STONECOMMS
RESEARCH AND INTELLIGENCE

FLAGSHIP RESEARCH / 19 OCTOBER 2026

Solar Irrigation in Africa:

Financing Farm Returns Within Water Limits

A comparative assessment of farmer-led investment, service models and groundwater governance



StoneComms Research & Intelligence / Public-source desk research

RELEVANT SDGS / PRIMARY: 2

2 6 7

STANDFIRST

Solar irrigation can make water cheaper to lift without making it more abundant, or crops more valuable. Recent African programmes are shifting attention from equipment access to the institutions around it. This paper examines how public and private capital can finance durable farm returns while respecting water limits, and why pump sales, loan repayment and sustainable agricultural development must be measured separately.



THE DECISION

An investable farm enterprise and a defensible water entitlement: both conditions must hold.

01 / ANALYSIS

EXECUTIVE THESIS

IN BRIEF

- Finance the agricultural enterprise and its water entitlement, not the pump in isolation.
- A viable borrower can still belong to an overdrawn aquifer; repayment is not proof of sustainability.
- Public support should purchase access, service reliability and accountable water management together.

A farmer deciding whether to irrigate faces several investments at once: in a crop, a water source, equipment and a route to market. Solar power changes one part of that calculation. It does not settle the others. A functioning pump can serve an unprofitable crop; an attractive farm margin can depend on water that neighbours also need.

The central research question is therefore not how many solar pumps Africa could accommodate. It is how an irrigation investment can remain financially useful to farmers within a defensible local water budget. The relevant unit is a farm or shared service over successive agricultural seasons, situated within a catchment or aquifer—not a panel, pump or theoretical suitable hectare.

StoneComms original synthesis: The investment mandate should have two binding conditions: a credible farm-income proposition and a credible water-use entitlement. Equipment finance and after-sales service connect them, but cannot substitute for either. This interpretation draws across financing designs, programme reports and groundwater research [1–8]. It is a proposed decision architecture, not a validated investment score or evidence that any particular project meets the conditions.



EVIDENCE STATUS

Programme design, administrative reach and measured outcomes are different evidence units.

02 / ANALYSIS

WHY THIS MATTERS NOW

IN BRIEF

- The 2026 debate is increasingly about delivery systems, not technology demonstrations alone.
- Co-financing programmes create an opportunity to build water safeguards into investment rules.
- Published plans and stakeholder assessments must not be mistaken for independently verified outcomes.

In August 2026, IWMI reported stakeholder dialogues in Ethiopia and Nigeria identifying finance, practical knowledge, technical capacity, supply chains and coordination as constraints on wider solar-irrigation adoption. These were structured stakeholder assessments, not a representative farmer survey or causal evaluation. Their value is diagnostic: scaling requires more than a commercially available device. [1]

The World Bank's 2026 report, Expansion Without Exhaustion, addresses the parallel question of expanding farmer-led groundwater irrigation without creating local depletion. It recommends joining access with management rather than treating sustainability as a later correction. Its regional assessment does not establish that water is available at any proposed installation. [2]

Together, these publications expose a consequential policy choice. Programmes can subsidise purchases and discover the

institutional gaps afterwards. Or they can use the financing transaction to assemble the agronomic advice, repair service and water accountability on which lasting returns depend. The latter costs more to prepare. It also makes the public purpose of the subsidy clearer.



SOURCE DISCIPLINE

No farm-level causal impact, loan-performance or hydrological evaluation was conducted.

03 / ANALYSIS

KEY FINDINGS

IN BRIEF

- Lower pumping costs do not remove crop-price, market-access or replacement-cost risk.
- Delivery models distribute responsibility differently; none makes water governance optional.
- The next evidence priority is linked seasonal income, service and abstraction records.

First, affordability is not the same as profitability. A grant can reduce the farmer's payment without improving the underlying crop margin. Appraisal should show both the unsubsidised enterprise economics and the household's actual payment obligation. These answer different questions: whether an activity creates value, and whether a particular farmer can enter it.

Second, equipment ownership is only one delivery model. Individual purchase, cooperative ownership and an irrigation service business can each be sensible. Their merits depend on plot distribution, maintenance capacity, crop timing, payment enforcement and control of the water source. A model that lowers the entry payment may transfer substantial risk to a service provider or public guarantor.

