

CHAPTER 12 GROUNDWATER MODELLING

12.1 Groundwater Basin Management and Groundwater Modelling

Groundwater basin management aims at an effective utilization of groundwater that improves the living condition of the people, controls drying-up, contamination and other problems associated with the use of groundwater, and preserves safe environment (Shibasaki et al., 1995). To achieve this aim, it is important to determine the qualitative and quantitative goal of management. Numerical value of quantitative goal is determined based on the concept of permissible yield.

12.1.1 Permissible Yield

1) Permissible Yield and Constraint Factors

The permissible yield can be defined as the “permissible amount of groundwater withdrawal for the residents of the area determined to compare the benefits resulting from the pumpage of groundwater and the risks that might arise from it” (Research Group for Water Balance, 1973).

Factors that determine the permissible yield generally include the following (Shibasaki et al., 1995):

- (1) Recharge factor (natural scientific factor): Water balance is maintained.
- (2) Economic factor: Cost of pumpage is below a certain level.
- (3) Legal factor: No violation of water rights of water laws.
- (4) Geo-environmental factor: Not causing dry-up of springs, land subsidence, seawater intrusion, or groundwater contamination.

Geo-environmental factor can be included under economic factor. All the factors above except recharge factor are considered as socio-scientific factors. Though each of these factors is not completely established in the present, it is pragmatic to combine these factors, and determine the permissible yield.

The relative importance of these factors differs depending on the changes in the natural conditions of groundwater or social conditions within communities (Fig. 12.1). The importance of determining factors for permissible yield depends on the circulating velocity, or renewability of the groundwater (Shibasaki et al., 1995). For humid areas with fast circulation and high renewability of the groundwater, the water balance is

important and the concept of sustainability is given a priority. On the contrary, for arid regions with a slow circulation and low renewability of the groundwater, the possibility of drying-up is increased, and the economic factor becomes more important.

2) Permissible Critical Groundwater Level

The permissible yield can refer to the groundwater level, which must be retained so that these factors are not violated. In other words, it can be called the permissible critical groundwater level. Groundwater level can be monitored easily by using observation wells and other existing wells. Therefore, if the permissible critical groundwater level is set up, and groundwater level is observed by using a monitoring system, the groundwater pumpage of a basin can be controlled to maintain the permissible yield.

The groundwater modelling is an effective tool to determine the permissible critical groundwater level or the permissible yield, showing an actual example in the following sections.

12.1.2 Work Elements of Groundwater Basin Management

In managing a groundwater basin, the following basic components should be taken into account: Monitoring system, Database, Prediction system, and Decision-making system (Shibasaki et al., 1995) (Fig. 12-2).

1) Monitoring System

Various parameters including groundwater levels, pumpage, groundwater quality should be monitored. Observation wells are used to measure groundwater levels, and their screens must be suitably equipped so that the water level can be measured separately for each aquifer.

2) Database System

A database system is necessary to effectively use and analyze large volume of data and information collected during monitoring. A database system is particularly needed for data on groundwater levels, groundwater withdrawals, and water quality. A database system is also used for geological logs in order to comprehend the structure of a groundwater basin.

3) Prediction System

Based on the findings of monitoring, the conditions of groundwater basin are predicted. The prediction results are used in determining appropriate measures for groundwater

utilization. Groundwater modelling (groundwater simulation) is used for prediction. Modelling (Simulation) has been used effectively in predicting the permissible limits of groundwater withdrawal in areas of land subsidence or seawater intrusion in Japan.

It is not sufficient to plan a project by means of predicting once at the beginning of it. Prediction has to be reviewed and repeated every few years, and its accuracy must be enhanced every time.

4) Decision-Making System

Appropriate measures to be taken for groundwater management are determined on the basis of monitoring and prediction. The criterion on which these measures are decided depends upon the concept of permissible yield.

12.2 General Procedure of Groundwater Simulation

The groundwater simulation study is composed of the development of the aquifer model, calibration, prediction and evaluation as shown in Fig. 12-3. An aquifer model is developed with field data manipulated for computer input. After calibrating the model with observed data, prediction of the water level is executed by inputting future abstraction scenario. The predicted results are evaluated for optimum abstraction, taking the water balance, environmental impacts and economics into consideration.

12.2.1 Aquifer Modeling

Aquifer modeling is carried out by numerical groundwater model. The aquifer model simulates a three-dimensional groundwater flow in the phreatic or confined aquifer. The aquifer model is developed by using mainly topography, aquifer distribution, hydraulic characteristics, groundwater discharge and recharge, and groundwater quality.

12.2.2 Data Manipulation

Groundwater model study uses various kinds of input data such as aquifer characteristics, water levels, abstraction, recharge, etc. These data are processed for model inputs.

1) Hydrogeological Data

Hydrogeological data consists of geological and topographical maps, geophysical survey results, composite loggings of test boreholes and pumping tests. Based on these data, contour maps on the surface of aquifer, aquitard and hydrogeological basement are prepared. The contour maps including ground elevation are converted into computer codes. Also, distributions of aquifer characteristics are prepared and converted into computer codes.

2) Water Level

Water levels measured in field are modified to groundwater level elevation based on the ground height of observed points. Then contour maps are converted into computer codes.

3) Groundwater Use and Recharge

Based on the results of the well inventory (Hydrocensus), present groundwater use is estimated. Variation in groundwater use in the past is estimated from the statistical data. Groundwater recharge is estimated by using recharge equations and rainfall data.

12.2.3 Calibration of Model

The model is test-operated by inputting recharge and pumpage data and outputting the calculated groundwater level in each node. The output is compared with the observed water level records, and then the model will be modified/adjusted until final agreement between the calculated and the observed water level is achieved. Thus the model is calibrated and ready to predict water level fluctuations under various abstraction scenarios.

12.2.4 Model Prediction and Evaluation

On the basis of future groundwater abstraction plans, a tentative proposal for groundwater withdrawal plan is prepared. Then the plan is inputted into the calibrated model. The response of the model is evaluated by the following criteria, which should be decided upon the basis of the socio-economic and environmental conditions in the study area:

Evaluation Factor	Criteria
1. Water Balance	Abstraction should be less than the recharge
2. Environmental Impact	Influence to springs and dug wells should be allowable Salinity should be less than the water quality standard
3. Economics	Total pumping head should be less than the criterion

If the model response is not acceptable even for one criterion, then the withdrawal plan should be modified in terms of withdrawal, pumping pattern and borehole location. The model is operated until the final agreement with all the criteria is achieved. With the above steps of aquifer modelling, the optimum abstraction plan (the permissible yield) is fixed and groundwater management plan will be examined.

12.3 Description of Numerical Model

12.3.1 Introduction

It is considered that a model is a tool designed to represent a simplified version of reality, and properly constructed groundwater models, as they are also representations of reality, can be valuable predictive tools for groundwater resources management. Of groundwater models, a mathematical model is commonly used to study groundwater system.

A mathematical model consists of a set of differential equations that describe groundwater flow. Since the assumptions to solve analytically a mathematical model are

fairly restrictive, numerical techniques are generally required to solve the mathematical model approximately under realistic situations.

There are many numerical techniques to solve differential equations. Among them, finite difference and finite element methods are representative (Fig. 12-4). The finite difference method is superior in less computer memory requirement and simplicity of data manipulation. The finite element method has excellence in flexibility of mesh formation. In practical aspect of groundwater flow simulation, there is little distinction between both methods. The finite difference method is applied for the proposed groundwater management plan of the study area, in consideration of data availability and accuracy of aquifer parameters.

12.3.2 Groundwater Flow Model

1) Basic Equation of Groundwater Flow

The unsteady-state, three-dimensional movement of groundwater through heterogeneous and anisotropic porous media is described by the following partial-differential equation.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(K_{xx} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(K_{yy} \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(K_{zz} \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} \right) - W = S_s \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} \quad (12-1)$$

Where, K_{xx} , K_{yy} and K_{zz} : values of hydraulic conductivity along the x , y and z coordinate axes, h : the potentiometric head, W : a volumetric flux per unit volume and represents source and/or sink of water, S_s : the specific storage of the porous media, t : time.

Equation (12-1), together with specified flow and/or head conditions at the boundaries of an aquifer system and specified initial-head conditions, constitutes a mathematical representation of a groundwater flow system. Numerical method, such as the finite difference method, is usually applied to solve equation (12-1).

2) Derivation of the Finite Difference Equation (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988)

An aquifer system is discretized with a mesh of blocks called “cells” as illustrated in Fig. 12-5, the location of which are referenced with a row(i), column(j) and layer(k) coordinate system parallel to the x , y and z directions, respectively. The width of cells in the row direction, at a given column j , is defined r_j ; the width of cells in the column direction at a given row i , is defined c_i ; and the thickness of cells in a given layer k , is defined v_k . At center of each cell, there is a point called a “node” at which head is to be calculated.

From the application of the continuity condition, the sum of all flows into and out of the

cell is equal to the rate of change in storage within the cell, expressing as follows

$$\Sigma Q_i = \Delta S \quad (12-2).$$

Where, Q_i : flow rate into the cell, S : storage change within the cell over a time interval t . For convenience flow entering cell is defined positive and outflow is defined negative.

