



HAL
open science

Wind erosion response to past and future agro-pastoral trajectories in the Sahel (Niger)

C. Pierre, P. Hiernaux, Jean-Louis Rajot, L. Kergoat, N. Webb, A. Abdourhamane Touré, B. Marticorena, Christel Bouet

► **To cite this version:**

C. Pierre, P. Hiernaux, Jean-Louis Rajot, L. Kergoat, N. Webb, et al.. Wind erosion response to past and future agro-pastoral trajectories in the Sahel (Niger). *Landscape Ecology*, 2021, 10.1007/s10980-021-01359-8. hal-03421069

HAL Id: hal-03421069

<https://hal.science/hal-03421069>

Submitted on 16 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Wind erosion response to past and future agro-pastoral trajectories in the Sahel (Niger)**

2 Pierre C.^{1*}, Hiernaux P.², Rajot JL.^{1,3}, Kergoat L.⁴, Webb N.P.⁵, Abdourhamane Touré A.⁶, Marticorena
3 B.⁷, Bouet C.^{1,3}

4
5 ¹IEES-Paris (Institute of Ecology and Environmental Sciences - Paris), CNRS, Sorbonne Université, Université Paris
6 Est Créteil, Université de Paris, INRAE, IRD, 4 place Jussieu, 75005 Paris, France, +33 1 44 27 32 96

7 ORCID : 0000-0002-7549-1460

8 caroline.pierre@upmc.fr

9 ** corresponding author*

10
11 ²Pastoc, 30 chemin de Jouanal, 82160 Caylus, France

12 pierre.hiernaux2@orange.fr

13
14 ³ Université de Paris and Univ Paris Est Creteil, CNRS, LISA, F-75013 Paris, France

15 jeanlouis.rajot@ird.fr

16 christel.bouet@ird.fr

17
18 ⁴GET (Géosciences Environnement Toulouse), CNRS, Université de Toulouse, IRD, 14 Avenue Edouard Belin, 31400
19 Toulouse, France

20 laurent.kergoat@get.omp.eu

21
22 ⁵ USDA-ARS Jornada Experimental Range, Las Cruces, NM, USA

23 nwebb@nmsu.edu

24
25 ⁶ Université Abdou Moumouni, Faculté des Sciences et Techniques, Département de Géologie, BP 10662 Niamey,
26 Niger

27 abdourahamane.toure@ird.fr ; doudu2000@yahoo.fr;

28
29 ⁷ Univ Paris Est Creteil and Université de Paris, CNRS, LISA, F-94010 Créteil, France

30 beatrice.marticorena@lisa.ipsl.fr

1 **Abstract**

2 *Context:* Wind erosion plays a major role in land degradation in semi-arid areas, especially in the Sahel.
3 There, wind erosion is as sensitive to land use and land management as to climate factors. Future land
4 use intensification may increase wind erosion and induce regional land degradation.

5 *Objective:* We aimed to estimate wind erosion responses to changing land management in a Sahelian
6 region.

7 *Methods:* We defined land use intensification scenarios for a study site in southwestern Niger for two
8 historical situations (1950s and 1990s), and two alternative prospective scenarios (2030s: extensive or
9 intensive). We simulated vegetation growth and horizontal sediment flux of wind erosion for the
10 corresponding landscapes.

11 *Results:* Annual amounts of horizontal sediment flux increased with land management changes from
12 1950s (nil flux) to 1990s (176 kg.m⁻¹.yr⁻¹) and 2030s (452 to 520 kg.m⁻¹.yr⁻¹), mostly because of
13 differences in land use, declining soil fertility, and practices decreasing the dry vegetation. For 2030s,
14 intensive scenario exhibited larger vegetation yields than extensive conditions, but similar large values
15 of horizontal sediment flux, thus questioning the sustainability of both scenarios. Realistic sets of
16 practices had as large an influence as the largest theoretical range of practices on the variability of
17 annual horizontal sediment flux. This variability was as large as that due to meteorological conditions.

18 *Conclusions:* This study demonstrates that the environmental impact of land use and management
19 practices, of which wind erosion is an aspect, must be assessed at the landscape scale to account for
20 the variability in land cover and associated land management.

21

22 **Key words:** wind erosion; agro-pastoral practices; land management scenarios; land use; modelling;
23 Sahel.

1 1. Introduction

2 Unprecedented human population and climate change make it increasingly important to understand
3 soil erosion impacts on the sustainability of socio-ecological systems (*Webb et al., 2017*). The effects of
4 human-driven land cover change - like grazing intensity, grassland conversion to cropland, crop residue
5 management or ecological restoration programs - on wind erosion has been highlighted in China (*Chi et*
6 *al., 2019; Du et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2018*), in the US (*Duniway et al., 2019; Galloza et al., 2018; Rakkar*
7 *et al., 2019*), in Southern (*Webb et al., 2020*) and Eastern Africa (*Fenta et al., 2020*) and in the Sahel
8 (*Abdourhamane Toure et al., 2019*). This issue is critical in semi-arid areas, where environmental
9 conditions are marginal for agriculture and where human-environment interactions can have a large
10 impact on the resilience of farming systems to climate stressors (*IPCC, 2019*). Of these semi-arid areas,
11 the Sahel exhibits the largest population growth, leading to a large food demand, whilst being one of
12 the poorest regions worldwide. Sahelian land degradation is a major concern (*Fensholt et al., 2013;*
13 *Mbow et al., 2015*) because Sahelian soils are inherently poor in organic matter and nutrients (*Breman*
14 *et al., 2001*). In this area, wind erosion plays a major role in land degradation as it can induce annual
15 losses of several millimeters of topsoil (*Sterk, 2003*). The consequent nutrient losses can be of the same
16 order as that needed as uptake for millet growth, the main staple crop in the area (*Sterk, 2003*).

17 In the Sahel, wind erosion depends on natural factors (wind, rain, vegetation cover) as much as on land
18 management (*Pierre et al., 2018*). Wind erosion not only depends on land use (e.g. cropland versus
19 rangeland) but also on associated management practices. For a given land use (e.g. cropland), with
20 Sahelian meteorological conditions, wind erosion could vary by as much as a factor of ten (in terms of
21 annual mass of the horizontal sediment flux, see *Pierre et al., 2018*) depending on management
22 practices. The agro-pastoral practices of local farmers and herders follow risk-avoidance strategies in
23 response to the high variability of Sahelian rainfall, in terms of annual amount as well as event intensity
24 and distribution throughout the rainy season (from June to October approximately). In many agro-
25 pastoral systems, the different practices strongly interact and should thus be considered at the
26 landscape scale. Nutrient transfer to croplands provided by livestock and manure is a good example of
27 such interactions (*Turner and Hiernaux, 2015*). Diversification of resources at the household scale also
28 shapes practices at the landscape scale (*Raynaut, 2001*). As for other dryland cropping systems,
29 cropping practices like choice of crop species and cultivars, sowing date, weeding and management of
30 crop residues can significantly influence wind erosion (*Pierre et al., 2018; Thomas et al., 2018*). Some of
31 these practices could lead to increased wind erosion and eventually to feedbacks of wind erosion on
32 land health and management through decline in soil fertility or reactivation of dunes (*Tidjani et al.,*
33 *2009*).

1 As stated by *Lavigne-Delville* (1997), cited by *Warren et al.* (2001): “soil degradation can only be
2 understood in its social context.” According to these authors (*Warren et al.*, 2001), who relied on a “local
3 political ecology” approach, soil erosion in southwestern Niger can be related to socio-economic factors
4 like male migration and access to non-farm incomes. However, observations and quantitative evidence
5 of these interactions are scarce. Wind erosion affects soil fertility over the long-term and thus is not
6 necessarily perceived as an urgent threat by local farmers; this could hinder short-term prevention of
7 wind erosion by local populations, although soil fertility is one of their main concerns (*Warren et al.*,
8 2003).

9 Despite the influence of wind erosion on the sustainability of Sahelian agro-pastoral systems, no studies
10 have quantified the interactions among changing land use, agro-pastoral practices and erosion rates in
11 the Sahel. No information on land management has been recorded alongside available classifications of
12 Sahelian land use systems to support such analyses (e.g. *Klein Goldewijk et al.*, 2011; *Monfreda et al.*,
13 2008; *Tappan et al.*, 2016). Furthermore, little is known about cropland change and land management
14 dynamics at the Sahel-scale (*van Vliet et al.*, 2013). It is therefore challenging to define realistic scenarios
15 of past and future Sahelian land use and agro-pastoral practices, along with associated socio-ecological
16 changes, to evaluate their impacts on wind erosion and its influence on the sustainability of Sahelian
17 agro-pastoral systems. Recent research based on field measurements (*Pierre et al.*, 2014, 2015), model-
18 driven sensitivity analysis (*Pierre et al.*, 2018) and survey of land management and vegetation
19 production (e.g. *Hiernaux et al.*, 2009) provide a basis for developing such scenarios to assess land use
20 and management practices impacts on wind erosion, and to establish a foundation for future systems-
21 level research to address land degradation-climate change interactions.

22 Here we investigate the impact of past and future trajectories of Sahelian agro-pastoral practices on
23 wind erosion. We develop landscape-level land use strategies and trajectories as scenarios based on
24 expert knowledge and published literature for a case study in southwestern Niger. Using a set of models
25 developed in previous work, we then investigate the impact of the scenarios on wind erosion. The spatial
26 extent of our study site is about 30 km x 30 km, the scale at which land use activities reflect decision-
27 making at the rural community level. This scale also approximates one grid cell for Earth System models
28 (e.g. *Pierre et al.*, 2012), thus investigation at this scale could help address how local-scale heterogeneity
29 in land use and management affecting wind erosion influences regional dust emissions. Section 2
30 introduces the selected study site and defines the scenarios of practices, before describing the
31 modelling approach. Section 3 presents the results of vegetation and wind erosion simulations and
32 analyzes the impact of practices scenarios on these variables. The results are discussed in section 4;
33 section 5 gathers the main conclusions of the study.

34

35 2. Materials and Methods


1 **2.1. Study site**

2 The study area is a 30 km x 30 km extent in the Fakara district, within the Tillabéri administrative region
3 in southwestern Niger, about 75 km east of the capital, Niamey (*Figure 1*). The Fakara district is located
4 between confluent valleys of the Niger River to the West and the fossil valley of Dallol Bosso to the East.
5 The annual rainfall is typical of Sahelian conditions with currently about 500 mm per year (e.g.
6 *Marticorena et al., 2017*), with a narrow unimodal distribution (June to September) due to the African
7 monsoon. About 20% of the area is covered by shallow loamy sand soils on flat hard pan plateaus, not
8 prone to wind erosion because of soil crusts and tiger bush vegetation cover. Deep sandy soils dominate
9 largely the rest of the landscape, with loamy-clay soils limited to the narrow ephemeral river bed and
10 pond floor, i.e. less than 5% of the landscape area (*Turner and Hiernaux, 2015*). We restrict our analysis
11 to the arable sandy soils (~80% of the area), considering that the remaining 20% are not prone to wind
12 erosion.

13 The study area has been a focal point for research over the last decades, including accounts of
14 meteorological and soil conditions and land use and land management practices (e.g. *Goutorbe et al.,*
15 *1997; Warren et al., 2003; De Rouw and Rajot, 2004; Cappelaere et al., 2009; Hiernaux et al., 2009*).
16 Several field measurements were dedicated to the dynamics of wind erosion (*Rajot, 2001; Biolders et*
17 *al., 2004*), some of which included the monitoring of crop residue degradation and land use effects
18 (*Abdourhamane Toure et al., 2011*). Measurements of meteorological data and dust concentration and
19 deposition fluxes were also collected since 2006 (*Marticorena et al., 2010, 2017*).

20 The human population in the study area is mainly composed of Jerma people with a strong minority of
21 Fulani, who are respectively farmers and pastoralists, with a recent conversion of the latter to agro-
22 pastoralism. Some minor groups of Kel Tamacheq and Maouri also live in the area (*Hiernaux and*
23 *Ayantunde, 2004*). Historical land rights for cropping are recognized to Jerma people in Dantiandou, and
24 to Fulani in Birni Ngaoure. The local land use evolved from very slight human impact in the 1950s to
25 cropping, fallowing and livestock grazing in the 1990s and ongoing cropland expansion today, with the
26 major staple-crop being millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*). Over the same period, land management changed
27 with increasing grazing pressure and collection of crop residues (*Schlecht et al., 2001; Akponikpè et al.,*
28 *2014*).