Third, sustainability is collective. Even a carefully sized pump does not establish an acceptable cumulative abstraction level when neighbouring installations expand. A lender needs a borrower assessment; a water authority needs an account of the shared resource. Neither institution's records are a replacement for the other's.

Fourth, inclusion has to be designed into rights and contracts. Eligibility based on land title, a large cash deposit or established cooperative membership may exclude viable cultivators. Counting

women among participants does not establish that they control crop income, equipment decisions or water access. These are questions for direct enquiry, not outcomes that this desk study can assert.



SEASONAL CASH

Crop price, service cost and repayment timing matter even when pumping energy is inexpensive.

04 / ANALYSIS

EVIDENCE AND METHOD

IN BRIEF

- The comparison separates programme design, administrative reporting, modelling and proposed pilots.
- Country cases illuminate different constraints; they do not form a performance league table.
- All financial scenarios below are explicitly hypothetical and reproducible.

This paper reviews public institutional evidence available on 19 October 2026. Ethiopia and Uganda illustrate farmer-led co-financing; Ghana supplies an early-stage finance-design case; Morocco provides a groundwater-governance comparison. Nigeria appears through the IWMI stakeholder assessment, not as a separately evaluated investment programme. [1–7]

The sources differ materially. A government-facilitated programme description establishes intended rules. An administrative count establishes reported reach, subject to its definitions. A workshop records participants' design questions. A spatial model identifies conditional risk. None alone establishes incremental household income, loan performance or sustainable abstraction. The analysis retains these distinctions instead of pooling unlike observations.

The comparison asks who pays, who maintains the asset, who bears a poor-season loss and who can authorise or restrict water use. It does not estimate a continental market size or rank national investment attractiveness. The illustrative cash-flow calculation is StoneComms analysis, not a synthesis of observed farm costs.

05 / ANALYSIS

FARM RETURNS: WHAT CHEAPER PUMPING DOES NOT SOLVE



IN BRIEF

- Evaluate the complete crop season, including labour, maintenance and asset renewal.
- Price and yield stress tests should not assume that additional water is available.
- Repayment calendars need to follow actual sales and seasonal working-capital demands.

HYPOTHETICAL

The cash-flow sensitivity is an illustrative calculation, not observed farm performance.

Solar irrigation's agricultural value depends on what a farmer can produce and sell with the permitted water. Engineering assessment remains essential: the FAO practice brief identifies water availability and quality, legal access, pumping conditions and system sizing among the prerequisites. It also warns that cheap solar pumping can encourage overuse without appropriate management. [9]

The investment appraisal should then begin with a seasonal production plan. Which crop, which market, which harvest window and which buyer? What is the cost of seed, fertiliser, paid labour, transport and rejected produce? What happens if neighbouring farmers enter the same crop at the same time? A pump quotation cannot answer these questions, and an assumed yield increase should not silently become an assumed revenue increase.

Replacement deserves an explicit line. A low immediate energy bill does not mean a system has no lifecycle cost. The appraisal should distinguish routine service, major component renewal, water-source maintenance and the financing charge. The farmer must understand which obligations survive a failed harvest and which are covered by warranty, insurance or a negotiated restructuring mechanism.

Revenue timing matters as much as the annual total. A farmer may have a positive season-end margin but insufficient cash for instalments before harvest. Conversely, long grace periods may conceal an enterprise that never generates enough surplus. Repayment should be linked to credible sales timing, while the

lender monitors the business rather than simply postponing recognition of distress.



CONTRACTS

Ownership changes who carries the obligation; it does not remove the obligation.

An illustrative seasonal sensitivity

StoneComms original synthesis: The following calculation isolates price and financing exposure. It is a hypothetical farm-season, in unspecified cash units, not a forecast, typical African farm budget or recommendation. Output is fixed; only the realised selling price and stated financing payment change. The water entitlement is unchanged in every case.

Table 1. Hypothetical farm-season cash remaining

SCENARIO	ILLUSTRATIVE CASH ACCOUNT
Base case.	Revenue 2,500; production, service and renewal costs 1,250; financing payment 600; cash remaining 650.
Selling price falls 20%.	Revenue 2,000; production, service and renewal costs 1,250; financing payment 600; cash remaining 150.
Selling price falls 30%.	Revenue 1,750; production, service and renewal costs 1,250; financing payment 600; cash remaining -100.
20% price fall, lower farmer financing payment.	Revenue 2,000; production, service and renewal costs 1,250; financing payment 300; cash remaining 450.