A cell i,j,k and six adjacent cells are illustrated in Fig. 12-6. Applying finite difference method, groundwater flow is approximated by the node-to-node flow. Flow into cell i,j,k in the row direction from cell $i,j-1,k$ is given by Darcy's law as

$$Q_{i,j-1/2,k} = KR_{i,j-1/2,k} \Delta c_i \Delta v_k \frac{h_{i,j-1,k} - h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta r_{j-1/2}} \quad (12-3)$$

Where, $Q_{i,j-1/2,k}$: volumetric fluid discharge through the face between cells i,j,k and $i,j-1,k$, $h_{i,j,k}$: head at node i,j,k , $h_{i,j-1,k}$: head at node $i,j-1,k$, $KR_{i,j-1/2,k}$: hydraulic conductivity along the row between nodes i,j,k and $i,j-1,k$, $c_j v_k$: area of the cell faces normal to the row direction, $r_{j-1/2}$: distance between nodes i,j,k and $i,j-1,k$. The hydraulic conductivity between the nodes is normally calculated as a harmonic mean.

$$KR_{i,j-1/2,k} = \frac{2KR_{i,j-1,k}KR_{i,j,k}}{KR_{i,j-1,k} + KR_{i,j,k}} \quad (12-4)$$

Similar expressions can be written approximating the flow into the cell through the remaining five faces. Flow in row direction through the face between cells i,j,k and $i,j+1,k$ is expressed as

$$Q_{i,j+1/2,k} = KR_{i,j+1/2,k} \Delta c_i \Delta v_k \frac{h_{i,j+1,k} - h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta r_{j+1/2}} \quad (12-5)$$

While for the column direction, flow into the cell through the forward face is

$$Q_{i+1/2,j,k} = KC_{i+1/2,j,k} \Delta r_j \Delta v_k \frac{h_{i+1,j,k} - h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta c_{i+1/2}} \quad (12-6)$$

And flow into the cell through the rear face is

$$Q_{i-1/2,j,k} = KC_{i-1/2,j,k} \Delta r_j \Delta v_k \frac{h_{i-1,j,k} - h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta c_{i-1/2}} \quad (12-7)$$

For the vertical direction, inflow through the bottom face is

$$Q_{i,j,k+1/2} = KV_{i,j,k+1/2} \Delta r_j \Delta c_i \frac{h_{i,j,k+1} - h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta v_{k+1/2}} \quad (12-8)$$

While inflow through the upper face is given by

$$Q_{i,j,k-1/2} = KV_{i,j,k-1/2} \Delta r_j \Delta c_i \frac{h_{i,j,k-1} - h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta v_{k-1/2}} \quad (12-9)$$

The notation can be simplified by combining grid dimensions and hydraulic conductivity into a single constant (“hydraulic conductance”). Hydraulic conductance between nodes $i,j-1,k$ and i,j,k can be written as

$$CR_{i,j-1/2,k} = KR_{i,j-1/2,k} \frac{\Delta c_i \Delta v_k}{\Delta r_{j-1/2}} \quad (12-10)$$

Storage change within the cell over a time interval t is expressed as follows.

$$\Delta S = Ss_{i,j,k} \frac{\Delta h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta t} \Delta r_j \Delta c_i \Delta v_k \quad (12-11)$$

Where, $Ss_{i,j,k}$: specific storage of cell i,j,k , $h_{i,j,k}$: head change over a time interval t , r_j c_i v_k : volume of cell i,j,k . Assuming $t = t_m - t_{m-1}$, an approximation to the time derivative of head at time t_m can be written as

$$\left(\frac{\Delta h_{i,j,k}}{\Delta t} \right)_m = \frac{h_{i,j,k}^m - h_{i,j,k}^{m-1}}{t_m - t_{m-1}} \quad (12-12)$$

Where, $h_{i,j,k}^m$: head of cell i,j,k at time t_m , $h_{i,j,k}^{m-1}$: head of cell i,j,k at time t_{m-1} which precedes t_m .

Substituting equation (12-3), equations (12-5) through (12-9), and equations (12-11) and (12-12) into equation (12-2), and applying relationship in equation (12-10), finite difference approximation for cell i,j,k can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} & CR_{i,j-1/2,k} (h_{i,j-1,k}^m - h_{i,j,k}^m) + CR_{i,j+1/2,k} (h_{i,j+1,k}^m - h_{i,j,k}^m) + \\ & CC_{i-1/2,j,k} (h_{i-1,j,k}^m - h_{i,j,k}^m) + CC_{i+1/2,j,k} (h_{i+1,j,k}^m - h_{i,j,k}^m) + \\ & CV_{i,j,k-1/2} (h_{i,j,k-1}^m - h_{i,j,k}^m) + CV_{i,j,k+1/2} (h_{i,j,k+1}^m - h_{i,j,k}^m) + OS_{i,j,k} \\ & = Ss_{i,j,k} (\Delta r_j \Delta c_i \Delta v_k) \frac{h_{i,j,k}^m - h_{i,j,k}^{m-1}}{t_m - t_{m-1}} \quad (12-13) \end{aligned}$$

Where, $QS_{i,j,k}$: source or sink term of cell i,j,k .

An equation of this form is written for every cell in the calculation domain, and the system of equations is solved simultaneously for the heads at time t_m . Solving techniques of simultaneous equations are classified into direct and iterative methods. Finite difference approximation of three-dimensional groundwater flow produces a large system of simultaneous equations. Iterative method is superior to direct method in requirement of computer memory, and is usually used to solve such large system. Strongly Implicit Procedure method (SIP), Slice Successive Overrelaxation method (SSOR), and Preconditioned Conjugate Gradient method (PCG) are typical of iterative method. Precise explanation of solving techniques should be referred to McDonald and Harbaugh (1988), and Hill (1990).

3) MODFLOW

MODFLOW (Modular Finite-Difference Ground-Water Flow Model) developed by U.S. Geological Survey (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988; Harbaugh and McDonald, 1996), is widely used numerical model which can simulate groundwater flow in a three-dimensional heterogeneous and anisotropic medium. As mentioned in the following section, MODFLOW was applied to simulate groundwater flow systems in the Stampriet Artesian Basin.

In a three-dimensional finite difference model, vertical discretization can be seen as a sequence of horizontal layers. In complicated hydrogeological condition, this grid system causes a cell contain material from different stratigraphic units (Fig. 12-7(b)). In MODFLOW, vertical discretization can be viewed as an effort to represent individual aquifers or permeable zones by individual layers of the model (Fig. 12-7(c)). This distortion can be generated by giving the elevation of the top and bottom of the layer. It allows flexibility in discretizing, however, introduces small error into the finite difference approximation.

12.4 Conceptual Model

12.4.1 Hydrogeologic Condition

From a geological point of view, there are major four formations. They are the Damara Sequence, the Nama Group, the Karoo Sequence and the Kalahari Beds. The relationships among four formations are unconformity. The Damara Sequence and the Nama Group consist of sandstone, shale and metamorphic rocks. They form the hydrogeological basement. The Karoo Sequence is divided into the Dwyka Group and the Ecca Group. The Dwyka Group is composed of tillite and mudstone, and is also a hydrogeological basement. The Ecca Group is divided into the Nossob, Mukorob, Auob

and the Rietmond Members. The Nossob Member is composed of sandstone and is a confined aquifer. The Lower Mukorob Member consists of shale and is an aquitard/aquiclude. The Upper Mukorob Member consists of sandstone and is a confined aquifer. The Auob Member is composed of sandstone and shale. It contains three confined aquifers and two aquitards. However, it is difficult to clarify the distribution of these aquifers and aquitards over the whole study area. Therefore, the Auob Member is assumed to be one confined aquifer. The Lower Rietmond Member is composed of shale, and is an aquitard. The Upper Rietmond Member consists of sandstone, and is an unconfined or confined aquifer. The Kalkrand Basalt and the Karoo Dolerite intrude into the Auob and Rietmond Members and are considered to be an unconfined-confined aquifer or aquitard. The Kalahari Beds are composed of sand, gravel and calcrete. It is an unconfined aquifer. Between the Kalahari Beds and the Upper Rietmond Member, there is no distinct aquitard or low-permeability layer.

12.4.2 Aquifer System

As a result of the above discussion, an aquifer system consisting of one unconfined aquifer and two confined aquifers with two confining layers (aquitards) was selected for the groundwater model in the Stampriet Artesian Basin. The unconfined aquifer represents the Kalahari and the Upper Rietmond aquifers. The first confined aquifer represents the Auob and the Upper Mokokob aquifers. The second confined aquifer represents the Nossob aquifer. The upper unconfined aquifer and the first confined aquifer are connected due to leakage through the first confining layer (the Lower Rietmond Member). The first confining layer is absent and the unconfined aquifer directly overlies the first confined aquifer with a large area of the Stampriet Basin. In that area, the lower part of the unconfined aquifer is assumed to be an aquitard. The second confined aquifer is considered to be isolated from upper aquifers (Table 12-1).

12.5 Data Manipulation

12.5.1 Grid Design

Considering the hydrogeological structure of the study area, modeled domains were defined as shown in Fig. 12-8. The model area covers all of the Stampriet Artesian Basin. The area of the domain is about 125,000 km² (303 × 413km). The domain was divided by a grid at intervals of 6.3 km in the longitudinal and 6.9km in the latitudinal directions (see Fig. 12-9). Numbers of cells in row and column directions are 60 and 48 respectively. The application of a fixed grid system causes a slight error in the cell size, but it is negligible in practical application of the model (see Fig. 12-10).

12.5.2 Elevation of Top and Bottom of Layers

As mentioned previously, a deformed grid can be used in MODFLOW. Therefore, the study area was divided into 6 layers in vertical direction, and the elevations of the top and bottom of layers were given. The Model layers basically correspond to the Kalahari Beds, the Upper Rietmond Member, the Lower Rietmond Member, the Auob Aquifer, the Lower Mukorob Member, and the Nossob Aquifer. However, individual aquifers or aquitard cannot be represented by individual layers of the model, because of the complicated hydrogeological condition of the study area. The elevations of the top and bottom of layers were determined according to the following procedure.

1) Digitization of Isodepth and Isopach Maps

The isodepth and isopach maps shown in Section 8.3 were digitised for each cell;

- Surface Elevation
- Bottom of Kalahari Beds (Fig. 8.3-2)
- Isopach of Lower Rietmond Member (Fig. 8.3-3)
- Top of Auob Aquifer (Fig. 8.3-4)
- Isopach of Auob Aquifer (Fig. 8.3-5)
- Isopach of Lower Mukorob Member (Fig. 8.3-6)
- Isopach of Nossob Aquifer (Fig. 8.3-8)

Also, averaged value of “USGS Satellite 30 seconds Elevation Data” was used for the surface elevation of each cell.

The difference between the surface elevation and the bottom of the Kalahari Beds was assumed to be the thickness of the Kalahari Beds. If the value of bottom of the Kalahari Beds was higher than the surface elevation, it was revised to be lower than the surface (5 to 10 meters in thickness). In the area where the Kalahari Beds directly overlay the Auob Aquifer, the top of the Auob Aquifer was revised to be the same as the bottom of the Kalahari Beds.

The value obtained through subtracting the top of the Auob Aquifer from the bottom of the Kalahari Beds was assumed to be the thickness of the Rietmond Member. The thickness of the Upper Rietmond Member was calculated to subtract the thickness of the Lower Rietmond Member from that of the Rietmond Member.

The bottom of the Auob Aquifer was obtained to subtract the thickness of the Auob Aquifer from the top of it. The bottom of the Lower Mukorob Member was calculated to subtract the thickness of it from the bottom of the Auob Aquifer. Then, the bottom of the Nossob Aquifer was calculated to subtract the thickness of it from the bottom of the

Lower Mokorob Member successively.

Digitized isodepth and isopach maps of aquifers and aquitards. These digitized isodepth maps were used for summing up groundwater use by aquifer.

