

1 Transpiration in an oil palm landscape: effects of palm age

2
3 A. Röhl ^{1*}, F. Niu ^{1*}, A. Meijide ², A. Hardanto ^{1,3}, Hendrayanto ⁴, A. Knohl ², and
4 D. Hölscher ¹

5
6
7 [1]{Tropical Silviculture and Forest Ecology, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen,
8 Germany}

9 [2]{Bioclimatology, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Germany}

10 [3]{Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia}

11 [4]{Department of Forest Management, Institut Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia}

12 [*]{The authors contributed equally to this work}

13 Correspondence to: A. Röhl (aroell@gwdg.de)

15 Abstract

16 Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) plantations cover large and continuously increasing areas
17 of humid tropical lowlands. Landscapes dominated by oil palms usually consist of a mosaic of
18 mono-cultural, homogeneous stands of varying age, which may be heterogeneous in their
19 water use characteristics. However, studies on the water use characteristics of oil palms are
20 still at an early stage and there is a lack of knowledge on how oil palm expansion will affect
21 the major components of the hydrological cycle. To provide first insights into hydrological
22 landscape-level consequences of oil palm cultivation, we derived transpiration rates of oil
23 palms in stands of varying age, estimated the contribution of palm transpiration to
24 evapotranspiration, and analyzed the influence of fluctuations in environmental variables on
25 oil palm water use. We studied 15 two- to 25-year old stands in the lowlands of Jambi,
26 Indonesia. A sap flux technique with an oil palm specific calibration and sampling scheme
27 was used to derive leaf-, palm- and stand-level water use rates in all stands under comparable
28 environmental conditions. Additionally, in a two- and a 12-year old stand, eddy covariance
29 measurements were conducted to derive evapotranspiration rates. Water use rates per leaf and

1 palm increased 5-fold from an age of two years to a stand age of approx. 10 years and then
2 remained relatively constant. A similar trend was visible, but less pronounced, for estimated
3 stand transpiration rates of oil palms; they varied 12-fold, from 0.2 mm day⁻¹ in a 2-year old
4 to 2.5 mm day⁻¹ in a 12-year old stand, showing particularly high variability in transpiration
5 rates among medium-aged stands. ~~Comparing~~ Comparing sap flux and eddy-covariance derived
6 water fluxes suggests that transpiration contributed 8% to evapotranspiration in the 2-year old
7 stand and 53% in the 12-year old stand, indicating variable and substantial additional sources
8 of evaporation, e.g. from the soil, the ground vegetation and from trunk epiphytes. Diurnally,
9 oil palm transpiration rates were characterized by an early peak between 10 and 11 am; there
10 was a pronounced hysteresis in the leaf water use response to changes in vapor pressure
11 deficit for all palms of advanced age. On the day-to-day basis this resulted in a relatively low
12 variability of oil palm water use regardless of fluctuations in vapor pressure deficit and
13 radiation. We conclude, that oil palm dominated landscapes show some spatial variations in
14 (evapo)transpiration rates, e.g. due to varying age-structures, but that the temporal variability
15 of oil palm transpiration is rather low. ~~Stand~~ The stand transpiration ~~rates~~ of some of the
16 studied oil palm stands ~~compared to~~ was as high or even ~~exceed~~ higher than values reported for
17 different tropical forests, indicating a high water use of oil palms under ~~certain~~ yet to be
18 explained site or management conditions. Our study provides first insights into the eco-
19 hydrological characteristics of oil palms as well as a first estimate of oil palm water use across
20 a gradient of plantation age. It sheds first light on some of the hydrological consequences of
21 the continuing expansion of oil palm plantations.

22

23 **Key words:** Chrono-sequence, evapotranspiration, eddy covariance, sap flux, Granier-type
24 thermal dissipation probes

25

26 **1 Introduction**

27 Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) has become the most rapidly expanding crop in tropical
28 countries over the past decades, particularly in South East Asia (FAO, 2014). Besides from
29 losses of biodiversity and associated ecosystem functioning (e.g. Barnes et al., 2014),
30 potentially negative consequences of the expansion of oil palm cultivation on components of
31 the hydrological cycle have been reported (e.g. Banabas et al., 2008). Only few studies have
32 dealt with the water use characteristics of oil palms so far (Comte et al., 2012).

