**Impact Assessment of Precipitation and Temperature Variability on Land Suitability for Surface Irrigation in Kilosa district, Morogoro-Tanzania**

**ABSTRACT**

This study focused on assessing the impacts of precipitation and temperature variability for land suitability in relation to surface irrigation in Kilosa district, Tanzania, utilized a multidisciplinary approach integrating remote sensing, geographical information systems (GIS), and multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDA) methods. The study evaluated various factors including precipitation, temperature, soil texture, soil depth, soil drainage, slope, altitude, distance from water source (river proximity) and land use/land cover to determine suitability classes. The land suitability was analyzed by considering baseline period (1981-2005) and climate scenarios. Precipitation and temperature data for the baseline period were downloaded from CHIRPS and ERA5 Ag datasets while the future climate scenarios (2011-2035) were projected using statistical downscaling methods based on Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs). By incorporating the factors, the land suitability for surface irrigation was analyzed for both baseline period and climatic scenarios. The suitability analysis employed Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) to assign weights to the contributing factors. Results indicated that approximately 796,024.48(53.36%) hectares of the study area was recommended for surface irrigation within a baseline period while for projected duration under RCPs the recommended areas were reduced significantly. The study underscored the importance of considering climate factors specifically precipitation and temperature in irrigation land planning and emphasized the need for adaptive management strategies to ensure sustainable surface irrigation practices.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Climate change is most influential factor to a global challenge by impacting natural and human systems (Bandh *et al.,* 2021). The increase in global temperatures and shifting of precipitation patterns causes a variation in water availability and distribution (Konapala *et al.,* 2020). Agriculture as the most sector which heavily dependent on climate conditions, is vulnerable in Africa specifically southern Sahara (Nhemachena *et al.,* 2020). Irrigation as a critical component of agricultural production, is directly influenced by changes in climate variables such as temperature and precipitation (Hatfield *et al.,* 2020).

Africa is susceptible to the impacts of climate change due to its high dependence on rain-fed agriculture (Pickson & Boateng, 2022). Many African countries, including Tanzania, are experiencing alteration in rainfall patterns and increased frequency of droughts and floods, which significantly affect agricultural productivity (Ibe & Amikuzuno, 2019).

Agriculture is the backbone of Tanzania's economy, employing more than 65% of the people, either formally or informally (Mpogole *et al.,* 2020). This industry accounts for around 33% of the GDP and has a considerable impact on export revenues (Mpogole *et al.,* 2020). Despite of the constant expansion of agricultural sector (Wineman *et al.,* 2020), the country is still not reaching the maximum production of surplus for export. This is despite the presence of substantial markets in East African nations such as Kenya and South Sudan (John, 2024). A high reliance on rainfed agriculture is one of the main reasons. It is estimated that irrigated output accounts for less than 2.3% of Tanzania's total cultivable area (Uisso & Tanrıvermiş, 2021).

Expanding irrigation infrastructure in Tanzania could boost agricultural output and lessen dependency on unpredictable rainfall (Gwambene & Mung'ong'o, 2023). The government's policy focuses the transition from rainfed to irrigation-based agriculture in order to improve surplus production for export. The goal is to increase irrigated land from 0.2 million hectares in 2004 to 1.0 million hectares by 2035 (NIMP, 2018). The planning for this development should prioritize evaluating land suitability for irrigation, focusing particularly on surface irrigation method due to its effective cost, as well as its vulnerability to the effects of climate change (Worqlul *et al.,* 2019). Consequently, it is essential to understand how future hydrological processes are influenced by current climatic trends, particularly changes in precipitation and temperature. The National Irrigation Master Plan (NIMP 2018) emphasizes the potential of land by making regional climate variability as the lowest unit of consideration (Oates *et al.,* 2023). However, following this strategy may produce average findings that are not always appropriate for planning reasons. Several studies show that focusing on smaller geographic areas rather than regional scales could produce more accurate estimates of climatic variability (Luhunga & Kahimba*,* 2016). Understanding how climate change impacts the suitability of land for surface irrigation, particularly at the local level, would help to plan the review of the future Tanzania's National Irrigation Master Plan (NIMP).

