





METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH AND TUTORIAL

# WEP: WEAP Erosion Plugin



AUTHORS Peter Droogers Johannes Hunink Jack Sieber

DATE May 2021

# WEP: WEAP Erosion Plugin

Methodological Approach and Tutorial

**FutureWater Report 223** 

#### Authors

Peter Droogers (<u>p.droogers@futurewater.nl</u>) Johannes Hunink (<u>j.hunink@futurewater.es</u>) Jack Sieber (<u>jack.sieber@sei.org</u>)

### Date

May 2021

ADDRESS

FutureWater B.V. Costerweg 1V 6702 AA Wageningen The Netherlands

TELEPHONE WEBSITE +31 317 460 050 www.futurewater.eu



# **Table of Contents**

1	Introduction	4		
2	Erosion	5		
2.1	Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE)	5		
2.2	Implemention of MUSLE in WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP)	6		
2.3	WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP) input parameters	7		
	2.3.1 K_USLE (soil erodibility factor)	7		
	2.3.2 C_USLE is the cropping management Factor (C)	7		
	2.3.3 P_USLE is the supporting conservation practice factor	8		
	2.3.4 Topographic Factor (LS)	8		
3	Tutorial	9		
3.1 Open the WEAP tutorial and Revert to Version				
3.2	Import the Plugin	9		
3.3	Add the appropriate erosion data	11		
3.4	Look at the results	12		
3.5	Exploring erosion reduction options	12		
4	References	14		

# 1 Introduction

Estimating erosion plays a critical role in soil and water resource conservation, sediment load assessment, conservation planning, design for sediment control, prioritization of nature-based solutions, amongst others. Average global soil erosion has been assessed at 2.8 ton ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> (Borrelli et al., 2017). However, large spatial variation exists and hotspots where erosion rates above 20 ton ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> are found as well. Results from this global assessment were based on analysis on grids of 250x250 m but at smaller scales (fields, plots) much higher values have been reported in many places.

The two primary types of erosion models are (i) process-based models and (ii) empirically based ones. Full process-based model implementations are very demanding in terms of data requirements and computational resources when implemented at river basin scale (Eekhout et al., 2018). For this reason, typically a mix of physical and empirical approaches are included in erosion simulation models (e.g. Hunink et al., 2015; Willemen et al., 2019). It is recommended that erosion model concepts need to be chosen dependent on data availability and project needs (Alewell et al., 2019).

It is well known that rainfall variability plays a dominant role in erosion processes and therefore most erosion models are based on dynamic hydrological models which allow simulations under different weather conditions. The WEAP<sup>1</sup> model (Water Evaluation And Planning Tool), as developed by the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), is one of the more frequently used models for water resources planning and scenario analysis. Up to now, WEAP did not include a module for the estimation of erosion rates. However, for many scenario assessments, erosion is an important topic to be accounted for, as it influences the lifetime and performance of grey infrastructure, and for evaluating the effectiveness of green infrastructure solutions (Hunink and Droogers, 2015; Simons et al., 2017; Simons and Hunink, 2018). FutureWater and SEI has developed therefore a plugin for WEAP (referred to as WEP: WEAP Erosion Plugin) to undertake erosion assessment studies.

The objective of this report is to introduce the methodological approach behind the erosion plugin and to provide a hands-on tutorial on using the WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP).

<sup>1</sup> https://www.weap21.org/



# 2 Erosion

### 2.1 Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE)

The Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) was developed based on empirical studies in erosion plots and rainfall simulator experiments. The USLE is composed of six factors to predict the long-term average annual soil loss (A). The empirical equation includes the rainfall erosivity factor (R), the soil erodibility factor (K), the topographic factors (L and S) and the cropping management factors (C and P). The equation takes a simple product form:

 $\mathsf{A} = \mathsf{R} \cdot \mathsf{K} \cdot \mathsf{L} \cdot \mathsf{S} \cdot \mathsf{C} \cdot \mathsf{P}$ 

where: A (Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is the annual average soil erosion, R (MJ mm h<sup>-1</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is the rainfallrunoff erosivity factor, K (Mg h MJ<sup>-1</sup> mm<sup>-1</sup>) is the soil erodibility factor, L (dimensionless) is the slope length factor, S (dimensionless) is the slope steepness factor, C (dimensionless) is the land cover and management factor, P (dimensionless) is the soil conservation or prevention practices factor.

