

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**EXPLORING THE GENETIC POTENTIAL OF LOCALLY ADAPTED
GERMPLASM FOR DROUGHT TOLERANCE: A CASE FOR
COWPEA (*VIGNA UNGUICULATA* (L.) Walp) FROM MALAWI**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Plant Science



MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Institute of Agriculture and Environment

Massey University

Palmerston North, New Zealand

LAWRENT LINO MICHAEL PUNGULANI

2014

Abstract

*The shortage of improved cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp) varieties and increased frequency of droughts in Malawi have created a need to identify drought tolerant genotypes with desirable agronomic and utility characteristics. This research evaluated local germplasm maintained by the Malawi Plant Genetic Resources Centre (MPGRC), as an initial step towards the identification of genotypes with drought tolerance. Eco-geographic characterisation revealed diverse ecologies among the different germplasm collected. These genotypes were subsequently assessed for drought tolerance in a glasshouse study. All genotypes which tolerated low moisture conditions in the glasshouse originated from areas with high rainfall and low temperatures suggesting that extreme environmental conditions and/or human mediated actions interfered with adaptation processes. Furthermore, the eco-geographic characterisation identified germplasm gaps which need to be filled by either collection or repatriation of germplasm from international genebanks. The establishment of on-farm conservation in areas with low rainfall and high temperature such as Chikwawa and Nsanje districts may enhance adaptation of cowpea to drought conditions. Genotypes 479, 601, 645, 2226 and 3254 fully recovered from moisture stress, while 2232 started wilting within one week of drought stress initiation in the first glasshouse experiment. The genotypes which recovered from moisture stress showed low scores for wilting scales, low leaf wilting index (LWI), high relative water content, high scores for stem greenness and high levels for re-growth. In addition, the first glasshouse experiment resulted in the development of a leaf wilting index, which has been identified as an easily used method for scoring wilting, compared to common wilting scales. In a subsequent glasshouse experiment, all the genotypes which fully recovered from moisture stress showed high relative water content during the period of stress, but showed differences in other physiological traits. For example, genotypes 479, 601, 645 and 2226 had reduced stomatal conductance, transpiration rate and net photosynthesis, while 3254 maintained high scores for the three traits from the initial stage of moisture stress. Although 2232 showed a high transpiration rate and stomatal conductance, its net photosynthesis was significantly reduced, compared to all the other genotypes, after the third week of stress. The differences in physiological traits among genotypes indicated that 3254 has drought tolerance; 479, 601, 645 and 2226 avoid drought while 2232 is drought susceptible. The field performance of these six genotypes and two released varieties (Sudan 1 and IT82E16) was assessed in field trials in Malawi at Baka, Bvumbwe, Chitala, Chitedze and Kasinthula. Results from field trials revealed significant*

variation for reproductive, yield and seed characteristics. Sudan 1, IT82E16, 409 and 601 matured in less than 65 days after planting; 3254 took 70 days and 645, 2226 and 2232 took more than 85 days. Genotype 3254 consistently gave high yields at sites with low rainfall and high temperatures compared to 2232 which yielded poorly at the same sites. The eight genotypes showed variation in seed size with genotype 2226 producing large seeds (>20g/100 seeds) at all sites. The seed size of 2232 was significantly lower than 2226 at sites with low rainfall and high temperatures. The field performance of these genotypes reflects the physiological responses observed in the glasshouse, confirming the drought response categories of the genotypes. The agreement between glasshouse experiments and the field trial suggests there is intrinsic value in the locally adapted germplasm maintained by the Malawi Plant Genetic Resources Centre. Among the genotypes tested in the field, farmers selected 479 for early maturity; 2226 and 2232 for high leaf biomass; 3254 for high pod load; 2226 and 2232 for large seeds; Sudan 1 for small seeds; and 601, IT82E16 and Sudan 1 for smooth seed texture. Genotype 3254 was ranked poorly at all the sites due to rough seed texture. Genotypes for potential use in improving production of cowpea in drought prone areas were identified. In the absence of released drought tolerant varieties, it is recommended that genotypes with drought avoidance characteristics be promoted in areas with mild droughts, while 3254 with its typical drought tolerance may be suitable for areas with intense droughts. However, the rough seed texture of 3254 may limit its usefulness due to its poor ranking by farmers at all sites. Priorities for future cowpea in Malawi include investigating inheritance of drought tolerance in cowpea.

