rates compared to the *commercial farms* scenario. The distance to household water is influenced by both the streamflow and
 groundwater level. An higher variability of distance to household water can be observed with the agents located near a river.
 The distance to household water follows a similar pattern as the streamflow (); an increase in streamflow results in a decrease
 in distance to household water and vice versa. Furthermore, a decreasing trend of the water distance can be linked to the
 increasing trend of groundwater levels in both the *forest* and the *communities* scenario.




Figure 8: Difference in forest and communities scenario compared to commercial farms scenario, expressed in crop production (%), milk production (%), and distance to household water (%). The figure also shows the impacts differentiated between agents located at the river (for crop production and distance to household water) and whether they migrated or not (for milk production). The spread indicates the 25th and 75th over the different runs.

5.1 Influence of commercial export farms on drought hazard and impact

Previous research has already shown that water abstraction by commercial export farms reduces streamflow during the dry season. For example, Lanari et al. (2018) found that streamflow in Naru Moru River (tributary within the Ewaso Ng'iro catchment) are influenced by commercial export farms in the catchment, resulting in a streamflow reduction between 3 and 450 32% in the month of February (dry season). In this study we observed minimal changes in the dry seasons, but observed large differences in streamflow during the cropping seasons of drought events (2010/11, 2015/16 and 2020/23). The average changes during OND season are 5.8% in the period of 2013-23. In the current modelling setup it is assumed that the 'crop' commercial farms only grow in the OND season (similar to the agents), which may not be the reality and underestimate water use, explaining the limited effect of the commercial farming activities on dry season flows. It is, therefore, expected that the ongoing 455 expansion of commercial export farms will result in a further reduction of streamflow if no further water saving measure will be taken (Lanari et al., 2018).

On top of these common findings for streamflow effects, our results show a large effect of commercial farms lead to lower groundwater tables. Initially, groundwater levels may appear sufficient to support both commercial farming activities and local community needs. As groundwater is a hidden water source and there is a lack of groundwater monitoring, it may be difficult 460 for communities and practitioners to perceive the extent of the problem. Additionally, the immediate economic benefits from export farming, such as employment opportunities and increased local revenue, may overshadow concerns about water consumption. Over time, the excessive withdrawal of groundwater may lead to unsustainable water management (Gaye and Tindimugaya, 2019) and thus high impacts in the long term (Hogeboom et al., 2015). Impacts may include wells running dry for domestic use, inequity in access to water, land subsidence, conflict, and ecosystem and biodiversity degradation (Perrone 465 and Jasechko, 2017; Rafiei Emam et al., 2015; Sarkar, 2012). As illustrated in this research, average distances to water are increasing over time during the dry seasons (up to 2.5%) and crop production decreased during drought seasons (up to 0.5 %) in the *commercial farms* scenarios. In non-drought periods, crop production for agents located near a river is lower in both the *forest* and *communities* scenario, although the streamflow is often higher during the cropping season (especially in the community scenario). A possible reason can be the competition of water for different purposes and the way the model 470 prioritizes water allocation. Increases in streamflow in the *communities* and *forest* scenario can lead to changes in agent's water sources from groundwater to river, resulting in an increase in water demand for domestic and livestock purposes at river locations. This increase in demand can result in less streamflow remaining for irrigation purposes (leading to a decrease in crop production).

To mitigate these long-term impacts, it is essential to implement sustainable water management practices that balance the 475 needs of commercial and local water users, including; i) Regulating (indirect) water use by enforcing existing regulations and/or establishing robust groundwater monitoring systems and regulations to ensure that extraction rates do not exceed recharge rates and abstraction permit limits. Not only for commercial export farms, but water abstraction in general (Mwaura

et al., 2021); ii) Supporting the implementation of sustainable agricultural practices. The adoption of water-efficient irrigation methods can be encouraged to reduce water consumption (Mulwa et al., 2021). Alternatively, water consumption can be decreased by decreasing bare soil evaporation through promoting soil moisture conservation techniques such as agroforestry (Mwangi et al., 2016) and mulching (Kader et al., 2019); iii) Promoting equitable water distribution (especially in dry periods) by involving local communities in water management decisions and raising awareness about the importance of sustainable water use. The governance structure of the WRUA's is already a step forward in equitable water distribution (Dell Angelo et al., 2016; Mwaura et al., 2021).