Source: StoneComms hypothetical calculation. Cash units are unspecified; full assumptions follow below.

The assumed 1,250 comprises production inputs and paid labour of 1,000, routine service of 150 and a renewal reserve of 100. The financing payment includes principal and financing charges for the season. Cash remaining is before household consumption, taxes, land rent and the valuation of unpaid household labour. Costs are held constant when prices fall. There is no yield-loss, inflation, exchange-rate, discount-rate or multi-year replacement model.

Arithmetic: revenue minus 1,250 minus the financing payment. Break-even revenue on this limited cash measure is 1,850 with the 600 payment, or 1,550 with the 300 payment. The lower payment could reflect subsidy or another financing arrangement; it is not a free economic gain. Someone else must bear any transferred cost. The example shows sensitivity, not an estimated benefit of solar irrigation.



SHARED RESOURCE

A creditworthy borrower can still depend on an overdrawn aquifer.

06 / ANALYSIS

DELIVERY MODELS: WHO OWNS THE OBLIGATION?

IN BRIEF

- Individual ownership offers control but concentrates repair and crop risk.
- Shared ownership needs enforceable scheduling and transparent collective finances.
- A service model should earn from dependable delivery within a water allocation, not unlimited pumping.

Individual farmer purchase can suit an enterprise with secure cultivation rights, a credible crop market and access to maintenance. Its contractual simplicity is attractive, but a lender should establish whether one household can absorb a major repair or a poor season. Equipment possession alone is weak evidence of repayment capacity.

Cooperative or group ownership can spread capital costs across users and aggregate demand for advice, spare parts or finance. It also creates a small institution. Members need rules for peak-season allocation, fee collection, non-payment, repair decisions and exit. An attractive group average can conceal a distribution of benefits that leaves smaller plots or less influential members worse served.

Irrigation as a service separates use from ownership. A provider might charge for scheduled access, a measured volume or an agreed seasonal package. The price structure should disclose what happens when water restrictions, equipment failure or crop-calendar conflicts interrupt service. Payment per cubic

metre without an enforceable abstraction limit could reward precisely the behaviour the water authority needs to constrain.

These are analytical options, not a finding that one has outperformed the others across Africa. A sensible procurement exercise would compare whole-life farmer cost, service response and water compliance under the same local assumptions. It would resist choosing a model merely because its entry price looks lowest.



TRANSFERABILITY

Standardise the questions. Adapt the answer to the crop, water source and institution.

07 / ANALYSIS

WATER GOVERNANCE: THE SECOND INVESTMENT CONDITION

IN BRIEF

- Screen the shared resource before treating site suitability as permission to pump.
- Set proportionate abstraction, monitoring and drought-response obligations before financing expansion.
- Include existing users and non-irrigation needs, not only prospective borrowers.

Groundwater is not uniformly scarce, nor uniformly available. The World Bank's 2026 assessment supports scope for farmer-led development while emphasising local sustainability constraints and the need for governance alongside expansion. Its discussion includes conditional financial support, community management and monitoring. Those measures require local institutional capacity; citing a regional resource estimate does not supply it. [2]

A 2024 World Bank working paper maps the risk to groundwater-dependent ecosystems from uncontrolled photovoltaic pumping. Its spatial, scenario-based analysis is a warning about exposure under specified assumptions—not observed ecosystem loss, an installation-level permit or a prediction that every aquifer will be depleted. [8]

The practical appraisal should distinguish four things often compressed into “water available”: a source physically present; reliable access during the proposed crop season; a lawful and socially legitimate right to use it; and an allocation compatible

with other users and ecological requirements. Each requires different evidence. A successful drilling result answers only part of the first question.

Morocco offers a concrete institutional comparison. FAO reported that November 2021 contracts in Berrechid joined the basin agency and two water-user associations. They regulated annual groundwater use per hectare and required metering, fees and quarterly volume reporting. The 2023 account describes a governance arrangement, not proof that the aquifer subsequently recovered. Nor is it a solar-pump evaluation. [7]

The transferable lesson is that water accountability needs an operating institution, not simply a clause in an equipment contract. Who receives the readings? Who can alter allocations in a dry year? How are domestic users heard? Who resolves disputes? A financing programme that cannot identify these responsibilities should not treat rising pump demand as sufficient evidence of a scalable proposition.