33 ~~Evapotranspiration~~ Available evapotranspiration estimates derived from micrometeorological

1 or catchment-based approaches range from 1.3 to 6.5 mm day⁻¹ for different tropical locations
2 and climatic conditions (e.g. Radersma and Ridder, 1996; Henson and Harun, 2005).
3 However, various components of the water cycle under oil palm yet remain to be studied
4 for a convincing hydrological assessment of the hydrological consequences of oil palm
5 expansion, e.g. regarding the partitioning of the central water flux of evapotranspiration into
6 transpirational and evaporative fluxes. Also, to our knowledge, influences of site or stand
7 characteristics on oil palm water use have not yet been addressed.

8 Landscapes dominated by oil palms are not necessarily homogeneous in their water use
9 characteristics. Oil palms are usually planted in mono-specific and even-aged stands;
10 commonly, stands are cleared and replanted at an age of approx. 25 years due to difficulties in
11 harvesting operations, potentially declining yields and the opportunity to plant higher yielding
12 varieties of oil palm. This creates a mosaic of stands of varying age, and hence with possibly
13 different hydrological characteristics.

14 Substantial differences in transpiration rates of dicot tree stands have been shown for stands
15 of varying age in several studies (e.g. Jayasuriya et al., 1993; Roberts et al., 2001; Vertessy et
16 al., 2001; Delzon and Loustau, 2005); commonly, water use increases rapidly after stand
17 establishment, reaching a peak after some decades (which is associated with high stand
18 productivity and high stand densities) before declining more or less consistently with
19 increasing age. This has e.g. been demonstrated for *Eucalyptus regnans* F. Muell. (Cornich
20 and Vertessy, 2001), *Eucalyptus sieberi* L. Johnson (Roberts et al., 2001) and *Pinus pinaster*
21 Aiton (Delzon and Loustau, 2005) for stands between 10 and 160 years old. Declines in
22 transpiration rates in older stands were mainly explained by decreasing leaf and sapwood area
23 with increasing stand age (Roberts et al., 2001; Vertessy et al., 2001; Delzon and Loustau,
24 2005). This may not be the case in palms, as at least at the individual level, for two
25 Amazonian palm species (*Iriartea deltoidea* Ruiz & Pav. and *Mauritia flexuosa* L.) linear
26 increases of water use with increasing height, and hence age, have been demonstrated
27 (Renniger et al., 2009; Renninger et al., 2010).

28 Water use patterns over a gradient of plantation age to our knowledge have not yet been
29 studied for oil palms. Water use could ~~both~~ increase or decline with increasing stand age or
30 could remain relatively stable from a certain age. Reasons for declining water use at a certain
31 age include decreasing functionality of trunk xylem tissue with increasing age due to the
32 absence of secondary growth in monocot species (Zimmermann, 1973), a variety of other
33 hydraulic limitations (see review of dicot tree studies in Ryan et al., 2006) and increased

1 hydraulic resistance due to increased pathway length with increasing trunk height (Yoder et
2 al., 1994). However, for Mexican fan palms (*Washingtonia robusta* Linden ex André H
3 Wendl.), no evidence of increasing hydraulic limitations with increasing palm height was
4 found (Renninger et al., 2009). ~~On the other hand,~~ Reasons for potentially increasing water use
5 in older plantations e.g. include linearly increasing oil palm trunk height ~~increases linearly~~
6 with increasing palm age (Henson and Dolmat, 2003). ~~With increasing~~ As trunk height and
7 ~~hence~~ thus volume increase, internal water storages probably also increase, possibly enabling
8 larger (i.e. older) oil palms to transpire at higher rates (Goldstein et al., 1998; Madurapperuma
9 et al., 2009). Additionally, increased stand canopy height is expected to result in an enhanced
10 turbulent energy exchange with the atmosphere, i.e. a closer coupling of transpiration to
11 environmental drivers, which can facilitate higher transpiration rates under optimal
12 environmental conditions (Hollinger et al., 1994; Vanclay, 2009). The mentioned reasons for
13 possibly increasing and decreasing water use with increasing plantations age, respectively,
14 could also partly outbalance each other, or could be outbalanced by external factors (e.g.
15 management related), potentially leading to relatively constant ~~no clear trend of oil palm~~
16 transpiration ~~over~~ with increasing plantation age.