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to numerous people who contributed to the successful completion of this gallant piece of work. Special thanks go to my Chief Supervisor Dr. James P. Millner and Co-Supervisors Prof. Warren M. Williams and Dr. Mackson H.P Banda for providing guidance during the implementation of my research. Your academic and social pieces of advice were very instrumental throughout the journey. Memories of our togetherness will linger in my mind forever as I advance my research career in Malawi and elsewhere for the benefit of farmers. Administrative support provided by the Institute of Agriculture and Environment (IAE) through the leadership of Prof. Peter Kemp would not pass without recognition.

All this work could not have come to fruition without the Commonwealth Scholarship provided through the New Zealand Aid Programme (NZ Aid). I am grateful to the International Student Support team under the leadership of Sylvia Hooker for administering the scholarship. I am also greatly thankful to the Malawi Government for nominating me to benefit from the Commonwealth Scholarship, specifically, Dr. A.T. Daudi the then Principal Secretary for Ministry responsible for agriculture and Dr. A.P Mtukuso the then Director for the Department of Agricultural Research Services (DARS) for facilitating all the arrangements for me to benefit from the scholarship. I also fully recognise financial support from the Benefit Sharing Fund of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) for the implementation of field trials in Malawi as part of the activities for Project Grant no. 219 (PR. 219).

The successful completion of this study was possible with technical support provided by Steve Ray, Lindsay Silva, Lesley Taylor and Simon Osborn, staff members of the Plant Growth Unit at Massey University during the implementation of glasshouse experiments.

Similarly, Chris Rawlingson, Laboratory Technician, at IAE played the pivotal role of providing equipment and time for measuring physiological parameters in the second glasshouse experiment. I recognise the Malawi Plant Genetic Resources Centre for providing germplasm and the Margot Forde Germplasm Centre for facilitating biosecurity assessment of the germplasm in New Zealand. I also recognise the role played by station managers and technical officers working on legumes at Baka, Bvumbwe, Chitala, Chitedze and Kasinthula research stations in Malawi for meticulously implementing the field trials. Credit is also due to my colleagues at the Malawi Plant Genetic Resources Centre: Richard Chitezi, Jackson Chikasanda, Wilson Bickiel, Irene Nyirenda, Memory Momba, Arkanjel Magombo and Pax Yobe for working hard during the implementation of my research work. Many thanks should also go to my colleagues at Massey University: Dr. Isaac Fandika, Pilirani Pankomera, Webby Chibomba, Moshi Mislai and Manley Mazila for technical and moral support during the study period. Friends, your presence played a key role in the successful completion of my research work. I am very appreciative for the generous support provided by Mr Conrad K. Black during my stay in New Zealand.

I acknowledge the companionship of my wife Stella and our son Michael in the final year of my study period. Your presence made a big difference. I know it was not easy to sacrifice your work Stella just for the sake of keeping me company.

Above all, I salute the Almighty God for guiding, keeping and protecting me throughout the study period. It was not easy but it was possible with His presence by my side. May the Almighty God continue blessing everyone who took part in the successful completion of this work.

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my wife, son, dad and mum, for being instrumental throughout my academic journey.

I also dedicate this work to the children of Malawi who do not complete their education, often because their parents do not appreciate its value. It is my prayer that such parents begin to realise the importance of education in changing the world. I also dedicate this work to all the people and organisations that selflessly support the education of children in Malawi. May you gain more blessings for this noble cause.

To the parents: *“If you think education is expensive, try ignorance”* by Derek Bok.

To the goodwill ambassadors: *“Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world”* by Nelson Mandela.

Candidate's declaration

This is to certify that the research carried out for my Doctoral thesis entitled “*Exploring the genetic potential of locally adapted germplasm for drought tolerance: A case for cowpea (Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp) from Malawi*” at the Institute of Agriculture and Environment, Massey University, New Zealand is my own work and that the thesis material has not been used in part or whole for any other qualification.