When reviewing experiences from drylands in other global regions, the question is whether producing water intensive commodities can be a sustainable water management practice in water-scarce dryland areas (Martinez-Valderrama et al., 2024). Especially when the commodity is exported and not contributing to the food security of the country itself. However, this is a political discussion, as there are also employment and economic benefits to this industry (Peter et al., 2018; Mekonnen et al., 2012). In addition, the importing countries can take virtual water (or energy) footprints into account in their supply chain (Mekonnen et al., 2012).

5.2 Drought impacts and human-water feedbacks

Drought impacts are a manifestation of complex system in which interaction between water and people exist and emerge (Van Loon et al., 2016). Drought impacts may be different for different people, as people have different capacities or respond differently. In turn, the drought responses of people (and other actors) may influence the propagation of drought. For example, irrigation may delay the drought impact of soil moisture drought, but may worsen the drought at a later stage during hydrological drought (Piemontese et al., 2024). Other feedbacks relate to behavioural factors. For example, results show how people influence each other's pasture availability and milk production. Agents tend to migrate towards the riparian zones where grass production is higher (Streefkerk et al., 2023). Therefore, in the *forest* and *communities* scenarios, grass yields at riparian areas are shared among more livestock, resulting in lower milk production for agents already located near rivers. The scenario analysis shows that the uptake of irrigation in the *communities* scenario and water harvesting is decreasing over time in the *forest* and *communities* scenario as compared to the scenario with commercial farms. This is probably due to the higher water availability in the scenario without commercial farms leading to a lower adaptation efficacy and risk perception, resulting in a lower uptake of water harvesting and irrigation. Understanding these interactions is crucial for developing effective drought adaptation strategies for agropastoral communities, and sustainable water management practices and governance (Wens et al., 2021). The results show, however, a wide range in the uptake of adaptation measure among the various model runs, highlighting the importance of heterogeneity and individual characteristics of agents in adaptation behaviour.

There is a broader scientific discussion on the (human-induced) conversion of agricultural land into forest, and what the effect is on (downstream) hydrology (Ellison et al., 2012). Some studies see forests as 'demanders' of water (through higher evapotranspiration rates) (Malmer et al., 2010; Trabucco et al., 2008), while other see them as 'providers' (through moisture transport, higher infiltration and lower soil evaporation) (Ellison et al., 2017; Sheil and Murdiyarso, 2009). In this study, the

scenario analysis excludes the scenario area itself from the analysis and focusses on downstream effects of the scenarios, where we do see small differences. As mentioned in the results, soil moisture is higher in the both the *communities* and *forest* scenarios compared to commercial farms scenarios, with the *communities* scenario an increased soil moisture peak during the cropping season. When looking into the hydrological fluxes over the entire catchment, higher canopy evaporation can be observed in the *forest* scenario, resulting in lower potential evaporation and precipitation reaching the soil. Insignificant differences are observed in groundwater storage and recharge. The model does not take any potential benefits of moisture recycling of forest into account. Keeping the human-drought feedbacks of adoption behaviour in mind, it is difficult to point out what causes the higher soil moisture; the higher uptake of adaptation measures or differences in hydrological fluxes. Future research would be needed for that.

520 **5.3 Reflections on modelling framework**

The development of models like ADOPT-AP provides a valuable tool for capturing and understanding the interactions between human activities and drought impacts, in particularly by quantifying these processes and accessing the implications of various scenarios. ABM's can inform policy development by providing evidence-based insights into how different stakeholder behaviours and interactions influence system outcomes under various management scenarios.

525 The model performance is considered acceptable, with a KGE score of ~0.54 for discharge and a BR of ~0.63 for crop production and ~0.62 for milk production. However, the model underestimated the milk production compared to observed data in dry periods. This might indicate that milk production is not just influenced by environmental stressors (Busker et al., 2023), but that responses of (non-)governmental organisations have decreased the impact of drought on milk production (e.g. people receiving cash transfers through humanitarian aid allowing people to buy water and hay). However, we should also note that the observed data might not be accurate. Milk production does not reduce as much as one would expect from the severity of drought impact reported on food security (Reliefweb, 2023) - assuming milk production is strongly correlated with food insecurity (Jodlowski et al., 2016).