PUBLIC PURPOSE

Make the preparation, service and subsidy costs visible alongside equipment costs.

08 / ANALYSIS

PAN-AFRICAN COMPARISON AND SCALABILITY

IN BRIEF

- Ethiopia and Uganda illuminate financing architecture and reported reach, not equivalent outcomes.
- Ghana's cocoa-finance work remains a design-stage case.
- Morocco contributes a governance mechanism, not a ready-made model for every aquifer.

CASE	TRANSFERABILITY TEST
Ethiopia — co-financing with public facilitation.	A World Bank feature dated 20 January 2026 describes farmer choice and management, with government support for training and market links. Its stated solar-equipment cost split is 70% government and 30% farmer. The page contains inconsistent prospective rollout dates, so this paper does not treat its milestones as completed. Separately, IWMI reported approximately 2,000 government-installed solar irrigation systems across five regions during 2016–2025. These are different evidence units, not one programme performance series. The transferable question is whether co-finance can be joined to reliable service and water accountability. [3][4]
Uganda — an established cost-sharing channel.	The World Bank country overview accessed on 19 October 2026 reports 5,370 farmers reached against a 5,000 target under the Micro-Scale Irrigation Program. The programme supports small plots and both solar and petrol-powered equipment; the count must not be presented as 5,370 solar installations. It demonstrates reported programme reach, not independently measured income gains or aquifer sustainability. The transferable question is how an existing co-financing channel can link administrative records to seasonal business and water outcomes. [5]
Ghana — finance co-design around cocoa.	IWMI's report of a 10 July 2025 workshop examines finance for cocoa farmers and proposes subsequent cooperative pilots. It brings lenders, farmers and equipment issues into one design discussion, but does not establish a mature loan portfolio or current standard lending terms. A perennial crop's investment horizon cannot simply be copied into a short-cycle vegetable budget. The transferable question is how repayment design follows the actual crop and cooperative, rather than a generic solar-product loan. [6]
Morocco — rules for a shared aquifer.	Berrechid's contracts show an explicit connection between authorisation, annual water use and reporting. Their relevance is institutional, not a claim that North African hydrology or regulatory capacity is typical of sub-Saharan Africa. The transferable question is which authority can agree and enforce a resource budget before a financing programme encourages further abstraction. [7]

Sources: institutional programme, workshop and governance evidence [3][4][5][6][7]. Interpretations are StoneComms original synthesis.

09 / ANALYSIS

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND CAPITAL

IN BRIEF

- Use public funds to close defined preparation and access gaps, with transparent subsidy costs.
- Align lender, supplier and water-authority records without pretending their mandates are identical.
- Judge success by sustained, fairly distributed farm value within water limits.

FURTHER RESEARCH

Link seasonal receipts, service records and water allocations to understand sustained value.

For governments and development partners, the strongest case for subsidy may include activities that equipment markets do not adequately fund: source assessment, extension, farmer decision support and the local water institution. These costs should be visible in the programme budget. A low subsidy per installed pump can be a misleading efficiency measure if it excludes the services needed to keep the investment useful.

For lenders and investors, underwriting should connect seasonal crop receipts, the service contract and the authorised water allocation. A guarantee may improve recoverability after default; it cannot make an unsuitable crop or disputed source productive. Portfolio growth should be accompanied by reporting on arrears, restructuring, repair downtime and changes in the permitted water supply—not only units financed.

For suppliers and service providers, a credible proposition includes installation standards, spare-parts availability, repair response and an intelligible warranty. Programmes should distinguish the obligation to repair equipment from the obligation to compensate a farmer for a lost crop window. If neither party carries that risk, it remains with the farmer even when marketing describes the product as a complete solution.

For water authorities, financing expansion creates a chance to establish practical records of abstraction and users. The transaction should not turn the lender into a substitute regulator. Rather, loan or subsidy conditions can require a valid

authorisation and agreed reporting, while the authority retains responsibility for allocation and enforcement.

10 / ANALYSIS

RISKS AND COUNTERARGUMENTS

IN BRIEF

- Over-engineered safeguards can delay useful investments and exclude poorer cultivators.
- Monitoring equipment does not itself create legitimate or enforceable rules.
- Crop-market and water risks can worsen together; financing must accommodate that possibility.