Thus, the primary goal of this study was to assess the impact of precipitation and temperature variability, on land suitability for surface irrigation in Kilosa district. The specific objectives of this study were to (1) Calibrate and validate the GCM models (2) Assess the suitability of physical land features, land use/cover and river proximity (3) Weight the overall factors suitability. In the assessment, this study considered 25 years duration, from 1981 to 2005 as a baseline period while 2011 to 2035 as projected period. This is due to the consideration of the National Irrigation Master Plan (NIMP), which used 2004 as the starting year and 2035 as the final year of the planning.

The findings of this study provide a useful recommendation for future irrigation planning, particularly when reviewing Tanzania's National Irrigation Master Plan (NIMP). Furthermore, the findings provide a valuable insight on the impact of climate change specifically precipitation and temperature variability on surface irrigated agriculture, as well as policymakers' recommendations for reducing these effects.

1. **METHODOLOGY**
	1. **Description of the study area**

Kilosa district is located in Morogoro region of Tanzania with latitude -6.8525 (approximately 6°51'9"S) and longitude 36.9916 (approximately 36°59'30"E) covering an area of approximately 14,918 square kilometers (John & Manyong, 2019). Geographically the district combines plains and hills terrains, which create a perfect environment for varied ecosystems to succeed (Quail, 2020). The local economy is primarily driven by agriculture, with a substantial portion of the population engaged in farming activities (Luanda, 2020), this is due to its potential in fertile land and favorable climate which both contribute to the cultivation of various crops, consequently making the district a vital hub for food production in the region.

The district has a huge potential for paddy production, contributing significantly to Morogoro's agricultural output (Mkubya & Mahoo, 2023). The rainfall in the district varies spatially and seasonally (dry and wet), resulting in uneven distribution patterns (Kitasho *et al.,* 2020). The dry season is spanning from May to October with little or no rains, while wet season is from November to April, generally the rainfall regime is described as unimodal (Wilson & Ouedraogo, 2017). The variations are influenced by climatic factors such as latitude, altitude, and prevailing wind patterns. This shows that with adequate planning and management, the surface irrigation systems might make efficient use of these different precipitation patterns.

The district is confronted with environmental challenges that pose significant implications for the well-being of its residents (Liwenga & Silangwa, 2020). The challenges such as deforestation, soil erosion, and inadequate water management practices have raised concerns about the sustainability of the district (Quail, 2020). Sustainable development practices, reforestation initiatives, and community engagement programs are essential components of any comprehensive strategy aimed at preserving the district's natural resources and ensuring the prosperity of its residents.

The chosen study area has been designated as one of the districts for the National Irrigation Master Plan (NIMP 2018) aimed at strategic irrigation potential planning.



Figure 1: Maps illustrating Tanzania, Morogoro Region, and Kilosa District.

* 1. **Calibration and Validation of GCM models**

Based on the area coverage of the district (14,918 km2), 35 grids were generated, each covering an area of 500 km2. The choice of such a large number of grids was driven by the geographical significance of precipitation pattern of the study area, which vary geographically and seasonally (Biasutti, 2019). In contrast, the analysis of temperature adopted only nine grids (9). This decision was informed by the understanding that temperature is influenced by global factors rather than localized geography (Erb *et al.,* 2017). These grids were used as representative rainfall stations for data gathering.

The precipitation data used were downloaded from the CHIRPS dataset (1981-2005) while temperature from the ERA5 Ag (1981-2005) dataset, both as an alternative to observed data as recommended by Solomon *et al.,* (2017).

The historical/baseline data of the district, and large-scale climatic variables from the NCEP (National Centers for Environmental Prediction) reanalysis data, were used as predictands and predictors, respectively (Liu *et al.,* 2021). Using multilinear regressions model and stochastic bias correction techniques, the Statistical Downscaling Method (SDSM) calibrated the models by establishing the relationships between the predictands and predictors (Baghanam *et al.,* 2024).

The calibrated models then reprojected the baseline/historical data to validate their performance (Figure 2) (Mendez *et al.,* 2020). The outputs were compared with the existing historical data from some of the grids. The SDSM incorporated multiple model evaluation techniques, including statistical and graphical methods, to assess the performance of the calibrated models in reproducing the observed data (San *et al.,* 2023). Different formula has been used for some of the statistical parameters (Equation i, ii and iii).

