

Generating Crop Maps in Uganda: From Census to Grid

Grace Cheng

Scarsdale High School

Scarsdale NY 10583

Abstract

1. Introduction

Agriculture has provided livelihood and nourishment for thousands of years. However, it is now a dominant force behind many environmental threats. In addition, the rising population and changing dietary patterns are estimated to double the food demand by 2050. Providing enough food for the seven billion people on the planet, while reducing the harmful effects of agricultural production is one of the biggest challenges in the 21st century.

To face this challenge, we need tools, data, and information to provide more responsive and evidence-based analysis to improve the use and allocation of resources. The spatially explicit data on the scale and intensity of agricultural and pastoral systems is of essential importance. Data on agricultural production (i.e., harvested area, production quantity and yield) are usually representative at the national and sub-national administrative units, but this level of statistics does not give a sense of the diversity or spatial patterns in agricultural production, and is not spatially explicit. In the last decade, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and its partners have been developing a spatial production allocation model (SPAM) for generating highly disaggregated, crop-specific production data. These include national or sub-national crop production statistics, satellite data on land cover, maps of irrigated areas, biophysical crop suitability assessments, population density, secondary data on irrigation and rainfed production systems, cropping intensity, and crop prices (Yu, You, et al. 2020). This information is compiled and integrated to generate the initial estimates of the spatial distribution of individual crops, which are then submitted to an optimization model using cross-entropy principles with area and production accounting constraints to simultaneously allocate crops into the individual “pixels” of a GIS database. The result for each pixel is the area and production of each crop produced, split by the shares grown under irrigated, high-input rainfed, low-input rainfed, subsistence conditions. The detailed spatial datasets fill in the data gap for exploring the social, economic, and environmental consequences of agricultural production at a highly disaggregated scale.

The original SPAM model has the estimates of crop area, yield, and production for 42 major crops under four farming systems across a global 5 arcmin grid. The current research attempts to utilize the SPAM model for a specific country – Uganda – by applying the recently collected national/sub-national level data, carrying out the optimization model, and finally generating the crop maps.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides background information of Uganda, focusing especially on agricultural production; Section 3 introduces the Spatial Production Allocation Model (SPAM); Section 4 describes data sources and applies the data to the SPAM model for Uganda; Section 5 lists out the gridded maps for certain major crops with interesting findings.

2. Background

Uganda is a landlocked country in East Africa. It has Kenya in the East, South Sudan in the North, Democratic Republic of the Congo in the West, Rwanda in the South-west, and Tanzania in the South. Agricultural land¹ (% of land area) in Uganda was reported at 71.89 % in 2018, according to World Bank collection of indicators. Agriculture is a key sector in this country's economy. In 2019 and 2020, 80% of the households engaged in agriculture, contributing to a total of 24% of its GDP. The government identifies agriculture as a driver of key growth opportunities with great potential to generate employment with positive multiplier effects on other sectors². (Annual Agricultural Survey 2019 Report, Uganda Bureau of Statistics) Therefore, a more accurate spatially explicit data/statistics would help to better understand land management practices and provide evidence-based decision-making and policy development to improve the performance of the specific sector.

This paper focuses on applying the SPAM2010 model to the most recent production data in Uganda. This practice produces gridded maps of Uganda's agricultural production at a 5 arcmin spatial resolution for 28 crops. The national level crop statistics are collected from FAOSTAT and the sub-national level distribution is from Uganda Bureau of Statistics.

Add summary of the output...

3. Model

The current research utilizes the Spatial Production Allocation Model (SPAM) first developed by You and Wood (2006). The main function of SPAM is to disaggregate crop statistics (e.g., harvested area, production quantity, and yield) by different farming systems and to further allocate such disaggregated statistics into spatially gridded units. The model uses a data fusion approach that combines information from different sources and at different spatial scales by

¹ Agricultural land refers to the share of land area that is arable, under permanent crops, and under permanent pastures.

² Includes manufacturing and services.

deploying various matching and calibration processes. Then, all the data elements are processed by the optimization model, which generates results at the grid level. Hence there are three submodules in a standardized SPAM model: disaggregation, optimization, and allocation.

3.1 Disaggregation

The first step for SPAM is to disaggregate crop statistics of agricultural production (e.g., the yield, harvested area, and total production) by administrative-unit levels (k), crop type (j), and farming system (l) from a coarser to finer scale.