17 To investigate the water use characteristics of oil palm stands of varying age, we derived leaf-
18 , palm- and stand-scale transpiration estimates from sap flux density measurements with
19 thermal dissipation probes (TDP; Granier, 1985) in 15 different stands (2–25 years old) in the
20 lowlands of Jambi, Sumatra, Indonesia. We used the oil palm specific calibration equation
21 and field measurement scheme recently proposed by Niu et al. (2015). Additionally, in two of
22 these stands (two and 12 years old) we used the eddy covariance technique (Baldocchi, 2003)
23 to derive independent estimates of evapotranspiration rates. For comparative purposes, the
24 measurements were conducted under similar environmental conditions and partly
25 simultaneously. Our objectives were (1) to derive transpiration rates of oil palms in stands of
26 varying age, (2) to estimate the contribution of palm transpiration to total evapotranspiration,
27 and (3) to analyze the influence of micro-meteorological drivers on oil palm water use. The
28 study provides some first insights into the eco-hydrological characteristics of oil palms at
29 varying spatial (i.e. from leaf to stand) and temporal (i.e. from hourly to daily) scales as well
30 as first estimates of oil palm stand transpiration rates and their contribution to total
31 evapotranspiration. It assesses some of the potential hydrological consequences of large-scale
32 oil palm expansion on main components of the water cycle at the stand level.

33

1 **2 Methods**

2 **2.1 Study sites**

3 The field study was conducted in Jambi, Sumatra, Indonesia (Fig. 1). Between 1991 and
4 2011, average annual temperature in the region was 26.7 ± 0.2 °C (1991–2011 mean \pm SD),
5 with little intra-annual variation. Annual precipitation was 2235 ± 385 mm, a dry season with
6 less than 120 mm monthly precipitation usually occurred between June and September.
7 However, the magnitude of dry season rainfall patterns varied highly between years (data
8 from Airport Sultan Thaha in Jambi). Soil types in the research region are mainly sandy and
9 clay Acrisols (Allen et al., [in review 2015](#)). We had research plots in a total of 15 different oil
10 palm stands (Table 1), 13 of which were small holder plantations and two of which were
11 properties of big companies. The stands were spread over two landscapes in the Jambi
12 province (i.e. the Harapan and Bukit Duabelas regions, Fig. 1), were all at similar altitude (60
13 $m \pm 15$ m a.s.l.) and belonged to the larger experimental set-up of the CRC990 ([www.uni-](http://www.uni-goettingen.de/crc990)
14 [goettingen.de/crc990](http://www.uni-goettingen.de/crc990), Drescher et al., in preparation). Stand age ranged from 2 to 25 years.
15 Management intensity and frequency (i.e. fertilizer and herbicide application, manual and
16 chemical weeding of ground vegetation and clearing of trunk epiphytes) varied considerably
17 among the examined oil palm stands, but both were generally higher in larger plantations,
18 particularly in PTPN6.

19 **2.2 Sap flux measurements and transpiration**

20 Following a methodological approach for sap flux measurements on oil palms (Niu et al.,
21 2015), we installed thermal dissipation probe (TDP, [Granier, 1985; Uniwerkstätten](#)
22 [Universität Kassel, Germany; see Niu et al. 2015 for technical specifications](#)) sensors in the
23 leaf petioles of 16 leaves, four each on four different palms, for each of the 15 examined
24 stands. Insulative materials and aluminum foil shielded the sensors to minimize temperature
25 gradients and reflect radiation. Durable plastic foil was added for protection from rain. The
26 sensors were connected to AM16/32 multiplexers connected to a CR1000 data logger (both
27 Campbell Scientific Inc., Logan, USA). The signals from the sensors were recorded every 30
28 sec and averaged and stored every 10 min. The mV-data from the logger was converted to sap
29 flux density ($\text{g cm}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$) with the empirically-derived calibration equation by Granier (1985),
30 but with a set of equation parameters a and b that was specifically derived for TDP
31 measurements on oil palm leaf petioles (Niu et al., 2015).