29 As in most parts of the Sahel, wind erosion in southwestern Niger exhibits a large seasonality related to
30 the monsoonal wind and rainfall regimes. Wind erosion occurs when wind speed is large and vegetation
31 cover is low. As the high wind speeds are mostly due to convective systems during the first part of the
32 rainy season (May to July, e.g. *Bergametti et al., 2017*), a large proportion of the annual wind erosion
33 occurs during this period (e.g. *Abdourhamane Toure et al., 2011*).



1
2 *Fig. 1 Location of the study site and main land uses in 1992*

3 *(adapted from Hiernaux and Ayantunde, 2004)*

4
5 **2.2. Land use and management scenarios**

6 We establish two historical situations and two alternative prospective scenarios that describe evolving
7 land use and land management in the study area, from a *Low density* situation (~1950) to a recent
8 situation (*High density*, ~1990) and to the near future (*Very high density*, ~2030) (Figure 2). The historical
9 situations are based on published descriptions of land use trends and on expert knowledge. The
10 prospective scenarios develop two different narratives following a *Very high density, Extensive* pathway,
11 in the line of current practices, and a *Very high density, Intensive* one that is probably more sustainable
12 but requires external inputs. The scenarios are defined as follows (see 2.3 for modelling details):

13
14 *(i) « Low density (1950s) » situation*

15 Representative of the mid-20th, this scenario assumes a slight human management of the environment,
16 as noticeable recent human settlement in the area started around 1950 (with about 6 inhabitants.km⁻²)
17 *(Hiernaux and Ayantunde, 2004)*. As no permanent water was accessible, the grazing pressure was

1 slight, limited to the wet season and assumed to have negligible impact on wind erosion (0 TLU.km^{-2}).
2 The land cover is herbaceous savanna over all arable land (i.e. 80% of the landscape).

3

4 *(ii) « High density (1990s) » situation*

5 This scenario is representative of the 1990s with a more densely populated crop-livestock farming
6 system (about $35 \text{ inhabitants.km}^{-2}$). It combines several land uses and land management practices.
7 Following population increase, cropland area increased significantly since the 1950s. Agro-pastoral
8 practices remain extensive and cultivation implies high time-labor and large cropped areas per
9 household, though limited by labor availability (*Hiernaux and Turner, 2002*). The Jerma and Fulani
10 agrarian cultures transformed into sedentary crop-livestock systems (*Bonfiglioli, 1990*). The
11 development of markets in the large village of Dantiandou and in nearby villages favored cash crops in
12 small gardens (cropped by women), small enough to be neglected for wind erosion analysis. Farming is
13 subsistence-oriented and the dominant crop is millet.

14 10% of the arable land, located near villages or pastoral camps, is under permanent cropping with
15 livestock manure and house wastes providing nutrients, allowing a large sowing density ($10\,000$
16 plants.ha^{-1}). The population pressure is still low enough that the remaining 90% of arable land (bush
17 fields) are under shifting cropping systems with fields cultivated for 5 years and fallowed for 3 years to
18 restore soil fertility (*Hiernaux and Turner, 2002*). *Reenberg et al.* (2013) observed similar alternate land
19 use of 5 years cropping and 3 years fallowing on sandy dunes in southeastern Niger after 1984. In these
20 unmanured fields, sowing density is lower ($6000 \text{ plants.ha}^{-1}$). In all cultivated fields (manured and
21 unmanured), 10% of crop residues were collected at harvest, as an emerging trend of storing and selling
22 part of these residues.

23 Thus, for a given year, 8% of the total surface is permanently cropped (10% of the 80% that are arable
24 lands), 45% of the land area is under shifting cultivation ($(5/8)*90=56.25\%$ of the arable land) and 27%
25 is fallow ($(3/8)*90 = 33.75\%$ of the arable land). The grazing pressure (8 TLU.km^{-2}) is exerted on the
26 whole landscape and corresponds to an equilibrium between livestock density and forage availability in
27 the landscape (see Appendix A).

28


29 *(iii) « Very high density, Extensive (2030s) » scenario*

30 This scenario intends to be representative of the near future (around 2030), following a narrative in
31 which current agro-pastoral practices are increasingly used. Following the observed recent trends,
32 croplands continue to expand until all arable land is cultivated and no field is fallowed anymore (thus all
33 the landscape but the plateaus). Due to continual nutrient uptake by crops, soil fertility further
34 decreases and farmers adapt planting density to soil fertility (i.e. with lower densities: $4000 \text{ plants.ha}^{-1}$).
35 Livestock are more numerous (12 TLU.km^{-2}) and can still graze on the plateaus during the wet season

1 and on crop residues during the dry season, but do not necessarily find enough forage on the sandy
 2 slopes and valleys of the study area. A large proportion of crop residue (75%) is collected at harvest to
 3 feed livestock or to be sold as forage or building material. This estimate aims at representing a large
 4 rate of residue harvesting, yet not a total collection, in order to design realistic conditions and not
 5 extreme behaviors.

6
 7 (iv) « Very high density, Intensive (2030s) » scenario


8 This last scenario is an alternative to what could occur around 2030, assuming funds are available (e.g.
 9 from a national policy) to purchase fertilizers and additional animal feed. The association of cropping
 10 and livestock is assumed to be maximized and soil fertility is supported with fertilizers. In this case, all
 11 arable land is cultivated using manure and inorganic N and P fertilizers and plant densities are large
 12 (12 000 plants.ha⁻¹). The fertilizers enhance both grain and stalks/leaf yields and thus fodder resources
 13 for livestock, in turn producing more manure. Yet, as in the *Extensive* scenario, livestock (20 TLU.km⁻²)
 14 do not necessarily find enough forage on the sandy slopes and valleys of the study area. A large
 15 proportion of crop residue (75%) is collected at harvest and 10% is laid down for surface mulching on
 16 crop fields.



17
 18 **Fig. 2** Land use proportions depending on the scenarios (with simulation names detailed in 2.3.4). Note
 19 that for a given land use, land management can differ: e.g. for savanna/fallows, lower soil fertility for
 20 fallows in ‘High density’ than for savanna in ‘Low density’; for unmanured fields, lower plants density
 21 and larger residues collecting and grazing pressure in ‘Very high density, Extensive’ compared to ‘High
 22 density’; for manured fields, larger soil fertility, plants density, residues collecting and grazing pressure
 23 in ‘Very high density, Intensive’ compared to ‘High density’ (see Table 2).

1 **2.3. Models**

2 Wind erosion results from the effect of wind on an unprotected soil surface (i.e. with low or no
 3 vegetation cover). It is a threshold phenomenon: the wind has to reach a minimum speed, depending
 4 on the surface characteristics, to initiate the movement of soil particles (*Greeley and Iversen, 1985*).
 5 Vegetation acts as an obstacle to the wind effect on the surface. Thus, it is essential to characterize the
 6 vegetation cover in order to estimate wind erosion. Therefore, we use one model for wind erosion and
 7 two models for vegetation cover - one to simulate the herbaceous cover of savanna/fallows and one to
 8 simulate millet growth in fields (*Figure 3*).
 9



10
 11 **Fig. 3:** Scheme of the models combination. Inputs (meteorological data, soil characteristics, land
 12 management practices) drive the vegetation models (Sarrah for millet fields, STEP for herbaceous
 13 savanna/fallows). Vegetation mass and Leaf Area Index (LAI) enable to estimate surface vegetation cover
 14 f_{cv} and aerodynamic surface roughness z_0 using empirical parameterizations. f_{cv} and z_0 , along with wind
 15 data, drive the wind erosion model to compute the horizontal wind erosion flux G (Figure adapted from
 16 *Pierre et al., 2015*).

17
 18 Each scenario depicts a landscape composed of several land units corresponding each to a given land
 19 use. For each land unit, simulations of vegetation and horizontal sediment flux were run for the
 20 corresponding set of practices (see *Table 2* for the detailed parameters of each simulation). Thus, the
 21 spatial scale of the simulations was the scale of a land unit (e.g. a field or a savanna grassland, typically
 22 of about 1 ha). The resulting horizontal sediment fluxes were aggregated at the scale of the study area,
 23 as the weighed mean of horizontal sediment flux from several land uses i.e. from several model
 24 simulations. Transport and spatial redistribution of the horizontal wind erosion flux is not considered
 25 here. We briefly describe the models below; more detailed information on equations and parameters
 26 of the models can be found in *Pierre et al. (2015; 2018)* and in Appendix B and C.

27
 28 **2.3.1 Wind erosion model**

29 We use here the Dust Production Model (DPM, *Marticorena and Bergametti, 1995*) to estimate wind
 30 erosion. This model has provided reliable estimates of the horizontal sediment mass flux at the local
 31 scale (*Gomes et al., 2003; Pierre et al., 2014*) as well as for dust emissions at regional scale (*Laurent et*

1 *al.*, 2008; *Pierre et al.*, 2012). The DPM estimates horizontal sediment flux G as a function of the total
2 wind friction velocity u_* over the vegetated surface and the threshold wind friction velocity u_{*t} , which
3 depends on surface characteristics:

$$4 \quad G = E \frac{\rho_a}{g} u_*^3 \left(1 + \frac{u_{*t}}{u_*}\right) \left(1 - \frac{u_{*t}^2}{u_*^2}\right) \text{ if } u_* > u_{*t}, G = 0 \text{ otherwise} \quad (1)$$

5 with :

6 E : proportion of erodible surface ($E = 1 - f_{cv}$ where f_{cv} is the cover ratio of the surface by vegetation)

7 ρ_a : air density (= 0.001227 g.cm⁻³)

8 g : gravity (= 981 cm.s⁻²)

9

10 The horizontal sediment flux G is expressed in kg.m⁻¹ per time unit, i.e. the total mass of particles
11 crossing a 1-m wide vertical plane perpendicular to wind direction with infinite height during the time
12 unit. The drag of the wind on the ground surface is distributed between the soil surface and the
13 vegetation according to a drag partition scheme. In the DPM, the drag partition scheme depends on the
14 surface aerodynamic roughness length z_0 , of prime importance for wind erosion modelling, and is
15 estimated here from vegetation characteristics. We use the parameterizations of ground surface
16 characteristics established by *Pierre et al.* (2015; equation (8)) to estimate z_0 for spontaneous
17 herbaceous, and by *Pierre et al.* (2018; equations (2) to (6)) to estimate E and z_0 for millet. These
18 parametrizations account for the distinct geometry of millet and herbaceous as they have been
19 empirically defined for each of these two cover types. They depend on vegetation mass or vegetation
20 cover, and they distinguish between standing and prostrate (i.e. litter) vegetation (see Appendix C).

21

22 2.3.2 Vegetation models

23 The STEP model (*Mougin et al.*, 1995) was developed to simulate the growth of seasonal Sahelian
24 herbaceous vegetation, while the SarraH model (*Baron et al.*, 2005) simulates crop growth for millet.
25 Both vegetation models have been extensively tested for several Sahelian study sites (e.g. *Tracol et al.*,
26 2006; *Pierre et al.*, 2011 for STEP; and *Kouressy et al.*, 2008; *Marteau et al.*, 2011 for SarraH). They run
27 on a daily time step, using meteorological data and soil texture information as inputs, and providing
28 vegetation mass and Leaf Area Index (LAI) as main outputs. The SarraH model further provides grain
29 yields as well as separate stalk and leaf mass. Among dry vegetation, standing straws inhibit more wind
30 erosion than prostrate litter due to their larger effectiveness at reducing wind momentum near the
31 surface (e.g. *Pi et al.*, 2020). Thus we need information on both dry vegetation types. STEP already had
32 a dry season submodel to simulate dry vegetation during the dry season. SarraH has been added a dry
33 season submodel to simulate crop residue dynamics after harvest (*Pierre et al.*, 2015; see also Appendix
34 B). According to these dry season submodels, livestock ingests part of dry leaves, and tramples dry stems

1 and leaves, while abiotic factors also induce vegetation degradation. Grazing pressure was assumed to
2 be spatially homogenous over all land uses.