For the administrative unit (ADM), three levels are considered – $k = 0$ (national level), 1 (subnational level 1), and 2 (subnational level 2) – and refer to the country specific administrative level as the statistical reporting units (SRUs; $SRU = k0, k1 \text{ or } k2$). In this study, 28 crop types are considered $j = j1, j2, \dots, j28$. They are described in details in the below data section. Four farming systems are specified ($l = I, H, L, S$) representing the irrigated farming system (I), the rainfed high-input farming system (H), the rainfed low-input farming system (L), and the rainfed subsistence farming system (S).

3.2 Optimization

A cross-entropy method is used to allocate the crop for each spatial grid (i). Specifically, the model iteratively minimizes the error between the pre-allocated shares of physical area (π_{ijl}) and the allocated shares of physical area (s_{ijl}) in each pixel i by crop j and production system l . The loss function is specified as follows:

$$\min_{\{s_{ijl}\}} CE(s_{ijl}, \pi_{ijl}) = \sum_i \sum_j \sum_l s_{ijl} \ln s_{ijl} - \sum_i \sum_j \sum_l s_{ijl} \ln \pi_{ijl}$$

where CE is the abbreviation for cross-entropy, which is defined as the log function of probability. The difference between $\{s \ln s\}$ versus $\{s \ln \pi\}$ means the estimated probability and its prior probability π are minimized subject to certain constraints. The constraints for the optimization and the prior probability π are specified in more details in the technical paper by Wood-Sichra et al. (2016).

3.3 Allocation

The allocation module produces maps of area, yield and production for each grid i by crop j and farming system l , using the results of the optimization, i.e., shares s_{ijl} :

$$s_{ijl} = \frac{AllocA_{ijl}}{AdjCrop_{jl}},$$

Where $AdjCrop_{jl}$ is the total physical area of a given SRU for crop j at input level l to be allocated and $AllocA_{ijl}$ is the area allocated to grid i for crop j at input level l .

4. Data

Uganda's first level administrative units are "sub-region", and "districts" at the second level. There are 14 sub-regions in the country and 112 districts. Table 1 shows the list of districts within each sub-region. This is the SRU for Uganda.

Table 1: List of districts within respective sub-regions of Uganda

| S. Buganda | N. Buganda | West Nile | Lango | Acholi | Kigezi | Bunyoro | Tooro | Busoga | Teso | Bukedi | Elgon | Karamoja | Ankole | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|---------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Kalangala | Kiboga | Adjumani | Apac | Gulu | Kabale | Hoima | Bundibugyo | Bugiri | Katakwi | Busia | Kapchorwa | Kotido | Bushenyi | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Masaka | Luwero | Arua | Lira | Kitgum | Kisoro | Kibaale | Kabarole | Iganga | Kumi | Pallisa | Mbale | Moroto | Mbarara | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mpigi | Mubende | Moyo | Amolatar | Pader | Rukungiri | Masindi | Kasese | Jinja | Soroti | Tororo | Sironko | Nakapiripirit | Ntungamo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rakai | Mukono | Nebbi | Dokolo | Amuru | Kanungu | Buliisa | Kamwenge | Kamuli | Kaberaido | Budaka | Bududa | Abim | Ibando | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ssembabule | Nakasongola | Yumbe | Oyam | Agago | Kiryandongo | | Kyenjojo | Mayuge | Amuria | Butaleja | Bukwo | Kaabong | Isingiro | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wakiso | Kayunga | Koboko | Alebtong | Lamwo | | | Kyegegwa | Kaliro | Bukedea | Kibuku | Manafwa | Amudat | Kiruhura | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lyantonde | Mityana | Maracha | Kole | Nwoya | | | Ntoroko | Namutumba | Ngora | | | Napak | Buhweju | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3ukomansimb | Nakaseke | Zombo | Otuke | | | | | Buyende | Serere | | | | Sheema | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Butambala | Buikwe | | | | | | | Luuka | | | | | Mitooma | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gomba | Buvuma | | | | | | | Namayingo | | | | | Rubirizi | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kalungu | Kyankwanzi | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kampala | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lwengo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Data sources for crop statistics include FAOSTAT and Annual Agricultural Survey 2019 Report published by Uganda Bureau of Statistics. FAOSTAT provides the national level area and yield information for the 28 crops planted in Uganda. Table 2 lists the most recent 3-year average³ of the area and yield for these 28 crops.

³ 2018-2020 data is used to calculate the 3-year average.

