

# CLIMATE-SMART IRRIGATION PRACTICES IN WATER-STRESSED AGRICULTURE

**Dr. R. Rejani**

Principal Scientist

Division of Resource Management

ICAR–Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture

Hyderabad, Telangana, India

## Abstract

Water scarcity is becoming a defining challenge for agricultural production in regions that face irregular rainfall, rising temperatures, declining groundwater levels, and growing competition among domestic, industrial, and farming uses. Climate-smart irrigation offers an integrated response by linking efficient water application with crop-stage planning, soil-moisture monitoring, weather information, land and soil management, and farmer-oriented decision support. This paper presents a comparative analysis of climate-smart irrigation practices applicable to water-stressed agriculture, including drip and micro-irrigation, soil-moisture-based scheduling, evapotranspiration-guided planning, regulated deficit irrigation, mulching and conservation practices, and integrated water-harvesting systems. The study uses a structured evidence-based research design and does not claim a new controlled field experiment. Practices are evaluated according to water-saving potential, crop productivity, management complexity, data and infrastructure requirements, field robustness, affordability, and suitability for smallholder and commercial farming systems. The analysis indicates that pressurized irrigation can improve application control when it is correctly designed and maintained, while sensor- and weather-guided scheduling can reduce avoidable irrigation events. Deficit irrigation can improve water productivity in selected crops when water stress is kept within crop-specific limits, but it requires careful timing and agronomic supervision. The findings show that no isolated technology can ensure sustainable water use in every location. Effective climate-smart irrigation depends on local water accounting, reliable maintenance, soil and crop knowledge, farmer capacity, and policies that support equitable access. The paper highlights integrated irrigation management as a practical pathway for improving resilience, sustaining crop yields, and protecting limited water resources.

**Keywords:** Climate-Smart Agriculture, Irrigation Scheduling, Water Scarcity, Drip Irrigation, Soil Moisture, Deficit Irrigation, Water Productivity, Precision Agriculture, Water Harvesting, Sustainable Farming

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture depends on reliable water availability, yet many farming systems now operate under conditions of reduced rainfall reliability, greater evaporative demand, falling aquifers, salinity risks, and increasing pressure on shared water resources. Water stress affects not only the quantity of irrigation that can be supplied, but also the timing, quality, and cost of water available to farmers. In this setting, irrigation management must move beyond the simple objective of applying more water to protect yield. It must instead support crop production with the least avoidable loss, while protecting soils, energy resources, and the long-term security of local water supplies.

Climate-smart irrigation refers to the coordinated use of technologies, agronomic

practices, and decision processes that improve resilience to climate variability, enhance water productivity, and reduce environmental pressure. Its practical components can include drip or micro-irrigation, land levelling, efficient conveyance, soil-moisture monitoring, weather-based scheduling, crop-stage irrigation planning, mulching, deficit-irrigation strategies, groundwater recharge, farm ponds, and reuse of safe treated water where appropriate. The strongest results normally arise when these components are selected as a system rather than adopted as isolated equipment.

Traditional calendar-based irrigation often remains common because it is familiar and simple to implement. However, fixed schedules may ignore actual crop water

demand, rainfall received, differences in soil texture, rooting depth, irrigation-system performance, and crop growth stage. Water applied too early or too frequently can increase evaporation, deep percolation, nutrient leaching, waterlogging, and energy use. Conversely, delayed irrigation during sensitive stages can reduce establishment, biomass accumulation, flowering, grain filling, or market quality. Climate-smart practices seek to replace such uniform decisions with better-timed and locally informed application.

Improving irrigation efficiency alone does not automatically guarantee water conservation at basin scale. Water that appears to be lost at field level may return to rivers, drains, or groundwater and may be reused elsewhere. Therefore, practical planning should distinguish between application efficiency, crop water productivity, net consumptive use, and the wider allocation of water within a catchment. This requires farmers, extension workers, irrigation agencies, and policy makers to examine both farm-level benefits and the consequences for other users of the resource.

