



Arab Republic of Egypt
Mansoura University
Faculty of Agriculture
Dept. of Agri. Engineering



Distribution Of Agricultural Crops Using Water Footprint and Virtual Water Analyses Model

By

ASMAA ALI KHALIL HAMED

B. Sc. in Agric., Eng., Mansoura University., 2012

M. Sc. in Agric. Sciences (Agric., Eng.), Mansoura University., 2015

A Thesis

Submitted In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

**AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE
(AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING)**

Supervisors

Prof. Dr.

Hesham Nagy Abdelmageed

Prof. of Farm Machinery and Power,
Agricultural Engineering Department,
Faculty of Agriculture,
Mansoura University

Prof. Dr.

Mohamed Maher Mohamed

Prof. of On-farm Irrigation and Drainage
Engineering, Agricultural Engineering Dept.
Faculty of Agriculture,
Mansoura University

Dr.

Hashem Mohamed Mahmoud

Researcher of On-farm Irrigation and
Drainage Engineering, On-farm Irrigation
and Drainage Engineering Department,
Agricultural Engineering Research Institute,
Agricultural Research Center

2022

CONTENTS

	Pages
CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2- REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
2.1 Background	3
2.2 water scarcity	3
2.3 Integrated water management (IWRM)	4
2.4 Irrigation water management	5
2.5 Concept of Water footprint and virtual water trade	6
2.5.1 water footprint concept	6
2.5.2 Trade of virtual water concept	7
2.6 Water footprint analysis	7
2.6.1 Water footprint analysis estimation based on the Water Footprint Assessment Manual	7
2.6.2 Water footprint analysis estimation based on new methods	21
2.7 Virtual water trade analysis studies	33
2.8 Crops pattern distribution methods	37
2.9 Water footprint and virtual water analysis estimators	39
CHAPTER 3- METHODOLOGY	42
3.1 First Module: water footprint analysis	42
3.1.1 crop evapotranspiration calculations	43
3.1.1.1 reference evapotranspiration	43
3.1.1.2 adjusted crop evapotranspiration	44
3.1.2 Gross irrigation [mm]	46
3.1.2.1 Effective rainfall	46
3.1.2.2 Leaching requirements	47
3.1.2.3 Application efficiency	48
3.1.2.4 Gross irrigation water depth (D_g , mm)	49
3.1.3 Total water footprint (m^3/ton)	50
3.1.3.1 Estimate the green-blue crop water requirements	50
3.1.3.2 Estimate the green and blue water footprint	51
3.1.3.3 Grey water footprint calculation	51
3.1.3.4 The total water footprint for crop or product	51
3.1.4 Economic water productivity of a product	53
3.2 Second Module: Virtual water trade analysis	54
3.2.1 Insert crop / product trade balance data	54
3.2.2 Estimate exported water footprint, exported economic water productivity, and exported virtual water	55
3.2.3 Estimate imported water footprint, imported economic water productivity, and imported virtual water	56
3.2.4 Estimate the virtual water trade balance for each crop / product	56
3.2.5 Estimate the nation's water footprint, water self-sufficiency, and water dependency	57

3.3 Third Module: Distributing crops on cultivated area/nation	58
3.3.1 Distributing one crop on cultivated area/nation	58
3.3.1.1 Generate study area map	58
3.3.1.2 Water footprint (WF) calculation for study area	59
3.3.1.3 Crop distribution scenarios according to WF indicator	60
3.3.2 Distributing many crops on cultivated area/nation	61
3.3.2.1 Generate a study area map	62
3.3.2.2 WF calculation for study area	62
3.3.2.3 Choose the most efficient crop distribution scenario	62
3.4 Statistical analysis	63
3.5 CVWAM Model flowchart	64
3.6 Model interfaces	67
3.6.1 Water footprint analysis module interfaces	67
3.6.2 Virtual water trade analysis module interfaces	73
3.6.3 Distributing one/many crops on cultivated area/nation module	76
CHAPTER 4- RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	80
4.1 crop water footprint analysis module	80
4.1.1 study area	80
4.1.2 Data preparation	81
4.1.3 Cropping area	82
4.1.4 Green and blue crop water requirements	83
4.1.5 Green, blue, and grey Water Footprint	90
4.1.6 Total Water Footprint	95
4.1.7 Economic water productivity	100
4.1.8 Module Calibration and verification	105
4.1.8.1 reference evapotranspiration Calibration	105
4.1.8.2 Net irrigation calibration	110
4.2 Virtual water trade analysis module	114
4.2.1 Study Area	115
4.2.2 Data preparation	115
4.2.3 Detailed trade matrix balance for agricultural products:	116
4.2.3.1 Import and Export quantity trade and value:	116
4.2.3.2 Water footprint and virtual water trade for agricultural products	118
4.2.3.3 Imported and exported economic water productivity for agricultural products	125
4.2.3.4 Net virtual water imports for agricultural products	125
4.2.3.5 Water self-sufficiency and water dependency for agricultural products	125
4.2.4 Detailed trade matrix balance per each country	130
4.2.5 Detailed trade matrix balance per continent	132
4.3 Distributing one/many crops on cultivated area/nation module	133