2) Elevation of Model Layers

The abovementioned aquifers and aquitards do not sequentially lie on top of another, since the hydrogeological condition of the study area is complex. There are 22 combinations of overlaying of them as shown in Table 12-2. The combination of each cell is shown in Table 12-3.

Allotment of aquifers and aquitards to the model layers was executed according to the procedure given in Table 12-4. The bottom elevations of layers are shown in Table 12-5 to Table 12-10. Fig. 12-11 shows the N-S cross-sectional grid design at column 25. Fig. 12-12 shows the E-W cross-section at row 30 (Locations of sections are shown in Fig. 12-8).

12.5.3 Boundary Condition

The model area is bounded by basement rocks on the north. However, the Kalahari Beds overlying basement rocks continue to the outside of the study area. Groundwater inflow can be expected across the border. Therefore, constant head condition was assumed at this boundary to approximate the groundwater inflow. On the western side, the distribution of the first and second confined aquifers is restricted at the border. This boundary was considered as a no flux condition. Near Kalkrand, groundwater level contours show outflow from the study area, therefore discharging condition was set on this border. On the southern border, the model area is bounded by basement rocks. No flux boundary condition was assumed. On the eastern side, the aquifers are continuous to the territory of Botswana and South Africa. Since groundwater level contours are almost perpendicular to the boundary, it was considered to be no flux condition. On the right bottom corner of the model, groundwater outflow can be expected across the border through the Kalahari Beds. Constant head condition was assumed to approximate the groundwater outflow.

The boundary conditions of the modelled area are shown in Fig. 12-8.

12.5.4 Aquifer Constants

There are very few pumping test data, excluding the JICA test boreholes as mentioned in section 2.5. Distributions of the permeability of aquifers are shown in Figs. 12-13 to

12-15. The study area was divided into several zones based on these figures. The permeability of a zone is assumed to be homogeneous and isotropic. These values were modified in the process of model calibration.

All pumping tests, except one, were executed without observation boreholes, therefore accurate storativity values were not able to obtain. The storativity values of the aquifers set uniformly and then these values modified in the model calibration process.

12.5.5 Groundwater Levels

The groundwater levels have been measured in the water level survey (section 2.8). The elevation survey of boreholes has been also done (section 2.7). Based on the results of these surveys, groundwater level contour maps were drawn. These maps were used in the model calibration.

There are 22 observation boreholes of the DWA. At these boreholes groundwater level changes have been measured monthly. Also, groundwater levels have been observed monthly in 30 NamWater boreholes. Observed groundwater level changes were used in the model calibration.

12.5.6 Pumpage

1) Data Source and Estimation Method

Data source and estimation method of present groundwater use is shown in Table 12-11. Production rate of NamWater is monthly, and report of irrigation permit holders is also monthly. The results of the Hydrocensus are average values at the surveyed date.

If the number of people in a farm was unknown, it was estimated by using farm area and unit population. Also, number of stocks was estimated from farm area and carrying capacity, if it was unknown. Average value of the Hydrocensus is used in the ratio of small stocks and large stocks.

Information of farms, which have not been surveyed by the Hydrocensus, is only farm area in the DWA database. The number of people and stock was estimated in the same way as mentioned above.

2) Results of the Hydrocensus

Present groundwater use was estimated, mainly based on the results of the Hydrocensus. The results are summarized in Table 12-12.

3) Summary of NamWater Scheme

Production rates of NamWater scheme are summarized in Table 12-13, and variations of each scheme are shown in Fig. 12-16. Monthly production rates of each scheme are given in Appendix Table B-1 to B-28.

Total production increased from 482 thousand m³/year in 1986 to 604 thousand m³/year in 1999. The production of the Aranos scheme is largest and about 40% of total in 1999.

4) Summary of Irrigation Permits

The irrigation permits are valid for five years, and water allocation is prescribed in annual production per farm. Boreholes must be equipped with water gauges, but some are not equipped. Monthly productions should be reported, however the DWA records on each farm are incomplete.

Using values of same month in the previous year or in the following year, lacking records of the monthly production reports were estimated. The results are shown in Table 12-14.

Irrigation uses of the permit holders have a tendency to increase. However, it is 64% of the allocated amount in 1999. The relation to rainfall is not distinct. The production in 1997 with a lot of rain is smaller than those in 1996 and 1998 with little rainfalls. But, the production in 1995 is smaller than that in 1996, although the rainfall in 1995 is less than that in 1996 (Fig. 12-17). Also, the relationship between monthly production and monthly rain is not clear (Fig. 12-18).

The groundwater abstraction for irrigation use affects the groundwater level change. For example, the water level change of the Spes Bona observation borehole (WW32457) is almost consistent with the variation of irrigation use. The water level of this borehole is considered to represent the change of irrigation use (Fig. 12-19).

The unit consumption for irrigation was calculated based on the groundwater use of the permit holders and irrigated areas of the Hydrocensus. Using the allocated amounts, the unit consumption becomes 42.0 m³/day/ha. Using the reported products, the unit consumptions are 28.6 m³/day/ha in 1998 and 26.0 m³/day/ha in 1999 respectively. Excluding farms with very small consumption values, the unit consumptions become 34.0 m³/day/ha in 1998 and 31.0 m³/day/ha in 1999 (Table 12-14).

5) Present Groundwater Use by Usage Type

Basically using the unit consumptions of the Hydrocensus (Table 12-16), present groundwater use was estimated. Results are shown in Table 12-17 and Fig. 12-20. Total

groundwater use in the study area is estimated to be 40,912 m³/day (14.9 million m³/year). Irrigation use amounts to 18,868 m³/day (6.9 million m³/year) and is 46% of total use. Stock watering use is 15,589 m³/day (5.7 million m³/year) and 38%. Domestic use is 6,455 m³/day (2.4 million m³/year) and 16%.

The distributions of present groundwater use by usage in each cell are shown in Figs. 12-21 to 12-24. The estimated groundwater use in a farm was divided among boreholes belonging to that farm. Then, the groundwater uses of boreholes were summed up for each cell. The location of boreholes was based on the results of the Hydrocensus and the DWA Database.

Domestic use is generally distributed over the study area. Pumping rate of almost cells is less than 10 m³/day. Near Aranos, there is only one cell with large pumping rate that is more than 500 m³/day (Fig. 12-22). Stock watering use is also generally distributed over the study area except the Aminuis region. Pumping rate of almost cells is less than 30 m³/day. There is no cell whose pumping rate is more than 500 m³/day (Fig. 12-23). Irrigation use centres on the Stampriet region, and expands along the Auob River and the road from Stampriet to Aranos. There is one cell whose pumping rate is more than 2000 m³/day. The ratio of cell with large pumping rate is high comparing with domestic or stock watering use (Fig. 12-24). Total groundwater use coincides with irrigation use in heavy pumping area. Generally groundwater use is dense in western half of the study area (Fig. 12-21).

6) Present Groundwater Use by Aquifer

(1) Present Groundwater Use by Aquifer

The estimated groundwater use in each borehole was divided into the aquifers based on the borehole construction information (i.e. screen depth, borehole depth, water strike depth) and the isodepth maps of aquifers. Unfortunately there are few boreholes with complete information. Therefore, dividing of the groundwater use into aquifers was done through the procedure shown in Table 12-18.

Results are shown in Table 12-19 and Figs. 12-25 to 12-31. Groundwater use from the Kalahari Aquifer amounts to 26,739 m³/day (9,8 million m³/year) and occupies 65% of total use. Groundwater use from the Auob Aquifer is estimated to be 13,622 m³/day (5.0 million m³/year) and 33%, and that from the Nossob Aquifer is merely 551 m³/day (0.2 million m³/year) and 1% (Fig. 12-25).

The domestic use from the Kalahari Aquifer amounts to 69% of total domestic use. These from the Auob Aquifer and the Nossob Aquifer are 24% and 7% respectively

(Fig. 12-26). For the stock watering use, groundwater from the Kalahari Aquifer occupies 81%, and that from the Auob Aquifer is 19% (Fig. 12-27). The irrigation use is equally shared between the Kalahari Aquifer and the Auob Aquifer (Fig. 12-28).

In the Kalahari Aquifer, the stock watering use is 47%, and the irrigation and domestic use are 36% and 17% respectively (Fig. 12-29). In the Auob Aquifer, the irrigation use is prominent and is 67%. The stock watering and domestic use are 22% and 11% respectively (Fig. 12-30). In the Nossob Aquifer, the domestic use is 88%, and the irrigation and stock watering use are only 10% and 2% respectively (Fig. 12-31).

(2) Distribution of Present Groundwater Use by Aquifer

The distributions of present groundwater use by aquifer in each cell are shown in Figs. 12-32 to 12-34. The distributions of each usage by aquifer are shown in Figs. 12-35 to 12-43.

Groundwater use of the Kalahari Aquifer is distributed over almost all study area. Heavy pumping cells are concentrated in the Stampriet region, and there is a cell with pumping rate of 1,000-2,000 m³/day. Along the Auob River, cells with relatively large pumping rate expand (Fig. 12-32). Groundwater use of the Auob Aquifer is centred at the Stampriet region, and there is a cell whose pumping rate is more than 2,000 m³/day. Cells with small pumping rate spreads in the area to the southeast of Aranos (Fig. 12-33). Groundwater use of the Nossob Aquifer is dotted around the study area (Fig. 12-34).

The domestic use of the Kalahari Aquifer extends over the study area. The pumping rate of cells is generally less than 10 m³/day (Fig. 12-35). The distributed area of the domestic use of the Auob Aquifer is smaller than that of the Kalahari Aquifer. The pumping rate is almost less than 10 m³/day (Fig. 12-36). The domestic use of the Nossob Aquifer is very similar to total groundwater use of it (Fig. 12-37).

The stock watering use of the Kalahari Aquifer is widely distributed except Aminuis area. Pumping rate is generally less than 30 m³/day. In the south-western part of the study area, there are several cells with pumping rate of 100-500 m³/day (Fig. 12-38). In the Auob Aquifer, the stock watering use is distributed around Stampriet, Aranos and Leonardville. Pumping rate is almost less than 30 m³/day (Fig. 12-39). The stock watering use of the Nossob Aquifer is scarce (Fig. 12-40).

The irrigation use of the Kalahari Aquifer is concentrated to the Stampriet region, and expands along the Auob River and the road from Stampriet to Aranos (Fig. 12-41). That of the Auob Aquifer is only centred on Stampriet region. There is a cell whose

pumping rate is larger than 2000 m³/day (Fig. 12-42).