CANDIDATE'S NAME

LAWRENT L.M. PUNGAUANI

SIGNATURE



DATE

23/10/2014

Supervisor's declaration

Chief Supervisor's Name James Miller
Signature JP Miller
Date 24/10/14

Co-Supervisor's Name Warren Williams
Signature JP Miller on behalf
Date 24/10/14

Table of Contents

Abstract	I
Acknowledgements.....	III
Dedication	V
Candidate’s declaration.....	VII
Supervisor’s declaration.....	VIII
Table of figures	XVII
List of tables.....	XIX
List of plates.....	XXI
List of appendices	XXII
Acronyms	XXIII
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.0 Background.....	1
1.1 Hypothesis and research questions	4
1.2 Objectives	5
1.3 Research outline.....	5
1.4 Relevance of the research	6
Chapter 2: Literature review: Available options and future direction for cowpea drought tolerance improvement in Malawi.....	7
2.0 Introduction.....	7
2.1 Importance and production trends of cowpeas	8

2.2	Drought conditions in Sub-Saharan Africa.....	10
2.3	Drought tolerance research in cowpea.....	10
2.4	Resistance of plants to drought conditions and implications on crop improvement	11
2.4.1	Drought escape.....	12
2.4.2	Drought avoidance	12
2.4.3	Drought tolerance.....	13
2.4.4	Breeding and crop management for drought adaptation.....	13
2.5	Systematic characterisation of germplasm for drought tolerance.....	14
2.5.1	Eco-geographic characterisation of germplasm	15
2.5.2	Morphological characterisation of cowpea for drought adaptation.	16
2.5.2.1	Root characteristics	17
2.5.2.2	Shoot root ratio.....	18
2.5.2.3	Leaf characteristics	18
2.5.3	Physiological characterisation.....	19
2.5.3.1	Stomatal conductance	20
2.5.3.2	Transpiration	20
2.5.3.3	Net photosynthesis	21
2.5.3.4	Water use efficiency and transpiration efficiency.....	21
2.5.3.5	Relative water content.....	22
2.6	Farmers' preference and adoption of improved varieties	23
2.7	Conclusions.....	24

Chapter 3: Eco-geographic characterisation of the locally adapted cowpea

germplasm.....	27
Abstract	27
3.1 Introduction.....	28
3.2 Materials and methods	29
3.2.1 Germplasm source and passport data.....	29
3.2.2 Distribution map and extraction of eco-geographic variables	30
3.2.3 Statistical analysis	31
3.3. Results.....	32
3.3.1 Germplasm distribution.....	32
3.3.2 Characteristics of collection points	33
3.3.3 Cluster analysis	33
3.4 Discussion.....	36
3.5 Conclusion	40

Chapter 4: Screening germplasm for canopy maintenance under water stress

conditions	43
Abstract	43
4.1 Introduction.....	44
4.2 Methodology.....	45
4.2.1 Plant material and experimental design	45
4.2.2 Moisture stress treatment	46
4.2.3 Scoring procedure	47
4.2.4 Statistical analysis	49

4.3	Results.....	49
4.3.1	Changes in soil moisture content	49
4.3.2	Genotypic responses to water stress.....	49
4.3.2.1	Relative water content.....	50
4.3.2.2	Leaf wilting scales	50
4.3.2.3	Leaf wilting index.....	51
4.3.2.4	Regrowth and stem greenness	54
4.3.3	Correlations between leaf wilting index and leaf wilting scales,relative water content, stem greenness and re-growth	55
4.3.4	Cluster analysis	56
4.4	Discussion.....	59
4.4.1	Moisture stress	59
4.4.2	Relative water content.....	60
4.4.3	Leaf wilting	61
4.4.4	Stem greenness and regrowth	65
4.4.4	Cluster analysis	65
4.5	Conclusion	66
Chapter 5: Physiological characterisation of cowpea genotypes with canopy		
	maintenance attributes under moisture stress conditions.....	69
	Abstract	69
5.1	Introduction.....	70
5.2	Methodology.....	71
5.2.1	Experimental procedure	71
5.2.2	Statistical analysis	73