530 Furthermore, lack of data on adaptation measures over time hinders the validity of modelling the effects of adaptation measures as human-water feedbacks (Aerts, 2020). Although alternative calibration parameters can be used to calibrate and test the performance of the model, empirical longitudinal data from consecutive surveys on the uptake of adaptation measures would be valuable (Kalthof et al., 2024). Such panel data would give more certainty around calibrating the weighting of relative importance of the risk and coping appraisal parameters in our decision model and the threshold that drives the intention to adapt to measures actually implemented (Bubeck et al., 2020).

540 In this study households and commercial farms are incorporated as actors that influence the water balance. However, other water users may be important as well, especially considering population growth in urban areas (Wamucii et al, 2023) and the expansion of the tourism industry (Mutiga et al., 2010). Furthermore, this study represents the adaptive behaviour of households through the Protection Motivation Theory (PMT). Although research shows that PMT factors best explain the adaptive behaviour of farmers in Kenya (Wens et al., 2021), it should be noted more factors may influence the adoption of

drought measures, such as variables which are included in economic theories (e.g. risk and time preference) (Schrieks et al.,
545 2023).

Conclusion

This study presents an evaluation of the effects of commercial export farms in terms of drought hazard and impacts within the Upper Ewaso Ng'iro catchment. The model was calibrated using NSGA-II technique and shows a performance of a KGE score of 0.54 for discharge, and a BR score of 0.63 and 0.62 for crop and milk production, respectively. Compared to the observed
550 data, milk production is underestimated by the model during dry periods.

After calibration, we compared the base scenario, in which commercial farms are present in part of the catchment, to two scenarios where there are agropastoral communities or forests instead of the commercial farms. The analysis shows that in the scenarios where these farms are replaced by forests or communities, drought conditions are lower due to increased soil moisture up to 0.00025, averaged over the sub-catchments) and increased groundwater tables during dry periods (up to 1.2 m at the end
555 of the simulation period). Streamflow at the outlet of the catchment is higher in the *community* scenario (up to 1.5 m³/s). This varies in the *forest* scenario, with both lower and higher in streamflow (between -0.5 m³/s and 0.5 m³/s), due to higher evaporation leading to lower runoff. These improvements of drought conditions are related to lower water abstraction and higher infiltration of communities and forests compared to commercial farms. Downstream communities benefit with lower distances to household water in the dry season (-2.5% for agents near a river and -2% for agents not located near a river) and
560 higher crop production in times of drought (average up to 0.25%). Milk production is both higher and lower throughout the simulation period, with agents located at river seeing more change in the *forest* and *communities* scenario (ranging from -2% to 2% for agents at river, and -0.5 and -0.5% for agents not located at river). Differences in drought impacts among the different scenarios are, however, low in comparison to the effect of drought itself.

Future research can explore different actors that may influence drought impact of communities, and improve on longitudinal
565 adaption behaviour data collection for model validation purposes. Furthermore, including moisture recycling feedbacks into these types of modelling frameworks would allow to assess the effect of forest or adaptation measures like agroforestry on drought risk more thoroughly. The increase of drought hazard and drought impacts during dry periods, due the commercial farming activities, highlight the need for equitable and sustainable water management practices.

Code and data availability

570 The ADOPT-AP model code is publicly available in GitHub via <https://github.com/istreefkerk/ADOPT-AP> and <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7447665>.

Author contribution

IS, JB, AL, JA; conceptualization. IS, JB, AL, JA, TS; writing – original draft. IS; methodology and visualization. JB IS: software. TS: formal analysis. JB, AL, JA supervision. RO, KH, OW, investigation. KH, RO, OW: writing – reviewing & editing.

Competing interests

The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank several people cooperating and contributing to this research. Firstly, Merel Mattijssen did her MSc thesis on the topic, and helped in the understanding of the drought impacts on agropastoral communities. Secondly, we would like to thank Timafloor for talking with us about the operations on the flower farm. Thirdly, thank you to Andrés Quichimbo for answering questions on the DRYP model. Lastly, we would like to thank research assistants, community members and officials for participating and contributing to this research. The project has been funded by the European Commission as part of Horizon 2020 under DOWN2EARTH project (Grand Agreement ID: 869550) and the ERC Coastmove project nr 8844442.