$CC=\frac{\sum\_{i=1}^{N}\left(P\_{i}-P\right).(O\_{i}-O)}{\sqrt{\sum\_{i=1}^{N}(P\_{i}-P)^{2}}.\sqrt{\sum\_{i=1}^{N}(O\_{I}-O)^{2}}}$.....................................................................i

$MAE=\frac{\sum\_{i=1}^{N}\left[O\_{i}-P\_{i}\right]}{N}$.......................................................................................ii

$RMSE=\sqrt{\frac{\sum\_{I=1}^{N}(O\_{i}-P\_{i})^{2}}{N}}$................................................................................iii

* 1. **Precipitation and Temperature**

The assessment was conducted for the baseline (1981-2005) period and projected climate scenarios (2011-35) (Faggian, 2021). The two scenarios were utilized for projected period which are Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 4.5 as a moderately optimistic, and Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP 8.5), which assumes no mitigation (Lee *et al.,* 2024). By using Q-GIS package, the Inverse Distance Weighting (IDW) interpolation method was used to convert the point data for the baseline period and projected period, into spatial representations in the forms of suitability maps.

* 1. **Physical land features, Land use/cover and River proximity**

**2.4.1 Soil properties**

Key soil properties crucial for land suitability evaluation for surface irrigation included texture, drainage, and soil depth (Hagos *et al*., 2022). In the study area, these properties were analyzed and classified into four suitability categories: highly suitable, moderately suitable, marginally suitable, and not suitable.

**2.4.2 Topographic factors**

Slopes and altitudes, played a critical role in determining land suitability for surface irrigation (Girma *et al.,* 2020). Utilizing a 30-meter resolution Digital Elevation Model (DEM) from the freely accessible Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM), slope and altitude data were reclassified using the QGIS software. Slopes were categorized into four groups: 0–2%, 2–5%, 5–8%, and >8% (FAO, 1993). Similarly, altitudes were divided into four classes: 0–1000 m, 1000–2000 m, 2000–3000 m, and above 3000 m, as shown in Table 2.

**2.4.3 Land use/cover (LU/LC)**

The 2023 Land Use/Land Cover (LULC) assessment for Kilosa district was assessed using QGIS package. The study area was classified into ten categories: cultivated land, grassland, bushland, natural forest, plantation forest, woodland, permanent swamp, urban areas, water bodies, and bare soil. Based on land suitability evaluation for surface irrigation, the district was then grouped into four classes: highly suitable (S1), moderately suitable (S2), marginally suitable (S3), and not suitable (N) (Mazahreh *et al.,* 2019).

**2.4.4 River proximity**

Proximity to water sources was a crucial criterion in assessing land suitability for surface irrigation in the study area (Balew *et al.,* 2021). The river proximity was analyzed and categorized into four groups using QGIS, as detailed in Table 2.

* 1. **Overall Land Suitability**

The land suitability assessment method involved assigning ratings from highly suitable to not suitable based on how well the land's characteristics met the requirements of surface irrigation practice (FAO, 1976). Surface irrigation land suitability maps categorized areas into four classes: highly suitable (S1), moderately suitable (S2), marginally suitable (S3), and not suitable (N) (Yao *et al.,* 2021), as shown in Table 1. The overall conceptual methodology adopted in this study is illustrated in Figure 2, while Table 2 outlines the weights assigned to each contributing parameter and its respective classes.

**Table 1:** Land suitability classification (FAO, 1976)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Class Suitability** | **Description** |
| S1 Highly suitable | Land without any major limitations |
| S2 Moderately suitable | Moderate limitations that reduce productivity, or increase the required inputs |
| S3 Marginally suitable | Significant limitations, making land use only marginally justifiable. |
|  N Not suitable | Limitations that cannot currently be overcome with existing knowledge at an acceptable cost. |

**Table 2:** Suitability criteria established for the studied parameters.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Main factor** | **Sub factor** | **Factor rating** | **Source** |
| S1 | S2 | S3 | N |
| Topography | Slope (%) | 0-2 | 2-5 | 5-8 | >8 | FAO, (1984) |
| Altitude (m) | 2000-3000  | 1500-2000 or | 3300-3800 | <1500 or >3800 | FAO, (1984) |
| 3000-3300  |
| Soil | Drainage class | Well | Moderately well | Imperfectly | Poor | Adem, A. F., & Danbara, J. H. (2022) |
| Depth (cm) | >100 (Very deep) | 50-100 (Moderately deep) | 10-50 (Shallow) | <10 (Very shallow) | Mandal et al. 2018 |
| Texture | Loam, Clay-Loam | Clay, Sand-Clay-Loam | Sand-Loam | N/A | Kilosa DC (2020). |
| Distance from water source | Euclidian distance (m) | 1000 | 1000-3000 | 3000-5000 | >5000 | Han *et al.,* 2021. |
| LU/LC | LU/LC | Cultivated land | Grass land | Bushland | Constraints (Forest, Build-up, water, ponds)  | Barman, J., & Das, P. (2023) |
| Precipitation | Precipitation (mm) | 1200 | 800-1200 | 600-800 | <600 | Angelakιs *et al.,* (2020). |
| Temperature | Temperature (0C) | <20 | 20-23 | 23-25 | >25 | NIMP, (2018) |