5.3 Results.....	74
5.3.1 Relative water content.....	74
5.3.2 Stomatal conductance	75
5.3.3 Transpiration rate	76
5.3.4 Net photosynthesis	77
5.3.5 Specific leaf area.....	78
5.4 Discussion.....	79
5.4.1 Relative water content.....	79
5.4.2 Stomatal conductance	80
5.4.3 Net photosynthesis	81
5.4.4 Relationships among physiological parameters.....	82
5.4.5 Specific leaf area.....	84
5.5 Conclusion	86
Chapter 6: Evaluation of eight cowpea genotypes for variability in reproductive characteristics, yield and seed size at five experimental sites in Malawi.....	89
Abstract	89
6.1 Introduction.....	90
6.2 Materials and methods.....	91
6.2.1 Site characteristics.....	91
6.2.2 Genetic material	91
6.2.3 Evaluation procedure	92
6.2.4 Statistical analysis	92
6.3 Results.....	94
6.3.1 Weather patterns for experimental sites.....	94

6.3.2	Descriptive statistics of measured characters.....	94
6.3.3	Reproductive characteristics	97
6.3.3.1	Number of days to flowering	97
6.3.3.2	Number of days to first mature pod	99
6.3.4	Yield characteristics	102
6.3.4.1	Number of seeds per pod	102
6.3.4.2	Grain yield per square metre	104
6.3.4.3	Seed size.....	107
6.4	Discussion.....	110
6.4.1	Reproductive characteristics	110
6.4.2	Yield characteristics	114
6.4.2.1	Number of seeds per pod	114
6.4.2.2	Grain yield.....	114
6.4.2.3	Seed size.....	119
6.5	Conclusion	121
 Chapter 7: Towards the development of a farmer-oriented cowpea improvement programme in Malawi		
		123
Abstract	123
7.1	Introduction.....	124
7.2	Methodology.....	125
7.2.1	Experimental sites	125
7.2.2	Research design.....	125
7.2.2.1	Focus group discussions.....	126
7.2.2.2	Participatory variety selection.....	126

7.2.3	Statistical analysis	128
7.3	Results.....	129
7.3.1	Production challenges	129
7.3.2	Farmers' desirable attributes	129
7.3.3	Variation among genotypes based on farmers' preference.....	131
7.3.3.1	Rank correlations.....	131
7.3.3.2	Farmers' scores for maturity	133
7.3.3.2	Farmers' scores for leaf biomass yield	134
7.3.3.3	Farmers' scores for pod load.....	135
7.3.3.4	Farmers' scores for seed size	136
7.3.3.5	Farmers' scores for texture of the seed testa.....	138
7.3.3.5	Priority list of widely accepted genotypes.....	138
7.4	Discussion.....	140
7.4.1	Production challenges	140
7.4.2	Selection of desirable attributes for cowpea varieties.....	141
7.4.3	Selection of genotypes	143
7.4.3.1	Maturity.....	143
7.4.3.2	Leaf biomass	144
7.4.3.3	Pod load.....	144
7.4.3.4	Seed size.....	145
7.4.3.5	Seed testa texture	145
7.4.4	Scatterplots as a statistical method for selection of widely accepted varieties...	146
7.4.5	Genotypes with contrasting characteristics.....	147
7.4.6	Variation in farmers scores within and among sites	148
7.5	Conclusion	149

Chapter 8: General discussion: Application of key findings and opportunities for commercialisation and future directions for cowpea research in Malawi...151

8.0 Introduction.....	151
8.1 Application of key findings	152
8.1.1 Management of plant genetic resources.....	153
8.1.2 Drought tolerance in local germplasm	156
8.1.3 Leaf wilting index as a measure for wilting due to moisture stress.....	159
8.1.4 Super early maturing genotypes.....	160
8.1.5 Seed characteristics and drought tolerance	160
8.2 Opportunities for commercialisation of cowpea in Malawi	161
8.3 Policy considerations for production and commercialisation of varieties derived from local germplasm	162
8.4 Limitations of the study	163
8.5 Conclusions.....	165
8.6 Future research direction	166
References	169
Appendices.....	185