4.3.1 Data preparation	133
4.3.2 Crop water footprint index	134
4.3.3 Optimized crop pattern according to water footprint (Egypt case study)	135
4.3.3.1 The effect of water footprint and water use efficiency (first constraint) on crop pattern	135
4.3.3.2 The effect of water footprint and water self-sufficiency (The second constraint) on crop pattern	148
4.3.3.3 The effect of water footprint , water use efficiency, and water self-sufficiency (The first and second constraints) on crop pattern	157
4.3.4 Optimized crop pattern according to water footprint (Dakhlia governorate case study)	165
4.3.4.1 The effect of water footprint and water use efficiency (first constraint) on crop pattern	166
4.3.4.2 The effect of water footprint and water self-sufficiency (second constraint) on crop pattern	167
CHAPTER 5- SUMMARY AND CONCLUTIONS	170
5.1 First module: Crop Water Footprint Analysis	170
5.2 Virtual water trade analysis module	171
5.3 Distributing many crops on cultivated area/nation module	173
REFERENCES	176
APPENDISES	204
ARABIC SUMMARY	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Pages
3.1	Available water holding capacity (AW) (mm/m) for soil types according to	48
3.2	Typical values of application efficiency for different irrigation systems	49
4.1	Average green and blue crop water requirement of crops for all governorates in Egypt year 2017	90
4.2	Countries recommended imported/exported into Egypt according to VWT analysis in 2017	131
4.3	Total planted area of each governorate for winter and summer seasons in Egypt year 2017	137
4.4	Total production of each crop for winter and summer seasons in Egypt year 2017	139
4.5	water self-sufficiency and water dependency of each crop understudy in Egypt year 2017 in the current situation	148
4.6	The production changes of each crop understudy under scenarios S2 and S3 in Egypt year 2017	156
4.7	The production changes of each crop understudy under scenarios S5 and S6 in Egypt year 2017	164
4.8	The planted of each crop understudy under scenarios S1 and S2 in Dakhlia over the year 2017	166
4.9	The planted of each crop understudy under scenarios S4 and S5 in Dakhlia over the year 2017	168

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Pages
3.1	Diagram for steps of the first module (water footprint analysis).	42
3.2	Flowchart for generating study area map steps	60
3.3	Flowchart for steps of the first module (water footprint analysis).	64
3.4	Flowchart for steps of the second module (virtual water trade analysis).	65
3.5	Flowchart for steps of the third module (Distributing crops on cultivated area/nation)	66
4.1	The Case study; Africa, Egypt governorates	81
4.2	The planted area for summer crops in Egypt in 2017 (EAS-MALR, Volumes 2017–2018)	84
4.3	The planted area for Nili crops in Egypt in 2017 (EAS-MALR, Volumes 2017– 2018)	85
4.4	The planted area for winter crops in Egypt in 2017 (EAS-MALR, Volumes 2017– 2018)	85
4.5	The blue crop water requirement of summer crops in 2017	86
4.6	The blue crop water requirement of Nili crops in 2017	88
4.7	The blue crop water requirement of winter crops in 2017	89
4.8	The green, blue and grey water footprint of summer crops for each governorate in Egypt year 2017	92
4.9	The green, blue, and grey water footprint of Nili Crops for each governorate in Egypt year 2017	93
4.10	The green, blue, and grey water footprint of Winter Crops for each governorate in Egypt year 2017	94
4.11	The average green, blue, and grey water footprint crops under study in Egypt year 2017	95
4.12	The Total water footprint for summer crops in Egypt year 2017	96
4.13	The total water footprint for nili crops in Egypt year 2017	98
4.14	The total water footprint for winter crops in Egypt year 2017	99
4.15	The average total water footprint for crops in Egypt year 2017	100
4.16	The economic water productivity of summer crops for each governorate in Egypt year 2017	101
4.17	The economic water productivity of nili crops for each governorate in Egypt year 2017	103
4.18	The economic water productivity of winter crops for each governorate in Egypt year 2017	104
4.19	Reference Evapotranspiration for crops under study in Egypt in 2017 by using the CVWAM model and its calibration with CROPWAT 8.0	105
4.20	The Calibration of net irrigation data from the CVWAM model and CROPWAT 8.0 model for crops under study in Egypt in 2017	111
4.21	Crop trade quantity and value for 70 crops in Egypt in 2017	119
4.22	Water footprint and virtual water trade for 70 crops in Egypt in 2017	123
4.23	The imported and exported economic water productivity for 70 crops in Egypt in 2017	126