**Figure 2:** The Overall conceptual framework utilized in the study.

The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) assigned weights to each contributing criterion. AHP was used to identify and classify criteria for assessing the spatial planning decisions (Aidinidou *et al*., 2023). The three key principles which are decomposition, comparative judgment, and synthesis of priorities were used to guide the method (Gyani *et al.*, 2022). A pairwise comparison matrix was constructed for the parameters influencing land suitability in relation to surface irrigation. The scale from 1 to 9 was applied to indicate the relative importance between two factors. The prioritization of the factors in the study area was informed by Tanzania's experiences as recommended by NIMP (2018). Reciprocal values ranging from 1/1 to 1/9 represented the relative significance between the criteria (Table 3). Criteria weights were determined by calculating eigenvalues through pairwise comparisons and then normalizing the results (Odu, 2019). The consistency ratio (CR) was calculated using the random consistency indices (RI) established by Saaty (1980) to assess the consistency of the pairwise comparisons (Table 4).

**Table 3**: Saaty’s scale in AHP (Saaty 1980)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Definition** | **Index** | **Definition Index** |
| Equally important  | 1 | Equally important 1/1 |
| Equally or slightly more important | 2 | Equally or slightly less important 1/2 |
| Moderately/Slightly more important  | 3 | Moderately/Slightly less important: Experience and judgment slightly favor one option over the other (with a ratio of 1/3). |
| Slightly to much more important  | 4 | Slightly to weigh less important 1/4 |
| Strongly more important / Much more important  | 5 | Way less important: Experience and judgment strongly favor one option over the other. 1/5 |
| Much to far more important  | 6 | Way to far less important 1/6 |
| Very much more important/Far more important  | 7 | Far less important: Experience and judgment strongly favor one option over the other. 1/7 |
| Far more important to extremely more important  | 8 | Far less important to extremely less important 1/8 |
| Absolutely more important / Extremely more important  | 9 | Extremely less important: The evidence supporting one option over the other (with a ratio of 1/9) is of the highest possible validity. |

**Table 4:** Values of random index (RI)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| RI | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.90 | 1.12 | 1.24 | 1.32 | 1.41 | 1.45 | 1.49 |

The consistency index (CI) was calculated using the formula provided below.

$CI=\frac{λ\_{max}-n}{n-1}$……………………………………………………iv

Where λmax is the largest eigenvalue of the pairwise comparison matrix and n is the number of classes.

The consistency ratio is defined as

$CR=\frac{CI}{RI}$………………………………………………………v

where RI is ratio index/average value of CI for random matrices using Saaty scale.

The consistency index (CI) (equation i) was compared to a random index (RI) (Table 4) to assess the reliability of the pairwise comparisons (Pant, 2022). The RI reflected the average CI of randomly generated reciprocal matrices using a scale from 1/9 to 9/1 (Peláez *et al.,* 2018). Saaty (1980) generated random matrices of varying sizes (n) and calculated their mean CI values (Table 4). For matrices with n≥5, a consistency ratio (CR) of lower than 0.1 was accepted, indicating a reasonable level of consistency (Saaty, 1979). To evaluate overall land suitability spatially, the QGIS weighted overlay analysis tool (Figure 2) was employed, generating a suitability map by combining the outputs from AHP (Salifu *et al.,* 2022).

1. **RESULTS**
	1. **Calibration and Validation of GCM models**

The outcome for validation were produced in graphical and statistical (Figure 3 and Table 5).









**Figure 3:** The performance of the models by comparing the modeled results to the observed (grid) monthly precipitation using graph method.