Table of Figures

Figure 1.1	Production trends of five most important grain legumes in Malawi	2
Figure 2.1	Production trends of cowpea in Malawi over a period of ten years	9
Figure 3.1:	Map of Malawi showing collection sites of cowpea germplasm.....	32
Figure 3.2:	Dendrogram showing grouping pattern of 66 cowpeas accessions.....	34
Figure 4.1:	Changes in volumetric soil moisture content during the water stress period.	50
Figure 4.2:	Dendrogram showing clusters of 36 accessions based on leaf wilting index, wilting scales, relative water content, regrowth and stem greenness.	58
Figure 4.3:	Means of 36 accessions for the leaf wilting index after four weeks of moisture stress.	63
Figure 4.4:	Means of 36 accessions for the relative water content after four weeks of moisture stress.	63
Figure 5.1:	Change in relative water content (a), stomatal conductance (b), ranspiration rate (c) and net photosynthesis (d) for each genotype over the period of water stress.	75
Figure 6.1:	Monthly average rainfall, maximum and minimum temperatures for 2012/2013 growing season of the five experimental sites.....	95
Figure 6.2:	Number of days to flowering of the eight genotypes at five experimental sites	99
Figure 6.3:	Number of days to first mature pods of eight genotypes at five experimental sites..	100
Figure 6.4:	GGE biplot analysis for maturity period of eight cowpea genotypes across eight sites.	101
Figure 6.5:	Average number of seeds per pod of eight genotypes at five experimental sites..	104

Figure 6.6: Yield performance of eight genotypes at eight experimental sites.....	105
Figure 6.7: GGE biplot analysis for grain yield of eight cowpea genotypes across eight sites.....	106
Figure 6.8: Hundred seed weight of eight genotypes at five experimental sites.....	108
Figure 6.9: GGE biplot analysis for 100 hundred seed weight of eight cowpea genotypes across eight sites	109
Figure 7.1: Average scores of 19 genotypes for maturity on a scale of 1–5 where 1 represents early maturity and 5 late maturity.	134
Figure 7.2: Mean scores for 19 genotypes for leaf biomass on a scale of 1–5 where 1 represents low biomass and 5 high leaf biomass yield.	135
Figure 7.3: Mean scores for 19 genotypes for pod load on a scale of 1-5 where 1 represents low pod load and 5 high pod load.	136
Figure 7.4: Mean scores for 19 genotypes for seed size on a scale of 1–5 where 1 represents small seed side and 5 large seed size.....	137
Figure 7.5: Mean scores for 19 genotypes on texture of seed testa on a scale of 1–5 where 1 represents smooth seed and 5 rough seed.	138
Figure 7.6 Scatterplots for pooled means and respective standard error of means for different genotypes	139

List of Tables

Table 3.1:	List of cowpea germplasm with district, latitude and longitude of origin.....	30
Table 3.2:	List of variables extracted from the WORLDCLIM database.....	31
Table 3.3:	Minimum maximum and means with standard errors for the variables used in cluster analysis.....	33
Table 3.4:	Cluster means with standard errors and ranges for all eight variables measured.....	35
Table 3.5:	Factor loadings for the four clusters.	36
Table 4.1:	List of accessions evaluated for drought tolerance showing district of origin, latitude, longitude and cluster from eco-geographic characterisation	46
Table 4.2:	Variables used to categorise drought tolerance of the 36 cowpea accessions assessed.	48
Table 4.3:	Variation among 36 cowpea accessions for relative water content, leaf wilting, re-growth and stem greenness.	52
Table 4.4:	Pearson correlation coefficients for variables measured during water stress and after re-watering periods.	57
Table 4.5:	Mean cluster scores for all 14 variables.	58
Table 4.6:	Factor loadings for the five clusters.	59
Table 5.1:	Description of parameters measured and used in the statistical analyses.....	72
Table 5.2:	Genotypic variation for relative water content measured at one week intervals for a period of four weeks of water stress.....	74
Table 5.3:	Genotypic variation for stomatal conductance after one and three weeks of water stress.	76
Table 5.4:	Genotypic variation for transpiration rate after one and three weeks of water stress.	77