7) Variation of Groundwater Use

The groundwater use variation from 1990 to 1999 was estimated by using the statistics and existing data (Table 12-20). In the domestic use, groundwater use variation in commercial farms and communal land was calculated from the population change. For commercial farms, annual population growth was estimated to be 0.68% based on the 1991 Population and Housing Census and the Hydrocensus. For communal land, annual population growth was estimated to be 2.14% in Aminuis and 2.48% in Nama land (see Chap.10). For village centre, the productions of NamWater (Table 12-13) were used directly.

The variation of the stock watering use was estimated by number of livestock. Based on the Hydrocensus 1986-1989 (DWA, 1986; 1987; 1989), the stock watering use in Area 1-3 amounted to 883,600m³/a, using unit consumptions 35 Litter/head for LS and 5 Litter/head for SS (Table 12-21). Based on the Hydrocensus, the stock watering use in the same area was estimated to be 735,000 m³/a, using the same unit consumptions. From these figures annual growth was calculated to be -1.82%.

From 1994 to 1999, production of the permit holders (Table 12-14) was used directly estimating the irrigation use variation. From 1990 to 1993, exponential approximation equation of productions from 1994 to 1999 was used ($y=2.9754\exp(0.1017x)$; y: annual production, x=year-1993).

The estimated results are shown in Table 12-22 and Figs 12-44 and 12-45. The groundwater use increased from 11.6 million m³/year in 1990 to 14.9 million m³/year in 1999. The stock water use decreased from 6.7 million m³/year and 58% of total in 1990 to 5.7 million m³/year and 38% in 1999. On the other hand, the irrigation use increased 2.7 million m³/year and 23% of total in 1990 to 6.9 million m³/year and 46% in 1999 (Fig. 12-44).

Groundwater from the Kalahari Aquifer increased from 8.4 million m³/year in 1990 to 9.8 million m³/year in 1999. That from the Auob Aquifer rapidly increased from 3.0 million m³/year to 5.0 million m³/year (Fig. 12-45).

12.5.7 Recharge

It is difficult to estimate the groundwater recharge based on the runoff analysis (see section 2.2). Therefore, the groundwater balance analysis was applied to estimate it.

1) Groundwater Balance in An Area

The groundwater balance in an area is expressed as follows.

$$R - D = S \frac{dh}{dt} \quad (12-14)$$

Where, R : recharge rate, D : discharge rate, S : storativity, dh/dt : groundwater level change in unit time. R means the groundwater inflow, D means the groundwater outflow and Sdh/dt is the storage change of groundwater in the area.

For the period without recharge, a regression curve of groundwater level is expressed by following exponential-type equation.

$$\frac{dh}{dt} = C(h - h_0) \quad (12-15)$$

Where, h : groundwater level, h_0 : standard groundwater level (at this level, discharge rate becomes zero), C : constant. Substituting equation (12-15) into equation (12-14), the discharge rate (D) can be expressed as follows (where, $R=0$).

$$D = -SC(h - h_0) \quad (12-16)$$

For the recharge period, a recharge rate (R) is expressed following equation, substituting equation (12-16) into equation (12-14).

$$\begin{aligned} R &= -SC(h - h_0) + S \frac{dh}{dt} \\ &= S \left\{ \frac{dh}{dt} - C(h - h_0) \right\} \quad (12-17) \end{aligned}$$

From equation (12-17) the recharge rate can be estimated reading groundwater level on the observation borehole records.

2) Recharge Estimation at Olifantswater

To estimate the recharge rate by the above method, it needs to select an observation borehole that represents natural recharge. Of course the recharge rate cannot be estimated from an observation borehole influenced heavily by pumping.

The Olifantswater WW21815 was selected for the recharge estimation. It has observed the groundwater level in the unconfined Kalahari aquifer. The groundwater level change of WW21815 differs from that of the Spes Bona WW32457, which is strongly effected by the irrigation groundwater use (see Fig. 12-19). It is considered to represent the natural

recharge-discharge process.

The water level of WW21815 shows a tendency to decrease annually. To calculate C and h_0 , it is necessary to make a correction of the water level. As shown in Fig. 12-46, the correction value is 0.61m for 11 years (i.e. 5.5cm/year). The calculated C and h_0 are 0.0167 and -15.245m respectively (Fig. 12-47).

Using equations (12-16) and (12-17), the monthly discharge and recharge rates were calculated. For the recharge calculation, it was assumed that the recharge occurs when water level is rising, and it equals zero when water level is declining. The results are shown in Fig. 12-46. Annual values are summarized in Table 12-24.

The discharge and recharge rates calculated from equations (12-16) and (12-17) are proportional to the storativity that equals the effective porosity in unconfined aquifer. The results of neutron logging of the JICA test boreholes show that the porosity of the Kalahari aquifer is about 25%. Using this value as an effective porosity, the calculated recharge rate exceeds rainfall. Therefore, the effective porosity is smaller than the porosity estimated by the neutron logging, and it seems that value from 2% to 5% is adequate.

These values were used for the initial setting of model calibration, and were revised in process of the calibration.

12.6 Model Calibration

12.6.1 Procedure of Model Calibration

Model calibration was carried out in the following steps:

- a. Calibrating groundwater level distribution by the steady-state calculation
- b. Calibrating groundwater level variation by the unsteady-state calculation
- c. Calibrating groundwater level change caused by 1/50 years rain (in 2000)

The first step of model calibration is to clarify the hydraulic conductivity and to make initial heads (1990) for unsteady-state calculation. Calculated heads were compared with groundwater level distribution based on the groundwater level survey. The second step of yearly unsteady-state calculation from 1990 to 1999 is to clarify the specific storage and recharge rate. Calculated head variations were compared with water level records of DWA and NamWater. Third step is to clarify the recharge rate with 1/50years rain (in 2000). Calculated head was compared with observed water level, then parameters (mainly hydraulic conductivity) and recharge rate were modified until final agreement between the calculated and the observed water level is achieved.

12.6.2 Calibrated Model

1) Comparison between Observed and calculated results

(1) Groundwater Level Configurations

Calculated heads were compared with results of the groundwater level survey. The results of survey show distribution of groundwater level in 2000. Groundwater level changes between 1990 and 2000 are relatively small, therefore the configuration of groundwater level is considered to be almost unchanged. Calculated heads were also verified by observation well records of Jan. 1990.

Fig. 12-48 shows observed and calculated groundwater level configurations of the Kalahari Aquifer. From the 1300m to 1100m contours, calculated and observed heads are almost coincided. On the 1000m and 950m contours, differences between calculated and observed heads are slightly large. In that area, there were few measuring points therefore strict comparison is difficult. Comparison of the Auob Aquifer is shown in Fig. 12-49. From the 1300m to 1050m contours, calculated and observed heads well agree. The 1000m and 950m contours of the both are not in

agreement. Fig. 12-50 shows the configuration of the Nossob Aquifer. From 1250m to 1100m contours, the both are well coincided. In the eastern and southern part of the model, the both do not entirely agree. In these areas, configuration of observed head is not accurate since there are few measuring points.

Fig.12-51 shows comparison of observed and calculated heads at observation wells. If the both values coincide, corresponding point is plotted on a line of 45 ° angle. All points distributes along the line of 45 ° angle. The mean error that is the mean difference between measured and calculated head is 1.0m. The results indicate good agreement of the two.

(2) Variations of Groundwater Level

Observed and calculated groundwater level variations in 1990-1999 at observation wells are shown in Figs. 12-52 to 12-59. Observations are monthly, but calculated results are yearly. At Olifantswater, calculated heads of the Kalahari Aquifer well agree with the trend of observed groundwater level (WW21815). Calculated heads of the Auob Aquifer are approximately 1 meter higher than the observed one (WW21784). However, these well simulates the declining trend of the observed records (Fig. 12-52). At Gomchanas (WW8399) calculated heads are about 1.5 meters lower than observed groundwater level. Decline of calculated heads is slightly smaller than that of the observation (Fig. 12-53).

At Spes Bona calculated heads are approximately 2 meters lower than the observed heads (WW32457), however these well agree with the trend of observed variations (Fig. 12-54). Calculated heads at Boomplaas correspond to the observation (WW10120). These in 1998 and 1999 are slightly lower than the observation (Fig. 12-55).

At Tugela (WW22838) calculated heads of the Kalahari Aquifer are about 3 meters lower than the observed heads and these of the Auob Aquifer are about 4 meters lower than the observed ones. Both of calculated heads well coincide with the trend of declining observation records. Calculated heads of the Nossob Aquifer is approximately 5 meters higher than the observation. Decline of calculated heads is slightly smaller than that of the observation (Fig. 12-56).

At Gochas calculated heads of the Kalahari and Auob Aquifers are almost unchanged. Levels of the both correspond to the observation (WW7491, WW16343) approximately (Fig. 12-57). Calculated head of the Nossob Aquifer at Aranos well agree with the observed heads (WW7407) (Fig. 12-58). At Aminuis calculated heads

are about 1 meter lower than the observed groundwater level (WW26164). Since observed variation is irregular, it is difficult to compare the trends of both (Fig. 12-59)

Gochas(WW7491, WW16343), Aranós(WW7407) and Aminuis(WW26164) are NamWater scheme wells. Therefore groundwater change caused by pumping is large, and it is difficult to clarify the trend of variation.

(3) Groundwater Level Change with 1/50 years rain

Groundwater level recovery in 2000 caused by heavy rain in 1999-2000 was calibrated, assuming pumping rates in 2000 and 2001 to be the same as that in 1999. Results are also shown in Figs. 12-52 to 12-59.

Calculated heads of the Kalahari Aquifer agree well with the observed recovery at Olifantswater. In the Auob Aquifer groundwater level recovery has not observed, however calculated heads indicate a little recovery (Fig. 12-52). At Gomchanas the observed records shows slight recovery and calculated head agree with it (Fig. 12-53).

Though observed heads at Spes Bona shows about 3 meters recovery, calculated heads continue to decline. This recovery is considered to arise from pumping rate change. In the calculation pumping rate in 2000 is the same as that in 1999, therefore the calculated heads do not agree with the observed recovery (Fig. 12-54). At Boomplaas, calculated and observed heads indicate the same situation as Spes Bona (Fig. 12-55).

At Tugela calculated heads of the Kalahari and Auob Aquifers coincide with about 2 meters recovery of the observed heads. Calculated heads of the Nossob Aquifer do not agree with slight recovery of observation (Fig. 12-56).

At Gochas, Aranós and Aminuis groundwater level recovery in the observed records are not distinct for the above-mentioned reason (Figs. 12-57 to 12-59).