References

- Aerts, J. C. (2020). Integrating agent-based approaches with flood risk models: A review and perspective. *Water Security*, 11, 100076.
- Alam, M. F., McClain, M., Sikka, A., and Pande, S. (2022). Understanding human–water feedbacks of interventions in agricultural systems with agent based models: A review. *Environmental Research Letters*, 17(10), 103003.
- Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., and Smith, M. (1998). Crop evapotranspiration-Guidelines for computing crop water requirements-FAO Irrigation and drainage paper 56. *Fao, Rome*, 300(9), D05109.
- Baldwin, E., Washington-Ottombre, C., Dell'Angelo, J., Cole, D., and Evans, T. (2016). Polycentric Governance and Irrigation Reform in Kenya. *Governance*, 29(2), 207-225.
- Bubeck, P., Berghäuser, L., Hudson, P., and Thieken, A. H. (2020). Using panel data to understand the dynamics of human behavior in response to flooding. *Risk Analysis*, 40(11), 2340-2359.
- Busker, T., de Moel, H., van den Hurk, B., and Aerts, J. C. (2023). Impact-based seasonal rainfall forecasting to trigger early action for droughts. *Science of the Total Environment*, 898, 165506.
- Camberlin, P., Moron, V., Okoola, R., Philippon, N., and Gitau, W. (2009). Components of rainy seasons' variability in Equatorial East Africa: onset, cessation, rainfall frequency and intensity. *Theoretical and applied climatology*, 98, 237-249.

- 600 Castilla-Rho, J. C., Mariethoz, G., Rojas, R., Andersen, M. S., and Kelly, B. F. (2015). An agent-based platform for simulating complex human–aquifer interactions in managed groundwater systems. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 73, 305-323.
- Cavanaugh, J. E., and Neath, A. A. (2019). The Akaike information criterion: Background, derivation, properties, application, interpretation, and refinements. *WIREs Computational Statistics*, 11(3), e1460. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wics.1460>
- Chiarelli, D. D., D’Odorico, P., Müller, M. F., Mueller, N. D., Davis, K. F., Dell’Angelo, J., ... and Rulli, M. C. (2022).
- 605 Competition for water induced by transnational land acquisitions for agriculture. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 505.
- de Hoog, J. (2001). Handbook for modern greenhouse rose cultivation. *Applied Plant Research*. <https://edepot.wur.nl/408821>
- Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., and Meyarivan, T. A. M. T. (2002). A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II. *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, 6(2), 182-197.
- De Bruijn, J. A., Smilovic, M., Burek, P., Guillaumot, L., Wada, Y., and Aerts, J. C. (2023). GEB v0. 1: a large-scale agent-
- 610 based socio-hydrological model–simulating 10 million individual farming households in a fully distributed hydrological model. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 16(9), 2437-2454.
- Dell’Angelo, J., McCord, P. F., Gower, D., Carpenter, S., Caylor, K. K., and Evans, T. P. (2016). Community water governance on Mount Kenya: an assessment based on Ostrom’s design principles of natural resource management. *Mountain Research and Development*, 36(1), 102-115.
- 615 Di Baldassarre, G., Viglione, A., Carr, G., Kuil, L., Salinas, J. L., and Blöschl, G. (2013). Socio-hydrology: conceptualising human-flood interactions. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 17(8), 3295-3303.
- Ellison, D., N. Futter, M., and Bishop, K. (2012). On the forest cover–water yield debate: from demand-to supply-side thinking. *Global change biology*, 18(3), 806-820.
- Ellison, D., Morris, C. E., Locatelli, B., Sheil, D., Cohen, J., Murdiyarsa, D., ... and Sullivan, C. A. (2017). Trees, forests and
- 620 water: Cool insights for a hot world. *Global environmental change*, 43, 51-61.
- Fortin, F. A., De Rainville, F. M., Gardner, M. A. G., Parizeau, M., and Gagné, C. (2012). DEAP: Evolutionary algorithms made easy. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1), 2171-2175.
- Gaye, C. B., and Tindimugaya, C. (2019). Challenges and opportunities for sustainable groundwater management in Africa. *Hydrogeology Journal*, 27(3), 1099-1110.
- 625 Gichuki, F. N. (2002). Water scarcity and conflicts: A case study of the Upper Ewaso Ng’iro North Basin. *The changing face of irrigation in Kenya: Opportunities for anticipating change in eastern and southern Africa*, 113-34.
- Giger, M., Reys, A., Anseeuw, W., Mutea, E., Kiteme, B. (2022) Smallholders’ livelihoods in the presence of commercial farms in central Kenya, *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 96, 2022, Pages 343-357, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.11.004>.
- 630 Hogeboom, R. H., van Oel, P. R., Krol, M. S., and Booij, M. J. (2015). Modelling the influence of groundwater abstractions on the water level of Lake Naivasha, Kenya under data-scarce conditions. *Water Resources Management*, 29, 4447-4463.
- Iacob, O., Brown, I., and Rowan, J. (2017). Natural flood management, land use and climate change trade-offs: the case of Tarland catchment, Scotland. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 62(12), 1931-1948.