4.24	Net virtual import for 70 crops in Egypt in 2017	128
4.25	Water self-sufficiency and water dependency (%) for 70 crops in Egypt in 2017	129
4.26	Exported and imported virtual water trade in agricultural products between Egypt and continents in 2017	132
4.27	Exported and imported economic water productivity in agricultural products between Egypt and continents in 2017	132
4.28	The flow chart for crop pattern scenarios under study	133
4.29	Average water footprint for winter crops under current situation and scenario with 10% increase in water use efficiency	135
4.30	Average water footprint for nili and summer crops under current situation and scenario with 10% increase in water use efficiency	135
4.31	Cropping pattern for each winter crop under current situation, scenario S1 and scenario S4 in Egypt 2017	140
4.32	Cropping pattern for each summer and nili crop under current situation, scenario S1 and scenario S4 in Egypt 2017	141
4.33	Cropping pattern for winter season under current situation in Egypt 2017	143
4.34	Cropping pattern for winter season under scenario S1 in Egypt 2017	143
4.35	Cropping pattern for winter season under scenario S4 in Egypt 2017	144
4.36	Cropping pattern for summer season under current situation in Egypt 2017	144
4.37	Cropping pattern for summer season under scenario S1 in Egypt 2017	145
4.38	Cropping pattern for summer season under scenario S4 in Egypt 2017	145
4.39	Water use by summer and winter crops under scenarios S1 and S4 compared with the current situation in Egypt 2017	147
4.40	Cropping pattern for each winter crop under current situation, scenario S2 and scenario S3 in Egypt 2017	151
4.41	Cropping pattern for each summer and nili crop under current situation, scenario S2 and scenario S3 in Egypt 2017	152
4.42	Water use by summer and winter crops under scenarios S2 and S3 compared with the current situation in Egypt 2017	155
4.43	Cropping pattern for each winter crop under current situation, scenario S5 and scenario S6 in Egypt 2017	159
4.44	Cropping pattern for each summer and nili crop under current situation, scenario S5 and scenario S6 in Egypt 2017	160
4.45	Water use by summer and winter crops under scenarios S5 and S6 compared with the current situation in Egypt 2017	163
4.46	Cropping pattern for summer season under scenarios S1 and S2 in Dakahlia 2017	166
4.47	Cropping pattern for summer season under scenarios S4 and S5 in Dakahlia 2017	168

