

## Table of Contents

Contents	Pages
Table of Contents .....	i
List of Figures.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
List of Acronyms.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE .....	1
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem .....	3
1.3. Objectives of the Study .....	5
1.3.1. General Objective.....	5
1.3.2. Specific Objectives.....	5
1.4. The Scope of the Study .....	5
1.5. Significances of the Study.....	5
1.6. Limitation of the Study .....	6
1.7. Organization of the Thesis .....	6
CHAPTER TWO .....	7
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	7
2.1. The Concept of Food Security.....	7
2.2. Theories of Vulnerability to Food Insecurity.....	8
2.3. Factors of Vulnerability to Food Insecurity.....	11
2.4. Vulnerability to Food Insecurity in Ethiopia.....	13
2.5. The Role of Remote Sensing and GIS for Studying Vulnerability to Food Insecurity.....	14
2.6. Drought Indices.....	15
2.7. Land Degradation Models.....	21
CHAPTER THREE.....	25
3. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	25
3.1. Description of the Study Area .....	25

3.2. Data Acquisition, Pre-processing and Software Packages .....	30
3.2.1. Remote Sensing Data .....	30
3.2.3 Ground data .....	32
3.3. Data Processing, Analysis and Modeling.....	34
3.3.1. Analysis of Drought Pattern .....	34
3.3.2. Generating Land Degradation Vulnerability Layer.....	36
3.3.3. Generating Socio-economic Susceptibility Layer.....	41
3.4. Model Validation.....	41
3.5. Modelling Vulnerability to Food Insecurity .....	42
CHAPTER FOUR.....	45
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	45
4.1. Drought Vulnerability .....	45
4.1.1. Relationship between Seasonal Rainfall and NDVI.....	45
4.1.2. Drought Monitoring by NDVI Anomaly.....	46
4.1.3. Drought Monitoring by SPI.....	51
4.1.4. Combined Drought Severity.....	56
4.2. Land Degradation Vulnerability.....	58
4.2.1. Land Degradation Assessment Index.....	63
4.3. Socio-economic Susceptibility.....	65
4.4. Vulnerability to Food Insecurity.....	67
CHAPTER FIVE.....	70
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	70
5.1. Conclusion.....	70
5.2. Recommendations.....	71
REFERENCES.....	72
APPENDICES.....	88

## List of Figures

Fig 3.1: Location map of the study area.....	25
Fig 3.2: Soil map.....	26
Fig 3.3: Flow chart of the study.....	44
Fig 4.1: Spatial pattern of long-term (2008 to 2017) seasonal (June to September) average rainfall and Normalized Difference Vegetation Index.....	45
Fig 4.2a: Normalized Difference vegetation Index for the period from 2008 to 2012.....	47
Fig 4.2b: Normalized Difference vegetation Index for the period from 2013 to 2017.....	48
Fig 4.3: Normalized Difference vegetation Index Anomaly for drought years 2010 and 2015....	49
Fig 4.4: Normalized Difference vegetation Index Anomaly for wet years 2013 and 2017.....	50
Fig 4.5a: Seasonal Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) for the period from 2008 to 2012....	52
Fig 4.5b: Seasonal Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) for the period from 2013 to 2017....	53
Fig 4.6: Spatial pattern of drought severity for the drought years of 2010 and 2015 using SPI.....	54
Fig 4.7: Spatial pattern of drought severity for the wet years of 2013 and 2017 using SPI.....	55
Fig. 4.8: Spatial pattern of drought severity for combined drought risks .....	57
Fig 4.9: Map of vegetation factor (C), LULC (B) and NDVI (A) .....	59
Fig 4.10: Map of rainfall erosivity factor (C), rainfall intensity (B) and rainfall depth (A) .....	60
Fig 4.11: Map of soil erodibility factor (D), soil texture (C), stoniness (B) and water holding capacity (A).....	61
Fig 4.12: Map of topographic factor.....	62
Fig 4.13: Map of human pressure factor (C), livestock population density (B) and human population density (A) .....	63
Fig 4.14: Map of the spatial pattern of land degradation vulnerability.....	64
Fig 4.15: Map of Crop production factor (E), Cattle population factor (D), Small ruminant population factor (C), Poultry size factor (B) and Beehive size factor (A) .....	65
Fig 4.16: Socio-economic map.....	66
Fig 4.17: Vulnerability to food insecurity map.....	68

## List of Tables

Table 3.1: SPOT dekadal NDVI data composite for a month.....	30
Table 3.2: Sources of data for the study .....	33
Table 3.3: Softwares used for the study .....	34
Table 3.4: Drought severity class based on NDVI Anomaly.....	35
Table 3.5: Drought severity based on Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) values.....	36
Table 3.6: Classes of vegetation cover type and condition.....	37
Table 3.7: Classes of rainfall erosivity.....	38
Table 3.8: Classes of soil Erodibility.....	39
Table 3.9: Classes of topographic factor.....	40
Table 3.10: Classes of human factor.....	40
Table 3.11: Classes of the socio-economic factors and the socio-economic layer .....	41
Table 4.1: Area coverage of drought severity for drought years 2010 and 2015 using NDVI anomaly.....	49
Table 4.2: Area coverage of drought severity for wet years of 2013 and 2017 using NDVI anomaly.....	51
Table 4.3: Area coverage of drought severity for drought years of 2010 and 2015 using SPI.....	54
Table 4.4: Area coverage of drought severity for wet years of 2013 and 2017 using SPI.....	56
Table 4.5: Area coverage of drought severity for combined drought risks.....	58
Table 4.6: Percentage of area of level of land degradation vulnerability.....	64
Table 4.7: Percentage of area in terms of the socio-economic capacity of the people.....	67
Table 4.8: Percentage of areas and vulnerability to food insecurity.....	69