- Jeptum, I., Mati, B. M., Gathenya, J. M., and Thomas, M. (2018). Effects of water abstraction on Burguret flows, Kenya. *American Journal of Water Resources*, 6(5), 189-202.
- Jodlowski, M., Winter-Nelson, A., Baylis, K., and Goldsmith, P. D. (2016). Milk in the data: food security impacts from a livestock field experiment in Zambia. *World Development*, 77, 99-114.
- Kader, M. A., Singha, A., Begum, M. A., Jewel, A., Khan, F. H., and Khan, N. I. (2019). Mulching as water-saving technique in dryland agriculture. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre*, 43(1), 1-6.
- 640 Kalthof, M., Jens de Bruijn, Hans de Moel, Heidi Kreibich, Jeroen C.J.H Aerts (2024) Adaptive Behavior of Over a Million Individual Farmers Under Consecutive Droughts: A Large-Scale Agent-Based Modeling Analysis in the Bhima Basin, India. NHESS, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-1588>
- Kentainers, (2024). Kentank. <https://kentainers.co.ke/shop>
- Kenyaseed. (2024). Kenya Seed Company Limited. <https://kenyaseed.com/>
- 645 Kergoat, L. (1998). A model for hydrological equilibrium of leaf area index on a global scale. *Journal of hydrology*, 212, 268-286.
- King, J. M. (1983). Livestock water needs in pastoral Africa in relation to climate and forage. International Livestock Centre for Africa.
- Kiteme B., Breu T., Bastide J., Eckert S., Fischer M., González-Rojí S.J., Hergarten C., Hurni K., Messmer M., Raible C.C.,
- 650 Snethlage M., Stocker T.F., Torre-Marin Rando A., Wiesmann U. (2021). Towards sustainable futures for nature and people: An appraisal report for the Mt. Kenya–Ewaso Ng’iro North landscape, Kenya. Wyss Academy Report 2, Wyss Academy for Nature, Bern, Switzerland. <https://doi.org/10.48350/161382>
- Kling, H., Fuchs, M., and Paulin, M. (2012). Runoff conditions in the upper Danube basin under an ensemble of climate change scenarios. *Journal of hydrology*, 424, 264-277.
- 655 KNBS (2024) National Platform for Food Security and Nutrition. <https://nipfn.knbs.or.ke/nipfndashboard/> 024)
- Konar, M., Evans, T. P., Levy, M., Scott, C. A., Troy, T. J., Vörösmarty, C. J., and Sivapalan, M. (2016). Water resources sustainability in a globalizing world: who uses the water?. *Hydrological Processes*, 30(18), 3330-3336.
- Lanari, N., Schuler, R., Kohler, T., and Liniger, H. (2018). The impact of commercial horticulture on river water resources in the Upper Ewaso Ng’iro River Basin, Kenya. *Mountain research and development*, 38(2), 114-124.
- 660 Lesrima, S., Nyamasyo, G., and Karatu, K. (2021). Constraints in water access in Laikipia County, case of Ewaso Ng’iro River Basin in Kenya. *East African Journal of Science, Technology and Innovation*, 2(2).
- Lopez, S. (2008). Non-linear functions in animal nutrition. In *Mathematical modelling in animal nutrition* (pp. 47-88). Wallingford UK: CABI.
- Maddux, J. E., and Rogers, R.W. (1983). Protection motivation and self-efficacy: a revised theory of fear appeals and attitude
- 665 change. *J. Exp. Social Psychol.* 19, 469–479. doi: 10.1016/0022-1031(83)90023-9
- Malmer, A., Murdiyarsa, D., Bruijnzeel, L. A., and Ilstedt, U. (2010). Carbon sequestration in tropical forests and water: a critical look at the basis for commonly used generalizations. *Global Change Biology*, 16(2), 599-604.

