Efficiency Concept Under Stochastic Consideration of Water Value in Irrigated Agriculture Land in Crete, Greece.

Mohamed Elhag

Department of Hydrology and Water Resources Management, Faculty of Meteorology, Environment & Arid Land Agriculture, King Abdulaziz University
Jeddah, 21589. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Correspondence to: melhag@kau.edu.sa

Abstract

Water is an increasingly scarce and valuable resource. It is generally accepted that there is a finite supply of water. As economies grow there is an increasing demand for water. The application of water to agricultural lands for irrigation is one of the essential uses of this natural resource in many areas. There is competition among agriculture, industry, and human consumption for the limited supplies of water. Efficiency studies are necessary, especially in areas where there is a shortage of factors of production such as water. Panel data for viticulture products, citrus products and olive oil for the time period 2002-2012, in the area of Iraklio, Crete were used for the estimation of production models. The results indicate that the production process for the three crops cannot be represented by a single production function having a single set of coefficients. Different methods yield different efficiency measures. The stochastic frontier yields higher efficiency measures. Farmers are less efficient in the use of irrigation water than in the use of water and fertilizer together. The value of water is found to be equal to 0.73 Euros/m^3.

Key Words: Efficiency Concept, Irrigation water, Production functions, Stochastic Modelling.

1. Introduction

Iraklio prefecture economy is basically depending on the agricultural practice. Therefore, water has immense significance in the economic cycle. Recently, the common crops of the prefecture like olives and grapes are taken into consideration in any irrigation plans designed in Iraklio (Dedian et al., 2000; Tsagarakis et al., 2004). Commonly, to increase the production of crops; adequate irrigation and tolerable fertilization are among the limiting factors that need to be considered, especially for traditional products like wine production using American rootstocks planting technique (Angelakis et al., 2005; Karagiannis and Soldatos, 2007).

Irrigation schemes play an important role in crop production. Thus, low rainfalls periods in spring and prolonged drought period in summer besides the heavy irrigational practice adopted recently have led to intensify the water shortage problem (Lazarova et al., 2001; Iglesias et al., 2007). Moreover, such circumstances put the underground water under pressure to satisfy irrigational purposes (Maliarakis, 1991). Based on the latter scholarly work, the prefecture is under the jeopardy of groundwater over exploitation due to illegal wells and unlicensed drilling.

According to another point of view made by Monopolis, (1993) there is not a lack of water but rather a lack of good management of water. Most of the underground water ends up in the sea without being used because of lack of good management by the responsible agency in the prefecture. To support this view, Monopolis (1993) estimated that the renewable underground reserves of water for the whole island of Crete are approximately 3 BCM per year, while the annual total consumption cannot be more than 450 MCM. Therefore, about 15% of the underground water that flows in the island every year is consumed.

According to Forsund et al. (1980), a production frontier sets a range to all possible observations, and gives the maximal product that can be attained from a group of input quantities. All possible points can lie below the frontier and none is allowed to be above it. It is the locus of maximum possible outputs for each level of input use (Kumbhakar, 1994).

Aigner and Chu (1968) in their definition of production frontier explain that it sets the limitation of the highest possible output that a firm can realize under certain combination of factors at a given state of technical knowledge during the production period. Production frontiers can be either deterministic or stochastic.

Principally, Farrell (1957) assumed constant returns to scale and constructed a unit isoquant as a frontier. This isoquant is estimated from a subset of observations from the sample. The rest of the observations lie above the isoquant. Aigner and Chu (1968) proposed a homogeneous Cobb Douglas production frontier. Afriat (1972) proposed this model first and suggested that it be estimated by the maximum likelihood method. He also proposed a two-parameter beta distribution (Forsund et al. 1980).

Schmidt (1976) showed that the estimates of Aigner and Chu are maximum likelihood estimates under certain assumptions for the distribution of the disturbance term. The main disadvantage of a deterministic frontier is that it ignores the possibility that a firm's performance may be affected by factors such as bad weather which are entirely outside its control, as well as by factors like inefficiency which are under its control.