LIST OF PLATES

Plate		Pages
3.1	CVWAM model start page	67
3.2	Reference evapotranspiration (mm/period) and effective rainfall (mm/period) calculations in Tool 7, module 1	68
3.3	Fertilizer application rate, crop yield, planted date, and economic water productivity data for each crop in Tool 7, module 1	68
3.4	Crop evapotranspiration calculations for each crop in each region in Tool 7, module 1	69
3.5	Soil data, soil conditions options, and irrigation management for each crop in each region in Tool 7, module 1	70
3.6	Net and gross irrigation output data for each crop in each region in Tool 7, module 1	71
3.7	Green, blue, grey, and total water footprint output data for each crop in each region in Tool 7, module 1	71
3.8	Energetic and economic water productivity output data for each crop in each region in Tool 7, module 1	72
3.9	product trade matrix, and annual consumption for each crop input data in Tool 1, module 2	73
3.10	Product fraction, exported and imported water footprint for each product input data in Tool 1, module 2	74
3.11	imported and exported virtual water for each product from/ to each country output data in Tool 1, module 2	74
3.12	Virtual water trade balance for agriculture products and crops output data in Tool 1, module 2	75
3.13	Virtual water trade balance for each country output data in Tool 1, module 2	75
3.14	Nation water footprint, total exported and imported virtual water for each crop output data in Tool 1, module 2	76
3.15	Reference evapotranspiration and effective rainfall calculations in Tool 2, module 3.	77
3.16	fertilizer application, optimum and actual crop yield, and plant date in Tool 2, module 3	77
3.17	Soil data and irrigation scheduling as input data and total gross irrigation as output data in Tool 2, module 3	78
3.18	Water footprint estimation for crops in each polygon in Tool 2, module 3	78
3.19	Crop distribution limitations and final scenario of crop pattern in Tool 2, module 3	79

List of symbols

K_y	A yield response factor, [dimensionless]
e_a	Actual vapour pressure, [kPa]
NJS	Agriculture-based northern Jiangsu
PERC	Amount of percolation and seepage losses, [mm]
SAT	Amount of water to saturate the soil by land preparation by puddling, [mm]
cons _{annual}	Annual consumption in the interested country, [ton/capita]
E_a	Application efficiency, [%]
AW	Available water holding capacity, [mm/m]
T	Average air temperature, [°C]
WF _{blue}	Blue water footprint, [m ³ /ton]
BWS	Blue water scarcity
E	Class is the highest value
A	Class is the lowest value
K_s	Crop coefficient by the water stress coefficient, [dimensionless]
K_c	Crop coefficient, [dimensionless]
ET _{c adj}	Crop evapotranspiration under soil water stress conditions, [mm / day]
P _{crop}	Crop price, [\$/ton]
T _{crop}	Crop trade, [ton/year]
CVWAM	Crop virtual water analysis model
CWR	Crop water requirement
CWR	Crop water requirement (either green or blue), [m ³ /ha]
CWU	Crop water use
R	Daily rainfall, [mm / day]
Z_r	Development stage effective root zoon depth, [m]
R_e	Effective rainfall, [mm/ day]
EC _w	Electrical conductivity of the irrigation water, [dS/m]
EC _{c threshold}	Electrical conductivity of the saturation extract at the threshold of EC _e when crop yield first reduces below min yield, [dS/m].
Eng	Energetic water productivity, [kcal/m ³]
EN _{output}	Energy output of the crop, [kcal/ton]
P _{EN}	Energy price, [\$/kcal]
ESRI	Environmental Systems Research Institute
ET	Evapotranspiration
a	Fixed percentage insert by user which range (0.7-0.9)
GADM	Global Administrative Areas
LULC	Global map of land use/land cover
WF _{green}	Green water footprint, [m ³ /ton]
GWS	Green water scarcity
Dg	Gross irrigation water depth, [mm]
V.W.I	Imported virtual water, [m ³ /year]
SJS	Industry-based southern Jiangsu
IWRM	Integrated water management
LR	Leaching requirement, [mm / day]
LCA	Life cycle assessment