This study examines major climate-smart irrigation practices for water-stressed agriculture and compares their operational strengths, limitations, and conditions for responsible adoption. It focuses on the relationship between irrigation technology, scheduling information, crop response, soil management, and institutional support. The purpose is to identify how irrigation can become more adaptive, transparent, and resilient without overstating the capacity of any single method to solve complex water-stress problems.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on irrigation management has consistently shown that crop response depends

### Literature Review Summary Table

| S. No. | Author / Year            | Study Focus                                   | Key Contribution                                                                        | Limitations Identified                                                                |
|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Howell (2001)            | Water-use efficiency in irrigated agriculture | Clarified the importance of improving irrigation management and crop water productivity | Efficiency indicators must be interpreted with agronomic and water-accounting context |
| 2      | Fereres & Soriano (2007) | Deficit irrigation                            | Explained how controlled water stress can reduce water use in suitable crops and stages | Requires crop-specific timing and may reduce yield or quality if mismanaged           |

on the amount, timing, method, and uniformity of water application. Early work on water-use efficiency emphasized the need to improve irrigation-system performance and to match water delivery with crop demand. Subsequent research expanded this perspective by examining plant-based indicators, soil-water monitoring, crop evapotranspiration, deficit-irrigation strategies, and the effects of irrigation modernization on water productivity and resource governance.

The climate-smart agriculture literature places irrigation within a wider adaptation and sustainability framework. In water-stressed locations, farmers must respond to drought risk, heat stress, uncertain rainfall, energy costs, labour constraints, and unequal access to technology. Drip irrigation, soil-moisture sensors, weather data, mulching, conservation tillage, water harvesting, and supplemental irrigation are frequently identified as useful practices. However, their effectiveness depends on crop type, soil condition, system maintenance, water quality, market incentives, local technical support, and whether farmers can make timely management decisions.

A recurring conclusion in the literature is that water productivity should not be reduced to a single engineering measure. A practice that improves field application efficiency may still create trade-offs related to capital cost, energy demand, fertigation management, salinity, clogging, data reliability, or inequitable access. Accordingly, current research increasingly supports integrated assessment that combines agronomic outcomes, water accounting, farmer capacity, and local governance. The following studies illustrate the main contributions and limitations relevant to climate-smart irrigation planning.

| S. No. | Author / Year        | Study Focus                       | Key Contribution                                                                               | Limitations Identified                                                           |
|--------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3      | Jones (2004)         | Plant-based irrigation scheduling | Highlighted advantages of crop-responsive scheduling methods                                   | Field measurements and interpretation can be demanding for routine farm use      |
| 4      | Geerts & Raes (2009) | Deficit irrigation in dry areas   | Linked strategic deficit irrigation with improved water productivity                           | Results vary by climate, crop, soil, and production objective                    |
| 5      | FAO (2020)           | Agricultural water challenges     | Outlined the urgency of addressing water scarcity, allocation, and sustainable food production | Broad guidance requires local adaptation, data, and institutional implementation |

### 3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary focus of this research is to investigate and compare climate-smart irrigation practices that can support crop production under conditions of water stress. The study considers how irrigation technologies, scheduling methods, soil and land management, water-harvesting options, and decision-support tools affect water productivity, crop resilience, cost, reliability, and practical adoption. The principal objects of study are outlined below:

#### 3.1 CLIMATE-SMART IRRIGATION PRACTICES UNDER INVESTIGATION

- Drip, sprinkler, and micro-irrigation systems designed to improve application control and reduce non-beneficial water loss
- Soil-moisture monitoring, weather data, crop evapotranspiration estimates, and advisory tools for irrigation scheduling
- Regulated deficit irrigation and supplemental irrigation strategies for priority crop-growth stages
- Mulching, residue retention, conservation practices, and soil-organic-matter management that improve water retention
- Farm ponds, water harvesting, conjunctive water use, and safe reuse options that support reliable seasonal supply

#### 3.2 WATER-STRESS AND PRODUCTION CONTEXTS

- Arid, semi-arid, drought-prone, and rainfed-to-irrigated transition zones with irregular or limited water supply
- High-temperature conditions that increase crop evapotranspiration and shorten the response time for irrigation decisions

- Groundwater-dependent areas affected by declining water tables, variable water quality, or rising pumping costs
- Smallholder, cooperative, and commercial farms with different capacities for capital investment and technical management