The production frontier models have one-sided error terms that are used as a measure of technical efficiency because they show production below the frontier (Forsund et al., 1980). In order to estimate efficiency many methods have been developed, including economic-engineering analysis, average factor productivity, efficiency indices and parametric and non-parametric frontier functions (Bravo-Ureta, 1986; Antonellim and Ruini, 2015).

The aim of the current research is to envisage the efficient use and proper management of the water in the prefecture taking into consideration the production functions under the concept efficiency.

2. Methodological framework

2.1. Study area

Iraklio prefecture is the largest prefecture of Crete island. It's located at 35° 18' 0" N, 25° 13' 0" E, with total area close to 2,700 Km^2. The prefecture is characterized by mountainous regions with two major plains Iraklio and Messara plain. The main mountains are called the Yuhtas (height 837 m), the Afentis (1,592 m) and the Kofinas (1,250 m). The main rivers are the Yofiros and the Geropotamos. The climate is the typical climate of the islands of the Mediterranean. According to the annual average rainfall during the period from 1909 to 1987 was recorded to be around 500 mm. Furthermore, the major precipitation take place in winter season (250 mm), followed by autumn precipitation (140 mm), spring precipitation is close to 100 mm, then finally almost dry summer with precipitation recorded around 5 mm (Maheras and Koliva-Mahera, 1989). Two mosit periods were observed from the archive precipitation date, long moist period of 16 years started at 1917 and another shorter moist period started at 1961 and lasted for 8 years. One long drought period of 23 years started at 1938 was also observed. According to Monopolis, (1993) there is not a lack of water but rather a lack of good management of water. Most of the underground water ends up in the sea without being used because of lack of good management by the responsible agency in the prefecture. Monopolis (1993) estimated that the renewable underground reserves of water for the whole island of Crete are approximately 3 BCM, while the annual total consumption cannot be more than 450 MCM. So, only 15% of the underground water that flows in the island every year is used.



Figure 1. Location of the designated study area.

2.2. Description of data

The main source of information is the Rural Agronomic Development Administration of Crete and the Greek ministry of Agriculture (2002). Panel data for viticulture products, citrus products and olive oil for the time period 2002-2012, in the area of Iraklio; were used for the estimation of the model.

Viticulture products consist of the Sultana viticulture products for dry raisins, for consumption and for wine making, the Dessert viticulture products for consumption and for wine making, the wine viticulture products for wine making and for consumption, and the vine leaves. Citrus products consist of oranges, mandarins, sour oranges, grapefruits, and citrons.

Fertilizer and water are the two inputs that are used as independent variables of the model. The recommended quantities of fertilizer are 97.5 Kg/stremma for the viticulture products, 54 Kg/stremma for olive oil and 60 Kg/stremma for citrus products (1 stremma = 1000m^2).

The water input was approximated in a similar way by taking into account the percentages of cultivated area per crop that are irrigated each year, and the recommended quantities of water per stremma. The recommended quantities of water are 400 m^3/stremma for viticulture products, 400 m^3/stremma for olive oil and 500 m^3/stremma for citrus products.

The production quantities and the fertilizer of the three crops for each year are measured in euros. Water is measured in m^3. All values, in money terms, are deflated using 2002 as the base year.

2.3. Stochastic frontier

Stochastic frontier uses a mixture of one-sided and two-sided errors. The maximal output that is produced, given some inputs, is random and not exact and that is due to the unbounded effects of some inputs (e.g. weather). This type of frontier expresses maximal output, given some inputs, as a normal distribution and not as a point. The sub-optimal values of certain inputs cause the one-sided error (Forsund et al., 1980). According to Aigner et al., (1977) a stochastic production frontier is written as:

$$y_i = f(x_i, \beta) + \varepsilon_i \qquad \text{Eq.1}$$

Where $\varepsilon_i = v_i + u_i$, and i = 1-N

Where

y_i = maximum output produced

x_i = vector of inputs

β = vector of unknown parameters to be estimated, and

ε = error term and ε - N (0,σ_v^2).