3 STEP and SarraH models require parameters related to agro-pastoral practices. Namely, these
4 parameters are:

5 (i) for STEP: soil fertility and grazing pressure,

6 (ii) for SarraH: cultivar, intensity of the use of manure, sowing date, sowing density, proportion of
7 collected residues at harvest, proportion of residues laid down at harvest, grazing pressure (after
8 harvest) and date of field clearing (date at which all remaining standing residues are laid down on the
9 soil).

10 In SarraH, grazing pressure is only applied to dry vegetation, in line with the exclusion of livestock from
11 Sahelian cropped fields during the rainy season. In STEP, a light grazing effect on green vegetation is
12 implicitly accounted for in the growth parameters, while grazing pressure is applied in the dry season.
13 Soil fertility is taken into account through a productivity coefficient. Here, we adjusted the productivity
14 coefficient to attain target herbaceous and millet production levels for each set of practices under the
15 scenarios (see 2.3.4).

16

17 *2.3.3 Meteorological data*

18 In order to separate effects of climate change from land management practices, the simulations were
19 run for each land use and associated set of management practices using the same meteorological 12-
20 year series. As in *Pierre et al.* (2018), we used meteorological data (wind speed, air temperature, relative
21 humidity, and precipitation) monitored in Banizoumbou since 2006 at 6.5 m height with 5-min
22 resolution (*Marticorena et al.*, 2017), but over a longer period (2006-2017). Temporal coverage of
23 meteorological measurements was very good with less than 3% of missing wind and rainfall data. Solar
24 radiation data were re-analyses of the European Center for Medium-Range Weather Forecast (ERA-
25 Interim; *Dee et al.*, 2011). Meteorological data were converted to daily values for vegetation modelling,
26 whereas 5-minutes wind and rainfall data were used for wind erosion modelling. Horizontal aeolian flux
27 was then summed to get daily, seasonal and annual values for the analysis. Following *Bergametti et al.*
28 (2016; pers. comm.), simulated wind erosion was assumed to be nil for rains larger than 0.4 mm in 4
29 hours, from rain start to 12 h after the end of the rain event (the end of the event being defined as soon
30 as there is no rain during 4 hours).

31 Meteorological conditions at the study site exhibit a large interannual variability (*Table 1*). The mean
32 annual rainfall over the used time-series is 505 mm with a standard deviation of 144 mm. The proportion
33 of high wind speeds (greater than 7 m.s⁻¹, at 5-minutes resolution, 6.5m height, corresponding to wind
34 erosion threshold for the bare soil at the study site, see *Abdourhamane Toure et al.*, 2011) was also
35 highly variable through years with a mean of 1.35 % and a standard deviation of 0.63%.

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	mean	std	std/mean
Rainfall (mm)	533	471	698	307	371	349	807	504	432	584	548	450	505	144	0.28
Prop wind >7 m.s ⁻¹ (%)	2.24	2.29	2.08	1.41	1.68	1.35	1.52	0.84	0.68	0.98	0.54	0.59	1.35	0.63	0.47

1 *Table 1: Interannual variability of meteorological conditions over the 12-year period*

2

3 *2.3.4 Sets of simulations*

4 Detailed information about simulation names and parameters are reported in *Table 2*. Note that given
5 land uses (e.g. manured fields) exhibit different associated land management practices among
6 scenarios.

7 In the *Low Density* scenario, the soil fertility of savanna - in the grassland vegetation model (STEP), used
8 in the 'Sav1950s' simulation - was set to produce an annual maximum mass of green vegetation of about
9 180 g.m⁻² (237 g.m⁻² for the sum of standing green and dry vegetation) on average for the 12-year
10 meteorological data used, to be in agreement with observations (see Table 28 in *Hiernaux and*
11 *Ayantunde, 2004*).

12

Simulation name	Land use	Vegetation model	Parameters	Simulated mass (mean of annual max)
Sav1950s	Savanna	STEP	<i>Soil fertility: 3.4</i> <i>Grazing Pressure: 0 TLU.km⁻²</i>	Green: 182 g.m ⁻² Tot: 237 g.m ⁻²
Fal1990s	Fallows	STEP	<i>Soil fertility: 2.9</i> <i>Grazing Pressure: 8 TLU.km⁻²</i>	Green: 142 g.m ⁻² Tot: 156 g.m ⁻²
FieldBush1990s	Unmanured fields	SarraH	<i>Manure: none (NF)</i> <i>Sowing density: 6000 plants.ha⁻¹</i> <i>Residues collecting: 10%</i> <i>Residues laid down: 0%</i> <i>Grazing pressure: 8 TLU.km⁻²</i>	Grains: 104 g.m ⁻² Stalks: 152 g.m ⁻² Leaves: 56 g.m ⁻²
FieldHome1990s	Manured fields	SarraH	<i>Manure: slight (mF)</i> <i>Sowing density: 10 000 plants.ha⁻¹</i> <i>Residues collecting: 10%</i> <i>Residues laid down: 0%</i> <i>Grazing pressure: 8 TLU.km⁻²</i>	Grains: 124 g.m ⁻² Stalks: 241 g.m ⁻² Leaves: 56 g.m ⁻²
FieldExt2030s	Unmanured fields	SarraH	<i>Manure: none (NF)</i> <i>Sowing density: 4 000 plants.ha⁻¹</i> <i>Residues collecting: 75%</i> <i>Residues laid down: 0%</i> <i>Grazing pressure: 12 TLU.km⁻²</i>	Grains: 102 g.m ⁻² Stalks: 134 g.m ⁻² Leaves: 54 g.m ⁻²

FieldInt2030s	Manured fields	SarraH	Manure: high (F)	Grains: 128 g.m ⁻²
			Sowing density: 12 000 plants.ha ⁻¹	Stalks: 345 g.m ⁻²
			Residues collecting: 75%	Leaves: 61 g.m ⁻²
			Residues laid down: 10%	
			Grazing pressure: 20 TLU.km ⁻²	

Table 2: Simulation names and models parameters

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

In the *High Density* scenario, the soil fertility in fallows (simulation ‘Fal1990s’ with STEP model) was lower than in savannas of the *Low Density* scenario, due to nutrient depletion induced by shifting cultivation (Turner and Hiernaux, 2015). It was adjusted to produce an annual maximum mass of green vegetation of about 140 g.m⁻² (150 g.m⁻² for the sum of standing green and dry vegetation) on average over the 12-year period, to be in agreement with observations (Table 28 in Hiernaux and Ayantunde, 2004). Similarly, the soil fertility in millet fields was set (in the crop model SarraH) to simulate a total aboveground mass of about 312 g.m⁻² for unmanured fields (simulation ‘FieldBush1990s’) and 421 g.m⁻² for manured fields (simulation ‘FieldHome1990s’), close to the values observed by Hiernaux and Ayantunde (2004; Table 28). The simulated vegetation amounts for stalks (152 and 241 g.m⁻²) and for leaves (56 g.m⁻² in both cases) were also in fair agreement with observations. Simulated grain amounts (104 and 124 g.m⁻²) were large and likely overestimated. However, grains are filled during the late rainy season, when vegetation cover already prevents wind erosion, and they are collected at harvest, and so do not play a role for soil protection during the dry season. Therefore, the uncertainty in simulated grain amounts was not problematic for our study. For the *High density* scenario, livestock density was assumed to be balanced with forage availability over the study site (see Appendix A for the estimate of the grazing pressure).

Both *Very high density* scenarios are prospective and thus do not compare with observations. They assume cropland expansion over all the arable land in the simulation area. There was no manure effect for the croplands of the *Extensive* scenario (simulation ‘FieldExt2030s’ with SarraH model) and a full manure and fertilizer effect for the croplands of the *Intensive* scenario (simulation ‘FieldInt2030s’ with SarraH model). Accordingly, millet sowing density was high for *Intensive* and low for *Extensive*, while grazing pressure increased slightly in *Extensive* and significantly in *Intensive*, compared to the *High density* scenario.

For all scenarios including croplands (*High density*, *Very high density*, *Extensive* and *Very high density*, *Intensive*), the cultivar was millet Haini Kirey, sown on June 7th and fields were cleared on March 1st. These practices were set up in agreement with previous work (Pierre et al., 2018) as they were not prone to change under the socio-environmental conditions defining the scenarios.

1 3. Results

2 3.1 Per land use:

3 Wind erosion depends on the occurrence of strong winds combined with a low soil protection by
4 vegetation. Thus, we must scrutinize (i) the seasonality of vegetation to understand (ii) the seasonality
5 of horizontal sediment flux and ultimately (iii) its annual amounts. Vegetation mass is of particular
6 interest, as it is a relevant variable to estimate the drag partition of the wind due to vegetation (see
7 2.3.1).

8

9 3.1.1 Vegetation mass seasonality

10 For the same meteorological conditions, differences were large between millet and herbaceous mass
11 (see Table 3 for pluriannual amounts, and Figure 4 where 2010 illustrates the seasonality of vegetation
12 growth). At the beginning of the rainy season, herbaceous growth was faster than millet growth, while
13 the maximum standing mass was much larger for millet than for herbaceous (Figure 4a). As described
14 below, differences are also noticeable between simulations for each vegetation type.

15

16 *Herbaceous:*

17 'Sav1950s' and 'Fal1990s' simulations exhibited the same dynamics (e.g. onset of vegetation growth in
18 early June and maximum in late September, see Figure 4b) but lower green vegetation maximum
19 amounts for 'Fal1990s' (140 g.m⁻² in 2010, 142+/-25 g.m⁻² pluriannual mean) than for 'Sav1950s' (174
20 g.m⁻² in 2010, 182+/-32 g.m⁻² pluriannual mean) due to a lower soil fertility. Similarly, standing straws
21 reached larger maximum amounts for 'Sav1950s' (144 g.m⁻² end of October in 2010; 138+/-16 g.m⁻²
22 pluriannual mean) than for 'Fal1990s' (87 g.m⁻² in 2010; 83+/-14 g.m⁻² pluriannual mean) because of the
23 difference in green vegetation amounts and because the grazing pressure increased from 0 for
24 'Sav1950s' to 8 TLU.km⁻² for 'Fal1990s'. This grazing pressure also induced a faster decrease of standing
25 straws amounts for 'Fal1990s' than for 'Sav1950s'. As trampling transforms straws into litter, litter
26 amounts became slightly larger for 'Fal1990s' during the dry season (from December to April; maximum
27 of 31 g.m⁻² in 2010; 30+/-4 g.m⁻² as pluriannual mean), before reaching lower values than for 'Sav1950s'
28 (maximum of 24 g.m⁻² in 2010; 25+/-3 g.m⁻² as pluriannual mean) at the end of the dry season.
29 Altogether, annual minimum amounts of total vegetation were thus lower for 'Fal1990s' (24 g.m⁻² in
30 2010 -, 20+/-6 g.m⁻² pluriannual mean) than for 'Sav1950s' (77 g.m⁻² in 2010, 77+/-10 g.m⁻² pluriannual
31 mean). This minimum value was usually reached by the end of June (e.g. June 26th in 2010).