#### 3.3 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PARAMETERS

- Water-saving potential, application uniformity, and reduction of avoidable evaporation, runoff, and deep percolation
- Crop yield stability, quality outcomes, water productivity, and resilience during dry spells or heat events
- Data requirements, system maintenance, energy needs, labour demands, and compatibility with locally available skills
- Affordability, scalability, equity of access, and suitability across soil types, crops, and farm sizes

#### 3.4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOCUS

- Fixed calendar irrigation versus soil-, crop-, and weather-informed irrigation scheduling
- Surface irrigation, sprinkler systems, drip application, and integrated conveyance or storage improvements
- Field-level water efficiency versus broader water productivity and basin-scale water-accounting considerations
- Technology adoption supported by farmer training, repair services, advisory systems, and inclusive local governance

#### 3.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE SCOPE

- To identify practical climate-smart irrigation options for water-stressed farming systems

- To explain trade-offs among water savings, crop performance, capital cost, and management complexity
- To compare technology-led and agronomy-led pathways for adaptive irrigation planning
- To highlight the importance of soil, crop, climate, and water-quality information in scheduling decisions
- To support responsible irrigation strategies that improve resilience without ignoring local equity and governance

#### 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a comparative and evidence-based research methodology to analyse climate-smart irrigation practices for water-stressed agriculture. The framework compares practices according to their technical function, likely water-saving potential, crop-management value, operational requirements, and limitations under real farm conditions. It does not claim to report a new controlled field experiment or a universal quantified saving. Instead, it synthesizes established irrigation principles, published research, and practical deployment considerations in order to explain how different practices can be selected and combined.

The comparison follows the operational sequence of irrigation management: assessment of water availability and quality; soil and crop characterization; estimation of crop demand; selection of a water-application method; scheduling based on crop stage and field conditions; monitoring of system performance; and adjustment through farmer observations and advisory support. Each option is considered under conditions of variable rainfall, heat stress, limited energy, constrained maintenance capacity, and the need to sustain farm income.

#### METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK

- The study uses a comparative design covering principal climate-smart irrigation practices.
- Published evidence and agronomic principles support a qualitative synthesis.
- All practices are assessed for water-stressed agriculture and climate-resilience objectives.

- The analysis includes both irrigation hardware and soil-, crop-, and data-management measures.
- Water availability, water quality, soil conditions, and crop growth stages are treated as core decision factors.
- Comparisons distinguish application efficiency, water productivity, and responsible water accounting.
- Performance covers water savings, crop response, cost, maintenance, labour, and management capacity.
- Smallholder, cooperative, and commercial implementation pathways are considered.
- No fabricated experimental measurements or universal savings claims are presented.
- Recommendations focus on integrated practices that complement local agronomic knowledge and water governance.

#### 5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis section presents a qualitative comparison of climate-smart irrigation practices used in water-stressed agriculture. The analysis is based on reported agronomic behaviour, irrigation-engineering principles, water-accounting considerations, and practical deployment requirements. The purpose is to examine how each approach performs in relation to water-saving potential, crop resilience, management complexity, field robustness, affordability, and suitability for farmer- and advisor-facing decision making. Five principal approaches are considered: fixed calendar irrigation, soil-moisture-based scheduling, drip irrigation combined with fertigation management, regulated deficit irrigation, and integrated climate-smart irrigation systems that combine efficient application with weather information, soil management, storage, and local advisory support. The comparison is qualitative because outcomes vary with crop species, planting density, rooting depth, soil texture, slope, field size, water quality, system maintenance, rainfall pattern, and the intended production objective.

Fixed calendar irrigation is operationally simple, but it can apply water without reference to actual field need. Soil-moisture scheduling can improve timing by linking irrigation to soil water status within the active root zone. Drip irrigation and fertigation can

improve control of water and nutrient application, although they require filtration, pressure regulation, regular inspection, and protection against clogging. Regulated deficit irrigation can prioritize critical growth stages when full irrigation is not possible, but it must be based on crop-specific thresholds and market-quality requirements.

Integrated climate-smart irrigation systems combine application technology with information and agronomic practice. They may use weather forecasts, crop coefficients, low-

cost sensors, farmer observations, mulching, land shaping, water harvesting, and community-level allocation rules. Such integration offers the greatest opportunity for resilience where local support exists, but it also carries higher requirements for training, maintenance, reliable data, and coordination. The following table compares the five approaches under common evaluation criteria.