The strongest objection to this approach is that smallholders already face too many barriers. Adding studies, meters and documentation may protect an institution's balance sheet while leaving farmers without water. That objection is substantive. The answer is proportional preparation: shared assessments where users draw on the same resource, simple farmer-facing obligations and publicly funded support where the information is a public good.

Requirements should follow risk, not institutional fashion. A small installation using a demonstrably adequate, authorised source should not automatically face the same process as rapid expansion across a stressed aquifer. But the distinction needs evidence, review and an accountable decision-maker; it cannot rest on the small size of each individual pump when cumulative use is large.

There is also a political risk. Rules applied only to newly financed smallholders may leave larger or older users unchallenged. A defensible programme must explain how existing abstraction enters the shared budget and how restrictions are distributed. Technology-assisted monitoring without fair allocation can sharpen conflict rather than resolve it.

Finally, irrigation cannot insure every agricultural loss. Heat, pests, price collapse or a drought restriction can damage revenue



EVIDENCE STANDARD

Public-source desk research. No proprietary data or original field interviews.

despite functioning equipment. A responsible finance offer makes these residual risks explicit and tests whether household obligations remain tolerable under stress. It does not promise that solar power removes uncertainty from farming.

11 / ANALYSIS

COMMISSIONABLE RESEARCH AGENDA

IN BRIEF

- Build linked farm-season and water-source records, with appropriate consent and data protection.
- Compare delivery models against common service, income and allocation measures.
- Test distributional outcomes through interviews as well as administrative counts.

A useful next commission would follow matched groups of individual owners, cooperative users and service customers across contrasting water settings. Selection should document crop type, market access, tenure, source characteristics and subsidy exposure. Baseline and repeated seasonal observations would allow comparison without pretending that a non-random sample automatically identifies causation.

The core dataset should link receipts and production costs to financing payments, repair incidents, actual irrigation service and metered abstraction where appropriate. Water-level observations need hydrogeological interpretation; a seasonal fall is not by itself evidence of permanent depletion. A credible evaluation should record both the authorised allocation and how it changes during dry periods.

Interviews should include cultivators who did not adopt, tenants, women controlling or lacking control of farm revenue, technicians, buyers, lenders and water officials. Non-adopters reveal affordability and institutional barriers that a survey of satisfied purchasers would miss. Contract review should establish who actually bears drilling failure, service interruption and drought-allocation risk.



EVIDENCE STANDARD

Public-source desk research. No proprietary data or original field interviews.

The deliverable would be a locally grounded investment and governance design: which enterprises can support which obligations, what public support is justified, which users gain or lose, and what water-management capacity must precede expansion. That is more decision-useful than another estimate of technically suitable hectares.



EVIDENCE STANDARD

Public-source desk research. No proprietary data or original field interviews.

12 / ANALYSIS

CONCLUSION

Solar irrigation deserves neither automatic enthusiasm nor a presumption of prohibition. Its promise is specific: a better-timed, more dependable agricultural water service using a different source of energy. Realising that promise requires an enterprise that can earn, equipment that can be maintained and a shared resource that can support the use.

The immediate opportunity is to connect those responsibilities while financing systems are being built. Count pumps to understand deployment. Count successful seasons, fairly distributed farm returns and compliance with water allocations to understand whether deployment is working. The distinction is the foundation of an investable agricultural service, not an obstacle to one.

13 / ANALYSIS

KEY METRICS

70% / 30% — government/farmer split for solar-equipment co-payments described in Ethiopia's January 2026 FLID feature; a programme design, not a measured return. [3]

Approximately 2,000 systems — government-installed solar irrigation systems in five Ethiopian regions during 2016–2025, as reported by IWMI in June 2026; not a current audited national stock. [4]

5,370 farmers — reported reach of Uganda's Micro-Scale Irrigation Program on the World Bank country overview accessed 19 October 2026; the programme includes solar and petrol systems. [5]

650 to -100 cash units — change in cash remaining when the illustrative farm's selling price falls 30%, with fixed output and stated costs; StoneComms hypothetical calculation, not observed farm results.

EVIDENCE STATUS

Reported programme design, historical installations, programme reach and an illustrative calculation are different kinds of evidence. They are not added together or treated as comparable outcomes.