32

33 *Millet:*

34 A larger soil fertility and larger plant density yielded a larger green vegetation amount for
35 'FieldHome1990s' compared to 'FieldBush1990s' over the whole rainy season, along with a faster

1 increase in green vegetation mass at growth onset (*Figure 4c*). Maximum green vegetation in 2010 was
2 483 g.m^{-2} for 'FieldHome1990s' ($409 \pm 108 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean) and 377 g.m^{-2} for 'FieldBush1990s'
3 ($307 \pm 113 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean). The same observation applied between 'FieldHome1990s' and
4 'FieldInt2030s', with a larger soil fertility and plant density for the latter, yielding the largest maximum
5 green vegetation amount (608 g.m^{-2} in 2010; $519 \pm 123 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean). Maximum green
6 vegetation amounts were similar between 'FieldBush1990s' and 'FieldExt2030s' (351 g.m^{-2} ; 286 ± 110
7 g.m^{-2} pluriannual mean), the only difference stemming from green vegetation having a slightly larger
8 plant density for 'FieldBush1990s' ($6000 \text{ plants.ha}^{-1}$) than for 'FieldExt2030s' ($4000 \text{ plants.ha}^{-1}$). These
9 observations held true for every year and for each part of the plant (grains, stems, leaves; not shown).
10 Differences in crop residue management induced contrasting behaviors for dry vegetation (standing
11 straws, that include standing dry stems and leaves; and litter, that include flattened dry stems and
12 leaves) compared to green vegetation. 'FieldHome1990s' yielded the largest standing straw mass
13 (maximum of 291 g.m^{-2} in 2010; $243 \pm 81 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean), followed by 'FieldBush1990s' (215
14 g.m^{-2} in 2010; $173 \pm 76 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean). Although the difference in green vegetation amounts
15 was slight between 'FieldBush1990s' and 'FieldExt2030s', it became larger for standing straws because
16 of the larger proportion of crop residues collected at harvest for 'FieldExt2030s' (54 g.m^{-2} in 2010; $43 \pm$
17 20 g.m^{-2} pluriannual mean) compared to 'FieldBush1990s'. Similarly, the large proportion of crop
18 residues collected at harvest for 'FieldInt2030s' (that occurred usually at the beginning of October, e.g.
19 October 9th in 2010) yielded a low maximum amount of standing straws after harvest (65 g.m^{-2} in 2010;
20 $55 \pm 16 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean), although this simulation produced the largest green vegetation
21 amounts. It was also similar to 'FieldExt2030s', which produced the lowest green vegetation amounts.
22 'FieldInt2030s' was the only simulation in which some of the residues were laid down as litter at harvest.
23 For all millet simulations, field clearing on March 1st induced a sharp increase in litter mass. From then
24 on, as for the mass of standing straws, litter mass was the largest for 'FieldHome1990s' (maximum of
25 142 g.m^{-2} in 2010; $120 \pm 49 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean), intermediate for 'FieldBush1990s' (98 g.m^{-2} in
26 2010; $81 \pm 43 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean), and the lowest for 'FieldInt2030s' (44 g.m^{-2} in 2010; 37 ± 11
27 g.m^{-2} pluriannual mean) and 'FieldExt2030s' (18 g.m^{-2} in 2010; $15 \pm 8 \text{ g.m}^{-2}$ pluriannual mean). As they
28 considered the same grazing pressure, 'FieldHome1990s' and 'FieldBush1990s' exhibited the same rate
29 of decrease of dry vegetation amounts. 'FieldInt2030s' decreased faster than 'FieldExt2030s' because
30 of a larger grazing pressure; their litter masses were very small (e.g. about 2 g.m^{-2} at the beginning of
31 June 2010, versus 15 g.m^{-2} for 'FieldBush1990s' and 23 g.m^{-2} for 'FieldHome1990s').
32 Although maximum mass of standing straws was of similar magnitude between some herbaceous and
33 millet simulations ('FieldBush1990s' and 'Sav1950s'; 'FieldInt2030s' and 'Fal1990s'), this did not hold
34 true during the dry season due to contrasting rates of decrease of dry vegetation. Altogether, annual
35 minimum mass of total vegetation reached much lower values for millet than for grass, ranging between

1 0.6+/-0.2 g.m⁻² for 'FieldInt2030s' (0.6 g.m⁻² in 2010) to 12+/-5 g.m⁻² for 'FieldHome2030s' (13.5 g.m⁻²
 2 in 2010), also usually reached at the end of June (June 27th in 2010, July 24th for 'FieldBush1990s').

3


Simulation	Green max	Straws max	Litter max	Total min
Sav1950s	182+/-32	138+/-16	25+/-3	77+/-10
Fal1990s	142+/-25	83+/-14	30+/-4	20+/-6
FieldHome1990s	409+/-108	243+/-81	120+/-49	12+/-5
FieldBush1990s	307+/-113	173 +/- 76	81+/-43	7+/-4
FieldExt2030s	286+/-110	43+/-20	15+/-8	1+/-0.7
FieldInt2030s	519+/-123	55 +/-16	37+/-11	0.6+/-0.2

4

Table 3: Pluriannual mean and standard deviation

5

of annual maximum and minimum vegetation mass (in g.m⁻²) for the 6 simulations



6

1 **Fig. 4** Vegetation amounts in 2010 for a) total vegetation for the 6 simulations, b) green vegetation
2 (BMg), standing straws (BMs) and litter (BML) for the 2 herbaceous simulations, and c) the 4 millet
3 simulations
4

5 3.1.2 Horizontal sediment flux seasonality

6 Table 4 presents the pluriannual means of monthly horizontal sediment flux and Figure 5 illustrates its
7 seasonality for year 2010, with an additional case of bare soil for comparison, enabling to assess the
8 impact of meteorological conditions only, although this latter case is not realistic in terms of land
9 management. In all cases, horizontal sediment flux was nil to negligible from August to January,
10 suggesting that meteorological conditions yielded no wind erosion during that period. Both prospective
11 simulations led to non-negligible amounts from January to March, yet lower than for bare soil, indicating
12 that the dry vegetation cover reduced wind erosion during that time, even for low amounts of
13 vegetation mass. In spring (April to July), monthly amounts of horizontal sediment flux were nil to
14 negligible for herbaceous cover, intermediate for the 1990s croplands and large for 'future' croplands.
15 During (late) spring, horizontal sediment flux for bare soil was similar to that for 'FieldExt2030s' and
16 'FieldInt2030s' ('FieldBush1990s'), as vegetation cover had almost disappeared at that time in these
17 simulations. Altogether, the horizontal sediment flux was thus the largest for croplands, especially in
18 May ($46\pm 102 \text{ kg.m}^{-1}$ for 'FieldHome1990s' to $196\pm 162 \text{ kg.m}^{-1}$ for 'FieldInt2030s' kg.m^{-1}), June ($111\pm$
19 107 kg.m^{-1} for 'FieldHome1990s' to $238\pm 144 \text{ kg.m}^{-1}$ for 'FieldExt2030s' kg.m^{-1}) and July (59 ± 87 and
20 $59\pm 78 \text{ kg.m}^{-1}$ for 'FieldHome1990s' and 'FieldInt2030s' to $104\pm 88 \text{ kg.m}^{-1}$ for 'FieldExt2030s' kg.m^{-1}).
21 Monthly horizontal sediment fluxes were constantly larger for 'FieldBush1990s' than for
22 'FieldHome1990s', mostly from May to July, as threshold friction velocity (u_{*t}) was always larger for
23 'FieldHome1990s' than for 'FieldBush1990s' due to larger vegetation amounts. In 2010, this threshold
24 reached a minimum value of 47.9 cm.s^{-1} for 'FieldBush1990s' on July 24th and 58.0 cm.s^{-1} for
25 'FieldHome1990s' on June 27th (not shown).

26 The difference in horizontal sediment flux between 'FieldExt2030s' and 'FieldInt2030s' was slight and
27 resulted from seasonal differences in vegetation cover. Crop residue management yielded close
28 amounts of litter for both simulations, yet with slightly larger amounts for 'FieldExt2030s' than for
29 'FieldInt2030s' at the end of the dry season due to a larger grazing pressure for 'FieldInt2030s'. Thus,
30 the threshold friction velocity was larger for 'FieldExt2030s' than for 'FieldInt2030s' at the end of the
31 dry season and became lower at the beginning of the rainy season (not shown). For example, in 2010
32 u_{*t} reaches a minimum value of 25.2 cm.s^{-1} for 'FieldInt2030s' and 29.0 cm.s^{-1} for 'FieldExt2030s' on
33 June 27th, before increasing to 38.6 cm.s^{-1} for 'FieldInt2030s' but only to 29.7 cm.s^{-1} for 'FieldExt2030s'
34 on July 1st because of the larger soil fertility and sowing density in 'FieldInt2030s'. This fast increase for
35 'FieldInt2030s' after vegetation germination prevented wind erosion earlier in the year than for


1 'FieldExt2030s'. Altogether, the horizontal sediment flux was thus larger for 'FieldInt2030s' at the end
 2 of the dry season (May-June) and larger for 'FieldExt2030s' during the beginning of the rainy season
 3 (end of June to beginning of August).

4

Simulation	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Sav1950s	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fal1990s	0	0	0	0	0	12+/-17	8+/-16	0	0	0	0	0
FieldHome1990s	0	0	0	0	46+/-102	111+/-107	59+/-87	1+/-2	0	0	0	0
FieldBush1990s	1+/-5	0	0	7+/-14	89+/-161	159+/-136	82+/-101	3+/-5	0	0	0	0
FieldExt2030s	19+/-55	12+/-28	21+/-39	72+/-93	178+/-171	238+/-144	104+/-88	6+/-9	0	0	0	1+/-2
FieldInt2030s	3+/-9	1+/-3	6+/-10	64+/-68	196+/-162	237+/-147	59+/-78	1+/-2	0	0	0	0
Bare soil	64+/-91	64+/-59	111+/-68	129+/-93	234+/-152	246+/-132	108+/-77	22+/-	22+/-	11+/-	9+/-	18+/-
								10	12	12	11	16

5 *Table 4: Pluriannual mean and standard deviation*
 6 *of monthly horizontal sediment flux (in kg.m⁻¹) for the 6 simulations, and a bare soil*

7



8 *Fig. 5 Cumulated daily horizontal sediment flux G for the 6 simulations and a bare soil in 2010.*

9

10 3.1.3 Mean annual horizontal sediment flux

11 The mass of total horizontal sediment fluxes and its annual mean were computed for each simulation
 12 (i.e. for each land unit) and for a bare soil over the 12-year period. As observed in the previous
 13 subsections, the vegetation cover of 'Sav1950s' was always large enough to prevent wind erosion,
 14 notably because of a large soil fertility and no grazing pressure. The decrease in soil fertility and the
 15 intermediate grazing pressure in 'Fal1990s' compared to 'Sav1950s' yielded a low horizontal sediment
 16 flux of 20+/-28 kg.m⁻¹ per year on average.

17

1 In agreement with the seasonality discussed above, 'FieldHome1990s' yielded the lowest annual
2 horizontal sediment flux among the four cultivated cases ($217\pm 263 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$) due to a large soil
3 fertility and a low rate of residue collection and thus large vegetation amounts protecting the soil from
4 wind during the rainy season and the dry season. Conversely, 'FieldExt2030s' yielded the largest
5 horizontal sediment flux ($649\pm 515 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$), in response to residue collection, yet about 1.6 times
6 lower than a bare soil ($1037\pm 533 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$). It was closely followed by 'FieldInt2030s' (565 ± 396
7 $\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$), which produced larger green vegetation amounts than 'FieldExt2030s' thanks to manure
8 and fertilizers, but had some residues laid down at harvest (in addition to residue collection) and a larger
9 grazing pressure on dry vegetation from then on. 'FieldBush1990s' yielded intermediate values of
10 horizontal sediment flux ($341\pm 363 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$), with a low soil fertility but also a very low proportion
11 of residue being collected. Standard deviations over the 12-year series were large, yet the relative order
12 of annual sediment fluxes remains every year, from 'FieldExt2030s' yielding the largest values to
13 'Sav1950s' yielding the lowest ones.

14

15 ***3.2 Landscape scale responses***


16 *3.2.1 Mean annual horizontal sediment flux*

17 Mean annual horizontal sediment flux for scenarios are reported in *Figure 6*, as weighted combinations
18 of the simulations over the whole landscape according to the corresponding land use proportions,
19 including the plateaus (see *Figure 2*). Under the *Low density* scenario, annual horizontal sediment flux
20 remained zero across the landscape. For the *High density* (1990s) scenario, the combination of fallows,
21 unmanured and manured fields, and plateaus, yielded an average horizontal sediment flux of $176 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}$
22 $\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$. The weighing slightly reduced the values for both future scenarios (*Very high density, Extensive:*
23 $520 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$ and *Very high density, Intensive:* $452 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$) compared to single land uses, as their
24 estimates included 20% of the landscape covered by plateaus that are not prone to wind erosion.
25 Similarly, bare soil would induced a horizontal sediment flux of $830 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$ over the landscape, with
26 no wind erosion over the plateaus.

27 Thus, the fact that landscapes are composed of several land uses had a noticeable influence on the final
28 results among scenarios. As an example, the unmanured fields of the *High density* scenario
29 ('FieldBush1990s') produced a mean annual horizontal sediment flux of $341 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$. Yet, under the
30 *High density* scenario, unmanured fields constitute only 45% of the landscape (and fallows, manured
31 fields, and plateaus respectively 20%, 8%, and 20% of the landscape), yielding a landscape scale
32 horizontal sediment flux (per unit area) much lower than for unmanured fields only.