**Table 5**: The performance of the models by comparing the modeled results to the observed (grid) monthly precipitation and temperature using statistical method

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PRECIPITATION | 6 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 34 |
| MAE | 0.72 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.77 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| RMSE | 1.16 | 1.23 | 1.03 | 1.11 | 1.03 | 1.18 | 1.12 | 1.01 | 1.04 |
| CC | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TEMPERATURE | 6 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 34 |
| MAE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| RMSE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| CC | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

* 1. **Precipitation and Temperature**

The analysis of average annual rainfall revealed that the study area was predominantly characterized by moderately suitable. During the baseline period, it covered 1,320,988.90(88.55%) hectares (Table 6). Under the RCP 4.5 scenario, this area slightly decreased to 1,258,930.02(84.39%) hectares, and further declined to 1,229,094.02(82.39%) hectares, under the more extreme RCP 8.5 scenario.

Highly suitable areas were observed only during the baseline period, covering 50,721.20(3.40%) hectares (Table 6).

In contrast, marginally suitable areas accounted for 120,089.90(8.05%) hectares during the baseline period (Table 6). The area increased significantly to 230,930.64(15.48%) hectares under RCP 4.5 and to 260,617.46(17.47%) hectares under RCP 8.5.

Finally, the areas classified as not suitable were only observed under RCP 4.5 as 1,939.34 (0.13%) hectares and remained unchanged as 2,088.52(0.14%) hectares under RCP 8.5.

Temperature analysis showed the area was dominated by moderately suitable. During the baseline period, covering 1,013,976.46(67.97%) hectares (Table 6), under scenario RCP 4.5, the analysis indicated that 998,610.92(66.94%) hectares, while under scenario RCP 8.5, the analysis indicated that 995,925.68(66.76%) hectares. Under marginal suitable, the baseline presented 300,597.70(20.15%) hectares (Table 6), under scenario RCP 4.5 indicated 181,999.6(19.20%) hectares, while under scenario RCP 8.5 indicated 289,260.02(19.39%) hectares. Where the remaining area was assigned under highly suitable for surface irrigation, During the baseline period the area indicated 177,225.84(11.88%) hectares (Table 6), under scenario RCP 4.5 was 206,763.48(13.86%) hectares, while under scenario RCP 8.5 was 206,614.30(13.85%) hectares.

* 1. **Physical land features****, Land use/cover and River proximity**

The study also highlighted other critical factors influencing land suitability in relation to surface irrigation. The highly suitable areas of the district were characterized by loam and clay-loam soils, excellent drainage, deep soil profiles, proximity to water sources within 1000 meters, gentle slopes below 2%, and altitudes of 2000–3000 meters (Table 6). Moderately suitable regions, including areas with sand-loam or sand-clay-loam soils, imperfect drainage, moderate slopes (2–5%), altitudes of 1500–2000 meters, and distances of 1000–3000 meters from water sources (Table 6). Marginally suitable areas faced greater constraints, such as poor drainage, shallow soils, steep slopes (5–8%), lower altitudes below 1500 meters, and distances of 3000–5000 meters from water sources (Table 6). Not suitable regions, including those with very poor drainage, excessive slopes, distances beyond 5000 meters from water sources, and conflicting land uses like urbanization (Table 6).

* 1. **Overall Suitability/Weighting of factors using AHP**

The overall spatial suitability for surface irrigation based on overlaid individual factors for the baseline period indicated that 242,119.14 (16.23%) hectares of the study area was potentially highly suitable, 553,905.34(37.13%) hectares was moderately suitable, 652,214.96(43.72%) hectares was marginal suitable, whereas 43,560.56(2.92 %) of the district was accounted for not suitable (Figure 4a, Table 7).

Under the RCP 4.5 scenario, the suitability analysis for surface irrigation in the study area revealed significant changes compared to the baseline period. The highly suitable area decreased to 223,173.28(14.96%) hectares, a reduction of 1.27%. The moderately suitable area also decreased to 450,076.06(30.17%) hectares, a decline of 6.96%. Conversely, the marginally suitable area increased to 754,701.62(50.59%) hectares, a rise of 6.87%, and the area not suitable for surface irrigation increased to 63,849.04(4.28%) hectares, a rise of 1.36% (Figure 4b, Table 7).