Table 5.5:	Genotypic variation for net photosynthesis after one and three weeks of water stress.	78
Table 5.6:	Genotypic variation for specific leaf area measured at one week intervals for a period of four weeks of water stress.	79
Table 6.1:	Characteristics of the five experimental sites.	91
Table 6.2:	Description of cowpea genotypes evaluated in the five sites.	91
Table 6.3:	Mean, minimum, maximum values and coefficient of variations for all characters measured.	96
Table 6.4:	Pearson correlation coefficients for all characters measured.	96
Table 6.5:	Means of main effects on flowering and maturity periods.	98
Table 6.6:	Means of main effects on number of seeds per pod, grain weight and 100 seed weight.	103
Table 7.1:	Description of biological materials used in participatory variety selection.	127
Table 7.2:	Description of scoring scale used by farmers for the selection of cowpea genotypes.	128
Table 7.3:	Farmers' criteria for selecting desirable cowpea genotypes.	130
Table 7.4:	Farmers' priority scores of desirable traits using a scale of 1-5 during focus group discussion.	131
Table 7.5:	Spearman's rank correlation coefficients for leaf biomass, maturity, podload, seedsize and seedtexture between sites.	132
Table 7.6:	Mean scores for 19 genotypes for maturity, leaf biomass, pod load, seed size and seed texture on a scale of 1-5.	133

List of Plates

Plate 4.1:	Variation in leaf wilting after second week of stress for selected genotypes.....	54
Plate 4.2:	Variation in leaf wilting levels at the beginning of third week of stress	55
Plate 4.3:	Recovery responses of cowpea after two weeks of re-watering.....	55
Plate 5.1:	Taking measurements for the second glasshouse experiment	73

Appendices

Appendix I:	Map of Malawi showing field experiment sites	185
Appendix II:	Photographs of participatory variety selection (PVS) trials.....	186
Appendix III:	Box plots for exploring distribution pattern of the data set of different variables at each site	187
Appendix IV:	Kruskal-Wallis mean ranks of 19 genotypes for maturity scores at each site and across four sites.....	188
Appendix V:	Kruskal-Wallis mean ranks of 19 genotypes for leaf biomass scores at each site and across four sites.....	189
Appendix VI:	Kruskal-Wallis mean ranks of 19 genotypes for pod load scores at each site and across four sites.....	190
Appendix VII:	Kruskal-Wallis mean ranks of 19 genotypes for seed size scores at each site and across four sites.....	191
Appendix VIII:	Kruskal-Wallis mean ranks of 19 genotypes for seed texture scores at each site and across four sites.....	192
Appendix IX:	Statement of contribution to Doctoral thesis containing publications.....	193

Acronyms

ABA	Absciscic Acid
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
asl	Above Sea Level
ASWAp	Agriculture Sector Wide Approach
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
DAES	Department of Agricultural Extension Services
DARS	Department of Agricultural Research Services
DLS	Delayed Leaf Senescence
E	Net Transpiration
EPA	Extension Planning Area
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLM	General Linear Model
Gs	Stomatal conductance
IBPGR	International Board for Plant Genetic Resources
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for Semi-Arid Tropics
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
IAE	Institute of Agriculture and Environment
ITPGRFA	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
LSD	Least Significant Difference
LWI	Leaf Wilting Index

MC	Moisture Content
MGDS II	Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II
MLS	Multilateral System
MPGRC	Malawi Plant Genetic Resources Centre
NZAID	New Zealand Aid for International Development
PGU	Plant Growth Unit
Pn	Net photosynthesis
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PVS	Participatory Variety Selection
QTL	Quantitative Trait Loci
RCBD	Randomised Complete Block Design
RWC	Relative Water Content
SLA	Specific Leaf Area
STG	Stem Greenness
TDR	Time-Domain Reflectometer
TE	Transpiration Efficiency
UCR	University of California Riverside
WS	Water Stressed
WUE	Water Use Efficient
WW	Well Watered