Max EC _e	Maximum tolerable Electrical conductivity of the soil saturation extract, [dS/m]
EC _e	Mean electrical conductivity of the saturation extract for the root zone, [dS / m]
CJS	Middle-type central Jiangsu
MU	Municipal unit
R _n	Net radiation, [MJ / m ² day]
NVWI	Net virtual water trade, [m ³ /year]
A _{CP}	Planted area for each crop in each polygon (he)
P _{CP}	Production for each crop in each polygon (ton)
γ	Psychrometric constant, [kPa / °C]
RAW	Readily available water, [mm]
b	Reduction in yield per increase in EC _e , [% / (dS / m)]
ET _o	Reference evapotranspiration [mm/day]
D _{ri}	Rice soil water depletion on day i, [mm]
D _(ri-1)	Rice soil water depletion on day i-1, [mm]
D _r	Root zone depletion, [mm]
e _s	Saturation vapor pressure derived from air temperature, [kPa]
Δ	Slope of the vapour pressure curve, [kPa/ °C]
G	Soil heat flux density [MJ / m ² day]
p	Soil water depletion fraction, [%]
D _i	Soil water depletion on day i, [mm]
D _{i-1}	Soil water depletion on day i-1, [mm]
Appl	The application rate of chemicals to the field per hectare, [kg/ha]
CWE	The comprehensive water efficiency
CPWF	The crop production water footprint
Y	The crop yield, [ton/ha]
C.W.P	The economic water productivity, [\$/m ³]
C.W.P _{Ex}	The exported economic water productivity, [\$/m ³]
WF _{Exported country}	The exported water footprint, [m ³ /ton]
WF _{grey}	The grey water footprint, [m ³ /ton]
C.W.P _{Imp}	The imported economic water productivity
VW	The imported virtual water
WF _{import country}	The imported water footprint, [m ³ /ton]
GIS	The integration of geographic information systems
α	The leaching-run-off fraction, [dimensionless]
c _{max}	The maximum acceptable concentration for Nitrogen, [kg/m ³]
c _{nat}	The natural concentration for Nitrogen, [kg/m ³]
NCP	The North China Plain
h	The Plant height for each growth stage, [m]
F _{prod}	The product fraction, [dimensionless]
SWAT	The Soil and Water Assessment Tool
WF _{tot}	The total water footprint, [m ³ /ton]
WD	The water dependency, [%]
WF _{prod}	The water footprint of a product, [m ³ /ton]
WSS	The water self-sufficiency, [%]
C _{ha}	Total costs per hectare, [\$/ha]
C _{ton}	Total costs per ton, [\$/ton]

A_{crop}	Total planted area
P_{total}	Total production
TAW	Total root zone available water, [mm]
WU_{crop}	Total water use for a crop
WU	Total water use for a crop, [m ³ /year]
UTRB	Upper Tigris river basin
$e_s - e_a$	Vapour pressure deficit, [kPa]
V.W.X	Virtual water exported, [m ³ /year]
Ec_w	Water electrical conductivity
WF	Water footprint
WFA	Water footprint assessment
WFN	Water footprint network
WFP	Water footprint of crop production
WU_{CP}	Water footprint used by each crop for each polygon (m ³ of water)
WPL	Water pollution level
WUBR	Water use benefit ratio
WUER	Water use efficiency ratio
u_2	Wind speed 2 m above the ground surface, [m/s]

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

By Appreciating the water footprint and virtual water trade analysis, many problems (such as inefficient water use, water scarcity, Poor irrigation water management, and bad trade decisions for crops) could be solved. These analyses linked a lot of sectors and issues together so, researchers face great difficulty in using water footprint analysis to overcome the poor integrated water management in water-scarce countries. Water footprint and virtual water trade analysis are used as an index for irrigation consumption and irrigation efficiency; however, this analysis can be used as an integrated water management tool. So, Crop Virtual Water Analysis Model (CVWAM model) was designed and developed using Microsoft visual studio 2019 (C sharp language). The model was divided into three modules:

- 1- First module: Crop Water Footprint Analysis
- 2- Second module: Virtual Water Trade Analysis
- 3- Third module: Distributing one/many crops on cultivated area/nation module

5.1 First module: Crop Water Footprint Analysis

The calculation steps for the module were based on the Water Footprint Assessment Manual (**Hoekstra *et al.*, 2011**). This module is divided into eight tools, each tool contained three choices (one/many crops, one/many years, and one/many regions). These multiple tools help users to identify the main objective of analysis.

As a case study of this module, the water footprint and virtual water flow analyses for summer, nili, and winter seasons were evaluated for Egypt over 2017 by using the CVWAM model. The chosen summer and nili crops were potato, tomato, cotton, maize, sunflower, groundnut, and soybeans. While studying crops in the winter season were clover, flax, wheat, potato, and tomato.

The results indicated that cotton had the highest blue water footprint (4556.75 m³/ton) due to the growth period, followed by groundnuts and sunflowers about 2486.8 and 222.9 m³/ton. While the lowest blue water footprint was for potato nili, potato winter and clover (53.29, 129.3, and 181.6 m³/ton, respectively) due to climatic conditions and crop requirements. The output data for blue water footprint agreed with **El-Marsafawy and Mohamed, 2021**. The green water footprint depends on yield, governorate rainfall

data, and the period of crop growth. The highest green water footprint was for wheat, and cotton about 18.3 and 13.01 m³/ton. Grey water footprint depends on yield and fertilizer application rate for each crop, it was observed flax and clover have the lowest grey water footprint about 2.98 and 5.30 m³/ton. The highest value for grey water footprint is about 90.94 m³/ton for Cotton.