The original USLE is based on the experimental unit plot concept. The unit plot is defined as the standard plot condition to determine the soil's erodibility (K). These conditions are when the LS factor = 1 (slope = 9% and length = 22.1 m), the plot is fallow, tillage is up and down slope, and no conservation practices are applied (C and P are both 1). USLE and its parameters are based upon an 80 year history of erosion modelling and applications in over 100 countries. The origin of USLE model was in the US to provide a management decision support tool and was based upon thousands of controlled studies on field plots and small watersheds since 1930.

An implementation of the USLE where the rainfall erosivity is replaced by runoff volume (Modified USLE, MUSLE) resulted in a satisfying prediction of measured sediment yield already in the mid-seventies and early eighties (Smith, Williams, Menzel, & Coleman, 1984; Williams, 1975). The latter allows the equation to be applied to individual storm events. Several variants of the MUSLE equation exist and MUSLE was even integrated in GIS (e.g. in ArcMUSLE; (Zhang, Degroote, Wolter, & Sugumaran, 2009).

In the SWAT model, erosion caused by rainfall and runoff is computed with the Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (MUSLE) (Williams, 1975). MUSLE is a modified version of the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) developed by Wischmeier and Smith (1965, 1978). USLE predicts average annual gross erosion as a function of rainfall energy. In MUSLE, the rainfall energy factor (R) is replaced by a runoff factor. This improves the erosion prediction, eliminates the need for delivery ratios, and allows the equation to be applied to individual storm events.

This modified universal soil loss equation as used in SWAT is (Williams, 1995):

sed =11.8 • (Qsurf • qpeak • areahru)<sup>0.56</sup> • KUSLE • CUSLE • PUSLE • LSUSLE

where

sed is the sediment yield on a given day (metric tons),

Qsurf is the surface runoff volume (mm H20/ha), q<sub>peak</sub> is the peak runoff rate (m<sup>3</sup>/s), area<sub>hru</sub> is the area of the HRU (ha), K<sub>USLE</sub> is the USLE soil erodibility factor (0.013 metric ton m<sup>2</sup> hr/(m<sup>3</sup> metric ton cm)), C<sub>USLE</sub> is the USLE cover and management factor, P<sub>USLE</sub> is the USLE support practice factor, LS<sub>USLE</sub> is the USLE topographic factor and CFRG is the coarse fragment factor.

The two coefficients 11.8 and 0.56 were obtained during the original development of MUSLE and might be adjusted by calibration. In practice, most research assumes those coefficients as constants.

Cârdei (2010) undertook a dimensional analysis of the many implementations and modifications of the original USLE (e.g. MUSLE, RUSLE). Their quite shocking conclusion was that that all fails in terms of dimensional analysis (= units on the left and right side of the equation do not match). However, given the practical development in terms of parameters and reference factors, the various USLE models have proven to be useful to assess erosion rates.

### 2.2 Implemention of MUSLE in WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP)

The WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP) is based on the MUSLE approach as described above. WEP has been designed to derive the MUSLE parameters in a simplified way:

- R\_USLE (rainfall-runoff erosivity factor)
  - based on surface runoff as calculated by WEAP and the intensity of the rainfall expressed as hours in the day it rains (1-24)
- K\_USLE (soil erodibility factor):
  - o derived from the geometric mean weight diameter of soil particles
- C\_USLE (land cover and management factor)
  - o user input between 0 (e.g. forest) and 1(degraded land)
- P\_USLE (soil conservation and prevention practices factor)
  - user input between 0 (e.g. full erosion control measures) and 1(no erosion control measures)
- LS\_USLE (slope and steepness factor)
  - $\circ \quad$  derived from the average slope in an area