33 As for the land use estimates, the landscape scale values exhibited large standard deviations over the
34 12-year time series (not shown), yet the relative order of annual sediment fluxes remained consistent

1 every year, from *Very high density, Extensive* yielding the largest amounts to *Low density* yielding the
 2 lowest.
 3 Altogether, these mean annual horizontal sediment fluxes differed by approximately a factor 2.5 to 3
 4 between *High density* and *Very high density, Extensive*, while *Low density* yields no wind erosion. Thus, both future
 5 scenarios suggest a significant increase of wind erosion compared to historical and recent situations
 6 (under current meteorological conditions). However, both yielded a lower horizontal sediment flux than
 7 bare soil (1.6 times lower for *Extensive* and 1.8 times lower for *Intensive*). The *Extensive* scenario yielded
 8 slightly larger values of horizontal sediment flux than the *Intensive* one, related to lower green
 9 vegetation amounts in *Extensive*, which is not totally counterbalanced by the lower use of crop residues
 10 in *Extensive* compared to *Intensive*.



11
 12 **Fig. 6** Annual mean horizontal sediment flux over the 12-year period for all scenarios

13
 14 **3.2.2 Wind erosion frequencies and large events**

15 For present-day meteorological conditions, the frequency of days with wind erosion ranged from 0 for
 16 *Low Density* to 15.5% for *Very High Density, Extensive* (and 44.1% for bare soil), with lower values of
 17 11.9% for *Very High Density, Intensive* and 5.9% for *High Density* (Table 5). Thus, land use and land
 18 management had an impact on both total amount and frequency of horizontal sediment flux. In
 19 addition, any land use and land management simulated here largely reduced the occurrence of wind
 20 erosion compared to a bare soil, especially for small events.

1 Most of the erosive days occurred in May, June and July, with 70% (*Very high density, Extensive*) to 77%
 2 (*Very high density, Intensive*) and 88% (*High density*) of events occurring over this period (not shown).
 3 Large events, with horizontal sediment flux larger than 50 kg.m⁻¹ per day, also concentrate between
 4 mid-May and early July. They sum up to 19%, 19%, and 21% of the total sediment flux of the 12-year
 5 period for *High density*, *Very high density, Extensive* and *Very high density, Intensive*, respectively,
 6 although they represented only about 3% of the erosive days. These figures emphasize the large
 7 seasonality of wind erosion, which persisted with a mosaic of land uses over the simulated landscape.
 8 In addition, the differences in total amounts of horizontal sediment flux between the *High Density* and
 9 the *Very High Density* scenarios were related to significant differences in the frequencies at which the
 10 landscape was prone to wind erosion, for all kind of events. Between *Extensive* and *Intensive*, the
 11 differences were mostly due to days with horizontal sediment flux lower than 20 kg.m⁻¹, as the
 12 frequencies of days with larger events were similar.
 13 Large aeolian sediment transport events can abrade plants, especially if they occur during the beginning
 14 of plant growth (*Sterk*, 2003). Here, maximum daily horizontal sediment flux was about 100 kg.m⁻¹ (102
 15 kg.m⁻¹ on May 13th 2008 and 108 kg.m⁻¹ on June 29th 2008 for *Very high density, Intensive*; 100 kg.m⁻¹
 16 on June 9th 2010 for *Very high density, Extensive*; versus 111 kg.m⁻¹ on May 13th 2008 for a bare soil),
 17 occurring in croplands at the end of the dry season. Maximum daily horizontal sediment flux for *High*
 18 *density* was 71 kg.m⁻¹ (on July 4th 2008). Given that most wind erosion events lasted less than 1 hour
 19 (not shown), these figures compare with the ones from *Michels et al.* (1995), who noticed a significant
 20 abrasion effect on millet seedlings after horizontal sediment flux of about 37 kg.m⁻¹ over 15 minutes.
 21

Scenario	Freq. of days with wind erosion > 0 kg.m ⁻¹ (%)	Freq. of days with wind erosion > 20 kg.m ⁻¹ (%)	Freq. of days with wind erosion > 50 kg.m ⁻¹ (%)
<i>Low density</i> (1950s)	0	0	0
<i>High density</i> (1990s)	5.9	0.8	0.2
<i>Very high density, Extensive</i> (2030s)	15.5	2.2	0.4
<i>Very high density, Intensive</i> (2030s)	11.9	2.2	0.4
<i>Bare soil</i>	44.1	4	0.6

22 Table 5: Frequency of days with wind erosion larger than 0, 20 or 50 kg.m⁻¹ for each scenario and the
 23 bare soil over the 12-year period
 24

25 3.2.3 Interannual variability of horizontal sediment flux


1 The large interannual variability of meteorological conditions raises the question of the extent to which
2 cropping practices may prevent wind erosion, compared to the variability of wind erosion due to
3 meteorological conditions. For each scenario, annual horizontal sediment flux exhibited large
4 interannual variability, about the same order as its pluriannual mean (see *Table D1* in Appendix D). Thus,
5 for the same practices, meteorological conditions induced large variability in the annual horizontal
6 sediment flux (of about 70% to 105%, depending on the scenario).

7 Similarly, each year, the variability of the horizontal sediment flux among scenarios was about the same
8 order as its mean over the four scenarios (*Table D2*; this does not include the bare soil case). Thus, for
9 the same meteorological conditions, land management induced large variability in the horizontal
10 sediment flux (of about 80 to 110%). Altogether, the variability of annual horizontal sediment flux due
11 to land management was of the same order as that due to meteorological conditions. While such
12 observations were made on benchmark simulations (*Pierre et al., 2018*), these results show that realistic
13 sets of practices have as large an influence as the largest theoretical range of practices on the variability
14 of annual horizontal sediment flux.

15 More specifically, the results show that:

16 1) Management promoting wind erosion tended to reduce annual wind erosion relative variability
17 related to meteorological conditions (see e.g. the low values of the coefficients of variation over years
18 of 0.70 and 0.79 for *Very high density*, *Extensive* and *Intensive* in *Table D1*, with both scenarios
19 associated with the largest horizontal sediment fluxes; the latter decreased to 51% for the case of a
20 bare soil).

21 2) Conversely, the relative variability of annual horizontal sediment fluxes between scenarios (i.e. due
22 to management) tended to be the lowest when high winds were the most frequent. There was a
23 significant ($p < 0.05$) anticorrelation ($R = -0.65$) between the annual frequencies of high wind events and
24 the relative variability of annual horizontal sediment fluxes in *Table D2* ($n = 12$).



1
2 *Fig. 7 Annual horizontal sediment flux versus frequency of large winds over the 12-year period for all*
3 *scenarios*

4
5 Additionally, there was a correlation of about 0.9 (n=12, p-value<0.0005) between the annual horizontal
6 sediment flux and the frequency of winds higher than 7 ms⁻¹ for all landscapes (*Figure 7*). This correlation
7 was larger for both *Very high density* scenarios (R=0.92 for Extensive, 0.93 for Intensive) than for the
8 *High density* situation (R=0.87). This trend is driven by cropped land uses, while fallows in the *High*
9 *density* landscape yielded a correlation lower than 0.3 (not shown). Indeed, for cropped surfaces, the
10 low vegetation cover during the erosive period of the year allowed wind erosion to mainly depend on
11 wind conditions.

12 13 4. Discussion

14 The steady increase in rural population density since the 1950s induced a widespread cropland
15 expansion throughout the Sahel (*van Vliet et al., 2013; Tappan et al., 2016*). As lands are becoming
16 increasingly cultivated, fields are less often fallowed and generally with no chemical fertilizer applied
17 (though manure can be applied in fields located close to villages or pastoralist camps) and soil fertility
18 tends to decline (*Turner and Hiernaux, 2015*). Meanwhile, crop residues are increasingly collected
19 (although not necessarily exported from the village territory), which has a large impact on wind erosion

1 as the surface becomes less protected from wind. Both phenomena, decrease in soil fertility and
2 increase in crop residues collection, have been observed and reported in the literature, including in
3 southwestern Niger (*Schlecht et al., 2001; Akponikpè et al., 2014*).

4 Our simulations show that a consequence of these changes is an increasing horizontal airborne
5 sediment flux, from nil flux with 1950s land management (*Low density*) to intermediate values with
6 1990s land management (*High density*) and large values with potential land management in 2030s (*Very*
7 *high density*). Also, as weighted mean of land uses composing each landscape, available forage
8 (maximum annual amounts of grass and millet leaves) decreases from 189 g.m⁻² (*Low density*) to 72 g.m⁻
9 ² (*High density*) and to 49 g.m⁻² (*Very high density, Intensive*) or 43 g.m⁻² (*Very high density, Extensive*).

10 Thus, the disappearing of fallows and rangelands in the prospective scenarios led to a decrease in forage
11 availability and an increase in horizontal sediment flux compared to historical and recent situations.

12 The horizontal sediment flux was only slightly lower for the *Intensive* prospective scenario (based on a
13 tight combination of cropping and livestock farming) than for the *Extensive* one (with increased use of
14 current practices and soil depletion), although intensification could enable larger amounts of grain and
15 forage production. This difference in vegetation amounts was due to practices enhancing green
16 vegetation growth in *Intensive* (manuring and sowing density), allowing a higher collection of crop
17 residues while keeping horizontal sediment flux of the same magnitude as in the *Extensive* scenario.

18 Compared to the *Extensive* scenario, *Intensive* provides sensibly higher grain yields, slightly higher mass
19 of millet leaves, and much larger stalks mass. The latter constitutes a resource as they can be sold, e.g.
20 as building material (yet they are not palatable for livestock). Their annual maximum amounts ranged
21 from 0 for *Low density* (no millet fields) to 88 g.m⁻² for *High density*, 107 g.m⁻² for *Very high density*,
22 *Extensive* and 276 g.m⁻² for *Very high density, Intensive*.

23 Thus, although the *Intensive* prospective scenario yielded larger vegetation production, it resulted in
24 horizontal sediment fluxes of similar magnitude to the *Extensive* scenario. Such large horizontal
25 sediment fluxes could deplete soil fertility and thus increasingly require the use of fertilizers, reducing
26 the long-term sustainability of such a scenario. This result could help designing future land management
27 policies to assess wind erosion risk along with other ecological issues like forage production and soil
28 nutrients depletion.

29 Altogether, the simulated values were in good agreement with the few existing observations (*Table 6*),
30 in terms of vegetation amounts as well as horizontal sediment flux, for both vegetation types.

	Millet	Herbaceous
Annual maximum mass of total vegetation (g.m⁻²)	300-500 <i>Marteau et al., 2011</i> (Niamey area, 2004-2009)	40-160 <i>Hiernaux et al., 2009</i> (Fakara area, Niger, 1994-2006)
	200-300 <i>Rockström & de Rouw, 1997</i> (Banizoumbou, 1994-1996)	150-230 <i>Mougin et al., 2009</i> (Gourma, Mali, 2005-2007)

Mass of residues (g.m⁻²)	100-300 standing in October <i>Schlecht et al.</i> , 2001 (Western Niger, 1997-1998) 20-40 litter in May <i>Schlecht et al.</i> , 2001 (Western Niger, 1997-1998)	
Grain yield (g.m⁻²)	40-100 <i>Marteau et al.</i> , 2011 (Niamey area, 2004-2009) 40-50 <i>Rockström & de Rouw</i> , 1997 (Banizoumbou, 1994-1996)	
Annual horizontal sediment flux (kg.m⁻¹)	300-400 millet field <i>Abdourhamane Toure et al.</i> , 2011 (Banizoumbou, 2007-2008) 1100-1800 bare soil <i>Abdourhamane Toure et al.</i> , 2011 (Banizoumbou, 2007-2008)	2-20 <i>Rajot et al.</i> , 2001 (Banizoumbou, 1996-1998)

Table 6: Observations of vegetation mass and horizontal sediment flux, from literature mostly dedicated to southwestern Niger

Our results show that realistic sets of practices have as large an influence as the largest theoretical range of practices on the variability of annual horizontal sediment flux. They induced a variability of annual horizontal sediment flux as large as that due to meteorological conditions. This study goes one step further than the benchmark study of *Pierre et al.* (2018) that addressed one land management practice at a time, considering the largest range of variation for each practice. Here, we considered scenarios representing a combination of land uses over the landscape with realistic proportional areas and associated land management practices. The practices associated with each land use within a scenario ensured internal consistency (e.g. sowing density related to soil fertility, livestock pressure related to forage availability) as land management operates in agro-pastoral systems. Off-farm activities were implicitly taken into account as they might provide income for producers to purchase fertilizers (like in 'Very high density, Intensive').