2) Water Budget in Calibration Period

Water Budget in 1999 and 2000 is given in Figs. 12-60 and 12-61. In 1999, well pumping rate ($38,400 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$) considerably exceeded recharge rate ($12,600 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$). To compensate this shortage, water released from the storage ($24,000 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$) declining groundwater level. Pumping rate of the model doesn't agree with that of the study area, since the model area is smaller than the study area (Fig. 12-60).

In 2000, recharge rate ($218,800 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$) increased by about 17 times that of 1999. With 1/50years rain, groundwater level recovered and the storage increased ($181,900 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$) (Fig. 12-61).

3) Fixed Parameters

Hydraulic conductivity, Specific Storage (effective porosity) and recharge rate were modified to calibrate the model. The distributions of fixed hydraulic conductivity of model layer 1 to 6 are shown in Figs.12-62 to 12-67. The distribution of fixed specific storage and effective porosity of model layer 4 and 6 are shown in Figs. 12-68 and 1-69. Fixed hydraulic conductivity, specific storage and effective porosity are summarized in Table 12-25. Zone number in Figs. 12-62 to 12-69 corresponds to that in Table 12-25. Specific storage and effective porosity of model layer 1 to 3, and 5 sets uniformly to be zone 1.

Recharge rate is summarized in Table 12-26 and distribution of zones is shown in Fig. 12-70. Zone number in Fig. 12-70 corresponds to that in Table 12-26. In ordinary years (1990-1999), recharge rate is very small except zone 6. Results of Carbon-14 and Tritium analysis support this low recharge rate. At zone 6 relatively large recharge rate was needed to prevent cells from drying up, since the aquifers locate at high altitude. In 2000 with 1/50years rain, recharge rate increased to about 1 to 3% of annual rainfall to calibrate the groundwater level change at observation wells.

12.7 Model Prediction

12.7.1 Prediction Cases

1) Pumpage

To predict the groundwater level change caused by pumping rate change, 6 cases shown in Table 2-27 were studied. Cases 1 and 2 were assumed to keep present groundwater use. For case 3 irrigation use was increased to 120% of present. For cases 4 to 6 irrigation use was decreased to 70%, 50%, 0% respectively. Indicating the calibration results, groundwater level depletion in Stampriet area is major problem in the basin. Therefore change of irrigation use that causes the depletion was studied. Prediction period for each case is 100 years.

2) Recharge

Recharge rate will vary in prediction period, but there is no precise recharge analysis to obtain probability of recharge at present. Calibrated recharge rate was used as an average of long period. For Cases 2 to 6, recharge rate with 1/50years rain was assumed in 30th and 80th year (Fig. 12-71).

12.7.2 Constraints on Permissible Yield

As mentioned in section 12.1.1, constraints on permissible yield are social scientific matter except water balance. Therefore it is difficult to define the constraints. Here, following constraints are assumed. These are not complete and should be revised with exhaustive argue.

1) Water Balance Constraint

Groundwater abstraction should be within the possible amount of recharge on arbitrary spatial and time scales. In this study time scale is determined to be one year, therefore annual amount of pumpage must not exceed that of the possible recharge. In other words, the groundwater level must recover to the initial level at the end of one hydrologic year. Following table shows the criteria for the annual residual drawdown.

Criteria for Water Balance Constraint

Rank	Annual Residual Drawdown (m)	Description
A	0.00 – 0.03	Allowable: Not surely safe, but allowable if there is no alternative plan
B	0.03 – 0.10	Undesirable: The aquifer storage will be possibly depleted in future
C	0.11 -	Not Allowable: The aquifer storage will be probably depleted in near future

2) Water Quality Constraint

In this simulation groundwater quality is not studied, since groundwater level change is considered to be small and it would not cause groundwater quality change. However, there are high salinity zones (“salt blocks”), and groundwater quality is one of the problems in this basin. Prediction of groundwater quality is the subject for a future study.

3) Environmental Constraint

Influences on existing springs and vegetations are possible environmental constraints to be considered. According to the environmental analysis (see Chap. 14), springs in this basin already dried up decades ago. Therefore, the impact on existing springs can be negligible. Decline or recovery of groundwater level will affects the vegetations in this basin. However, no quantitative analysis on the relationship between groundwater level and vegetations has been done. In this study, the influence on vegetations was neglected.

It is the subject for a future study.

4) Economical Constraint

This constraint comes from the limits of pump lift. Average PID (Pump Installed Depth) is 46 meters and average groundwater level depth is 29 meters based on the Hydrocensus. As a result, the total drawdown should be within about 10 meters. Otherwise the pump must be altered to suit deeper water level, which will cost more. Criteria for the economic constraint are shown in the following table.

Criteria for Economic Constraint

Rank	Total Drawdown after 100 years (m)	Description
A	0 – 10	Good: No problems in practical use
B	10 – 20	Allowable: Well yield may decrease
C	20 >	Undesirable: Pump should be changed

12.7.3 Model Prediction

In Figs. 12-72 to 12-89, predicted results are shown as drawdown after 100 years for each aquifer and case. Calculation of bottom area of the model was unstable and there were incomprehensible head differences. These differences were ignored in figures. Also, groundwater level variations at observation wells are shown in Figs. 12-90 to 12-92.

1) Case 1

Groundwater pumpage is kept at the rate of 1999 (14.9 million m³/ year) in this case. Maximum drawdown of the Kalahari Aquifer will exceed 30 meters, and the Kalahari Aquifer will dry up within 35 years at Spes Bona (Figs. 12-72 and 12-91). It corresponds to the rank C (Not Allowable) of water balance constraint and the rank C (Undesirable) of economic constraint. In Stampriet area there is no observation well of the Kalahari Aquifer then the predicted results are not calibrated. However, the results can show the trend of the variation of groundwater level. Maximum drawdown in the Auob Aquifer is 14 meters at Stampriet (Figs. 12-78 and 12-91). It corresponds to the rank C (Not Allowable) of water balance constraint and the rank B (Allowable) of economic constraint. When a cell dries up, the MODFLOW automatically eliminates pumpage in that cell. Therefore, the groundwater level in the Auob Aquifer is slightly recovered, when the Kalahari Aquifer dries up and the pumpage of the aquifer is eliminated.

At Olifantswater drawdown in the Kalahari Aquifers is 3 meters and that of the Auob

Aquifer is 3 meters also (Fig. 12-90). These correspond to the rank A (Allowable) of water balance constraint and the rank A (Good) of economic constraint. At Tugela drawdown in the Kalahari Aquifer is 1 meter. It corresponds to the rank A of water balance and economic constraints. Drawdown in the Auob and Nossob Aquifers are 5 meters and 4 meters respectively (Fig. 12-92). These classified into the rank B (Undesirable) of water balance constraint and the rank A of economic constraint.

2) Case 2

Pumping rate is the same as that of Case 1 (14.9 million m³/year). In 30th and 80th years it is assumed to get recharge with 1/50years rain. At Spes Bona drawdown in the Kalahari and Auob Aquifers are the same as these of Case 1 (Figs. 12-73 and 12-79). The Kalahari Aquifer will dry up within 35 years (Fig. 12-91). The classifications are the same as these of Case 1. In the Stampriet area no recharge condition is set (Fig. 12-70), therefore no groundwater level recovery is calculated in the year with 1/50years rain. The drawdown of the Kalahari Aquifer is accelerated with increase of groundwater level decline. The Kalahari Aquifer is unconfined aquifer. When a decline of groundwater level becomes larger, the transmissivity of unconfined aquifer becomes smaller. Pumping rate in the aquifer is constant. Therefore, acceleration of decline is observed.

At Olifantswater groundwater level of the Kalahari Aquifer shows the recovery of about 0.4 meters in the year with 1/50years rain. Drawdown for 100 years reaches about 2.6 meters. Groundwater level of the Auob Aquifer shows the recovery of about 0.2 meters in the year with 1/50years rain. Total drawdown is about 2.2 meters (Fig. 12-90). These correspond to the rank A of water balance and economic constraints.

At Tugela groundwater level of the Kalahari Aquifer indicates the recovery of 0.7 meters in the year with 1/50years rain. The recovery of the Auob Aquifer with that rain is 0.6 meters. Total drawdown of the Kalahari Aquifer is 0.8 meters. These of the Auob and Nossob Aquifers are 3.0 meters and 2.8 meters respectively (Fig. 12-92). The results are classified into the rank A of water balance and economic constraints.

3) Case 3

Pumping rate of irrigation use is increased to 120% in this case. Total pumping rate is 109% of Case 1 (16.3 million m³/year). Maximum drawdown of the Kalahari Aquifer will exceed 30 meters, and the Kalahari Aquifer will dry up within 25 years at Spes Bona (Figs. 12-74 and 12-91). It corresponds to the rank C of water balance constraint and economic constraint. Maximum drawdown in the Auob Aquifer exceeds 20 meters at Stampriet (Figs. 12-78 and 12-91). It corresponds to the rank C of water balance and

economic constraints.

At Olifantswater groundwater levels of the Kalahari and Auob Aquifers are slightly lower than these of Case 2. The differences of total drawdown between the both are less than 0.1 meters (Fig. 12-90). These correspond to the rank A of water balance and economic constraints. At Tugela groundwater level of the Kalahari Aquifer is almost the same as that of Case 2. Drawdown of the Auob and Nossob Aquifers are 0.05 and 0.1 meters lower than these of Case 2 (Fig. 12-92). These are classified into the rank A of both constraints.

4) Case 4

In this case the pumping rate of irrigation use is reduced to 70% of Case 1. Total pumping rate is 86% of Case 1 (12.9 million m³/ year). At Spes Bona the period to dry up in the Kalahari Aquifer extends for 80 years (Fig. 12-91). However, maximum drawdown in Stampriet area exceeds 30 meters (Fig. 12-75). It corresponds to the rank C of water balance and economic constraints. Total drawdown of the Auob Aquifer at Spes Bona is 3.4 meters. Maximum drawdown in Stampriet area is less than 10 meters (Fig. 12-81). It is classified into the rank B of water balance and the rank A of economic constraint.

At Olifantswater groundwater level of the Kalahari and Auob Aquifers are 0.06 to 0.15 meters higher than these of Case 2, and are classified into the rank A of water balance and economic constraints (Fig. 12-90). At Tugela groundwater level of the Kalahari Aquifer is almost the same as that of Case 2. Drawdown of the Auob and Nossob Aquifers are 0.07 and 0.21 meters higher than these of Case 2 (Fig. 12-92). These are classified into the rank A of both constraints.

5) Case 5

The pumping rate of irrigation use is reduced to 50% of Case 1 in this case. Total pumping rate is 77% of Case 1 (11.5 million m³/ year). At Spes Bona total drawdown of the Kalahari Aquifer is almost 0 meter, however total drawdown of 5 to 9 meters remains in Stampriet area (Figs. 12-76 and 12-91). The water balance constraint is the rank B and economic constraint is the rank A. Total drawdown of the Auob Aquifer is 3.0 meters, and it corresponds to the rank A of both constraints (Figs. 12-82 and 12-91).