 

**Figure 4(a)**: Overall baseline suitability map **(b)** RCP-4.5 scenario map **(c)** RCP-8.5 scenario map

Under the RCP 8.5 scenario, the suitability analysis for surface irrigation in the study area also revealed significant changes compared to the baseline period. The highly suitable area decreased to 201,393.00(13.50%) hectares, a reduction of 2.73%. The moderately suitable area also decreased to 448,733.44(30.08%) hectares, a decline of 7.05%. Conversely, the marginally suitable area increased to 760,370.46(50.97%) hectares, a rise of 7.25%, and the area not suitable increased to 81,303.10(5.45%) hectares, a rise of 2.53%. These results indicate a shift in suitability, with a notable increase in both marginally suitable and not suitable areas (Figure 4c, Table 7).

1. **DISCUSSION**

In determining the performance level of the GCM model based on Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE), the level of predictive accuracy of performance was good. The MAE, which varied from 0.69 to 0.79, showed that the model predictions were slightly different from actual values. Likewise, the RMSE, which varied from 1.01 to 1.23, showed significant error, supporting the validity of the model. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient (CC) of 1.0, as anticipated, reflected linear correlation among the observed and predicted values, validating the strength of the model. The findings concur with Pham et al. (2020), whose high accuracy also resulted when predictive models were used in comparative hydrological and climatic evaluations.

Land suitability analysis for surface irrigation under a changing climate was extremely spatially variable. Nine most important factors (temperature, rainfall, soil type, slope, drainage, land use/cover, distance from rivers, altitude, and topography) were utilized to compute suitability by the application of weighted approach. The findings revealed that the eastern region of Kilosa district was the most suitable place for surface irrigation. The climatic conditions of the area, such as high precipitation and proximity to large water bodies (Mkondoa and Wami rivers), played a major role in enhancing its irrigation potential. These are in line with earlier research in East Africa by Gebrechorkos *et al.* (2019b), which had similar factors among the main determinants of irrigation suitability.

But, future projected climates (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5) showed reduction in highly suitable regions, which means that climate change is increasingly eroding irrigation potential. Both scenarios showed significant reduction in highly and moderately suitable regions and increasing marginally suitable and unsuitable regions. This change was most experienced in the western and northern regions of the district, where the hilly landscapes, drainage, and additional distances from the water sources lowered the potential for irrigation. Rubeho and Ukaguru mountains, with their rough lands and poorly drained soils, progressively became less favorable, motivated by decreasing rainfalls and a rise in temperature. These results are consistent with larger scale climate change projections, where enhanced temperature extremes and changed regimes of precipitation are likely to further exacerbate water shortage in semi-arid areas.

Apart from climatic conditions, human activities also impacted land suitability. Land degradation resulting from deforestation within the Ukaguru and Rubeho forest reserves, as a result of charcoal production and agriculture expansion, has caused land degradation and disturbance to local water catchments. Urbanization in fast-growing towns like Gairo, Kilosa, Mikumi, Kimamba, and Dumila has changed land use patterns, promoted soil erosion and diminishing arable land for irrigation. Permanent water bodies expansion and protected forest reserves have also limited the extent of irrigable land. These socio-environmental processes show that climate change is not the only driving factor behind irrigation issues, but that human activities and land use changes also play important roles.

The implications of the findings above highlight the paramount importance of climate-resilient irrigation practices. With climatically stressed locations reducing due to lower suitability, sustainable land and water management practices should be accorded topmost priority. Adaptation measures like wise utilization of water by means of rainwater harvesting, better irrigation facilities, afforestation and land reclamation in order to avoid further degradation in marginally suitable locations, and Climate-smart agriculture practices like drought-tolerant crops and conservation agriculture in order to enhance productivity under change.

Overall, the study points out that climatic and human-induced factors together impact land suitability for surface irrigation in Kilosa district. The trends that have been observed emphasize the necessity of integrated management of water resources and forward-looking policy measures for ensuring the sustainability of irrigation agriculture under changing climatic scenarios.