In the summer season, cotton had the highest total water footprint and the lowest Yield (about 4660.71 m³/ton). While the lowest total water footprint (62.94 m³/ton) was founded on potato nili. However, in the winter season, the highest yield was for clover, which had a lower water footprint of about 190.01 m³/ton.

Reference evapotranspiration was estimated by the CVWAM model and calibrated with CROPWAT 8.0 model. A very good correlation was found between the Two models. This calibration was conducted to reference evapotranspiration for each governorate in Egypt and the overall R-square value for reference evapotranspiration was about 0.99.

To make sure that the water footprint calculated using the CVWAM model was accurate, the net irrigation was estimated by the model for each crop in each governorate in Egypt. Then the output data compared with CROPWAT8.0 model data. The overall R-square value for net irrigation between the CVWAM model and CROPWAT 8.0 model was about 0.97.

5.2 Virtual water trade analysis module:

Virtual water trade is a highly complex index because many sectors are linked together. Virtual water trade is influenced by water resources per capita, arable land, geographic distance, and population. So, virtual water trade analysis needs more concentration and observation to make correct decisions.

Virtual water trade (VWT) methodology would be conducted as set out by **Chapagain and Hoekstra (2003; 2004)**. This module is divided into two tools. The first one is virtual water trade for one country (one product/crop or many products/crops), however, the second one is virtual water trade for many countries (one product/crop or many products/crops). The main goal of this module is to estimate virtual water trade easily moreover provides a chance to concentrate on results analysis and future challenges.

As a case study for this module, Egypt's VWT for 149 agricultural products derived from 70 crops in 2017. Detailed results from this analysis were discussed from three perspectives:

a. VWT analysis for crops

According to the results, we should stop importing the following crops: for example, in the cereals group, maize and sweet corn had exported economic water productivity (6.83 and 2.61\$/m³) higher than imported ones (0.27 and 0.61\$/m³). All crops' Forages, Oil, and Fibre crops group, they are better to be export, but flax, cotton, and cotton seed had the highest export economic water productivity (about 3.06, 1.2, and 0.94 \$/m³, respectively). In the Fruit Trees group, olive, peaches, and apples had imported economic water productivity lower than exported. In the Legumes, Roots, and Tubers group, sugarcane, potatoes, peas, chilies, and beans had shipped economic water productivity (16.12, 6.53, 3.5, 2.75, and 2.26 \$/m³) higher than the imported ones. In the Perennial Vegetable and Small Vegetable group, strawberries, tomatoes, watermelon, onion, pumpkins, eggplants, and cauliflowers had more economic productivity for exported quantity units than the imported ones. In Tropical Fruits and Trees, pineapple and banana had imported economic water productivity (3.1 and 0.99 \$/m³) lower than exported one.

b. VWT analysis for countries

For trade strategy between Egypt and world countries, the suggestions have been built on the economic water index because it depends on the water footprint and economic value. From the observed situation in 2017, Ukraine had the highest import VWT with Egypt about 26.85% of total import VWT. Followed by the United States, Australia, Bulgaria, Paraguay, Russia, Uruguay, South Korea, Italy, Spain, and Brazil, where they had 53.45% of total import VWT. However, the export VWT from Egypt to Djibouti was 7.58% of the total export VWT, the highest quantity. About 51.79% of total export VWT was traded from Egypt to Jordan, Qatar, Poland, Russia, Kuwait, Iraq, Oman, United States, Mauritius, Netherlands, Palestinian National Authority, Pakistan, and Germany.

The recommended situation according to economic water productivity (CWP), a 10 \$/m³ of CWP or higher was observed when agricultural products were exported from Egypt to the following countries: Malawi, Togo, Brunei, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Guatemala,

Rwanda, Ethiopia, Namibia, Nepal, Eritrea. On the other hand, Norway, Iran, Afghanistan, Eritrea, Belize, Benin, Burkina Faso, Turkmenistan, Qatar, Ecuador, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Colombia, Honduras, and Croatia had imported CWP of less than 0.5 $\$/\text{m}^3$ when import to Egypt.

c. VWT analysis for the continent

Africa had the highest export CWP (6.28 $\$/\text{m}^3$) and the lowest import CWP (0.44 $\$/\text{m}^3$), so the analysis recommended trading more agricultural products with Africa.