At Olifantswater groundwater level of the Kalahari and Auob Aquifers are 0.1 and 0.25 meters higher than these of Case 2, and correspond to the rank A of both constraints (Fig. 12-90). At Tugela groundwater level of the Kalahari Aquifer is almost the same as that of Case 2. Drawdown of the Auob and Nossob Aquifers are 0.12 and 0.25 meters higher than these of Case 2 (Fig. 12-92). These are classified into the rank A of both constraints.

6) Case 6

The pumping rate of irrigation use is reduced to 0% (abolishing irrigation) of Case 1 in this case. Total pumping rate is 54% of Case 1 (8.1 million m³/ year). At Spes Bona groundwater level of the Kalahari Aquifer shows the recovery of 21 meters (Fig. 12-77 and 12-91). It corresponds to the rank A of water balance and economic constraints. Groundwater level of the Auob Aquifer shows the recovery of 15.5 meters, and it corresponds to the rank A of both constraints (Figs. 12-83 and 12-91).

The model layer 1 and 2 correspond to the Kalahari Aquifer as mentioned before. The model layer 1 at Spes Bona is dry cell (inactive) in the calibration periods and the bottom altitude of it is 1155m. The model layer 2 is unconfined until groundwater level recovers to 1155m. When groundwater level reaches to 1155m, the model layer 2 becomes confined condition. Storativity of confined aquifer is smaller than that of unconfined aquifer in two orders. Then groundwater level recovers suddenly in 2014. This recovery causes the model layer 1 to be active (re-wetting). The model layer 1 is unconfined and the groundwater level recovery becomes to be gradual.

At Olifantswater groundwater level of the Kalahari and Auob Aquifers are 0.25 and 0.5 meters higher than these of Case 2, and correspond to the rank A of both constraints (Fig. 12-90). At Tugela groundwater level of the Kalahari Aquifer is almost the same as that of Case 2. Drawdown of the Auob and Nossob Aquifers are 0.25 and 0.7 meters higher than these of Case 2 (Fig. 12-92). These are classified into the rank A of both constraints.

12.8 Evaluation of Permissible Yield

12.8.1 Permissible Yield in the Basin

1) Water Balance

Results of water balance in prediction period are shown in Figs. 12-93 to 12-103 for ordinary year (after 10 years) and year with 1/50years rain (after 30 years). After 30 years pumping rate from wells reduced since pumping rate of dry cells is eliminated by the MODFLOW. In ordinary year total groundwater outflow (pumping + outflow at boundary) exceeds the groundwater inflow (recharge + inflow from boundary) and is compensated by the groundwater storage release, declining groundwater levels. In year with 1/50years rain, the groundwater inflow exceeds temporarily the groundwater outflow and increases the groundwater storage, recovering groundwater levels.

2) Results of Prediction

As shown in previous section, predicted results in Stampriet area are different from these of other area. Therefore, the results were evaluated for Stampriet area and remaining other area respectively. Results of the model prediction in the Stampriet Basin were summarized as bellow:

Relation to Expected Constraints

Area	Stampriet area				Other area			
	Water Balance		Economic		Water Balance		Economic	
Case ^{Aquifer}	Kala	Auob	Kala	Auob	Kala	Auob	Kala	Auob
1	NA	NA	UD	A	A	A/UD	G	G
2	NA	NA	UD	A	A	A	G	G
3	NA	NA	UD	UD	A	A	G	G
4	NA	UD	UD	G	A	A	G	G
5	UD	A	G	G	A	A	G	G
6	A	A	G	G	A	A	G	G

Remarks: G=Good, A=Allowable, UD=Undesirable, NA=Not Allowable
Kala = Kalahari Aquifer, Auob = Auob Aquifer

3) Permissible Yield

Present groundwater abstraction (Case1, Case 2) is acceptable in the Stampriet Basin except Stampriet area. In this area groundwater is mainly used for stock watering and domestic purposes. It is considered that groundwater use will not increase remarkably. In Tugela area declines of groundwater level are slightly large with present groundwater pumpage. Careful monitoring is necessary.

In Stampriet area, the Kalahari Aquifer will dry up in near future, if present groundwater abstraction is kept. From the above results, pumping plan of Case 5 (reducing irrigation use to 50%) and Case 6 (reducing irrigation use to 0%) are acceptable in Stampriet area. Case 4 (reducing irrigation use to 70%) is not allowable since the Kalahari Aquifer will dry up within 80 years. To prevent the dry-up of aquifer, groundwater pumping for irrigation use is at least reduced to 50% of that in 1999, which is almost the same as the irrigation use in 1992.

4) Steps to Permissible Yield

(1) Schedule of Protective Measures

As protective measures differ for each area, their specific schedule needs to be suitably set respectively for each area. Based on the experience in Japan, the following stages can be considered in general (Shibasaki et al., 1995).

i) Research Stage

A preliminary reconnaissance based on available information is carried out in order to learn the general conditions of the basin. For all the boreholes in the basin, registration, arrangement of well inventory, measurement of groundwater level and pumping rate, and submission of its report should be ensured.

Base on these data, a preliminary review is carried out, minimum level of facilities for monitoring is set up, and the permissible (yield) critical groundwater level is tentatively worked out. In this stage, construction of new boreholes is strictly regulated.

The period for the first stage is desirably within a few years, even for areas without substantial data.

ii) Observation and Arrangement Stage

Based on the permissible critical groundwater level determined initially in the first stage for each area, groundwater level and extraction are observed, and groundwater pumpage for each area is reduced. The deduction of groundwater pumpage is closely related to the socio-economic factors as well as with the general utilization of water resources including the possibility of development of alternative water sources such as dams.

In the second stage, the monitoring system is further improved, and the data are comprehensively analyzed. Then for each area, each municipal unit (cities and towns), of for smaller zones, permissible yield are determined. For this second stage, a period of five years would be practical.

iii) Stage for Intensive Enforcement Measures

As long as measures are strictly enforced in the second stage, the objectives to stop groundwater problems may be considered to be mostly achieved. If groundwater level still cannot be regained, a third stage may be considered in which intensified restriction on pumpage, intensive alteration of water sources, and measures for artificial recharge

should be resorted to.

For the realization of effective groundwater basin management, besides technological improvements, legal and social issues such as the improvement of groundwater utilization system should be considered.

(2) Steps to Permissible Yield in the Study Area

For the study area, groundwater management may be in a transition period from the first stage to the second stage. For the present, observation of groundwater levels should be continued using the monitoring system that made by this study. Improving the groundwater model based on the observation results, tentative permissible yield in this study should be revised precisely.

Urgent measures to be taken are preventing the increase of groundwater abstraction. In order to achieve this, it is important to inform farmers of the present situation in the basin, and to make farmers understand the problems that will occur with present groundwater use. Therefore the farmers may be cooperative to reduce the pumpage.

Meanwhile measures reducing pumping rate to the permissible yield should be prepared. It is considered to apply permits strictly to irrigation use. Charging system for groundwater use is worth considering.

12.8.2 Future Improvement in Modelling

The modelling of the Stampriet Artesian Basin is based on the knowledge at present. Therefore, modification of the model will be expected in future observations and investigations.

There is no observation well of the Kalahari Aquifer in Stampriet area, where serious problems are estimated to occur in near future. New Kalahari observation wells are necessary to monitor the variation of groundwater level and to improve the model accuracy.

The calculation model in this study was unstable at the bottom area of the model and there were incomprehensible head differences. Future improvement is necessary to enhance the model accuracy.

Groundwater pumping rate was estimated by using many assumptions. The reports from permit holders are incomplete. It is necessary to report monthly abstraction properly. For domestic and stock watering use, there are no data on the variation of pumping rate. It is recommended to select sample wells and to install the flow meter.

The recharge rate is unknown at present. A basic hydrologic and hydrochemical study is necessary to estimate accurate recharge rate.

The model calibration should be improved based on the future studies above mentioned and the observation results of the monitoring system. It is recommended to model the groundwater quality, investigating the influence of “salt block”.

Table 12-1 Hydrogeological Structure in the Stampriet Artesian Basin

Formation	Lithology	Hydrogeological Structure			
		Aquifer Type	Conceptual Model		
Kalahari Beds	Sand, Gravel, Calcrete	Unconfined aquifer	(aquitard)		
Karoo Sequence	Ecca Group	Karoo Dolerite	Dolerite	Aquitard-	Unconfined aquifer
		Kalkrand Basalt	Basalt	Unconfined aquifer	
	Rietmond member	Sandstone	Unconfined-confined aquifer	Leakage (aquitard)	
		Shale	Aquitard		1st confining layer absent
	Auob member	Sandstone	Confined aquifer	1st confined aquifer	
		Shale	Aquitard		
	Mukorob member	Sandstone	Confined aquifer	2nd confining layer	
		Shale	Aquitard		
	Nossob member	Sandstone	Confined aquifer	2nd confined aquifer	
	Dwyka Group	Tillite, Mudstone	Basement	Hydrogeological Basement	
Nama Group	Sandstone, Shale	Basement			
Damara Sequence	Metamorphic rock	Basement			

Table 12-2 Combination of Aquifers and Aquitards

	B	C	K	M	A	L	P	Q	R	S	T	V	W	X	Y	D	E	I	J	G	H	O
Kalahari Beds	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Basalt	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper Rietmond	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
Lower Rietmond	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	-	-
Auob Aquifer	-	-	-	-	X	-	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	-	-
Lower Mokerob	-	-	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	-

- 1) Basalt: Kalkrand Basalt
- 2) The Nossob Aquifer is assumed to be isolated form upper aquifers

Table 12-4 Procedure of Aquifer Allotment to Model Layer

Symbol	O	B	C	A	P	Q	R	W	X	Y	S
Layer 1	10m	20m	TK	0.5*TK	TK	TK	TK	TK	TK	TK	0.75*TK
Layer 2	10m	50m	50m	0.25*TK	TUR	TUR	TUR	0.75*TUR	0.75*TUR	0.75*TUR	0.25*TK
Layer 3	10m	50m	50m	0.25*TK	TLR	TLR	TLR	0.25*TUR	0.25*TUR	0.25*TUR	TLR
Layer 4	10m	100m	100m	TA	TA	0.25*TLM	TA	TA	0.25*TLM	TA	TA
Layer 5	10m	10m	10m	TLM	TLM	0.75*TLM	10m	TLM	0.75*TLM	10m	TLM
Layer 6	10m	10m	10m	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Symbol	T	V	L	M	K	I	J	D	E	G	H
Layer 1	0.75*TK	0.75*TK	0.75*TK	0.5*TK	TK	0.25*TUR	0.25*TUR	0.25*TUR	0.25*TUR	0.25*TLR	0.125*TLM
Layer 2	0.25*TK	0.25*TK	0.25*TK	0.25*TK	10m	0.75*TUR	0.75*TUR	0.5*TUR	0.5*TUR	0.25*TLR	0.125*TLM
Layer 3	TLR	TLR	TLR	0.25*TK	10m	TLR	TLR	0.25*TUR	0.25*TUR	0.5*TLR	0.125*TLM
Layer 4	0.25*TLM	TA	10m	0.25*TLM	10m	TA	0.25*TLM	TA	0.25*TLM	TA	0.125*TLM
Layer 5	0.75*TLM	10m	10m	0.75*TLM	10m	TLM	0.75*TLM	TLM	0.75*TLM	TLM	0.5*TLM
Layer 6	-	-	10m	-	10m	-	-	-	-	-	-

- *) TK: Thickness of Kalahari Beds
 TUR: Thickness of Upper Rietmond Member
 TLR: Thickness of Lower Rietmond Member
 TA: Thickness of Auob Aquifer
 TLM: Thickness of Lower Mukorob Member
 **) Symbols correspond to those in Table12-2 and Table12-3.