The error term is composed of two parts: v_i is assumed to be independently and identically distributed as N (0,σ_v^2) and u_i is assumed to be distributed independently of v_i. The condition u ≤ 0 must be satisfied in order to insure that each dataset's output will lie on or below its frontier [f$(x_i, \beta) + v_i$]. Such deviations mean that all results are under the control boundaries of each dataset. v_i is a random disturbance, which can be equal, greater than or less than zero, and it is the result of factors and errors of measurement on y.

2.4. Efficiency concept

The study of frontiers is necessary for the estimation of efficiency. Forsund et al. (1980) state that inefficiency is the amount by which a target dataset lies below its production and profit frontier and the amount by which it lies above its cost frontier. It can be separated into technical, allocative and economic efficiency (Aldaya et al., 2010).

Consider a stochastic production frontier mentioned in Eq.1, v_i permits random variation in output due to factors outside the control of the designated dataset (Dawson, 1990) and u_i reflects technical efficiency. Aigner et al., (1977) and Meeusen and Van den Broeck (1977) assume that v is normal, that is $v -$ N (0,σ_v^2) and u is half normal, that is u distributes as the absolute value of a normal distribution |N (0,σ_v^2)|, and

$$f(v) = \frac{1}{\sigma_v (2\pi)^{1/2}} exp\left(\frac{v^2}{2\sigma_v^2}\right) \qquad \text{Eq.2}$$

$$f(u) = \frac{1}{\sigma_u (2\pi)^{1/2}} exp\left(\frac{u^2}{2\sigma_u^2}\right), u \geq 0 \quad \text{Eq.3}$$

The derivation of the density function of ε according to Aigner et al. (1977) is:

$$f(\varepsilon) = \frac{2}{\sigma} f^*\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma}\right)[1 - F^*(\varepsilon\lambda\sigma^{-1})], -\infty \leq \varepsilon \leq +\infty \quad \text{Eq.4}$$

Where the variance of $\varepsilon(\sigma)^2$ is equal to $\sigma^2 = \sigma_u^2 + \sigma_v^2$, $\lambda = \frac{\sigma_u}{\sigma_v}$, $f^*(.)$ is the standard normal density function. λ is an indicator of the relative variability of the two sources of random error that distinguish firms from one another. $f(\varepsilon)$ is asymmetric around zero, with its mean and variance presented by:

$$E(\varepsilon) = E(u) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}\sigma_u$$

$$V(\varepsilon) = V(u) + V(v) = \left(\frac{\pi-2}{\pi}\right)\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_v^2 \quad \text{Eq.5}$$

The estimation problem is posed by assuming we have available a random sample of N observations and then forming the relevant log-likelihood function:

$$\ln L\left(y \,\middle|\, \beta, \lambda, \sigma^2\right) = N \ln\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} + N \ln \sigma^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln[1 - F^*(\varepsilon_i\lambda\sigma^{-1})] - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \varepsilon_i^2 \quad \text{Eq.6}$$

This form of likelihood function was also considered by Amemiya (1973). By taking the partial derivatives of the logarithm of the likelihood function, equating them to zero, and solving them, we obtain the maximum likelihood estimates for $\beta, \lambda,$ and σ^2. The partial derivatives are:

$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \sigma^2} = -\frac{N}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^4}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(y_i - \beta' x_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2\sigma^3}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{f_i^*}{(1-F^*)}(y_i - \beta' x_i) = 0 \quad \text{Eq.6}$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{1}{\sigma}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{f_i^*}{(1-F^*)}(y_i - \beta' x_i) = 0 \quad \text{Eq.7}$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(y_i - \beta' x_i)x_i + \frac{\lambda}{\sigma}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{f_i^*}{(1-F^*)}x_i = 0 \qquad \text{Eq.8}$$

Combining the first two equations we get the maximum likelihood estimator for σ^2, as following:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(y_i - \beta' x_i)^2 \qquad \text{Eq.9}$$

By pre-multiplying (-λ) into equation (7) and adding to this, equation (8) pre-multiplied by β' and simplifying it as following:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(y_i - \beta' x_i)\beta' x_i + \frac{\lambda}{\sigma}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{f_i^*}{(1-F^*)}y_i = 0 \qquad \text{Eq.10}$$

Which in conjunction with (8) gives a system of (k+1) equations, k is considered to be the number of inputs.