- Martínez-Valderrama, J., Gartzia, R., Olcina, J., Guirado, E., Ibáñez, J., and Maestre, F. T. (2024). Uberizing Agriculture in Drylands: A Few Enriched, Everyone Endangered. *Water Resources Management*, 38(1), 193-214.
- 670 Mattijssen, M. (2022). Linking Drought Severity Indices to Drought Impacts: Experiences of Kenyan Agro-Pastoralists. [unpublished master thesis]. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- McEvoy, D. J., Roj, S., Dunkerly, C., McGraw, D., Huntington, J. L., Hobbins, M. T., and Ott, T. (2022). Validation and Bias Correction of Forecast Reference Evapotranspiration for Agricultural Applications in Nevada. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 148(11). doi.org/10.1061/(asce)wr.1943-5452.0001595
- 675 Mekonnen, M. M., Hoekstra, A. Y., and Becht, R. (2012). Mitigating the water footprint of export cut flowers from the Lake Naivasha Basin, Kenya. *Water resources management*, 26, 3725-3742.
- Mkutu, K., and Mdee, A. (2020). Conservancies, Conflict and Dispossession: The Winners and Losers of Oil Exploration in Turkana, Kenya. *African Studies Review*, 63(4), 831-857. doi:10.1017/asr.2020.2
- Müller, B., Bohn, F., Dreßler, G., Groeneveld, J., Klassert, C., Martin, R., et al. (2013). Describing human decisions in agent-based models—ODD+D, an extension of the ODD protocol. *Environ. Model. Softw.* 48, 37–48. doi: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.06.003
- 680 Mulwa, F., Li, Z., and Fangninou, F. F. (2021). Water scarcity in Kenya: current status, challenges and future solutions. *Open Access Library Journal*, 8(1), 1-15.
- Mungai, D. N., Ong, C. K., Kiteme, B., Elkaduwa, W., and Sakthivadivel, R. (2004). Lessons from two long-term hydrological studies in Kenya and Sri Lanka. *Agriculture, ecosystems and environment*, 104(1), 135-143.
- 685 Mutiga, J. K., Mavengano, S. T., Zhongbo, S., Woldai, T., and Becht, R. (2010). Water allocation as a planning tool to minimise water use conflicts in the Upper Ewaso Ng'iro North Basin, Kenya. *Water resources management*, 24, 3939-3959.
- Mwangi, H. M., Julich, S., Patil, S. D., McDonald, M. A., and Feger, K. H. (2016). Modelling the impact of agroforestry on hydrology of Mara River Basin in East Africa. *Hydrological Processes*, 30(18), 3139-3155.
- 690 Mwaura, S. N. A. A., Maina Kariuki, I., Kiprop, S., Muluvi, A. S., Obare, G., and Kiteme, B. (2021). The impacts of community-based water development projects on rural poverty among small-holder farmers: Evidence from the Ewaso Ng'iro North Catchment Area, Kenya. *Cogent Economics and Finance*, 9(1), 1882763.
- NDMA (2023). County Early Warning Bullitins. <https://www.ndma.go.ke/index.php/resource-center/national-drought-bulletin/category/64-county-early-warning-bulletins>. Accessed on 22-2-2023.
- 695 Ngutu, M., Bukachi, S., Olungah, C. O., Kiteme, B., Kaeser, F., and Haller, T. (2018). The actors, rules and regulations linked to export horticulture production and access to land and water as common pool resources in Laikipia County, northwest Mount Kenya. *Land*, 7(3), 110.
- Notter, B., MacMillan, L., Viviroli, D., Weingartner, R., and Liniger, H. P. (2007). Impacts of environmental change on water resources in the Mt. Kenya region. *Journal of Hydrology*, 343(3-4), 266-278.
- 700 Nyariki, D.M., Amwata, D.A. (2019) The value of pastoralism in Kenya: Application of total economic value approach. *Pastoralism* 9, 9 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13570-019-0144-x>