1 Individual leaf water use rates were calculated by multiplying respective sap flux densities
2 (e.g. hourly averages, day sums) by the water conductive areas of the leaves; the water use
3 values of all individual leaves measured simultaneously (min. 13 leaves) were averaged (kg
4 day⁻¹). To scale up to average palm water use (kg day⁻¹), average leaf water use rates were
5 multiplied by the average number of leaves per palm. Multiplying the average palm water use
6 by the number of palms per unit of land (m²) yielded stand transpiration rates (T ; mm day⁻¹).
7 ~~This approach is associated with sample size related estimation errors of stand transpiration~~
8 ~~rates of 14% (described in detail in Niu et al., 2015).~~

9 The sap flux measurements were conducted between April 2013 and December 2014, for a
10 minimum of 3 weeks per study plot (Table 1). Three of the plots (BO3, PA, and PTPN6) ran
11 over several months, partly in parallel to other plots. Most measurements, however, were
12 conducted successively and thus partly took place under varying weather conditions. Thus, to
13 minimize day-to-day variability introduced by varying weather for the analysis of effects of
14 stand age on water use at different spatial scales, we used the average of three comparably
15 sunny and dry days from the measurement period of each stand. Exploratory analyses had
16 shown that unexplained variability was lower on sunny days than e.g. on cloudy or
17 intermediate days or when using the averages of the full respective measurement periods. We
18 chose days with a daily integrated radiation of more than 17 MJ m⁻² day⁻¹ and an average
19 daytime VPD of more than 1.1 kPa; respective averages (mean ± SD) of all days included in
20 the analysis were 20.3 ± 2.6 MJ m⁻² day⁻¹ and 1.6 ± 0.3 kPa (also see Table 1).

21 **2.3 Stand structural characteristics**

22 For all sample leaves, the leaf petiole baseline length was measured between upper and lower
23 probe of each TDP sensor installed in the field; this allowed calculating the water conductive
24 area of each leaf (Niu et al., 2015). For each sample palm, trunk height to the youngest leaf
25 (m) and diameter at breast height (cm) were measured (see Kotowska et al., 2015 for detailed
26 methodology) and the number of leaves per palm was counted. Over time, new leaves
27 emerged and old ones were pruned by the farmers; we assumed the number of leaves per palm
28 to be constant over our measurement period. On the stand level, we counted the number of
29 palms per hectare.

30 **2.4 Eddy covariance measurements and evapotranspiration**

31 The eddy covariance technique (Baldocchi, 2003) was used to measure evapotranspiration
32 (E_T , mm day⁻¹) in two of the 15 oil palm stands, the 2-year-old (PA) and the 12-year-old

1 (PTPN6) stand (Table 1). Towers of 7 m and 22 m in height, respectively, were equipped with
2 a sonic anemometer (Metek uSonic-3 Scientific, Elmshorn, Germany) to measure the three
3 components of the wind vector, and an open path carbon dioxide and water analyzer (Li-
4 7500A, Licor Inc., Lincoln, USA) to derive evapotranspiration rates (Meijide et al., in
5 preparation). Fluxes were calculated with the software EddyPro (Licor Inc), planar-fit
6 coordinate rotated, corrected for air density fluctuation and quality controlled. Thirty-minute
7 flux data were flagged for quality applying the steady state and integral turbulence
8 characteristic tests (Mauder and Foken, 2006). Data were also filtered according to friction
9 velocity to avoid the possible underestimation of fluxes in stable atmospheric conditions. Due
10 to the amount of data gaps created by lack of power and instrument failure, in the two year-
11 old plantation we calculated the energy balance closure for the selected three sunny days
12 included in the analysis (see Table 1), for which it was 82%. In the 12 year-old stand, the
13 energy balance closure for the respective full measurement period (May 2014-February 2015)
14 was 84%. ~~Data used for this analysis were not gap filled. We selected three days when most~~
15 of the thirty-minute measurements during the day where available. When a single thirty-
16 minute value was missing, the value was filled by linear interpolation between the previous
17 and the next 30 min value. Measurements were conducted between July 2013 and February
18 2014 in the 2-year old and from ~~March-May 2014~~ to ~~December-February 2014~~5 in the 12-year
19 old stand. For the analysis, we used the average of the same three sunny days that were
20 selected for the sap flux analysis in the respective plots (see ~~sap flux measurements and~~
21 ~~transpiration~~).Table 1). Daytime (6am–7pm) evapotranspiration rates were used for the
22 analyses and comparison to transpiration rates in order to avoid possible measurement errors
23 as a consequence of low turbulent conditions during nighttime hours.