Aigner et al. (1977) claim all the usual maximum likelihood (ML) properties for the values β, λ and σ^2which simultaneously equate (6), (7) and (8) to zero, since this density function is continuous in the range of ε.

The technical efficiency relative to the stochastic production frontier is captured by the one-sided error component u_i, ≥ 0 (Huang and Bagi, 1984). The population average technical efficiency is:

$$E(e^{-u_i}) = 2e^{\sigma_u^2/2}(1 - F^*(\sigma_u)) \qquad \text{Eq.11}$$

Where F^* is the standard normal distribution function. The estimated stochastic frontier and the variances σ_u^2 and σ_v^2 can be used to measure population average technical efficiency. The measurement of the individual technical efficiency e^{-u_i} requires the estimation of the non-negative error u_i.

Jondrow et al. (1982) have shown that individual firm measures of technical efficiency can be calculated from:

$$E\left[u_i \mid \varepsilon_i\right] = \frac{\sigma_u \sigma_v}{\sigma}\left[\frac{f^*(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma)}{1-F^*(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma)} - \frac{\varepsilon_i \lambda}{\sigma}\right] \quad \text{Eq.12}$$

Where

i = 1….n number of firms, and *f**(.) and *F**(.) are respectively the values of the standard normal density function and the standard normal distribution function evaluated at $(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma)$. The standard normal density and distribution functions (Chow, 1983) are respectively:

$$f^*(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} e^{-x^2/2} \quad \text{Eq.13}$$

$$F^*(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} e^{-x^2/2} ds \quad \text{Eq.14}$$

The estimates of ε, λ and σ are used to evaluate and *f**(.) and *F**(.) at $(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma)$ by substituting x in equations 13 and 14:

$$f^*(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} e^{-(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma)^2/2} \quad \text{Eq.15}$$

$$F^*(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma) = \int_{-\infty}^{(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma)} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} e^{-(\varepsilon_i \lambda/\sigma)^2/2} ds \quad \text{Eq.16}$$

Finally, measures of technical efficiency can then be calculated according to Dawson, (1990) as following:

$$TE = exp\left(-E\left[u_i \mid \varepsilon_i\right]\right), 0 \leq TE \leq 1 \quad \text{Eq.17}$$

Battese and Corra (1977) define γ = σ_u^2/σ^2, $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$. This represents the total variation in output from the frontier attributed to technical efficiency.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Crop Production Model

The stochastic frontier was estimated using the results of the fixed effects model and an average intercept for the three crops. It was found that γ=0.94. This implies that 94% of the discrepancy between the observed values of output and the frontier output is due to technical inefficiency. u_i dominates v_i and the shortfall of realized output from the frontier is due primarily to factors that are within the control of the farmer (Chenoweth et al., 2014). The ratio of the two standard errors is defined as λ= 4,006. The frontier was estimated by applying the maximum likelihood method (Kumbhakar, 1994). The maximized value of the logarithm of the likelihood function is -21.82. Meanwhile, the constant term has decreased also. Fertilizer is a more important factor than water. The estimates are given in Table 1.

Table1. Estimates of the crop stochastic frontier

Constant $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$	**Fertilizer** $\boldsymbol{\alpha_1}$	**Water** $\boldsymbol{\alpha_2}$	$\boldsymbol{\sigma_u^2}$	$\boldsymbol{\sigma_v^2}$	**Log-likelihood**
5.699 (3.338)	0.894 (2.633)	0.103 (1.137)	0.621	0.308	-21.82

The results of the estimated stochastic production frontier were used to calculate the technical efficiency of the Iraklio prefecture farmers in the production of viticulture products, olive oil and citrus products during the period 2002-2012. The estimates are presented in Table 2, Figure 2.

