ICID2015 DRIP IRRIGATION AS AN EFFICIENT WATER SAVING PRACTICE B Reinders, ARC- Institute for Agricultural Engineering, reindersf@arc.agric.za GR Backeberg, Water Research Commission, gerhardb@wrc.org.za South Africa

Introduction

26th ERC & 66th IEC

Drip irrigation is considered as one of the most efficient irrigation systems but it should be management and maintained properly to keep it to perform at its best to enhance crop growth and water productivity.

Performance testing of different types and ages of drippers under different water quality conditions under typical farming conditions was carried out.

Agriplas's Drip-In Regular and Agridrip Pressure Compensated and Netafim's Ram Pressure Compensated drippers were selected, as they were the most commonly used drippers for surface drip in South Africa.

Field evaluation of drip systems

A complete system evaluation was done according to the procedure described in ASAE EP 458 (1997) where five dripper lines were evaluated at five positions. Apart from the and CVq, the statistical discharge uniformity (Us) were also calculated as shown as equation :

$$\mathsf{Us} = 100 - \mathsf{CVq}$$

Where: $U_s =$ Statistical uniformity of emitter discharge rate (%).

A Us value of 80% or higher is normally considered as an acceptable criteria (ASAE EP 458, 1997).

Drippers that were tested Agriplas

-Drip-In Regular -Agridrip Pressure Compensated Netafim

-Ram Pressure Compensated

Research was carried out by the ARC-Institute for Agricultural Engineering (ARC-IAE), South Africa on two drip irrigation companies' drip irrigation equipment to determine the performance of the individual drippers. Evaluations were carried out on new drippers under controlled conditions in a laboratory and it was complimented by testing of installed drippers under farming conditions.

Laboratory testing of drippers



The field emission uniformity (EU') was also used to judge the uniformity of emitter discharges within an irrigation block and is shown as equation :



Where: EU' = field emission uniformity (%); $q_{min} = Measured$ mean of lowest ¼ of emitter discharge (I/h); and $\overline{q} = Measured$ mean emitter discharge (I/h).

Comparison between U _s and EU for design purposes (ASAE EP 458, 1997)					
Classification	Us (%)	EU (%)			
Excellent	95 - 100	94 - 100			
Good	85 - 90	81 - 87			
Acceptable	75 - 80	68 - 75			
Poor	65 - 70	56 - 62			
Unacceptable	<60	<50			

Field evaluation of drippers



Laboratory tests on drippers

The new drip lines with emitters were tested in the laboratory for average discharge ($\overline{\mathbf{q}}$) and for the manufacturing coefficient of discharge variation (CVq).



Field evaluation results								
Site	EU %	Eu _a %	Us %	CV _q %	q _{max}	q _{min}	q _{ave}	FV %
Inyoni	90,9	89,1	90,9	9,1	1,3	1,0	1,1	20
Savan	81,3	80,6	83,3	16,2	2,0	1,3	1,6	70
Simu1	93,8	89,0	83,1	16,9	1,9	1,5	1,6	40



Where: q_i = emitter discharge rate (ℓ/h);

n

q

 S_q

- = number of emitters of the sample;
- = mean of all the measured discharge rates (ℓ/h) ;
- = standard deviation of the discharge rate of the emitter; and
- CV_q = coefficient of variation of discharge rate of the emitters (%).

SIMUZ 61,6 61,6 57,2 42,8 2,9 0 1,8 2	9 0 1,8 290
---	-------------

Conclusion

In the laboratory the new regular emitters' average coefficient of variation (CVq) was an excellent 2,2% and the pressure compensated emitters' average CVq was a good 3,2%.

With the farm site evaluations the coefficient (CV) varied from a marginal 9,1% to a poor 42,8%. The emission uniformity (EUa) varied from a good 89,1% to an unacceptable 61,6%.

If drip irrigation systems are management and maintained properly to keep it to perform at its best to enhance crop growth and water productivity it is considered as one of the most efficient irrigation systems.

References

F B Reinders, B Grové, N Benadé, I van der Stoep, A S van Niekerk. Technical aspects and cost estimating procedures of surface and subsurface drip irrigation systems. Water Research Commission, 2012. WRC Report No. TT525/12. ISBN No. 978-1-4312-0274-4.

Criteria for CVq		NEW EMITTER TEST RESULTS			
Classification	ASAE EP 405.1 (1997)	Classification	Dripper tested	Dripper	Average
Excellent	<5	Excellent	Dripper tested	(%)	(ℓ/h)
Average	5 - 7	Good	Super Typhoon	2,1	1,7
Marginal	7 - 11	Fair	Drip-In Light	4,2	2,2
Poor	11 – 15	Marginal	Ram 17L	2,1	1,6
Unacceptable	>15	Poor	DIS PC Lite	4,4	2,0