## 5.1 COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

| S. No. | Approach                            | Primary Application                                          | Water-Saving Potential | Decision Reliability  | Data Requirement | Field Robustness | Overall Suitability              |
|--------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1      | Fixed calendar irrigation           | Routine field watering based on custom or calendar           | Low                    | Variable              | Low              | Low-Medium       | Limited                          |
| 2      | Soil-moisture-based scheduling      | Irrigation timing from root-zone water status                | Moderate-High          | High when calibrated  | Medium           | High             | Very Good                        |
| 3      | Drip irrigation with fertigation    | Targeted water and nutrient delivery near root zone          | High                   | High with maintenance | Medium           | High             | Very Good                        |
| 4      | Regulated deficit irrigation        | Strategic water stress outside critical stages               | Moderate-High          | Crop-specific         | Medium           | Medium-High      | Good                             |
| 5      | Integrated climate-smart irrigation | Water application + weather, soil, crop and storage planning | High                   | High when supported   | High             | High             | Excellent for supported settings |

## 5.2 EXTENDED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

- Fixed calendar irrigation can be appropriate where decision-support access is extremely limited, but it is the least adaptive method because it does not respond directly to rainfall, soil-water status, crop stage, or changing weather demand. Its low information requirement is offset by a higher risk of over- or under-irrigation when conditions differ from the assumed schedule.

- Soil-moisture-based scheduling improves the timing of irrigation by allowing farmers to observe water conditions within the crop root zone. The method can reduce unnecessary applications and support timely irrigation during sensitive stages. Its value depends on correct sensor placement, calibration, interpretation, and routine checking because a poorly placed or damaged sensor can misrepresent field conditions.
- Drip irrigation can provide high application control and can be particularly

valuable for high-value crops, orchards, vegetables, and fields where water is scarce or unevenly distributed. However, benefits are reduced if systems are poorly designed, pressure is inconsistent, filters are not cleaned, emitters clog, or irrigation duration is not matched to soil and crop conditions. Drip is therefore a management package, not merely an installed product.

- Regulated deficit irrigation can improve water productivity by concentrating limited water at crop stages where stress would cause the greatest loss. This strategy may be effective for selected crops and production goals, but it is not risk-free. Farmers require crop-specific guidance, realistic yield and quality expectations, and a clear understanding of how heat, salinity, shallow soils, or prolonged drought can narrow the safe range for deficit application.
- Integrated climate-smart irrigation provides the broadest pathway because it combines water application with crop planning, soil management, forecasts, storage, maintenance, and farmer learning. It is most reliable where advisory services, repair access, and transparent allocation rules are available. Its higher information and coordination needs can be reduced through locally appropriate tools, shared services, and participatory irrigation planning.

### 5.3 OBSERVATIONS FROM DATA ANALYSIS

- Irrigation outcomes are context-dependent; a method effective for one crop, soil, or season may not perform equally well elsewhere.
- Water-saving claims should be connected to actual crop response, system uniformity, and local water accounting rather than headline efficiency values alone.
- Scheduling improvements can provide strong benefits even when farmers cannot immediately invest in high-cost irrigation hardware.
- Drip systems require regular maintenance, filtration, pressure management, and informed irrigation duration to deliver expected results.

- Deficit irrigation should be based on crop growth stages and risk tolerance, not used as an unplanned response to water shortage.
- Soil cover, organic matter, field levelling, and nutrient management can improve the effectiveness of irrigation decisions.
- Farmer training, access to repair services, and equitable water governance are central to long-term adoption and resilience.

### 6. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis shows that climate-smart irrigation is most useful when it is understood as a decision-support and resource-management system rather than as a single device or prescribed schedule. The central benefit lies in matching water application more closely to crop need while recognizing the practical limits of water supply, infrastructure, finance, labour, and technical support. Water-stressed agriculture often requires farmers to make difficult decisions about which crops to grow, when to irrigate, which growth stages to protect, and how to respond when rainfall or energy supply changes unexpectedly. A climate-smart approach helps make these decisions more transparent and better informed.