The technical efficiency for each crop each year is calculated by estimating the conditional expectation of the error term u_i given ε_i from equation (17). The level of technical efficiency in the area of Iraklio appears to be high for the three crops. On the average, the producers of viticulture products realized about 83.6% of their technical efficiency and the producers of olive oil 80.59% of their technical efficiency, during the period 2002-2012. The producers of citrus products realized about 84.37% of their technical efficiency during the same period.

The stochastic model provided crop efficiency estimates with low variability. Efficiency ranges from 60.77% to 92.21% for farmers of viticulture products, and from 70.70% to 90.87% for farmers of citrus products. Only in the case of olive oil is there still wide variation during the period 2002-2006, which in comparison to the corresponding variation in the deterministic frontier, can be considered low (Zeng et al., 2014). During the period 2006-2012, the technical efficiency of the farmers tends to be stable over time, as is shown in Figure 2. No farms are perfectly efficient (100%). This is because in the stochastic frontier a portion of the total error is attributable to random behavior (Huang et al., 2012). The farmers of viticulture products achieved their maximum technical efficiency in 2007, the farmers of olive oil in 2004 and the farmers of citrus products in 2009 as it demonstrated in Table 2.

3.2. Crop-Water Production Model

The results of the crop-water stochastic production frontier are shown in Table 3. Both the constant term and the water coefficient are highly significant. These estimates were used to measure crop technical efficiency of the use of irrigation water**.**

$\gamma = 0.97$ this means that 97% of the discrepancy between the observed values of output and the frontier output is due to technical inefficiency. The ratio of the two standard errors is $\lambda = 6.174$. The maximized value of the logarithm of the likelihood function is -27.1667. The year specific technical efficiency indices for the three crops are presented in Table 4 and also in Figure 3.

Table 2. Year specific technical efficiency indices for the three crops (SFA, two outputs).

Year	Viticulture products (%)	Olive oil (%)	Citrus products (%)
2002	60.77	91.94	74.78
2003	88.02	51.33	87.38
2004	88.71	93.92	75.54
2005	86.87	38.65	70.70
2006	87.47	89.42	89.35
2007	**92.21**	**93.48**	88.88
2008	79.63	90.88	86.96
2009	86.98	91.08	**90.87**
2010	89.74	91.32	89.96
2011	91.61	75.18	89.96
2012	67.63	79.30	87.35
Average	83.60	80.59	84.37
Minimum	60.77	38.65	70.70
Maximum	92.21	93.48	90.87



Figure 2. Year specific technical efficiency indices for the three crops using stochastic method with two inputs

There is a variation in the level of technical efficiency of the use of irrigation water. Efficiency ranges from 61.16% to 90.54% for viticulture products, from 35.35% to 95.17% for olive oil and from 52.94% to 96.24% for citrus products but this variation is lower than the variation that appears in the deterministic production frontier. The average technical efficiencies of the use of irrigation water which are 82.07% for viticulture products, 77.15% for olive oil and 81.03% for citrus products indicate that farmers of olive oil have the lowest average technical efficiency. It is obvious that in the case of the crop-water production frontier, the comparison of the results does not help to decide which crop farmers have the highest technical efficiency in the use of irrigation water (Bekri and Yannopoulos, 2012). Each method indicates a different crop.

Table3. Estimates of the crop-water stochastic frontier.

Constant α	**Water** α_2	σ_u^2	σ_v^2	**Log-likelihood**
9.846	2.021	0.98	0.025	-27.166
(13.826)	(11.375)			

Table 4. Year specific technical efficiency indices for the three crops (SFA, one output).

Year	**Viticulture products (%)**	**Olive oil (%)**	**Citrus products (%)**
2002	68.37	94.48	66.72
2003	80.49	35.35	65.73
2004	82.73	92.04	52.94
2005	**90.54**	40.63	78.01
2006	87.56	87.19	86.67
2007	89.91	93.45	90.61
2008	89.43	**95.17**	94.95
2009	86.01	82.91	92.12
2010	77.15	94.02	96.24
2011	89.42	64.77	**96.25**
2012	61.16	68.68	91.65
Average	82.07	77.15	81.03
Minimum	61.16	35.35	52.94
Maximum	90.54	95.17	96.24

Different methods yield different efficiency estimates which prove that the efficiency of the irrigation water use is lower than the efficiency of the use of both water and fertilizers inputs together (Podimata and Yannopoulos, 2013; Bekri et al., 2015).