## List of Acronyms

CHIRPS	Climate Hazard Group Infrared Precipitation with Station
CSA	Central Statistics Agency
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DN	Digital Number
ERDAS	Earth Resource Data Analysis System
EWS	Early Warning System
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FEWS NET	Family Early Warning System
GIS	Geographical Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LULC	Land Use/Land Cover
MCE	Multi Criteria Evaluation
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NMA	National Meteorological Agency
OAMD	Office of Agriculture of Meket District
PROBA-V	Project On-Board Automation Vegetation
SPI	Standard precipitation Index
SPOT	Satellite Pour l'Observation de la Terre
SPRITS	Software for Processing and Interpreting Remote Sensing Images Time Series
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VITO	Vlaamse Instelling voor Technologish Onderzoek
WMO	World Meteorological Organization

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am thankful to the Almighty God for his gifts of my wish and blessings throughout my life. I am indebted to some individuals and institutions since the study could not be conducted without their generous assistance. Firstly, I want to express my gratitude to my advisor, Dr. K. V. Suryabhadgavan (Associate Professor), for his constructive guidance to bring the study to this end. My heartfelt gratitude also goes to my father, Sileshi Merede, and my mother, Shigultish Hunegnaw, for taking full of family responsibilities and their encouragement so as to complete this MSc program in general and the study in particular.

I am also lucky to thank Menetewab Bekele, my grandmother, for her prayer in wishing my success in my life. I would like to extend my thanks to my special friends, Abebe Yirdaw ('Tinkishu'), Gebrie Muluaem and Amsal Fikiru, for their special support and encouragement on how can I accomplish the study on time in correspondence with my formal work.

I am also indebted to instructors in the College of Development of Addis Ababa University as well as experts working in MWOARD and ARBOARD for their expertise discussion on the weight of layers of the model of vulnerability to food insecurity. My thanks also go to the MWOARD, ARBOARD, CSA and NMA for providing me necessary data for the study.

## Abstract

### Remote Sensing and GIS-Based Modeling and Delineation of Vulnerability to Food Insecurity: The Case of Meket District, Northwest Ethiopia

Anteneh Sileshi Merede

MSc Thesis

Addis Ababa University, 2019

Food insecurity is a matter of both limited food availability and restricted access to food. Food availability is the availability of sufficient quantities of food of appropriate quality, supplied through domestic production or imports. The main objective of this study was to investigate vulnerability to food insecurity using Remote Sensing and GIS techniques in Meket District of Northwest Ethiopia. The necessary data used for the study were satellite images, meteorological data and other ancillary data. Drought, land degradation and socio-economic maps were generated by considering them as the major factors determining vulnerability to food insecurity in the study area. For drought detection, NDVI anomaly and SPI were generated from SPOT-Vegetation and PROVA-V dekadal NDVI images for the 10 study years (2008–2017). The land degradation vulnerability of the study area was modelled using Land Degradation Assessment Model. This model considers topographic, vegetation, soil, rainfall and human factors. In addition, socio-economic susceptibility of the community was also assessed and mapped. Then, these three determinant factors were weighted and overlaid to produce a model of vulnerability to food insecurity and further to delineate vulnerable areas. Firstly, a comprehensive map was produced that indicates agricultural drought risk prone areas of the study area by combining the frequency maps of the NDVI anomaly and SPI indices and confirmed drought pattern. This map shows that no, slight, moderate, severe and very severe drought risk areas constitute 2.5, 11.3, 34.87, 42.9 and 8.43%, respectively, of the total area of Meket District. The result map was validated using ground truth data such as crop production and experts in the Office of Agriculture of Meket District. Secondly, the land degradation vulnerability for 12.48, 28.78, 22.43, 26.42 and 9.89% of Meket District falls under very high, high, medium, low and very low vulnerability classes, respectively. Thirdly, the percentage areas categorized as very severely, severely, moderately, slightly and not susceptible classes were 7.25, 36.72, 33.24, 12.02 and 10.78% of the total area of Meket District, respectively. Finally, the result of vulnerability to food insecurity reveals that 23.26, 44.26 and 17.09% of the district were identified as moderately, severely and very severely vulnerable areas to food insecurity. Only 1.79 and 13.60% were found to be no and slightly vulnerable areas to food insecurity, respectively. Thus, the result could be used as a guide for concerned government and non-government organizations for taking actions on adaptive strategies of food insecurity in the study area. Spatially, most of northern, central and eastern parts of the district were found to be categorized into the severe and very severe food insecurity vulnerability classes.

**Key words:** Food insecurity, Drought, NDVI, SPI, Land degradation, Socio-economy