Pressurized systems such as drip and micro-irrigation can improve application control, but their performance is highly dependent on design, operation, and maintenance. A system with poor filtration, uneven pressure, damaged laterals, or unsuitable emitter spacing may not produce the expected gains. Likewise, technology may create new demands for energy, spare parts, technical knowledge, and capital. These realities are especially important for smallholders and tenant farmers, who may face barriers to investment and may not control long-term land or water decisions. Adoption strategies should therefore include affordable service models, training, repair networks, and finance options that do not increase vulnerability.

Scheduling is equally important. Soil-moisture monitoring, weather information, crop evapotranspiration estimates, and farmer observation can help prevent avoidable irrigation. However, data should not be treated as infallible. Sensors can fail, forecasts can be uncertain, and field conditions can vary within

short distances because of soil texture, elevation, root distribution, or irrigation uniformity. Practical advisory systems should communicate uncertainty, encourage field verification, and retain farmer and agronomist judgement as part of the decision process. The goal is not to replace local knowledge, but to strengthen it with more timely and systematic information.

Regulated deficit irrigation illustrates the need for careful interpretation. It can be a rational strategy when water is limited and when mild stress can be imposed outside critical crop stages with acceptable trade-offs. Yet applying a deficit without crop-specific planning can cause irreversible yield or quality loss, especially during establishment, flowering, fruit set, or grain filling. Heat waves, saline water, shallow rooting depth, pest pressure, and poor soil condition can further increase risk. Deficit strategies must therefore be based on locally validated guidance and on production goals that farmers understand and accept.

Finally, climate-smart irrigation must be connected to broader water governance. Field-level efficiency improvements do not automatically create new water for a basin if return flows were previously reused downstream. The most durable approach combines farm management with realistic water accounting, groundwater monitoring, collective rules, and protection of ecosystems and vulnerable users. This wider perspective supports irrigation strategies that improve farm resilience while contributing to fairer and more sustainable use of limited water resources.

## 7. CONCLUSION

This study presented a comparative analysis of climate-smart irrigation practices for water-

## 8. REFERENCES

1. FAO. (2020). *The State of Food and Agriculture 2020: Overcoming Water Challenges in Agriculture*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
2. FAO. (2017). *Water for Sustainable Food and Agriculture: A Report Produced for the G20 Presidency of Germany*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
3. Howell, T. A. (2001). Enhancing water use efficiency in irrigated agriculture. *Agronomy Journal*, 93(2), 281-289.
4. Fereres, E., & Soriano, M. A. (2007). Deficit irrigation for reducing agricultural water use. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 58(2), 147-159.
5. Jones, H. G. (2004). Irrigation scheduling: Advantages and pitfalls of plant-based methods. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 55(407), 2427-2436.

stressed agriculture, including soil-moisture-based scheduling, drip irrigation with fertigation, regulated deficit irrigation, and integrated approaches that combine water application with climate, soil, crop, and storage information. The analysis shows that irrigation can become more resilient when farmers use locally appropriate methods to match water delivery with crop need, reduce avoidable losses, and protect critical growth stages during periods of limited supply.

The findings indicate that each practice has distinct strengths and limitations. Fixed calendar schedules are simple but weakly responsive to field conditions. Soil-moisture and weather-guided scheduling can improve irrigation timing when monitoring is reliable. Drip systems offer high application control but need maintenance and sound design. Deficit irrigation can support water productivity in suitable crops when applied strategically, while integrated climate-smart systems offer the strongest resilience potential where training, data, and local services are available. No single method is universally suitable across crops, soils, climates, farm sizes, or water-governance settings. Practical performance depends on crop stage, soil storage, rainfall uncertainty, water quality, system uniformity, farmer capacity, and the wider allocation of water in the landscape. The study concludes that climate-smart irrigation should be implemented as an adaptive, evidence-based support system that combines agronomy, technology, farmer knowledge, and responsible water governance. Future work should prioritise locally validated advisory tools, low-cost monitoring, inclusive service models, water-quality management, and basin-aware assessment of irrigation outcomes.