Table 12-7 Bottom Elevation of Model Layer 3

1	1844	1795	1824	1720	1655	1618	1601	1571	1534	1514	1496	1466	1400	1348	1305	1268	1227	1191	1161	1131	1102	1075	1050	1026	1004	984	966	950	935	921	908	896	885	875	866	858	851	845	840	835	831	828	825	822	820	818	816	815	814	813	812	811	810	809	808	807	806	805	804	803	802	801	800	799	798	797	796	795	794	793	792	791	790	789	788	787	786	785	784	783	782	781	780	779	778	777	776	775	774	773	772	771	770	769	768	767	766	765	764	763	762	761	760	759	758	757	756	755	754	753	752	751	750	749	748	747	746	745	744	743	742	741	740	739	738	737	736	735	734	733	732	731	730	729	728	727	726	725	724	723	722	721	720	719	718	717	716	715	714	713	712	711	710	709	708	707	706	705	704	703	702	701	700	699	698	697	696	695	694	693	692	691	690	689	688	687	686	685	684	683	682	681	680	679	678	677	676	675	674	673	672	671	670	669	668	667	666	665	664	663	662	661	660	659	658	657	656	655	654	653	652	651	650	649	648	647	646	645	644	643	642	641	640	639	638	637	636	635	634	633	632	631	630	629	628	627	626	625	624	623	622	621	620	619	618	617	616	615	614	613	612	611	610	609	608	607	606	605	604	603	602	601	600	599	598	597	596	595	594	593	592	591	590	589	588	587	586	585	584	583	582	581	580	579	578	577	576	575	574	573	572	571	570	569	568	567	566	565	564	563	562	561	560	559	558	557	556	555	554	553	552	551	550	549	548	547	546	545	544	543	542	541	540	539	538	537	536	535	534	533	532	531	530	529	528	527	526	525	524	523	522	521	520	519	518	517	516	515	514	513	512	511	510	509	508	507	506	505	504	503	502	501	500	499	498	497	496	495	494	493	492	491	490	489	488	487	486	485	484	483	482	481	480	479	478	477	476	475	474	473	472	471	470	469	468	467	466	465	464	463	462	461	460	459	458	457	456	455	454	453	452	451	450	449	448	447	446	445	444	443	442	441	440	439	438	437	436	435	434	433	432	431	430	429	428	427	426	425	424	423	422	421	420	419	418	417	416	415	414	413	412	411	410	409	408	407	406	405	404	403	402	401	400	399	398	397	396	395	394	393	392	391	390	389	388	387	386	385	384	383	382	381	380	379	378	377	376	375	374	373	372	371	370	369	368	367	366	365	364	363	362	361	360	359	358	357	356	355	354	353	352	351	350	349	348	347	346	345	344	343	342	341	340	339	338	337	336	335	334	333	332	331	330	329	328	327	326	325	324	323	322	321	320	319	318	317	316	315	314	313	312	311	310	309	308	307	306	305	304	303	302	301	300	299	298	297	296	295	294	293	292	291	290	289	288	287	286	285	284	283	282	281	280	279	278	277	276	275	274	273	272	271	270	269	268	267	266	265	264	263	262	261	260	259	258	257	256	255	254	253	252	251	250	249	248	247	246	245	244	243	242	241	240	239	238	237	236	235	234	233	232	231	230	229	228	227	226	225	224	223	222	221	220	219	218	217	216	215	214	213	212	211	210	209	208	207	206	205	204	203	202	201	200	199	198	197	196	195	194	193	192	191	190	189	188	187	186	185	184	183	182	181	180	179	178	177	176	175	174	173	172	171	170	169	168	167	166	165	164	163	162	161	160	159	158	157	156	155	154	153	152	151	150	149	148	147	146	145	144	143	142	141	140	139	138	137	136	135	134	133	132	131	130	129	128	127	126	125	124	123	122	121	120	119	118	117	116	115	114	113	112	111	110	109	108	107	106	105	104	103	102	101	100	99	98	97	96	95	94	93	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60	59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	46	45	44	43	42	41	40	39	38	37	36	35	34	33	32	31	30	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Table 12-11 Data Source and Estimation Method of Present Groundwater Use

Use	Source	Number	Estimation Method
Domestic	Hydrocensus	1208	Number of People \times Unit Consumption
		farms	Area \times Unit Population \times Unit Consumption
	DWA Database	43 farms	Area \times Unit Population \times Unit Consumption
	NamWater	8 schemes	Monthly Abstraction
Stock Watering	Hydrocensus	1208	Number of Stock \times Unit Consumption
		farms	Area / Carrying Capacity \times Unit Consumption
	DWA Database	43 farms	Area / Carrying Capacity \times Unit Consumption
Irrigation	Hydrocensus	61 farms	Irrigated Area \times Unit Consumption
	Permit Holders	41 farms	Monthly Abstraction

Table 12-12 Results of the Hydrocensus

Number of farms In the study area	1,251	
Surveyed farms	1,208	
Number of boreholes	5,726	
Number of boreholes in use	4,467	
People on farms	9,403	on 1006 farms
Number of stock		on 1058 farms
Large stock	103,211	
Small stock	1,268,154	
Ratio of SS and LS	12.29SS/LS	
Irrigated area	566.5ha	on 102 farms
Present groundwater use		on 879 farms
Domestic	3,045m ³ /day	
Stock watering	9,919m ³ /day	
Irrigation	15,096m ³ /day	
Total	28,060m ³ /day	
Unit population	1.93capita/1000ha	Average of 831 farms
Unit consumption		
Domestic	408 Litter/day/capita	Average of 623 farms
Large stock	37 Litter/day/head	Average of 828 farms
Small stock	7 Litter/day/head	Average of 146 farms
Irrigation	27.3m ³ /day/ha	Average of 84 farms
Carrying capacity		
Large stock	16ha/head	Average of 668 farms
Small stock	3ha/head	Average of 899 farms

Table 12-13 Productions of NamWater Scheme

Unit: m³/year

Year	Aranos	Leonardville	Stampriet	Gochas	Koes	Kries	Aminius	Onderombapa	Total
1986	207595	80694	24827	61709	61406	12297	22652	11254	482434
1987	225373	84926	51959	67458	44592	17887	18513	13202	523910
1988	229445	87990	67216	64131	52437	18400	19248	14823	553690
1989	214061	78646	64532	73652	60886	19219	18771	20666	550433
1990	231499	69701	55087	73004	72619	18769	18706	24018	563403
1991	236790	64453	47509	76924	81159	15914	22593	25438	570780
1992	260828	72529	41392	74089	78686	13210	19317	30185	590236
1993	243750	63862	38674	63065	83641	9952	15755	28608	547307
1994	254894	60571	48707	63944	80505	10729	17990	29316	566656
1995	264970	64721	50059	62323	73234	10347	27178	28513	581345
1996	227863	62789	56417	60807	70285	10601	25324	24056	538142
1997	220427	61257	59878	58163	66449	10377	25355	15341	517247
1998	242633	71640	68915	62978	75638	11403	37308	20992	591507
1999	236212	70295	76305	60264	79451	11309	43866	26768	604470

Table 12-14 Estimated Irrigation Uses of Permit Holders

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
1994	241315	222371	213846	174800	175911	163299	199301	238937	334090	362365	418580	421244	3166060
1995	340450	269628	223514	209903	184949	182637	214159	278014	329975	424403	500396	485130	3643159
1996	414956	454732	425074	347015	338009	324907	254633	368545	371801	405419	471203	447132	4623428
1997	333611	318775	325190	275168	224816	262489	228166	342431	349942	406533	408957	410482	3886560
1998	424061	398935	432321	430346	308883	318409	323477	430729	479120	522470	613145	643734	5320701
1999	492834	502211	391590	604674	370264	296724	309408	357167	379680	478150	554038	584171	5320909

*) Allocated amount: 8,350,000 m³/year

Table 12-15 Estimation of Unit Consumption from Irrigation Permits

Data	Farms	Irrigated Area (ha)	Irrigation Use(m ³ /a)	Unit Consumption (m ³ /d/ha)	Ratio (%)	Remarks	
Allocated amount	30	383.5	5979000	42.0	100		
Monthly Reports			1998	4003193	28.6		68
			1999	3640425	26.0		62
Hydrocensus				4139438	29.6		70
Allocated amount	25	317.5	4352000	37.6	100	Excluding low unit consumption farms	
Monthly Reports			1998	3939017	34.0		90
			1999	3589689	31.0		82
Hydrocensus				3630628	31.3		83

Table 12-16 Used Assumptions for Groundwater Use Estimation

Items	Unit	Data Source
Unit Population	1.93 capita/ha	Hydrocensus
Unit Consumption		
Domestic		
Commercial Farms	400 Litter/day/capita	Hydrocensus
Communal Land	30 Litter/day/capita	Chap.10
Stock Watering		
SS	8 Litter/day/head	Hydrocensus
LS	37 Litter/day/head	Hydrocensus
Irrigation	28m ³ /day/ha	Permit Holders
Carrying Capacity		
SS	3ha/head	Hydrocensus
LS	16ha/head	Hydrocensus
Ratio of SS / LS	12.29	Hydrocensus