- Oageng, I., and Mmopelwa, G. P. (2014). Water consumption patterns in a rural setting in Ngamiland district, Botswana: the case of Boro village. *Journal of water, sanitation and hygiene for development*, 4(4), 720-726.
- Otte, M. J., and Chilonda, P. (2002). Cattle and small ruminant production systems in sub-Saharan Africa. A systematic review.
- 705 Pande, S., and Savenije, H. H. (2016). A sociohydrological model for smallholder farmers in Maharashtra, India. *Water Resources Research*, 52(3), 1923-1947.
- Perrone, D., and Jasechko, S. (2017). Dry groundwater wells in the western United States. *Environmental Research Letters*, 12(10), 104002.
- Peter, M. N., Bukachi, S. A., Olungah, C. O., and Haller, T. (2018). Opportunities and challenges in export horticulture as an
710 agro-industrial food system: case study of Northwest Mount Kenya region. *International Journal on Food System Dynamics*, 9(5), 470-483.
- Piemontese, L., Terzi, S., Di Baldassarre, G. et al. Over-reliance on water infrastructure can hinder climate resilience in pastoral drylands. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 14, 267–274 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-024-01929-z>
- Pörtner, H. O., Roberts, D. C., Adams, H., Adler, C., Aldunce, P., Ali, E., ... and Ibrahim, Z. Z. (2022). Climate change 2022:
715 impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. IPCC.
- Quichimbo, E. A., Singer, M. B., Michaelides, K., Hobbey, D. E., Rosolem, R., and Cuthbert, M. O. (2021). DRYP 1.0: a parsimonious hydrological model of DRYland Partitioning of the water balance. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14(11), 6893-6917.
- Quichimbo, E. A., Singer, M. B., Michaelides, K., Rosolem, R., MacLeod, D. A., Asfaw, D. T., and Cuthbert, M. O. (2023).
720 Assessing the sensitivity of modelled water partitioning to global precipitation datasets in a data-scarce dryland region. *Hydrological Processes*, 37(12), e15047.
- Rafiei Emam, A., Kappas, M., Akhavan, S., Hosseini, S. Z., and Abbaspour, K. C. (2015). Estimation of groundwater recharge and its relation to land degradation: case study of a semi-arid river basin in Iran. *Environmental earth sciences*, 74, 6791-6803.
- Rahimi, J., Fillol, E., Mutua, J. Y., Cinardi, G., Robinson, T. P., Notenbaert, A. M., ... and Butterbach-Bahl, K. (2022). A shift
725 from cattle to camel and goat farming can sustain milk production with lower inputs and emissions in north sub-Saharan Africa's drylands. *Nature Food*, 3(7), 523-531.
- Reckien, D., Magnan, A. K., Singh, C., Lukas-Sithole, M., Orlove, B., Schipper, E. L. F., and Coughlan de Perez, E. (2023). Navigating the continuum between adaptation and maladaptation. *Nature Climate Change*, 1-12.
- ReliefWeb. (2023). Kenya 2022 Drought Response in Review. [https://reliefweb.int/report/kenya/kenya-2022-drought-](https://reliefweb.int/report/kenya/kenya-2022-drought-response-review)
730 [response-review](https://reliefweb.int/report/kenya/kenya-2022-drought-response-review)
- Sarkar, A. (2012). Sustaining livelihoods in face of groundwater depletion: a case study of Punjab, India. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 14, 183-195.
- Savelli, E., Mazzoleni, M., Di Baldassarre, G., Cloke, H., and Rusca, M. (2023). Urban water crises driven by elites' unsustainable consumption. *Nature Sustainability*.