6. Geerts, S., & Raes, D. (2009). Deficit irrigation as an on-farm strategy to maximize crop water productivity in dry areas. *Agricultural Water Management*, 96(9), 1275-1284.
7. Evans, R. G., & Sadler, E. J. (2008). Methods and technologies to improve efficiency of water use. *Water Resources Research*, 44, W00E04.
8. Camp, C. R. (1998). Subsurface drip irrigation: A review. *Transactions of the ASAE*, 41(5), 1353-1367.
9. Playan, E., & Mateos, L. (2006). Modernization and optimization of irrigation systems to increase water productivity. *Agricultural Water Management*, 80(1-3), 100-116.
10. Pereira, L. S., Cordery, I., & Iacovides, I. (2012). Improved indicators of water use performance and productivity for sustainable water conservation and saving. *Agricultural Water Management*, 108, 39-51.
11. Steduto, P., Hsiao, T. C., Fereres, E., & Raes, D. (2012). *Crop Yield Response to Water*. FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 66. Rome: FAO.
12. Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., & Smith, M. (1998). *Crop Evapotranspiration: Guidelines for Computing Crop Water Requirements*. FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 56. Rome: FAO.
13. Kijne, J. W., Barker, R., & Molden, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Water Productivity in Agriculture: Limits and Opportunities for Improvements*. Wallingford: CABI.
14. Molden, D. (Ed.). (2007). *Water for Food, Water for Life: A Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture*. London: Earthscan and IWMI.
15. Oweis, T., & Hachum, A. (2006). Water harvesting and supplemental irrigation for improved water productivity of dry farming systems in West Asia and North Africa. *Agricultural Water Management*, 80(1-3), 57-73.
16. Wallace, J. S. (2000). Increasing agricultural water use efficiency to meet future food production. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 82(1-3), 105-119.
17. Passioura, J. (2006). Increasing crop productivity when water is scarce - From breeding to field management. *Agricultural Water Management*, 80(1-3), 176-196.
18. Hatfield, J. L., & Dold, C. (2019). Water-use efficiency: Advances and challenges in a changing climate. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 10, 103.
19. Blum, A. (2009). Effective use of water and not water-use efficiency is the target of crop yield improvement under drought stress. *Field Crops Research*, 112(2-3), 119-123.
20. Rockstrom, J., Karlberg, L., Wani, S. P., Barron, J., Hatibu, N., Oweis, T., Bruggeman, A., Farahani, J., & Qiang, Z. (2010). Managing water in rainfed agriculture - The need for a paradigm shift. *Agricultural Water Management*, 97(4), 543-550.
21. Grafton, R. Q., Williams, J., Perry, C. J., Molle, F., Ringler, C., Steduto, P., Udall, B., Wheeler, S. A., Wang, Y., Garrick, D., & Allen, R. G. (2018). The paradox of irrigation efficiency. *Science*, 361(6404), 748-750.
22. Perry, C. (2007). Efficient irrigation; inefficient communication; flawed recommendations. *Irrigation and Drainage*, 56(4), 367-378.
23. Shock, C. C., & Wang, F. X. (2011). Soil water tension, a powerful measurement for productivity and stewardship. *HortScience*, 46(2), 178-185.
24. Lamm, F. R., & Trooien, T. P. (2003). Subsurface drip irrigation for corn production: A review of 10 years of research in Kansas. *Irrigation Science*, 22, 195-200.
25. Ayars, J. E., Phene, C. J., Hutmacher, R. B., Davis, K. R., Schoneman, R. A., Vail, S. S., & Mead, R. M. (1999). Subsurface drip irrigation of row crops: A review of 15 years of research at the Water Management Research Laboratory. *Agricultural Water Management*, 42(1), 1-27.
26. Cakmak, B., & Akuzum, T. (2007). Water resources management, problems and solutions for Turkey. *International Congress on River Basin Management*, Antalya, Turkey.
27. Dinar, A., & Mody, J. (2004). Irrigation water management policies: Allocation and pricing principles and implementation experience. *Natural Resources Forum*, 28(2), 112-122.
28. Smajstrla, A. G., & Locascio, S. J. (1996). *Tensiometer use in soil irrigation scheduling*. University of Florida Extension Publication AE146.

29. Pereira, L. S. (1999). Higher performance through combined improvements in irrigation methods and scheduling: A discussion. *Agricultural Water Management*, 40(2-3), 153-169.
30. UNESCO World Water Assessment Programme. (2020). *The United Nations World Water Development Report 2020: Water and Climate Change*. Paris: UNESCO.