Future factors should be more interesting in virtual water trade, such as the opening of the economy, Sustainable agricultural practices in all countries, and water endowment. Furthermore, comparing this data with global trade and with the national water supply and demand in Egypt. Also, these results need to link with the driving Forces of virtual water trade in Egypt, such as social pressures, physical variables, political forces, customer taste, and quality of products coming from other countries, or exported from Egypt. Finally, the CVWAM model can help to get a virtual water trade analysis for any region or product with little effort, so we save effort and time to insert all previous sectors to analyse and build an optimal nation virtual water trade scenario.

5.3 Distributing many crops on cultivated area/nation module:

This Module consists of two main objectives (analysis for cultivated area and analysis for the nation) so, its divided into two tools as follows:

1. Distributing one crop on cultivated area/nation
2. Distributing many crops on cultivated area/nation

This module, water footprint analysis was employed to find optimal crop planting structures with the objectives of getting minimum total water use and highest economic water productivity. The module variables are water footprint for each crop under study, soil texture, soil salinity, and irrigation method.

As a case study for this module, six scenarios were defined to optimize Egypt's crop pattern, subject to two general constraints. The first constraint is water use efficiency (WUE) and the second one is water self-sufficiency (WSS). The first constraint was

applied as increasing WUE by 10%, however, the second constraint was considered two levels of increasing WSS by 10% and 20%. The six scenarios were defined as follows:

1. S1: Crop reallocated, Fixed WUE, Fixed WSS.
2. S2: Crop reallocated, Fixed WUE, With 10% WSS increase.
3. S3: Crop reallocated, Fixed WUE, With 20% WSS increase.
4. S4: Crop reallocated, With 10% WUE increase, Fixed WSS.
5. S5: Crop reallocated, With 10% WUE increase, 10% WSS increase.
6. S6: Crop reallocated, With 10% WUE increase, 20% WSS increase

The results indicated that:

- In comparing the current situation and scenarios S1 and S4:

The total water use for all winter crops in the current situation was about 14.57 billion m³ however in scenarios S1 and S4 was about 13.83 and 11.31 billion m³. Therefore, the water saving was about 0.74 and 3.27 billion m³ when scenario S1 and S4 were applied. In addition to that, the total water use for all summer crops in the current situation was about 23.12 billion m³ however in scenarios S1 and S4 were about 22.64 and 19.28 billion m³, respectively. Scenario S1 produced the same quantity of crops with saving in water and area, without any changes in water footprint in the current situation. The total water uses for all winter crops decreased by 22.41% when water use efficiency increased by 10% in scenario S4. So, it's recommended to use scenarios S1 and S4 because these scenarios achieved the objectives of this module.

- In comparing the current situation and scenarios S2 and S3:

The total water use for all winter crops in the current situation was about 14.57 billion m³ however in scenarios S2 and S3 was about 20.9 and 20.5 billion m³. In addition to that, the total water use for all summer crops in the current situation was about 23.12 billion m³ however in scenarios S2 and S3 were about 27.40 and 30.40 billion m³. Scenarios S2 and S3 produced a higher quantity of crops than the current situation due to an increase of about 10% and 20% in WSS, without any changes in water footprint in the current situation.

- In comparing the current situation and scenarios S5 and S6:

The total water use for all winter crops in the current situation was about 14.57 billion m³ however in scenarios S5 and S6 was about 18.40 and 17.84 billion m³. In

addition to that, the total water use for all summer crops in the current situation was about 23.12 billion m³ however in scenarios S5 and S6 were about 23.60 and 25.58 billion m³. Scenarios S5 and S6 produced a higher quantity of crops than the current situation due to increase of about 10% and 20% in WSS, with changes in water footprint according to increasing in WUE by about 10% in the current situation.

Finally, it's recommended to use the CVWAM model in:

- water footprint analysis for its ease and accuracy of results where, the CVWAM model give a chance for researcher to study multi variables factors in the same research.
- virtual water trade analysis under three levels: agriculture crops, countries, and continents.
- Distributing many crops on cultivated area/nation module, this module employed water footprint analysis to find optimal crop planting structure with the objectives of minimum total water use and highest economic water productivity.