In future research, improvements could be brought to the simulations. For example, to explicitly account for wind erosion feedbacks on soil nutrients, dust emissions (spatially exported from the landscape) should be estimated, and spatial interactions of aeolian fluxes between land units should be taken into account, like fallows trapping part of the horizontal sediment flux from neighboring plots (*Bielders et al.*, 2004). Such estimates of sediment redistribution (i.e. budget between loss and deposition among surface types) due to wind erosion at the landscape scale would be highly valuable for assessing the dynamics of soil fertility. Similarly, trees and shrubs could be taken into account for their effect on wind erosion. As shown by *Leenders et al.* (2016), for a well-instrumented study site in Burkina Faso, shrubs

1 usually decrease wind erosion in their lee and increase it on their sides, with a net decreasing effect,
2 while trees increase wind speed and thus wind erosion around their trunk.
3 Some uncertainties in our simulations may derive from the depiction of crop residue management in
4 the prospective scenarios (e.g. rates of crop residues collection, constant grazing pressure throughout
5 the dry season). Simulated practices inside a given village could exhibit a range of values instead of a
6 unique one (e.g. rate of residues collection, dates of sowing and clearing, ...; see e.g. *Raynaut, 2001*).
7 Spatial and seasonal variability of grazing (*Turner et al., 2005*) could also be accounted for in spatially
8 explicit simulations, although such information is especially challenging to assess. Accordingly, the
9 submodels for dry vegetation carry uncertainties in dry vegetation amounts, as observations used to
10 calibrate them are very rarely available. Their improvements would require extensive measurements of
11 both dry vegetation amounts and livestock grazing and trampling, with a good spatial and temporal
12 coverage.
13 Finally, a step forward will be to run new simulations with climate conditions from past measurements
14 and from climate projections to combine land management dynamics with regional climate change and
15 local meteorological conditions over the long term. Climate projections to 2100 for the Sahel suggest a
16 broad increase in temperature (*Roehrig et al., 2013*), opposite trends in annual rainfall between western
17 (decrease) and central and eastern (increase) Sahel, a later monsoon onset (*Monerie et al., 2020*), and
18 more intense rain events. These trends are associated with changes in the regional circulation, e.g. a
19 stronger Saharan heat low (a near-surface thermal low pressure system) which affects the strength of
20 the monsoon flow (*Parker et al., 2005*) and could further favor the occurrence of intense mesoscale
21 convective systems which produce wind gusts (*Fitzpatrick et al., 2020*). As suggested by our results,
22 these changes in meteorological conditions will affect vegetation cover and wind erosion, thus the
23 impacts of wind erosion on the productive potential of Sahelian landscapes will be strongly influenced
24 by future land management. The strong correlation that we noticed between horizontal sediment flux
25 and the occurrence of strong winds recalls the fact that climate models must reproduce the occurrence
26 and the intensity of the strongest winds in order to assess the impacts of climate change on future wind
27 erosion.

28

29 **5. Conclusion**

30 Wind erosion has been simulated for a study site in southwestern Niger for four scenarios describing
31 typical agro-pastoral practices of the past and future decades (1950s, 1990s, and 2030s). These
32 scenarios focus on the dynamics of practices that are related to population increase, cropland expansion
33 and possible future intensification. Our results clearly illustrate how evolving land use and associated
34 management practices can affect horizontal airborne sediment flux. They underline the larger horizontal
35 sediment flux for croplands compared to rangelands and fallows, and the importance of crop residue

1 management for controlling soil and nutrient losses from Sahelian agro-pastoral systems. Other factors
2 like manuring and related crop density also produced noticeable differences in horizontal sediment
3 fluxes among scenarios.

4 Our results show that land use and management changes in the study area from the 1950s to the 1990s
5 increased aeolian sediment transport rates and are likely to continue to increase wind erosion in the
6 coming decades. The two prospective scenarios for the 2030s exhibited similar horizontal sediment
7 fluxes, but much larger vegetation yields under intensification (relying on external inputs and a tight
8 crop-livestock integration) than for extensive conditions. Such a large increase of wind erosion in the
9 coming decades would induce noticeable soil loss and associated nutrient loss, and thus ultimately a
10 decrease in soil fertility. This land degradation would become increasingly difficult to counterbalance
11 using fertilizers, the use of which, in addition, requires financial resources. Thus, these results bring to
12 question the sustainability of both prospective scenarios for the 2030s.

13 These conclusions are particularly valuable as they have been developed for a set of consistent land use
14 trajectories, from scenarios based on extensive knowledge of land use and land management practices
15 of the study site. This study goes further than benchmark studies which considered one practice at a
16 time and its sole range of variability, isolated from other practices. Thus, it recalls the fact that the
17 environmental impact of land use and management practices, of which wind erosion is an aspect, must
18 be assessed at the landscape scale in order to account for the contrasted surface types and associated
19 land management.

20 Agro-pastoral practices are motivated by environmental and socioeconomic conditions under which
21 smallholders must balance wind erosion trade-offs against millet yield and fodder production. While
22 this study focused on the impacts of evolving practices, future research will combine both varying
23 practices and climate conditions. Such results must be analyzed in relation to social changes to interpret
24 the effect of land use changes and to better assess the impact of possible evolutions of agro-pastoral
25 practices for the coming decades. Ultimately, future work will assess the feedbacks of wind erosion on
26 land management and socioeconomic conditions. The scenarios and methodology we developed here
27 are generalizable beyond this wind erosion study to systems-level investigations of human-environment
28 interactions in the Sahelian area.

29

30 **Acknowledgment:**

31 The meteorological data monitored at Banizoumbou study site (Niger) were provided by the INDAAF
32 network (Service National d'Observation "International Network to Study deposition and Atmospheric
33 composition in Africa"; <https://indaaf.obs-mip.fr/>). INDAAF is funded by the INSU/CNRS, the IRD and the
34 OSUs Observatoire Midi-Pyrénées (Université Paul Sabatier) and EFLUVE (Université Paris Est Créteil)
35 and is part of the French Research Infrastructure ACTRIS-Fr. The author thanks the local operators, Aliko

1 Maman (IRD, Niamey, Niger) and Alfari Zakou for maintaining the station of Banizoumbou and the
2 measurements and for providing high quality data since 2006. Monitoring of land use in the study area
3 over the last decades was performed by P. Hiernaux and collaborators in the frame of the AMMA-CATCH
4 Observatory. The authors thank E. Mougin, C. Delon and M. Grippa for providing the latest version of
5 the STEP model, C. Baron for providing support on the use of the SarraH model, and A. De Rouw and G.
6 Bergametti for their useful comments.

7

8 **Declarations:**

9 Funding: No funding was received for conducting this study. N. Webb was an invited scientist supported
10 by the French MOPGA (Make Our Planet Great Again) program at iEES-Paris in November 2018.

11 Conflicts of interest: the authors have no competing interests to disclose.

12 Ethics approval: Not applicable

13 Consent to participate: Not applicable

14 Consent for publication: Not applicable

15 Availability of data: Not applicable

16 Author's contribution: All authors contributed to the study.

17

18 **References:**

19 Abdourhamane Touré, A., Tidjani, A.D., Rajot, J.L., Marticorena, B., Bergametti, G., Bouet, C., Ambouta, K.J.M.,
20 Garba, Z., 2019. Dynamics of wind erosion and impact of vegetation cover and land use in the Sahel: A case study
21 on sandy dunes in southeastern Niger. *Catena* 177, 272–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2019.02.011>

22 Abdourhamane Touré, A., Rajot, J.L., Garba, Z., Marticorena, B., Petit, C., Sebag, D., 2011. Impact of very low crop
23 residues cover on wind erosion in the Sahel. *Catena* 85, 205–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2011.01.002>

24 Akponikpè, P.B.I., Gérard, B., Biélers, C.L., 2014. Soil water crop modeling for decision support in millet-based
25 systems in the Sahel: A challenge. *Afr. J. Agr. Res.* 9, 1700–1713. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJAR10.263>

26 Baron, C., Sultan, B., Balme, M., Sarr, B., Traore, S., Lebel, T., Janicot, S., Dingkuhn, M., 2005. From GCM grid cell
27 to agricultural plot: scale issues affecting modelling of climate impact. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 360, 2095–2108.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2005.1741>

29 Bergametti, G., Marticorena, B., Rajot, J.L., Chatenet, B., Féron, A., Gaimoz, C., Siour, G., Coulibaly, M., Koné, I.,
30 Maman, A., Zakou, A., 2017. Dust Uplift Potential in the Central Sahel: An analysis based on 10 years of
31 meteorological measurements at high temporal resolution. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 122, 12,433–12,448.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027471>

33 Bergametti, G., Rajot, J.L., Pierre, C., Bouet, C., Marticorena, B., 2016. How long does precipitation inhibit wind
34 erosion in the Sahel? *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL069324>

- 1 Bielders, C.L., Rajot, J.-L., Michels, K., 2004. L'érosion éolienne dans le Sahel nigérien : influence des pratiques
2 culturelles actuelles et méthodes de lutte. *Sécheresse* 15, 19–32.
- 3 Bonfiglioli, A.M., 1990. Pastoralisme, agro-pastoralisme et retour : itinéraires sahéliens. *Cahiers des Sciences*
4 *Humaines*, 3. La théorie en question 26, 255–266.
- 5 Breman, H., Groot, J.J.R., van Keulen, H., 2001. Resource limitations in Sahelian agriculture. *Global Environ. Chang.*
6 11, 59–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780\(00\)00045-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780(00)00045-5)
- 7 Cappelaere, B., Descroix, L., Lebel, T., Boulain, N., Ramier, D., Laurent, J.-P., Favreau, G., Boubkraoui, S., Boucher,
8 M., Bouzou Moussa, I., Chaffard, V., Hiernaux, P., Issoufou, H.B.A., Le Breton, E., Mamadou, I., Nazoumou, Y., Oi,
9 M., Ottlé, C., Quantin, G., 2009. The AMMA-CATCH experiment in the cultivated Sahelian area of south-west Niger
10 – Investigating water cycle response to a fluctuating climate and changing environment. *J. Hydrol.* 375, 34–51.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.06.021>
- 12 Chi, W., Zhao, Y., Kuang, W., He, H., 2019. Impacts of anthropogenic land use/cover changes on soil wind erosion
13 in China. *Sci. Total Environ.* 668, 204-215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.03.015>
- 14 de Rouw, A., Rajot, J.-L., 2004. Soil organic matter, surface crusting and erosion in Sahelian farming systems based
15 on manuring or fallowing. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.* 104, 263–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2003.12.020>
- 16 Dee, D.P., Uppala, S.M., Simmons, A.J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M.A., Balsamo,
17 G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A.C.M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes,
18 M., Geer, A.J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S.B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E.V., Isaksen, L., Kållberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi,
19 M., McNally, A.P., Monge-Sanz, B.M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut,
20 J.-N., Vitart, F., 2011. The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system.
21 *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.* 137, 553–597. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.828>
- 22 Du, H., Zuo, X., Li, S., Wang, T., Xue, X., 2019. Wind erosion changes induced by different grazing intensities in the
23 desert steppe, Northern China. *Agric. Ecosys. Environ.* 274, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.01.001>
- 24 Duniway, M.C., Pfenningwerth, A.A., Fick, S.E., Nauman, T.W., Belnap, J., Barger, N.N., 2019. Wind erosion and
25 dust from US drylands: a review of causes, consequences, and solutions in a changing world. *Ecosphere* 10,
26 e02650. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2650>
- 27 Fensholt, R., Rasmussen, K., Kaspersen, P., Huber, S., Horion, S., Swinnen, E., 2013. Assessing land
28 degradation/recovery in the African Sahel from long-term Earth observation based primary productivity and
29 precipitation relationships. *Remote Sens.* 5, 664–686. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs5020664>
- 30 Fenta, A. A., Tsunekawa, A., Haregeweyn, N., Poesen, J., Tsubo, M., Borrelli, P., Anagos, P., Vanmaercke, M.,
31 Broeckx, J., Yasuda, H., Kawai, T., Kurosaki, Y., 2020. Land susceptibility to water and wind erosion risks in the East
32 Africa region. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 703, 135016. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135016>