24 To estimate the contribution of stand transpiration to total evapotranspiration, we confronted
25 sap flux derived transpiration rates with eddy covariance derived evapotranspiration rates. ~~To~~
26 ~~derive transpiration rates, we followed a sap flux calibration and field measurement scheme~~
27 ~~specifically put forward for oil palms (As described in Niu et al., (2015), which was reported~~
28 ~~to be our methodological approach for estimating sap flux transpiration is~~ associated with
29 sample size related measurement errors of about 14%. ~~To derive evapotranspiration rates we~~
30 ~~applied the~~ The eddy covariance ~~technique~~measurements were carried out in carefully-chosen
31 and well-suited locations and focused on daytime observations only, when estimation
32 uncertainties are commonly low (< 30%, Richardson et al., 2006). The observed differences
33 between evapotranspiration and transpiration estimates presented in this study are thus likely
34 largely due to natural rather than methodological reasons.

2.5 Environmental drivers of oil palm water use

A total of three micrometeorological stations were set up in proximity to the oil palm stands in both landscapes; for the analysis of the water use characteristics of the respective stands, we used the micrometeorological data from the closest available station, at a maximum distance of approx. 15 km and at similar altitude ($60 \text{ m} \pm 15 \text{ m a.s.l.}$). The stations were placed in open terrains. Air temperature and relative humidity were measured at a height of 2 m with a Thermohygrometer (type 1.1025.55.000, Thies Clima, Göttingen, Germany) to calculate vapor pressure deficit (VPD, kPa). A short wave radiation sensor (CMP3 Pyranometer, spectral range 300–2800 nm, Kipp & Zonen, Delf, The Netherlands) was installed at a height of 3 m, the latter to measure global radiation (R_g , $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ day}^{-1}$, from here on referred to as “radiation”). Measurements were taken every 15 sec and averaged and stored on a DL16 Pro data logger (Thies Clima) every 10 min.

The eddy covariance towers (see eddy covariance measurements and evapotranspiration) were also equipped with micrometeorological sensors. Measurements were taken above the canopy, at respective heights of 6.7 and 22 m. Air temperature and humidity (Thermohygrometer, type 1.1025.55.000, Thies Clima), short wave radiation (BF5, Delta-T, Cambridge, United Kingdom) and net radiation (CNR4 Net radiometer, Kipp & Zonen) were measured every 15 sec and averaged and stored on a DL16 Pro data logger (Thies Clima) every 10 min.

Soil moisture was recorded in the center of eight of the 15 study plots and at the micrometeorological stations and eddy covariance towers. Soil moisture sensors (Trime-Pico 32, IMKO, Ettlingen, Germany) were placed 0.3 m under the soil surface and connected to a data logger (LogTrans16-GPRS, UIT, Dresden, Germany). Data were recorded every hour, for 16 months from June 2013 on. Exploratory analyses showed no significant effects of soil moisture on water use rates ([linear regression](#), $P > 0.1$). Soil moisture fluctuated only little at the respective locations and during the respective measurement periods and even on a yearly scale, e.g. between $32 \pm 2\%$ and $38 \pm 2\%$ between June 2013 and June 2014 (minimum and maximum daily values, mean \pm SE between the three micrometeorological stations). Soil moisture did e.g. also not fall below 36% during the measurement period in the long-term monitoring (BO3) stand. It was non-limiting for plant water use. As it showed no significant relationship with water use rates, we omitted soil moisture from further analyses of influences of fluctuations in environmental variables on oil palm water use. ~~We instead focused on the micrometeorological drivers VPD and radiation. Likewise, further recorded micrometeorological variables (e.g. air pressure, wind speed) had no significant relationship~~