Figure 3. Year specific technical efficiency indices for the three crops using stochastic method with one input

4. Conclusions

The estimates indicate that these crops cannot be modeled with a single production function. Each crop has its specific production function characterized by common slope coefficients for all three crops and an intercept that varies over crops. Technical efficiency varies from one crop to another. In the case of two inputs, farmers are most efficient in the production of citrus products and least efficient in the production of olive oil. The farmers of viticulture products achieved their maximum technical efficiency in 2007, the farmers of olive oil in 2004 and the farmers of citrus in 2009. Using stochastic frontiers, it was found that farmers are more efficient in the use of all inputs than in the use of irrigation water. Using the stochastic frontiers, the average technical efficiency of all inputs use ranges from 80.59% for olive oil to 84.37% for citrus products and the average technical efficiency of water irrigation use ranges from 77.15% for olive oil to 82.07% for viticulture products. Therefore, the efficiency of irrigation water has to be increased by better irrigation management Using the stochastic frontiers it was found that on the average farmers are highly technically efficient in the production of these three crops. The marginal value product of water is equal to 0.73 Euros/m^3. It is higher than the price that the responsible agency of the prefecture charges the farmers for each m^3 they use (approximately 0.16 Euros/m^3, 2012 price). This indicates that water has a high value.

Acknowledgement

This article was funded by the Deanship of Scientific Research (DSR) at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah. The authors, therefore, acknowledged with thanks DSR for technical and financial support.

References

Afriat, S. N. (1972). Efficiency estimation of production functions. International Economic Review, 13: 568-598.

Aigner, D. J. and Chu, S. F. (1968). On estimating the industry production function. American Economic Review, 58: 826-839.

Aigner, D. J., Lovell, C. A. K. and Schmidt, P. (1977). Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production function models. Journal of Econometrics, 6: 21-37.

Aigner, D. J., Lovell, C. A. K. and Schmidt, P. (1977). Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production function models. Journal of Econometrics, 6: 21-37.

Aldaya, M. M., Allan, J. A. and Hoekstra, A. Y. (2010). Strategic importance of green water in international crop trade. Ecological Economics, 69: 887–894.

Amemiya, T. (1973). Regression analysis when the dependent variable is truncated normal. Econometrica, 41: 997-1016.

Angelakis, A. N., Koutsoyannis, D. and Tchobanoglous, G. (2005). Urban Wastewater and Stormwater Technologies in the Ancient Greece. Water Research, 39(1): 210–220.

Antonelli, M. and Ruini, L. F. (2015). Business Engagement with Sustainable Water Resource Management through Water Footprint Accounting: The Case of the Barilla Company. Sustainability, 7: 6742-6758

Bekri, E. S. and Yannopoulos, P. C. (2012). The interplay between the Alfeios river basin components and the exerted environmental stresses: A critical review. Water Air and Soil Pollution, 223: 3783–3806.

Bekri, E. S., Disse, M. and Yannopoulos, P. C. (2015). Optimizing Water Allocation under Uncertain System Conditions in Alfeios River Basin (Greece), Part A: Two-Stage Stochastic Programming Model with Deterministic Boundary Intervals. Water, 7: 5305-5344.

Bravo-Ureta, B. E. (1986). Technical efficiency measures for dairy farms based on a probabilistic frontier function model Canadian. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 34: 399-415.

Chenoweth, J., Hadjikakou, M. and Zoumides, C. (2014). Quantifying the human impact on water resources: A critical review of the water footprint concept. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 18: 2325–2342.

Chow, G. C. (1983). Econometrics. Singapore: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Dawson, P. J. (1990). Farm efficiency in the England and Wales dairy sector. Oxford Agrarian Studies, 1 (1): 35-42.

Dedian,V., Katochianou, D. and Labropoulou, A. (2000). The Social-Economic Identity of the Water Compartments. Centre of Planning and Economic Research (KEPE), Athens, Hellas.