**Table 7:** Overall suitability class for-Kilosa district

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Main Factor | Suitability | Description | Percentage (%) | Area (ha) | Variability (%) |
| Baseline | S1 | Highly Suitable | 16.23 | 242,119.14 | 0 |
| S2 | Moderately Suitable | 37.13 | 553,905.34 | 0 |
| S3 | Marginal Suitable | 43.72 | 652,214.96 | 0 |
| N | Not Suitable | 2.92 | 43,560.56 | 0 |
| RCP 4.5  | S1 | Highly Suitable | 14.96 | 223,173.28 | 1.27 |
| S2 | Moderately Suitable | 30.17 | 450,076.06 | 6.96 |
| S3 | Marginal Suitable | 50.59 | 754,701.62 | -6.87 |
| N | Not Suitable | 4.28 | 63,849.04 | -1.36 |
| RCP 8.5  | S1 | Highly Suitable | 13.5 | 201,393.00 | -2.73 |
| S2 | Moderately Suitable | 30.08 | 448,733.44 | -7.05 |
| S3 | Marginal Suitable | 50.97 | 760,370.46 | 7.25 |
| N | Not Suitable | 5.45 | 81,303.10 | 2.53 |

**Table 6;** Results of individual factors which influences the efficient surface irrigation land suitability.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Main factor | Criteria | Classes | Suitability | Area coverage (%) | Global weight (%) | Area coverage (ha) |
| Topography | Slope (%) | 0-2 | S1 | 40.67 | 24.86 | 606,715.06 |
| 2-5 | S2 | 13.34 | 199,006.12 |
| 5-8 | S3 | 24.56 | 366,386.08 |
| >8 | N | 21.43 | 319,692.74 |
| Altitude (m) | 2000-3000 | S1 | 73.14 | 14.65 | 1,091,102.52 |
| 1500-2000 | S2 | 17.11 | 255,246.98 |
| <1500 | N | 9.75 | 145,450.50 |
| Soil | Drainage | Somewhat excessive, well | S1 | 74.67 | 11.93 | 1,113,927.06 |
| Imperfect, moderately well | S2 | 4.91 | 73,247.38 |
| Poor | S3 | 13.23 | 197,365.14 |
| Very poor | N | 7.19 | 107,260.42 |
| Depth (cm) | >100 | S1 | 23.87 | 10.41 | 356,092.66 |
| 75-100 | S2 | 76.13 | 1,135,707.34 |
| Texture | Clay, sandy-clay-loam | S1 | 68.34 | 9.16 | 1,019,496.12 |
| Loam, clay-loam | S2 | 22.60 | 337,146.80 |
| sand-loam | S3 | 9.06 | 135,157.08 |
| Distance from water | Euclidian distance (m) | 0-1000 | S1 | 17.19 | 2.88 | 256,440.42 |
| 1000-3000 | S2 | 0.73 | 10,890.14 |
| 3000-5000 | S3 | 15.07 | 224,814.26 |
| >5000 | N | 67.01 | 999,655.18 |
| Land user/cover(LU/LC) | Land user/cover(LU/LC) | Cultivated land | S1 | 9.59 | 3.39 | 143,063.62 |
| Grassland | S2 | 20.19 | 301,194.42 |
| Bushland | S3 | 10.84 | 161,711.12 |
| Forest land, Pond, Buildings | N | 59.38 | 885,830.84 |
| Precipitation | Precipitation (mm) | >1200 | S1 | 3.4 | 19.68 | 50,721.20 |
| 800-1200 | S2 | 88.55 | 1,320,988.90 |
| 600-800 | S3 | 8.05 | 120,089.90 |
| Temperature  | Temperature (0C)  | 0-20 | S1 | 11.88 | 3.03 | 177,225.84 |
| 20-23 | S2 | 67.97 | 1,013,976.46 |
| 23-25 | S3 | 20.15 | 300,597.70 |

1. **CONCLUSIONS**

Comprehending the climate factors variability specifically precipitation and temperature is essential in determining the impact of climate change on land suitability for surface irrigation. This is essential in irrigation planning for the areas which faces erratic rainfall like Kilosa district in Morogoro Tanzania. The primary goal of this study was to assess the variation for the future period of the district. The findings revealed a significant variation influenced by different climate scenarios. During the baseline period, about 796,024.48(53.36%) hectares of the area was recommended for surface irrigation while the remaining 695,775.52(46.64%) hectares of the area was not recommended. Under the mitigation scenario RCP 4.5 (2011-2035), the recommended area was reduced to 673,249.34(45.13%) hectares while the area which was not recommended was increased to 818,550.66(54.87%) hectares. In the business-as-usual scenario RCP 8.5 (2011-2035), the recommended area was reduced to 650,126.44(43.58%) hectares while the area which was not recommended was increased to 841,673.56(56.42%) hectares. These assessments revealed that precipitation and temperature variability significantly affected the suitability of land for surface irrigation.
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