Table 12-17 Present Groundwater Use

Domestic Use	Population	Unit Consumption (Litter/day/capita)	Groundwater Use (m ³ /day)	Groundwater Use (thousand m ³ /a)
Commercial Farms	14,089	400	4,368	1,594
Communal Land	11,588 ^{*)}	30	348	127
Village Centres (NamWater Scheme)	—	—	1,739	635
Subtotal	—	—	6,455	2,356
Stock Watering Use	Head	Unit Consumption (Litter/day/head)	Groundwater Use (m ³ /day)	Groundwater Use (thousand m ³ /a)
SS	1,415,675	8	11,326	4,134
LS	115,221	37	4,263	1,556
Subtotal	—	—	15,589	5,690
Irrigation Use	Area (ha)	Unit Consumption (m ³ /day/ha)	Groundwater Use (m ³ /day)	Groundwater Use (thousand m ³ /a)
Permit Holders	—	—	14,578	5,321
Others	153.2	28	4,290	1,566
Subtotal	—	—	18,868	6,887
Total			Groundwater Use (m ³ /day)	Groundwater Use (thousand m ³ /a)
			40,912	14,933

*) See Table 12-20

Table 12-18 Procedure of Groundwater Use Dividing into Aquifers

Priority	Borehole Information	Decision of Aquifer	Number of Wells
1	Screen depth	Aquifer in which screen exists	28
2	Borehole depth	Aquifer in which bottom of borehole exists	3,405
3	Water strike depth	Aquifer in which deepest water strike occurred	17
4	Water strike aquifer	Aquifer in which deepest water strike occurred	135
5	No information	Unconfined (Kalahari) Aquifer	1,648
Total			5,233

Table 12-19 Present Groundwater Use by Aquifer

Use	Unit	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Total	%
Domestic	m ³ /d	4,426	1,546	483	6,455	15.8
	1000m ³ /a	1,615	564	176	2,356	
	%	68.6	24.0	7.5	100.0	
Stock Watering	m ³ /d	12,580	2,954	55	15,589	38.1
	1000m ³ /a	4,592	1,078	20	5,690	
	%	80.7	18.9	0.4	100.0	
Irrigation	m ³ /d	9,733	9,122	13	18,868	46.1
	1000m ³ /a	3,553	3,330	5	6,887	
	%	51.6	48.3	0.1	100.0	
Total	m ³ /d	26,739	13,622	551	40,912	100.0
	1000m ³ /a	9,760	4,972	201	14,933	
	%	65.4	33.3	1.3	100.0	

Table 12-20 Estimation Sources of Groundwater Use Variation 1990-1999

Year	Commercial Farms * ¹⁾	Communal Land		Stock Watering* ⁸⁾ (m ³ /a)	Irrigation* ¹¹⁾ (million m ³ /a)
		Aminuis* ⁴⁾	Nama Land* ⁶⁾		
1989	-	-	-	883,600* ⁹⁾	-
1990	13,260	7,670	1,800	867,479	2.193018
1991	13,350* ²⁾	7,830* ⁵⁾	1,850	851,652	2.427783
1992	13,440	8,000	1,910	836,113	2.68768
1993	13,530	8,170	1,960	820,859	2.9754
1994	13,620	8,340	2,010	805,882	3.29392
1995	13,720	8,520	2,070	791,179	-
1996	13,800	8,700	2,130	776,744	-
1997	13,900	8,890	2,190	762,572	-
1998	14,000	9,080	2,250	748,659	-
1999	14,090* ³⁾	9,280	2,310* ⁷⁾	735,000* ¹⁰⁾	-

1) Annual growth 0.68%

2) Population and Housing Census 1991

3) Estimated number based on the Hydrocensus (excluding R0132/A+R0134+R0249/Rem)

4) Annual growth 2.14%

5) From Chap. 10

6) Annual growth 2.48%

7) Estimated number based on the Hydrocensus (population of M0120+R0237+M0238)

8) Annual growth -1.82%

9) Based on the Hydrocensus 1986-1989, Area 1-3 (Table 12-22)

10) Based on the Hydrocensus

11) Exponential function approximation $y=2.9754\text{Exp}(0.1017x)$

Table 12-21 Results of Hydrocensus 1986-1989

		Area 1	Area 2	Area3	Total	
Surveyed Area		5140	8095	7500	20735	
Number of Farms		62	117	99	278	
Number of Wells		563	439	836	1838	
Number of Stocks	Large	8000	-	12000	-	
	Small	122000	-	16000	-	
Irrigation Area (ha)		330.0	13.4	40.0	383.4	
Groundwater Use (m ³ /year)	Domestic	200000	700000	530000	1430000	15%
	Stock Water	300000	370000	440000	1110000	12%
	Irrigation	6100000	240000	570000	6910000	73%
	Total	6600000	1310000	1540000	9450000	100%
Aquifer (m ³ /year)	Kalahari	400000	710000	1490000	2600000	28%
	Artesian	6200000	600000	50000	6850000	72%

Source: Geohydrology Division, Department of Water Affairs, South West Africa/Namibia, 1986; 1987; 1989

Unit Consumption, Large Stock: 35Liter/d/head, Small Stock: 5Liter/d/head
Irrigation: 50m³/d/ha (Drip Irrigation 16.7 m³/d/ha)

Table 12-22 Comparison of Results of Hydrocensus between 1986-1989
and 1999

1986-1989 (A)	Area1	Area2	Area3	Total
Farms	55	68	72	195
Wells	505	323	636	1464
Irrigation Area (ha)	320.8	21.3	16.5	358.6
Drip Irrigation Area (ha)				
Domestic Use (m ³ /a)	216200	396600	499000	1111800
Stock Water (m ³ /a)	271900	234800	376900	883600
Irrigation Use (m ³ /a)	5853700	389500	300200	6543400
Total (m ³ /a)	6341800	1020900	1176100	8538800
1999 (B)	Area1	Area2	Area3	Total
Farms	99	73	89	261
Wells	497	342	721	1560
People	1815	795	1077	3687
Large Stock	3750	4964	4950	13664
Small Stock	95928	91605	120306	307839
Irrigation Area (ha)	408.7	40.0	31.8	480.5
Production of Permit Holders (m ³ /a) ¹⁾	1090991	69136	0	1160127
Converted Irrigation Area (ha) ²⁾	72.9	4.6	0.0	77.5
Total (ha)	481.6	44.6	31.8	558.0
Drip Irrigation Area (ha)	110.0	2.0	18.0	130.0
Domestic Use (m ³ /a)	248800	205700	159500	614000
Stock Water (m ³ /a)	221600	230600	282800	735000
Irrigation Use (m ³ /a) ³⁾	8789200	813950	580350	10183500
Irrigation Use (m ³ /a) ⁴⁾	7450867	705700	360400	8516967
Total -1 (m ³ /a) ⁵⁾	7921267	1142000	802700	9865967
Total -2 (m ³ /a) ⁶⁾	9259600	1250250	1022650	11532500
Farms (B)/(A)	180%	107%	124%	134%
Wells (B)/(A)	98%	106%	113%	107%
Irrigated Area (B)/(A)	150%	209%	193%	156%
Domestic Use (B)/(A)	115%	52%	32%	55%
Stock Water (B)/(A)	82%	98%	75%	83%
Irrigation Use (B)3)/(A)	150%	209%	193%	156%
Irrigation Use (B)4)/(A)	127%	181%	120%	130%
Total-1/(A)	125%	112%	68%	116%
Total-2/(A)	146%	122%	87%	135%

1) Farms without Hydrocensus record, but with permit

2) Using unit consumption of 41m³/d/ha

3) Unit consumption: 50m³/d/ha

4) Unit consumption: 50m³/d/ha, Drip Irrigation: 16.7m³/d/ha

5) Using Irrigation use 4)

6) Using Irrigation use 3)

Table 12-23 Variation of Groundwater Use

Year	Domestic Use (m ³ /day)				Stock Watering (m ³ /day)				Irrigation Use (m ³ /day)				Groundwater Use (m ³ /day)			
	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Subtotal	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Subtotal	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Subtotal	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Total
1990	4228	1219	492	5939	14848	3486	65	18398	3856	3614	5	7475	22931	8319	561	31812
1991	4205	1180	474	5859	14577	3422	63	18063	4269	4001	6	8275	23051	8603	542	32196
1992	4201	1252	628	6081	14311	3360	62	17733	4726	4429	6	9161	23238	9041	696	32975
1993	4132	1237	629	5998	14050	3299	61	17410	5231	4903	7	10141	23413	9439	697	33549
1994	4210	1208	667	6086	13793	3239	60	17092	6157	5149	8	11313	24161	9596	735	34491
1995	4340	1262	562	6164	13542	3179	59	16780	7216	5881	9	13106	25098	10323	630	36051
1996	4365	1160	553	6078	13295	3121	58	16474	9626	6758	11	16396	27285	11040	621	38947
1997	4305	1201	553	6059	13052	3065	57	16173	8215	5657	9	13881	25572	9923	619	36114
1998	4344	1598	406	6348	12814	3009	56	15878	10307	8543	13	18862	27464	13150	474	41088
1999	4426	1546	483	6455	12580	2954	55	15589	9733	9122	13	18868	26739	13622	551	40912
Year	Domestic Use (1000m ³ /year)				Stock Watering (1000m ³ /year)				Irrigation Use 1000(m ³ /year)				Groundwater Use (1000m ³ /year)			
	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Subtotal	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Subtotal	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Subtotal	Kalahari	Auob	Nossob	Total
1990	1543	445	180	2168	5419	1272	24	6715	1407	1319	2	2728	8370	3037	205	11611
1991	1535	431	173	2138	5321	1249	23	6593	1558	1460	2	3020	8413	3140	198	11752
1992	1533	457	229	2220	5223	1226	23	6473	1725	1617	2	3344	8482	3300	254	12036
1993	1508	452	230	2189	5128	1204	22	6354	1909	1790	2	3702	8546	3445	254	12245
1994	1537	441	243	2221	5035	1182	22	6239	2247	1879	3	4129	8819	3503	268	12589
1995	1584	461	205	2250	4943	1161	21	6125	2634	2147	3	4784	9161	3768	230	13158
1996	1593	424	202	2218	4853	1139	21	6013	3514	2467	4	5984	9959	4030	227	14216
1997	1571	438	202	2212	4764	1119	21	5903	2998	2065	3	5067	9334	3622	226	13181
1998	1586	583	148	2317	4677	1098	20	5796	3762	3118	5	6885	10025	4800	173	14997
1999	1615	564	176	2356	4592	1078	20	5690	3553	3330	5	6887	9760	4972	201	14933