Farrell, M. J. (1957). The measurement of productive efficiency. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A, 120, Pt 3: 253-281.

Forsund, F. R., Lovell, C. A. K. and Schmidt, P. (1980). A survey of frontier production functions and of their relationship to efficiency measurement. Journal of Econometrics, 13: 5-25.

Forsund, F. R., Lovell, C. A. K. and Schmidt, P. (1980). A survey of frontier production functions and of their relationship to efficiency measurement. Journal of Econometrics, 13: 5-25.

Hellenic Ministry for Agriculture. (2002). Dams and Lagoons on the Aegean Islands, Athens.

Huang, C. J. and Bagi. F. S. (1984). Technical efficiency on individual farms in Northwest India. Southern Economic Journal, 51:108-115.

Huang, Y., Li, Y. P., Chen, X. and Ma, Y. G. (2012). Optimization of the irrigation water resources for agricultural sustainability in Tarim River Basin, China. Agricultural Water Management, 107: 74–85.

Iglesias, A., Garrote, L., Flores, F. and Moneo M. (2007). Challenges to Manage the Risk of Water Scarcity and Climate Change in the Mediterranean. Water Resources Management, 21: 775-788.

Iglesias, A., Garrote, L., Flores, F. and Moneo M. (2007). Challenges to Manage the Risk of Water Scarcity and Climate Change in the Mediterranean. Water Resources Management, 21: 775-788.

Jondow, J., Lovell, C. A. K., Materov, L. S. and Schmidt, P. (1982). On the estimation of technical efficiency in the stochastic production function model. Journal of Econometrics, 19: 233-238.

Karagiannis, I. C. and Soldatos, P. G. (2007). Current Status of Water Desalination in the Aegean Islands. Desalination, 203: 56–61.

Kumbhakar, S. C. (1994). Efficiency estimation in a profit maximizing model using flexible production functions. Agricultural Economics, 10: 143-152.

Kumbhakar, S. C. (1994). Efficiency estimation in a profit maximizing model using flexible production functions. Agricultural Economics, 10: 143-152.

Lazarova, V., Levine, B., Sack, J., Cirelli, G. L., Jeffrey, P., Muntau, H., Salgot6and, M. and Brissaud, F. (2001). Role of water reuse for enhancing integrated water management in Europe and Mediterranean countries. Water Science and Technology, 43(10): 25–33.

Maheras, P. and Koliva-Mahera, F. (1989). Statistical characteristics of precipitation in Heraclio during 20th century. Proceedings of the fourth Hellenic hydrotechnical congress cm water resources and regional development. March 14-17, 1990. Iraklio, Crete, Greece.

Maliarakis, E. (1991). The problem of shortage of irrigation water in the prefecture of Heraklion. GEOTE of Crete.

Maliarakis, E. (1991). The problem of shortage of irrigation water in the prefecture of Heraklion. GEOTE of Crete.

Meeusen, W. and Van den Broeck, J. (1977). Efficiency estimation from Cobb-Douglas production functions with composed error. International Economic Review, 18(2): 435-443.

Monopolis, D. (1993). Water resources balance-Water resources capacity of Crete. Proceedings of the meeting on management of water resources of Crete. May 27-28, 1993. Chania, Crete, Greece.

Podimata, M. and Yannopoulos, P. C. (2013). Evaluating challenges and priorities of a trans-regional river basin in Greece by using a hybrid SWOT scheme and a stakeholders' competency overview. International Journal of River Basin Management, 11: 93–110.

Schmidt, P. (1976). On the statistical estimation of parametric frontier production functions. Review of Economics and Statistics, 58: 238-239.

Tsagarakis, K. P. Dialinas, G. E. and Angelakis, A. N. (2004). Water Resources Management in Crete (Greece) Including Water Recycling and Reuse and Proposed Quality Criteria. Agricultural Water Management, 66(1): 35–47.

Zeng, X. T., Li, Y. P., Huang, G. H. and Yu, L.Y. (2014). Inexact mathematical modeling for identification of water trading policy under uncertainty. Water, 6: 229–252.