WEP requires the user to enter the following five input variables (see section below for details):

- Soil Particle Diameter
  - Geometric mean weight diameter of soil particles (mm). Values range from 0.0001 (clay) to 2 (sand). Is used to assess the K\_USLE.
- Slope
  - The average slope in the catchment in degrees. Is used to assess the LS\_USLE.
- Rain Intensity
  - Hours per day that rainfall occurs. 1 = daily rainfall falls in 1 hour (high intensity); 24 = daily rainfall fall during entire day (low intensity)

- C USLE
  - C\_USLE factor is the land cover and management factor. Values can range from 1 (fallow/bare land) to 0.001 (forest).
- P USLE
  - P\_USLE factor is the supporting conservation practice. Values range 0 (very good manmade erosion resistance facility) to 1 (no manmade erosion resistance facility).

WEP provides the following results:

- Erosion per Hectare
  - o The amount of erosion in ton per hectare
- Erosion Total
  - The total amount of erosion for the specific catchment in ton

### 2.3 WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP) input parameters

### 2.3.1 K\_USLE (soil erodibility factor)

K\_USLE factor is soil erodibility factor which represents susceptibility of soil to erosion as measured under the standard unit plot condition:

- Clay soils are resistant to detachment and have low K values
- Sandy soils have low runoff rates and have low K values
- Silt loam soils are moderately susceptible to detachment and produce moderate runoff and, have moderate K values
- Silty soils are most erodible of all soils. They are easily detached; tend to crust and produce high rates of runoff. K values are between 0.02 and 0.04

In WEP the K factor is calculated based on (Renard et al., 1997) using the geometric mean weight diameter of soil particles (mm):

 $K_USLE = 0.0437 \cdot exp(-(log(Dg) + 1.6680)^2 / (2 \cdot 0.7661^2))$ 

where:

Dg is geometric mean weight diameter of soil particles (mm) note that *log* is the log for base 10

Typical values of Dg (and the associated K\_USLE) are: Sand: 0.2 – 2.0 mm (0.0197 - 0.0016) Loam: 0.06 – 0.2 mm (0.0369 - 0.0197) Silt: 0.002 - 0.06 mm (0.0177 - 0.0369) Clay: 0 - 0.002 mm (0.0000 - 0.0177)

### 2.3.2 C\_USLE is the cropping management Factor (C)

C\_USLE is reduction factor to soil erosion vulnerability and is related to land-use. C\_USLE is basically the vegetation cover percentage and is defined as the ratio of soil loss from specific crops to the equivalent loss from tilled, bare test-plots. The value of C depends on vegetation type, stage of growth and cover percentage. There is a lot of literature on proposed C values. There are also methods that derive the C factor from satellite-based remote sensing data

(Hunink et al., 2015) which allows accounting for spatial and temporal variability. Table 1 provides one reference that can be used in the WEAP model, but this can be adapted as desired.

Land Use		С
Fallow/Bared land		1.0
Paddy field		0.34
Upland		0.31
Grassland	(95 ~ 100% cover) Grass	0.003
	Weeds	0.01
	(80% cover) Grass	0.01
	Weeds	0.04
	(80% cover) Grass	0.04
	Weeds	0.09
Forest	(75 ~100% cover)	0.001
	(40 ~ 75% cover)	0.002 ~ 0.004
	(20 ~ 40% cover)	0.003 ~ 0.01

Table 1. Cropping management factor C. Source: (Park et al., 2007)

### 2.3.3 P\_USLE is the supporting conservation practice factor

P\_USLE is the reduction factor that represents the effects of practices such as contouring, strip cropping, terracing, that help prevent soil from eroding by reducing the rate of water runoff. Table 2 shows the value of support practice factor according to the cultivating methods and slope. The P value range 0 to 1 where 0 represents very good manmade erosion resistance facility and 1 represents no manmade erosion resistance facility. Table 2 provides reference values for the P factor, but other sources can be used as desired.