1 Fitzpatrick, R.G.J., Parker, D.J., Marsham, J.H., Rowell, D.P., Guichard, F.M., Taylor, C.M., Cook, K.H., Vizi, E.K.,
2 Jackson, L.S., Finney, D., Crook, J., Stratton, R., Tucker, S., 2020. What drives the intensification of Mesoscale
3 Convective Systems over the West African Sahel under climate change? *J. Climate* 33, 3151–3172.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0380.1>

5 Galloza, M. S., Webb, N. P., Bleiweiss, M. P., Winters, C., Herrick, J. E., Ayers, E., 2018. Exploring dust emission
6 responses to land cover change using an ecological land classification. *Aeolian Res.* 32, 141-153.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2018.03.001>

8 Gomes, L., Rajot, J.L., Alfaro, S.C., Gaudichet, A., 2003. Validation of a dust production model from measurements
9 performed in semi-arid agricultural areas of Spain and Niger. *Catena* 52, 257–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341->
10 [8162\(03\)00017-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341-8162(03)00017-1)

11 Goutorbe, J.P., Lebel, T., Dolman, A.J., Gash, J.H.C., Kabat, P., Kerr, Y.H., Monteny, B., Prince, S.D., Stricker, J.N.M.,
12 Tinga, A., Wallace, J.S., 1997. An overview of HAPEX-Sahel: a study in climate and desertification. *J. Hydrol.* 188–
13 189, 4–17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694\(96\)03308-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(96)03308-2)

14 Greeley, R., Iversen, J.D., 1985. *Wind as a geological process on Earth, Mars, Venus and Titan*, Cambridge University
15 Press. ed, Cambridge Planetary Science Series. Cambridge - London - New York - New Rochelle - Melbourne -
16 Sydney.

17 Hiernaux, P., Ayantunde, A., 2004. *The Fakara: a semi-arid agro-ecosystem under stress (Report of research*
18 *activities), First phase (July 2002-June 2004) of the DMP-GEF Program (GEF/2711-02-4516)*. International Livestock
19 Research Institute (ILRI), Niamey, Niger.

20 Hiernaux, P., Ayantunde, A., Kalilou, A., Mougin, E., Gérard, B., Baup, F., Grippa, M., Djaby, B., 2009. Trends in
21 productivity of crops, fallow and rangelands in Southwest Niger: Impact of land use, management and variable
22 rainfall. *J. Hydrol.* 375, 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.01.032>

23 Hiernaux, P., Turner, M.D., 2002. The influence of farmer and pastoralist management practices on desertification
24 processes in the Sahel, in: Reynolds, J.F., Stafford Smith, M.D. (Eds.), *Global Desertification: Do Humans Cause*
25 *Deserts?*, Dalhem Workshop Reports. Berlin, Germany, pp. 135–148.

26 IPCC, 2019: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change,*
27 *desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in*
28 *terrestrial ecosystems* [P.R. Shukla, J. Skea, E. Calvo Buendia, V. Masson-Delmotte, H.-O. Pörtner, D. C. Roberts, P.
29 Zhai, R. Slade, S. Connors, R. van Diemen, M. Ferrat, E. Haughey, S. Luz, S. Neogi, M. Pathak, J. Petzold, J. Portugal
30 Pereira, P. Vyas, E. Huntley, K. Kissick, M. Belkacemi, J. Malley, (eds.)]. In press.

31 Klein Goldewijk, K., Beusen, A., van Drecht, G., de Vos, M., 2011. The HYDE 3.1 spatially explicit database of human-
32 induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* 20, 73–86.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00587.x>

1 Kouressy, M., Dingkuhn, M., Vaksman, M., Heinemann, A.B., 2008. Adaptation to diverse semi-arid environments
2 of sorghum genotypes having different plant type and sensitivity to photoperiod. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* 148, 357–
3 371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2007.09.009>

4 Laurent, B., Marticorena, B., Bergametti, G., Léon, J.F., Mahowald, N.M., 2008. Modeling mineral dust emissions
5 from the Sahara desert using new surface properties and soil database. *J. Geophys. Res.* 113.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009484>

7 Lavigne Delville, P., 1997. Sahelians agrarian systems: Principal rationales, in: Raynaut, C., Grégoire, E., Janin, P.,
8 Koechlin, J., Lavigne Delville, P. (Eds.), *Societies and Nature in the Sahel*. London, UK, pp. 138–158.

9 Leenders, J.K., Sterk, G., Boxel, J.H., 2016. Wind erosion reduction by scattered woody vegetation in farmers' fields
10 in northern Burkina Faso. *Land Degrad. Develop.* 27, 1863–1872. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2322>

11 Marteau, R., Sultan, B., Moron, V., Alhassane, A., Baron, C., Traoré, S.B., 2011. The onset of the rainy season and
12 farmers' sowing strategy for pearl millet cultivation in Southwest Niger. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* 151, 1356–1369.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2011.05.018>

14 Marticorena, B., Bergametti, G., 1995. Modeling the atmospheric dust cycle: 1. Design of a soil-derived dust
15 emission scheme. *J. Geophys. Res.* 100, 16415–16430.

16 Marticorena, B., Chatenet, B., Rajot, J.L., Bergametti, G., Deroubaix, A., Vincent, J., Kouoi, A., Schmechtig, C.,
17 Coulibaly, M., Diallo, A., Koné, I., Maman, A., NDiaye, T., Zakou, A., 2017. Mineral dust over west and central Sahel:
18 Seasonal patterns of dry and wet deposition fluxes from a pluriannual sampling (2006–2012). *J. Geophys. Res.*
19 *Atmos.* 122, 1338–1364. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025995>

20 Marticorena, B., Chatenet, B., Rajot, J.L., Traoré, S., Coulibaly, M., Diallo, A., Koné, I., Maman, A., NDiaye, T., Zakou,
21 A., 2010. Temporal variability of mineral dust concentrations over West Africa: analyses of a pluriannual
22 monitoring from the AMMA Sahelian Dust Transect. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 10, 8899–8915.
23 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-8899-2010>

24 Mbow, C., Brandt, M., Ouedraogo, I., De Leeuw, J., Marshall, M., 2015. What four decades of Earth observation
25 tell us about land degradation in the Sahel? *Remote Sens.* 7, 4048–4067. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs70404048>

26 Michels, K., Armbrust, D.V., Allison, B.E., Sivakumar, M.V.K., 1995. Wind and windblown sand damage to pearl
27 millet. *Agron. J.* 87, 620–626. <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1995.00021962008700040003x>

28 Monerie, P.-A., Sanchez-Gomez, E., Gaetani, M., Mohino, E., Dong, B., 2020. Future evolution of the Sahel
29 precipitation zonal contrast in CESM1. *Clim. Dynam.* 55, 2801–2821. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05417-
30 w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05417-
30 w)

31 Monfreda, C., Ramankutty, N., Foley, J.A., 2008. Farming the planet: 2. Geographic distribution of crop areas,
32 yields, physiological types, and net primary production in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochem. Cy.* 22, GB1022.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB002947>

1 Mougín, E., Lo Seen, D., Rambal, S., Gaston, A., Hiernaux, P., 1995. A regional Sahelian grassland model to be
2 coupled with multispectral satellite data. I: Model description and validation. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 52, 181–193.
3 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257\(94\)00126-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257(94)00126-8)

4 Parker, D.J., Burton, R.R., Diongue-Niang, A., Ellis, R.J., Felton, M., Taylor, C.M., Thorncroft, C.D., Bessemoulin, P.,
5 Tompkins, A.M., 2005. The diurnal cycle of the West African monsoon circulation. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* 131,
6 2839–2860. <https://doi.org/10.1256/qj.04.52>

7 Pi, H., Webb, N.P., Huggins, D.R., Sharratt, B., 2020. Critical standing crop residue amounts for wind erosion control
8 in the inland Pacific Northwest, USA. *Catena* 195, 104742. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2020.104742>

9 Pierre, C., Bergametti, G., Marticorena, B., AbdourhamaneTouré, A., Rajot, J.-L., Kergoat, L., 2014. Modeling wind
10 erosion flux and its seasonality from a cultivated sahelian surface: A case study in Niger. *Catena* 122, 61–71.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2014.06.006>

12 Pierre, C., Bergametti, G., Marticorena, B., Mougín, E., Bouet, C., Schmechtig, C., 2012. Impact of vegetation and
13 soil moisture seasonal dynamics on dust emissions over the Sahel. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 117.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016950>

15 Pierre, C., Bergametti, G., Marticorena, B., Mougín, E., Lebel, T., Ali, A., 2011. Pluriannual comparisons of satellite-
16 based rainfall products over the Sahelian belt for seasonal vegetation modeling. *J. Geophys. Res.* 116, D18201.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016115>

18 Pierre, C., Kergoat, L., Bergametti, G., Mougín, É., Baron, C., Abdourhamane Toure, A., Rajot, J.-L., Hiernaux, P.,
19 Marticorena, B., Delon, C., 2015. Modeling vegetation and wind erosion from a millet field and from a rangeland:
20 Two Sahelian case studies. *Aeolian Res.* 19, 97–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2015.09.009>

21 Pierre, C., Kergoat, L., Hiernaux, P., Baron, C., Bergametti, G., Rajot, J.-L., Abdourhamane Toure, A., Okin, G.S.,
22 Marticorena, B., 2018. Impact of agropastoral management on wind erosion in Sahelian croplands. *Land Degrad.*
23 *Develop.* 29, 800–811. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2783>

24 Rajot, J.L., 2001. Wind blown sediment mass budget of Sahelian village land units in Niger. *Bulletin de la Société*
25 *Géologique de France* 172, 523–531. <https://doi.org/10.2113/172.5.523>

26 Rakkar, M. K., Blanco-Canqui, H., Tatarko, J., 2019. Predicting soil wind erosion potential under different corn
27 residue management scenarios in the central Great Plains. *Geoderma* 353, 25–34.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2019.05.040>

29 Raynaud, C., 2001. Societies and nature in the Sahel: ecological diversity and social dynamics. *Global Environ.*
30 *Chang.* 11, 9–18. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780\(00\)00041-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780(00)00041-8)

31 Reenberg, A., Maman, I., Oksen, P., 2013. Twenty years of land use and livelihood changes in SE-Niger: Obsolete
32 and short-sighted adaptation to climatic and demographic pressures? *J. Arid Environ.* 94, 47–58.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2013.03.002>