- 735 Schrieks, T., Botzen, W. W., Haer, T., Wasonga, O. V., and Aerts, J. C. (2023). Assessing key behavioural theories of drought risk adaptation: Evidence from rural Kenya. *Risk Analysis*.
- Schrieks, T., Botzen W.J., Haer T., Aerts J.C.J.H. (2024) Drought risk attitudes in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in Kenya., *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 108, 2024, 102143, doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2023.102143
- 740 Sheil, D., and Murdiyarso, D. (2009). How forests attract rain: an examination of a new hypothesis. *Bioscience*, 59(4), 341-347.
- Shen, H., Tolson, B. A., and Mai, J. (2022). Time to update the split-sample approach in hydrological model calibration. *Water Resources Research*, 58(3), e2021WR031523.
- Siebert, S., and Döll, P. (2010). Quantifying blue and green virtual water contents in global crop production as well as potential production losses without irrigation. *Journal of Hydrology*, 384(3-4), 198-217.
- 745 Solomon, N., Birhane, E., Gordon, C., Haile, M., Taheri, F., Azadi, H., and Scheffran, J. (2018). Environmental impacts and causes of conflict in the Horn of Africa: A review. *Earth-science reviews*, 177, 284-290.
- Streefkerk, I. N., de Bruijn, J., Haer, T., Van Loon, A. F., Quichimbo, E. A., Wens, M., ... and Aerts, J. C. (2023). A coupled agent-based model to analyse human-drought feedbacks for agropastoralists in dryland regions. *Frontiers in Water*, 4.
- Tegemeo Institute (2010). Tegemeo Agricultural Policy Research Analysis (TAPRA) Project–Household Survey 2010.
- 750 Nairobi: Tegemeo Institute.
- Te Wierik, S. A., Keune, J., Miralles, D. G., Gupta, J., Artzy-Randrup, Y. A., Gimeno, L., ... and Cammeraat, L. H. (2022). The contribution of transpiration to precipitation over African watersheds. *Water Resources Research*, 58(11), e2021WR031721.
- 755 Trabucco, A., Zomer, R. J., Bossio, D. A., van Straaten, O., and Verchot, L. V. (2008). Climate change mitigation through afforestation/reforestation: a global analysis of hydrologic impacts with four case studies. *Agriculture, ecosystems and environment*, 126(1-2), 81-97.
- Van Duinen, R., Filatova, T., Geurts, P., and Veen, A. V. D. (2015). Empirical analysis of farmers' drought risk perception: Objective factors, personal circumstances, and social influence. *Risk analysis*, 35(4), 741-755.
- Van Emmerik, T. H. M., Li, Z., Sivapalan, M., Pande, S., Kandasamy, J., Savenije, H. H. G., ... and Vigneswaran, S. (2014).
- 760 Socio-hydrologic modeling to understand and mediate the competition for water between agriculture development and environmental health: Murrumbidgee River basin, Australia. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18(10), 4239-4259.
- Van Loon, A. F., Gleeson, T., Clark, J., Van Dijk, A. I., Stahl, K., Hannaford, J., ... and Van Lanen, H. A. (2016). Drought in the Anthropocene. *Nature Geoscience*, 9(2), 89-91.
- Van Oel, P. R., Martins, E. S., Costa, A. C., Wanders, N., and Van Lanen, H. A. (2018). Diagnosing drought using the downstreamness concept: the effect of reservoir networks on drought evolution. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 63(7), 979-990.
- 765 Veldkamp, T. I. E., Wada, Y., Aerts, J. C. J. H., Döll, P., Gosling, S. N., Liu, J., ... and Ward, P. J. (2017). Water scarcity hotspots travel downstream due to human interventions in the 20th and 21st century. *Nature communications*, 8(1), 1-12.

- Wamucii, C. N., van Oel, P. R., Ligtenberg, A., Gathenya, J. M., and Teuling, A. J. (2021). Land use and climate change effects on water yield from East African forested water towers. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 25(11), 5641-5665.
- 770 Wamucii, C. N., Teuling, A. J., Ligtenberg, A., Gathenya, J. M., and van Oel, P. R. (2023). Human influence on water availability variations in the upper Ewaso Ng'iro river basin, Kenya. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, 47, 101432.
- Wens, M., Veldkamp, T. I., Mwangi, M., Johnson, J. M., Lasage, R., Haer, T., and Aerts, J. C. (2020). Simulating small-scale agricultural adaptation decisions in response to drought risk: an empirical agent-based model for semi-arid Kenya. *Frontiers*
- 775 *in water*, 2, 15.
- Wens, M. L. K., van Loon, A. F., Veldkamp, T. I. E., and Aerts, J. C. J. H. (2022) Education, financial aid, and awareness can reduce smallholder farmers' vulnerability to drought under climate change, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 22, 1201–1232, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-22-1201-2022>, 2022.
- Wiesmann, U., Gichuki, F. N., Kiteme, B. P., and Liniger, H. (2000). Mitigating conflicts over scarce water resources in the
- 780 highland-lowland system of Mount Kenya. *Mountain Research and Development*, 20(1), 10-15.
- WOCAT (2024) Global Database on Sustainable Land Management. <https://www.wocat.net/en/global-slm-database/>
- Zaehring, J. G., Wambugu, G., Kiteme, B., and Eckert, S. (2018). How do large-scale agricultural investments affect land use and the environment on the western slopes of Mount Kenya? Empirical evidence based on small-scale farmers' perceptions and remote sensing. *Journal of environmental management*, 213, 79-89.