Slope (%)	Contouring	Strip Cropping	Terracing
0.0 - 7.0	0.55	0.27	0.10
7.0 - 11.3	0.60	0.30	0.12
11.3 - 17.6	0.80	0.40	0.16
17.6 - 26.8	0.90	0.45	0.18
>26.8	1.00	0.50	0.20

 Table 2. Support practice factor P according to the types of cultivation and slope. Source:

 (Parveen and Kumar, 2012)

### 2.3.4 Topographic Factor (LS)

LS\_USLE is the topographic factor that accounts for the effect of topography on erosion. The two parameters that constitute the topographic factor are slope gradient and slope length factor. The slope- and slope length factors are estimated in WEP using the equations of (Van der Knijff et al., 1999):

LS = 44.6 \* (sin 
$$\beta$$
) ^ 1.3

where:

 $\beta$  is the average slope (degrees)

# 3 **Tutorial**

### Note:

For this module you will need to have completed the WEAP Tutorial modules ("WEAP in One Hour, Basic Tools, Scenarios, and Hydrology) or have a fair knowledge of WEAP (data structure, key assumptions, expression builder, creating scenarios). To begin this tutorial on WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP), go to the Main Menu of WEAP, select "Revert to Version" and choose the version named "Answer key for 'Hydrology' module."

### 3.1 Open the WEAP tutorial and Revert to Version

After opening WEAP select:

> Area > Open > "Tutorial"

Revert to the version "Answer key for 'Hydrology' module":

> Area > Revert to Version > "Answer key for 'Hydrology'
module"

#### The Schematic View should look like below:



### 3.2 Import the Plugin

The WEAP Erosion Plugin (WEP) can be imported in the WEAP area. Note that for each new WEAP Area the Plugin has to be imported if erosion should be calculated.

> Advanced > Plugins > Download

W Plugins	— 🗆 X	]
Import <u>D</u> ownload <u>C</u> reate	😫 🛄 🛄 Edit Delete E <u>m</u> ail <u>B</u> ackup	
Plugins in Area "2021_Tutorial_WEP_v01"	Select Plugin to Download -	
	Plugin Erosion_v02 (Peter Droogers, FutureWater, Netherlands, 13-Apr-2021)	*
	Summary Variables   Files   Notes	1
	Erosion_v02	$\sim$
	Erosion_v02	
	<u>User-defined variables (10)</u> : Soil Particle Diameter, Slope, Rain Intensity, Peak Runoff, K USLE, C USLE, P USLE, LS USLE, Erosion per Hectare, Erosion Total	
	User-defined result variables (3): Peak Runoff, Erosion per Hectare, Erosion Total	
	26-Feb- 2021         Peter Droogers, FutureWater, Netherlands         Plugin "Erosion_v02" Created	
? Help	26-Feb- 2021         Peter Droogers, FutureWater, Netherlands         3 variables added (C USLE, LS USLE, Erosion per Hectare)	r
	13-Apr- 2021         Peter Droogers, FutureWater, Netherlands         Variable definition changed (C USLE), Notes changed	~
	2 m	Consul 1

If downloading from the WEAP website fails, the plugin can be imported if the plugin file itself has been made available. Copy the plugin file [Erosion\_v03.WEAPPlugin] to the directory where the WEAP areas are stored (e.g. c:\WEAP Areas\\_Downloads\Plugins\). The Plugin can then be installed using the same steps as above

> Advanced > Plugins > Import

To check whether importing has been successful the new tab Erosion under Data > Catchment should appear:



### 3.3 Add the appropriate erosion data

The specific soil and land data to calculate erosion rate should be entered in WEAP. In this tutorial the erosion of the three land covers in the Agriculture Catchment will be assessed:

>	> Data	View	>	Agriculture	Catchment	>	Erosion	>	Soil	Particle
Ι	Diamat	er								

21_Tutorial_WEP_v01 View General Tree Tags	Advanced Help				
Key Assumptions     Demand Sites and Catchme     Big City     Main River Headflow     Grasslands     Grasslands     Hydrology	Data for:       Current Accounts (2000) <ul> <li>Manage Scenarios</li> <li>Land Use)</li> <li>Climate)</li> <li>Irrigation)</li> <li>Flooding)</li> <li>Yield)</li> <li>Water Quality)</li> </ul> Cost     Erosion     Priority)     Advanced)           Soil Particle Diameter         Slope         Rain Intensity         C USLE         P USLE           User-defined variable:         Geometric mean weight diameter of soil         ? Help           particles (mm).         Values range from 0.0001 (clay) to 2 (sand). Is used to         ?				
Supply and Resources  River Groundwater	assess the K USLE. Range: 0.0001 to 2 mm Default: 0.1 mm Agriculture Catchment 2000 Scale Unit				
	Forest 0.1 mm				
ource / tasatripulons					
	View General Tree Tags View General Tree Tags Compand Sites and Catchme Big City Main River Headflow Grasslands Hydrology Supply and Resources River Groundwater Company River River Runoff and Infiltration Return Flows				

#### Enter the following data for the three land covers in the Agriculture Catchment:

	Soil Particle	Slope	Rain	C USLE	P USLE
	Diameter	(degrees)	Intensity	(-)	(-)
	(mm)		(hr per day)		
Irrigated	0.002	2	4	0.34	0.8
Forest	0.002	5	4	0.01	0.8
Grasslands	0.002	10	4	0.04	0.8

Data as shown above are derived using guidelines as presented in in the previous Chapter. It is assumed that soils (clay) and climate are similar for the three land covers. Differences are:

- **Irrigated** is practiced on quite flat land (slope 2 degrees), irrigation is quite sensitive to erosion (C\_USLE) and conservation practice is low (P\_USLE).
- Forest area is located on reasonable flat land (slope of 5 degrees), it is a well covered forest (C\_USLE) and conservation practice is low (P\_USLE).
- **Grass** is on undulating land (slope of 10 degrees), reasonable coverage (C\_USLE) and conservation practice is low (P\_USLE).

### 3.4 Look at the results

Results for Erosion are located in the "Catchment" category in the primary variable pull-down menu.

W WEAP: 2	021_Tutorial_WEP_v01	- 🗆 ×
Area Edit	View Favorites Advanced Help	
Schematic	Chart Table Map Erosion per Hect re Scenario: Reference  All months (12)  Bran	1 Tonne/Hectare ) ch: Demand Sites and Catchments\Agriculture Catchment v
Data Data Results Scenario Explorer	✓ Annual Total  Monthly Average       2.4       2.2       2.0       1.8       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.6       ↓1.1       ♥1.0       0.0       2001	All Branches
Supply	and Personnes	Exercise Total
✓ Catchr	nents	> 🖌 Erosion per Hectare
Financ Input D	Juanty al ata	>

> Result View > Catchments > Erosion per Hectare

### 3.5 Exploring erosion reduction options

Results show that for this case erosion of the irrigated area is quite high with over 2 ton ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>. Also for the grassland erosion is quite high with about 1.4 ton ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>. Some options that might be interesting to explore further:

- Currently climate conditions are considered to be constant for each year. What would happen with erosion if more extreme rainfall is happening?
- Surface runoff is quite high. By different land management soil parameters (e.g. Runoff Resistance Factor and Root Zone Conductivity) might change. What is the impact on erosion?
- Introducing conservation practice methods (e.g. contouring, vegetation strips, terracing) can be entered by changing the P\_USLE. What is the erosion reduction that can be achieved?
- Erosion in the forest area is relatively low (0.03 ton ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>). What would be the impact of forest degradation (C\_USLE will increase) on erosion?