- 1 Roehrig, R., Bouniol, D., Guichard, F., Hourdin, F., Redelsperger, J.-L., 2013. The present and future of the West
2 African Monsoon: A process-oriented assessment of CMIP5 simulations along the AMMA transect. *J. Climate* 26,
3 6471–6505. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00505.1>
- 4 Schlecht, E., Kadaouré, I., Graef, I., Hülsebusch, C., Mahler, F., Becker, K., 2001. Land-use and agricultural practices
5 in the agro-pastoral farming systems of western Niger — a case study. *Die Erde* 132, 399–418.
- 6 Sterk, G., 2003. Causes, consequences and control of wind erosion in Sahelian Africa: a review. *Land Degrad.*
7 *Develop.* 14, 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.526>
- 8 Tappan, G.G., Cushing, W.M., Cotillon, S.E., Mathis, M.L., Hutchinson, J.A., Herrmann, S.M., and Dalsted, K.J., 2016,
9 West Africa Land Use Land Cover Time Series: U.S. Geological Survey data release,
10 <https://doi.org/10.5066/F73N21JF>.
- 11 Thomas, D.T., Moore, A.D., Bell, L.W., Webb, N.P., 2018. Ground cover, erosion risk and production implications
12 of targeted management practices in Australian mixed farming systems: Lessons from the Grain and Graze
13 program. *Agr. Syst.* 162, 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2018.02.001>
- 14 Tidjani, A.D., Biolders, C.L., Ambouta, K.J.-M., 2009. Seasonal dynamics of the parameters determining wind
15 erosion on rangeland in Eastern Niger. *Geo-Eco-Trop.* 33, 39–56.
- 16 Tracol, Y., Mougin, E., Hiernaux, P., Jarlan, L., 2006. Testing a sahelian grassland functioning model against herbage
17 mass measurements. *Ecol. Model.* 193, 437–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.08.033>
- 18 Turner, M.D., Hiernaux, P., 2015. The effects of management history and landscape position on inter-field variation
19 in soil fertility and millet yields in southwestern Niger. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.* 211, 73–83.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.05.010>
- 21 Turner, M.D., Hiernaux, P., Schlecht, E., 2005. The distribution of grazing pressure in relation to vegetation
22 resources in semi-arid West Africa: The role of herding. *Ecosystems* 8, 668–681. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-003-0099-y)
23 [003-0099-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-003-0099-y)
- 24 van Vliet, N., Reenberg, A., Rasmussen, L.V., 2013. Scientific documentation of crop land changes in the Sahel: A
25 half empty box of knowledge to support policy? *J. Arid Environ.* 95, 1–13.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2013.03.010>
- 27 Warren, A., Batterbury, S., Osbahr, H., 2001. Soil erosion in the West African Sahel: a review and an application of
28 a “local political ecology” approach in South West Niger. *Global Environ. Chang.* 11, 79–95.
29 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780\(00\)00047-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780(00)00047-9)
- 30 Warren, A., Osbahr, H., Batterbury, S., Chappell, A., 2003. Indigenous views of soil erosion at Fandou Béri,
31 southwestern Niger. *Geoderma* 111, 439–456. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7061\(02\)00276-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7061(02)00276-8)
- 32 Webb, N.P., Okin, G.S., Bhattachan, A., D'Odorico, P., Dintwe, K., Tatlhego, M., 2020. Ecosystem dynamics and
33 aeolian sediment transport in the southern Kalahari. *Afr. J. Ecol.* 58, 337–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aje.12700>

- 1 Webb, N.P., Marshall, N.A., Stringer, L.C., Reed, M.S., Chappell, A., Herrick, J.E., 2017. Land degradation and climate
2 change: building climate resilience in agriculture. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 15, 450–459.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1530>
- 4 Zhang, H., Fan, J., Cao, W., Harris, W., Li, Y., Chi, W., Wang, S., 2018. Response of wind erosion dynamics to climate
5 change and human activity in Inner Mongolia, China during 1990 to 2015. *Sci. Total Environ.* 639, 1038-1050.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.05.082>

APPENDIX A: Grazing pressure for the High density (1990s) scenario

i) Forage amount:

Values (in kg of dry matter per ha) are adapted from *Hiernaux & Ayantunde* (2004; Tab. 24, 28, 29).

Herbaceous mass	yields	Palatable prop.	Palatable mass	Land use prop. in 1990s scenario	Potential livestock intake (kgDM.ha ⁻¹)
Rangelands	300	75%	225	20%	45
Fallows	1500	65%	975	27%	263
Manured fields	Stems: 1650 Leaves: 1350 Weeds: 250	10% 90% 50%	1505	8%	120
Unmanured fields	Stems: 1200 Leaves: 600 Weeds: 500	10% 90% 50%	910	45%	410
Leaf mass from woody plants					
Rangelands	534	20%	107	20%	21
Fallows	300	35%	105	27%	28
Fields	220	35%	77	53%	41

Table A1: Forage amounts and livestock intake at the study site in the 1990s

The total potential livestock intake is thus 928 kg.ha⁻¹. This value is in good agreement with values reported for October in Table 31 (*Hiernaux and Ayantunde*, 2004). We approximate to 0.9 t ha⁻¹, i.e. 90 t.km⁻², and assume that livestock can eat only about a third of it, i.e. about 30 t.km⁻², because of accessibility and browsing efficiency.

Yet, this palatable forage is highly variable year to year, by up to a factor 3. This value of 30 t.km⁻² is a pluriannual average, but can thus vary every year between 15 and 45 t.km⁻². As livestock density does not change so largely from year to year, but over longer timescales, we take this variability into account by performing the following computation using the minimum palatable mass, i.e. 15 t.km⁻².

ii) Required amount per Tropical Livestock Unit (TLU):

The intake is 73g.day⁻¹.kg⁻¹ of metabolic weight, where the metabolic weight is calculated as the power 0.75 of the live weight (*Assouma et al.*, 2018). Thus,

1 cattle TLU (250 kg Live weight) = 62.9 kg of metabolic weight so needs a daily intake of 4.59 kg;

Over the 9 months' dry season it corresponds to 1260 kg of forage, and to 1675 kg over 12 months.

1 Similarly:

2 1 sheep TLU (10 sheep of 25kg) = 111.8 kg metabolic weight so its daily intake is 8.162 kg;

3 Over the 9 months' dry season 2240 kg, and 2979 kg over 12 months.

4 And:

5 1 goat TLU (12.5 goats of 20 kg) = 118.2 kg metabolic weight so its daily intake is 8.630 kg;

6 Over the 9 months' dry season 2369 kg, and 3150 kg over 12 months.

7

8 Thus, if livestock is accounted for in TLU, forage intake depends on its composition. In the study area,

9 we estimate the livestock composition in the 1990s to be 85% cattle, 10% sheep, and 5% goats in

10 metabolic weight. Thus, the mean intake by TLU is:

11 $0.85*1.26+0.1*2.24+0.05*2.369=1.413$ t for the 9 months' dry season

12 $0.85*1.675+0.1*2.979+0.05*3.150=1.879$ t over the whole year.

13 *Nota: In the SarraH model, livestock density can only be quantified as total TLU.km⁻² (the livestock*
14 *composition is not explicitly parameterized).*

15

16 *iii) Livestock density:*

17 By comparing the available forage amount to the required intake per TLU, one estimates the grazing
18 pressure of the study site:

19 $15 \text{ t.km}^{-2} / 1.9 \text{ t} = 8 \text{ TLU.km}^{-2}$

20 This result is in good agreement with values reported in Table 35 (*Hiernaux and Ayantunde, 2004*) that

21 yield a weighted mean of 7.7 TLU.km⁻². Therefore, we define a grazing pressure of 8 TLU.km⁻² for the

22 *High density* scenario.

23

24 **References:**

25 Assouma MH, Lecomte P, Hiernaux P, Ickowicz A, Corniaux C, Decruyenaere V, Diarra AR and Vayssières J 2018.

26 How to better account for livestock diversity and fodder seasonality in assessing the fodder intake of livestock
27 grazing semi-arid sub-Saharan Africa rangelands. *Livestock Science* 216, 16-23.

APPENDIX B: Dry season millet submodel

The submodel estimating millet masses during the dry season has been presented in *Pierre et al.* (2015). It relies on the use of additional state variables for crop residues (the masses of standing dry stems, standing dry leaves, stem litter, and leaves litter) to simulate the dynamics of dry vegetation under biotic and abiotic factors. A set of differential equations describes how each of these masses is collected, trampled, grazed, and fueled by another (e.g. when standing residue become litter). These equations use a set of calibration parameters gathered in Table B1.

In this study, the submodel has been updated based on thorough comparisons to the few available observations of the dynamics of millet residues (*Abdourhamane Toure et al.*, 2011; *Hiernaux and Ayantunde*, 2004; *Hiernaux et al.*, 2019; *Schlecht et al.*, 2001), in order to be adapted to a wide range of grazing pressure values.

	Factor	Parameter	Value (in d ⁻¹)	Comment
Standing vegetation	Abiotic factors	K _N Up	0.001	Same for leaves and stems
	Trampling	K _T Up	0.0006*GP	Same for standing residues and for litter Same for leaves and stems
	Intake	K _i Up Leav	0.0005*GP	Only leaves are considered palatable, not stems Same for standing leaves and litter leaves
Litter	Abiotic factors	K _N Lit	0.0147	Same for leaves and stems
	Trampling	K _T Lit	0.0006*GP	Same for standing residues and for litter Same for leaves and stems
	Intake	K _i Lit Leav	0.0005*GP	Only leaves are considered palatable, not stems Same for standing leaves and litter leaves

Table B1: Parameters used in the dry season submodel for millet masses. GP stands for Grazing Pressure (in Tropical Livestock Unit per km²)

References

Hiernaux P., Adamou K., Garba S., 2019. Notes sur la dynamique des pailles et chaumes en saison sèche 2018-2019. Observatoire AMMA-CATCH, Pastoc, Caylus, France. 15p.

APPENDIX C: Parameterizations of surface characteristics

In both cases (herbaceous and millet), the lowest possible aerodynamic roughness length is the one of the bare soil, which was determined from field measurements ($z_{0s} = 9.7 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ m}$; *Pierre et al., 2015*).

For herbaceous :

a) The fractional cover of grass is computed as in *Pierre et al., 2015*:

$$f_{cvg} = 1 - e^{-0.431 LAI_g} \quad \text{for green grass} \quad (C1)$$

$$f_{cvs} = (1 - e^{-0.9 LAI_s}) \frac{LAI_s}{LAI_t} \quad \text{for standing dry grass} \quad (C2)$$

$$f_{cvl} = 0.05 \ln\left(1 + \frac{BM_l}{28}\right) \quad \text{for dry litter grass} \quad (C3)$$

Where LAI_g , LAI_s , LAI_t are respectively the LAI for green, standing dry and total grass cover.

$$b) z_0 = 0.0003 \cdot BM_{std} + 0.0007 \cdot BM_{lit} \quad (C4)$$

with BM_{std} (mass of standing herbaceous) and BM_{lit} (mass of litter herbaceous) in $\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ and z_0 in m.

For millet:

a) At the beginning of plant growth (from germination to the beginning of the reproductive stage) the vegetation mass simulated in SarraH (M_{tot}) is underestimated (*Pierre et al., 2018*). The corrected vegetation mass ($M_{tot\ cor}$) is computed as a linear interpolation of M_{tot} for this part of the year.

b) The fractional cover of green and dry standing millet $f_{cv\ std}$ is computed as

$$f_{cv\ std} = 1 - e^{-0.45 LAI_{std}} \quad (C5)$$

with LAI_{std} the LAI of green and dry standing millet.

The fractional cover of litter millet is computed as

$$f_{cv\ lit} = (0.14 BM_{lit} + 0.23)/100 \quad (C6)$$

1 where: BM_{lit} is the litter mass of millet (in $g.m^{-2}$).

2 The total fractional cover f_{cv} is the sum of $f_{cv\ std}$ and $f_{cv\ lit}$. Finally, the erodible surface ration is $E=1-f_{cv}$.

3

4 c) For standing millet:

5

$$6 \quad z_0 = 0.00036 \cdot BM_{tot\ cor} \quad (C7)$$

7

8 where: $BM_{tot\ cor}$ is in $g.m^{-2}$ and z_0 is in m and cannot exceed 10 cm.

9

10 For litter millet:

11

$$12 \quad z_0 = 0.0012 \ln(f_{cv\ lit}) + 0.0013 \quad (C8)$$

13

14 when only litter is present (from field clearing to the following germination). At the beginning of plant
15 growth, the new vegetation is still very small and would result in a low surface roughness, whereas litter
16 may remain from the previous growing year, possibly inducing a larger surface roughness. Therefore, z_0
17 is calculated as the maximum of Equations C7 and C8 during this period.

18

APPENDIX D: Variability of the annual horizontal flux

Scenario	Mean over years	Std over years	std/mean over years
<i>Low density</i>	0	0	/
<i>High density</i>	176	186	1.05
<i>Very high density, Extensive</i>	519	412	0.79
<i>Very high density, Intensive</i>	452	317	0.70
<i>Bare soil</i>	830	426	0.51

Table D1: Variability of the annual horizontal sediment flux (in kg.m^{-1}) over years for each scenario

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Mean of scenarios	591	685	585	255	445	163	161	179	158	113	82	29
Std of scenarios	510	532	460	200	398	158	160	166	141	100	89	27
Std/mean	0.86	0.78	0.79	0.79	0.89	0.97	0.99	0.93	0.89	0.89	1.09	0.94
<i>Prop wind > 7 m.s⁻¹ (%)</i>	2.24	2.29	2.08	1.41	1.68	1.35	1.52	0.84	0.68	0.98	0.54	0.59

Table D2: Variability of the annual horizontal sediment flux (in kg.m^{-1}) over scenarios for each year, and proportion of large winds