Table 2: 2018-2020 average of area and yield for the crops planted in Uganda

| | area (ha) | yield (hg/ha) |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| bean | 432,157 | 16,769 |
| cassava | 1,557,814 | 33,340 |
| chickpea | 8,524 | 6,126 |
| cocoa | 72,025 | 4,860 |
| coffee | 538,988 | 5,490 |
| cotton | 88,000 | 13,558 |
| cowpea | 35,221 | 3,715 |
| groundnut | 312,000 | 8,793 |
| maize | 1,198,807 | 27,237 |
| onion | 80,453 | 39,519 |
| other cereal (millet) | 130,761 | 13,967 |
| other oil | 51,851 | 8,976 |
| other tropical fruit | 411 | 84,773 |
| other vegetable | 152,290 | 67,308 |
| pigeon pea | 44,921 | 3,544 |
| plantain | 1,512,467 | 42,401 |
| potato | 51,112 | 63,010 |
| rice | 76,594 | 28,484 |
| sesame seed | 213,333 | 6,781 |
| sorghum | 286,280 | 8,513 |
| soybean | 49,667 | 20,246 |
| sugarcane | 79,454 | 703,967 |
| sunflower | 270,667 | 9,941 |
| sweet potato | 357,489 | 42,009 |
| tea | 30,965 | 21,320 |
| tobacco | 22,421 | 14,351 |
| tomato | 6,454 | 57,616 |
| wheat | 15,527 | 15,504 |

Annual Agricultural Survey 2019 Report provides the sub-region level area and yield statistics for each crop. However, a few crops (such as wheat) only have national, not sub-regional, level data. For these kind of crops, sub-regional level statistics are replaced with -999. Table 3 gives an example of the sub-regional area and yield information.

Table 3: Sub-regional area and yield statistics for crop “bean”

| | bean | |
|------------|-----------|---------------|
| | area (ha) | yield (kg/ha) |
| S. Buganda | 97,738 | 600 |
| N. Buganda | 123,709 | 600 |
| West Nile | 17,915 | 600 |
| Lango | 63,081 | 400 |
| Acholi | 12,805 | 400 |
| Kigezi | 34,800 | 600 |
| Bunyoro | 117,347 | 700 |
| Tooro | 89,453 | 600 |
| Busoga | 19,690 | 400 |
| Teso | 7,738 | 300 |
| Bukedi | 9,471 | 300 |
| Elgon | 72,970 | 400 |
| Karamoja | 4,102 | 200 |
| Ankole | 94,031 | 800 |

The SPAM model takes the national level statistics and then re-assigned the national level area or yield information to the sub-region level based on the sub-regional distribution.

5. Discussion

References

- Anderson, W, L.You, S. Wood, U. Wood-Sichra, W. Wu. 2015. An analysis of methodological and spatial differences in global cropping systems models and maps. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* Volume 24, Issue 2, Page 180-191
- Fischer, G., F.O. Nachtergaele, S. Prieler, E.Teixeira, G.Tóth, H. van Velthuisen, L. Verelst, D. Wiberg(2013). *Global Agro-Ecological Zones (GAEZ v3.0)*, <http://gaez.fao.org/Main.html#>. Accessed October 2013.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). *The State of Food Insecurity in the World: Economic crises—Impacts and Lessons Learned 8–12* (FAO, 2009
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAOSTAT). 2016. <http://faostat3.fao.org/browse/R/RL/E> (accessed Feb. 19, 2016)
- Foley, J. et al. 2011. Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature* **478**, 337–342. doi:10.1038/nature10452
- Portmann, F. T., S. Siebert, and P. Döll (2010). MIRCA2000-Global monthly irrigated and rainfed crop areas around the year 2000: A new high-resolution data set for agricultural and hydrological modeling. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 24(1), n/a–n/a. doi:10.1029/2008GB003435
- Ramankutty, N., A.T. Evan, C. Monfreda, and J.A. Foley (2008). Farming the planet: 1. Geographic distribution of global agricultural lands in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 22(1), n/a–n/a. doi:10.1029/2007GB002952
- Rockstrom, J. et al. 2009. A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* **461**, 472–475.
- You, L. and S. Wood (2006). An entropy approach to spatial disaggregation of agricultural production. *Agricultural Systems*, 90(1-3), 329–347. doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2006.01.008
- You, L., S. Wood, and U. Wood-Sichra (2009). Generating plausible crop distribution maps for Sub-Saharan Africa using a spatially disaggregated data fusion and optimization approach. *Agricultural Systems*, 99(2-3), 126–140. doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2008.11.003
- You, L., S. Wood, U. Wood-Sichra and W. Wu. (2014). Generating global crop distribution maps: From census to grid. *Agricultural System*, DOI: 10.1016/j.agsy.2014.01.002

Yu, Q, You, L., Wood, S. et al. (2020). A cultivated planet in 2010 – Part 2: The global gridded agricultural-production maps. *Earth System Science Data*, December 2020, page 3545 – 3572.