#### Annual erosion for the three land covers in tonnes per hectare:





### 4 References

- Alewell, C., Borrelli, P., Meusburger, K., Panagos, P., 2019. Using the USLE: Chances, challenges and limitations of soil erosion modelling. Int. Soil Water Conserv. Res. 7, 203–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswcr.2019.05.004
- Borrelli, P., Robinson, D.A., Fleischer, L.R., Lugato, E., Ballabio, C., Alewell, C., Meusburger, K., Modugno, S., Schütt, B., Ferro, V., Bagarello, V., Oost, K. Van, Montanarella, L., Panagos, P., 2017. An assessment of the global impact of 21st century land use change on soil erosion. Nat. Commun. 8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02142-7
- Borrelli, P., Robinson, D.A., Panagos, P., Lugato, E., Yang, J.E., Alewell, C., Wuepper, D., Montanarella, L., Ballabio, C., 2020. Land use and climate change impacts on global soil erosion by water (2015-2070). Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 117, 21994–22001. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2001403117
- Cârdei, P., 2010. The dimensional analysis of the USLE-MUSLE soil erosion model. Proc. Rom. Acad. 12(3), 249–253.
- Droogers, P., M. Kruisheer, F. de Boer, W. Terink, M. Andriessen, H. Pelgrum. 2017. Water Balance and Allocation Modelling in Rwanda. FutureWater Report 165.
- Eekhout, J.P.C., Terink, W., De Vente, J., 2018. Assessing the large-scale impacts of environmental change using a coupled hydrology and soil erosion model. Earth Surf. Dyn. 6, 687–703. https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-6-687-2018
- Gwapedza, D., Slaughter, A., Hughes, D., Mantel, S., 2018. Regionalising MUSLE factors for application to a data-scarce catchment. Proc. Int. Assoc. Hydrol. Sci. 377, 19–24. https://doi.org/10.5194/piahs-377-19-2018
- Hunink, J.E., Droogers, P., 2015. Impact Assessment of Investment Portfolios for Business Case Development of the Nairobi Water Fund in the Upper Tana River, Kenya. Report FutureWater: 133.
- Hunink, J.E., Terink, W., Contreras, S., Droogers, P., 2015. Scoping Assessment of Erosion Levels for the Mahale region , Lake Tanganyika , Tanzania Final report 31, 1–47.
- Hunink, J.E.E., Droogers, P., Kauffman, S., Mwaniki, B.M.M., Bouma, J., 2012. Quantitative simulation tools to analyze up- and downstream interactions of soil and water conservation measures: supporting policy making in the Green Water Credits program of Kenya. J. Environ. Manage. 111, 187–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.07.022
- Hunink, J.E.E., Niadas, I. a. A., Antonaropoulos, P., Droogers, P., Vente, J. De, de Vente, J., 2013. Targeting of intervention areas to reduce reservoir sedimentation in the Tana catchment (Kenya) using SWAT. Hydrol. Sci. J. 58, 600–614. https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2013.774090
- Jackson, W.L., Gebhardt, K., Van Haveren, B.P., 1986. Use of the modified universal soil loss equation for average annual sediment yield estimates on small rangeland drainage basins. Drain. basin sediment Deliv. Proc. Symp. Albuquerque, 1986 413–422.
- Karydas, C.G., Panagos, P., 2018. The G2 erosion model: An algorithm for month-time step assessments. Environ. Res. 161, 256–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.11.010
- Kauffman, J.H., Droogers, P., Mwaniki, B., Muchena, F.N., Gicheru, P.T., Bindraban, P.S., Hunink, J.E., Onduru, D., Cleveringa, R., Bouma, J., Kauffman, S., Droogers, P., Hunink, J.E., Mwaniki, B., Muchena, F.N., Gicheru, P.T., Bindraban, P.S., Onduru, D., Cleveringa, R., Bouma, J., 2014. Green Water Credits – exploiting its potential to enhance ecosystem services by reducing soil erosion in the Upper Tana basin, Kenya. Intern. J. Biodivers. Sci. Ecosyst. Serv. Manag. (in Press. 10. https://doi.org/10.1080/21513732.2014.890670
- Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., 2009. Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT). Theoretical Documentation, version 2009. Texas Water Resources Institute, College Station, Texas.
- Panagos, P., Ballabio, C., Borrelli, P., Meusburger, K., Klik, A., Rousseva, S., Tadić, M.P., Michaelides, S., Hrabalíková, M., Olsen, P., Aalto, J., Lakatos, M., Rymszewicz, A., Dumitrescu, A., Beguería, S., Alewell, C., 2015. Rainfall erosivity in Europe. Sci. Total Environ. 511, 801–814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.01.008
- Panagos, P., Borrelli, P., Meusburger, K., 2015. A New European Slope Length and Steepness Factor (LS-Factor) for Modeling Soil Erosion by Water. Geosciences 5, 117–126. https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences5020117