14 / REFERENCE

METHODOLOGY

Public-source comparative desk research, completed 19 October 2026. Sources were selected for institutional authority, relevance to farmer-led irrigation and transparency about evidence status. The comparison uses Ethiopia, Uganda, Ghana and Morocco to examine financing, service and water-governance mechanisms; it does not infer continent-wide effects from those cases. Quantitative units and periods are preserved. No field interviews, proprietary loan records, hydrological modelling, meta-analysis or causal impact evaluation were undertaken. Table 1 is a deterministic hypothetical calculation with assumptions stated in full; it is not financial advice.

15 / REFERENCE

LIMITATIONS

Programme descriptions and institutional reporting may favour implementation achievements and are not independent audits. Reported participation does not establish sustained use, additional income, equitable control or sustainable abstraction. Country cases differ in climate, crops, institutions and evidence maturity. Ethiopia's feature contains inconsistent future rollout dates; only its stated design is used. The Uganda count includes more than one power technology and has no separate solar-only denominator in the cited overview. Ghana's workshop concerns proposed finance, not a verified scaled product. Berrechid is a historical governance example, not evidence of subsequent aquifer recovery. No site-level water entitlement or investment viability is established here.

16 / REFERENCE

SOURCE NOTE

Numbered references support external facts; recommendations, the two-condition investment mandate, delivery-model comparison and hypothetical sensitivity are StoneComms original synthesis. “Relevant SDGs” is an editorial classification, not a claim of measured impact or UN affiliation: SDG 2 (primary), SDG 6 and SDG 7. Evidence was checked on 19 October 2026. This paper is informational research, not investment, agronomic, hydrological or legal advice.

17 / REFERENCE

SOURCES

1. Tafesse, Y.; Admasu, Z. B.; Oke, A.; Wamba, E. (18 August 2026). Solar irrigation technology is ready to scale, but is the system? International Water Management Institute. Stakeholder-assessment account for Ethiopia and Nigeria. https://www.iwmi.org/blogs/solar-irrigation-technology-is-ready-to-scale-but-is-the-system/

2. Villholth, K. G.; Namara, R.; Talbi, A.; Rex, W.; Izzi, G.; Bertone, F. (2026). Expansion Without Exhaustion: Groundwater Sustainability and Farmer-Led Irrigation Development in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank. Regional assessment; not a site-level abstraction authorisation. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099032526083541507/pdf/P176746-ffcd843f-6643-4001-ae63-3af2141ff8c6.pdf

3. World Bank (20 January 2026). Farmer Driven–Government Facilitated: A New Approach to Ethiopia's Irrigation Development. Programme design account; inconsistent prospective rollout dates are not treated as completed milestones. https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2026/01/20/farmer-driven-government-facilitated-a-new-approach-to-ethiopias-irrigation-development

4. International Water Management Institute (3 June 2026). Ethiopia plans to scale solar irrigation with public and private sector momentum. Reported installations for 2016–2025 and scaling discussions. https://solar.iwmi.org/2026/06/03/ethiopia-plans-to-scale-solar-irrigation-with-public-and-private-sector-momentum/

5. World Bank (undated; accessed 19 October 2026). Uganda country overview, Results section: Micro-Scale Irrigation Program. Administrative programme reach; solar and petrol-powered systems. https://www.worldbank.org/ext/en/country/uganda

6. Gbodji, K.; Zane, G.; Quarmine, W.; Schmitter, P. (2025). Improving Access to Solar Irrigation Finance for Cocoa Farmers in Ghana: Co-Design Workshop. IWMI. Workshop held 10 July 2025; design-stage evidence. https://cgspace.cgiar.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/00caf1cb-ffbd-4cc9-8b8e-cac89a1046c0/content

7. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (16 November 2023). Water sharing: From underground to common ground. Berrechid aquifer governance account; contracts signed November 2021. https://www.fao.org/newsroom/story/Water-sharing-From-underground-to-common-ground/en

8. Zuffinetti, G.; Meunier, S. (September 2024). Mapping the Risk Posed to Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems by Uncontrolled Access to Photovoltaic Water Pumping in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 10935. Spatial scenario analysis, not observed ecosystem loss. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099419309302454145/pdf/IDU17970fd3c1b6c4148521940c1908ba81aeae1.pdf

9. Schnetzer, J.; Pluschke, L. FAO / Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture (undated practice brief; accessed 19 October 2026). Solar-Powered Irrigation Systems: A clean-energy, low-emission option for irrigation development and modernization. Technical and governance considerations; not a current price quotation. https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/gacsa/docs/GACSA_Practice_brief_SolarIrrigation_v5.pdf