- Panagos, P., Borrelli, P., Poesen, J., Ballabio, C., Lugato, E., Meusburger, K., Montanarella, L., Alewell, C., 2015. The new assessment of soil loss by water erosion in Europe. Environ. Sci. Policy 54, 438–447. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.08.012
- Panagos, P., Meusburger, K., Ballabio, C., Borrelli, P., Alewell, C., 2014. Soil erodibility in Europe: A high-resolution dataset based on LUCAS. Sci. Total Environ. 479–480, 189–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.02.010
- Park, Y., Kim, J., Kim, N., Joongdae, K.K., Kyoung, C., Lim, J., 2007. Analysis of Sediment Yields at Watershed Scale using Area / Slope-Based Sediment Delivery Ratio in SATEEC. J. Korean Soc. Water Qual. 23, 650–658.
- Parveen, R., Kumar, U., 2012. Integrated Approach of Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) and Geographical Information System (GIS) for Soil Loss Risk Assessment in Upper South Koel Basin, Jharkhand. J. Geogr. Inf. Syst. 4, 588–596. https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/s4-IV.102.520-a
- Pongsai, Somnuck, Schmidt Vogt, D., Shrestha, R.P., Clemente, R.S., Eiumnoh, A., Pongsai, S, Vogt, S., Clemente, R.P., Eiumnoh, R.S., 2010. Calibration and validation of the Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation for estimating sediment yield on sloping plots: A case study in Khun Satan catchment of northern Thailand For personal use only. J. Soil Sci 90, 585–596. https://doi.org/10.4141/CJSS09076
- Renard, K.G., Foster, G.R., Weessies, G.A., McCool, D.K., Yoder, D.C., 1997. Predicting Soil Erosion by Water: A guide to to conservation planning with the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Handbook 703.
- Sadeghi, S.H.R., Gholami, L., Darvishan, A.K., Saeidi, P., 2014. A review of the application of the MUSLE model worldwide. Hydrol. Sci. J. 59, 365–375. https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2013.866239
- Sieber, J., 2016. WEAP- TUTORIAL Water Evaluation And Planning System, Stockholm Environment Institute.
- Simons, G., Buitink, J., Droogers, P., Hunink, J., 2017. Impacts of climate change on water and sediment flows in the Upper Tana Basin , Kenya Final Report 31, 1–35.
- Simons, G., Hunink, J., 2018. The business case for small hydropower to invest in catchment conservation : case studies Nyamindi River Catchment , Kenya and Kiwira River Catchment , Tanzania 31, 1–40.
- Simons, G.W.H., J. Buitink, P. Droogers, J.E. Hunink. 2017. Impacts of climate change on water and sediment flows in the Upper Tana Basin, Kenya. FutureWater Report 161.
- Van der Knijff, J.M., Jones, R.R.J. a., Montanarella, L., 1999. Soil Erosion Risk Assessment in Italy, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Willemen, L., Crossman, N.D., Newsom, D., Hughell, D., Hunink, J.E., Milder, J.C., 2019. Aggregate effects on ecosystem services from certification of tea farming in the Upper Tana River basin, Kenya. Ecosyst. Serv. 38, 100962. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOSER.2019.100962