1 with water use rates in our study (linear regression, $P > 0.1$) and where thus also omitted. We
2 instead focused on the micrometeorological drivers VPD and global radiation; among an array
3 of micrometeorological variables (e.g. also including temperature, humidity, net radiation)
4 exploratory analysis had shown that they were best suited to explain fluctuations in water use
5 rates. This has also been demonstrated in other studies on plant water use (e.g. Dierick and
6 Hölscher, 2009; Köhler et al., 2009, 2013)

7 For the diurnal analysis, we averaged the values of three comparably sunny days and
8 normalized VPD and radiation by setting the highest observed hourly rates to one. All
9 statistical analyses and graphing were performed with R version 3.1.1 (R Core Development
10 team, 2014) and Origin 8.5 (Origin Lab, Northampton, MA, USA).

12 **3 Results**

13 **3.1 Stand characteristics**

14 The number of palms per unit of land linearly decreased with increasing stand age ($R^2 = 0.29$,
15 $P = 0.04$; Fig. 2a). The number of leaves per palm remained constant and varied little (32–40
16 leaves per palm) over stand age (Fig. 2b). The trunk height of oil palms (Fig. 2c) increased
17 linearly with increasing age ($R^2 = 0.91$, $P < 0.01$), from about 2 m at an age of six to about 9
18 m at an age of 25 years. The average baseline length of leaf petioles at the location of sensor
19 installation increased linearly with stand age ($R^2 = 0.65$, $P < 0.01$). As the number of leaves
20 was constant in mature stands, the increasing baseline lengths of leaf petioles resulted in a
21 significant linear increase of the water conductive area per palm with increasing stand age (R^2
22 $= 0.53$, $P < 0.01$). In consequence, the stand-level water conductive area also linearly
23 increased with stand age ($R^2 = 0.26$, $P = 0.05$; Fig. 2d).

24 **3.2 Transpiration and evapotranspiration**

25 Maximum sap flux densities on three sunny days as measured in the leaf petioles of oil palms
26 were variable but did not show a significant trend over age among the examined stands (Fig.
27 3a). Converted to leaf water use, a clear non-linear trend over stand age became apparent
28 ($R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.61$, $P < 0.01$ for the Hill function, see Morgan et al., 1975, fit shown in Appendix
29 Fig. 1b, not shown) (in Fig. 3b): Leaf water use increased 5-fold from a 2-year-old stand to a
30 plot age of about 10 years; it then remained relatively constant with further increasing age. At
31 the palm level (Fig. 3c), water use rates closely resemble the relationship of leaf water use and

1 stand age. At the stand level, oil palm transpiration was very low (0.2 mm day^{-1}) in the 2-year
2 old stand and increased almost 8-fold until a stand age of 5 years. It then remained relatively
3 constant with increasing age at around 1.3 mm day^{-1} (Fig. 3d). However, three medium-aged
4 stands (PTPN6, BO5, and HO2) that showed increased sap flux densities and leaf and palm
5 water use rates also had higher stand transpiration rates, between 2.0 and 2.5 mm day^{-1} .
6 Potentially, this could be related to differences in radiation on the respective three sunny days
7 that were chosen for the analysis; ~~h~~However, there was no significant relationship between
8 average water use and radiation for rates on the respective three sunny days in the 15 stands
9 and the respective average radiation (or VPD) on those days (linear regression, $P > 0.05$), i.e.
10 observed spatial variability in transpiration among the 15 stands could not be explained by
11 differences in weather conditions. A further analysis of the water use rates of eight medium-
12 aged stands with highly variable transpiration rates also gave no indications of variability
13 being induced by differences in radiation. As for the leaf- and palm-level water use rates, a
14 Hill function explained the relationship between stand transpiration and stand age ($R^2_{\text{adj}} =$
15 0.45 , $P < 0.01$, [Appendix Fig. 1d](#)), but the observed scatter was high. ~~The transpiration rates~~
16 ~~of the two oldest examined stands (BD_old, 22 years and HAR_old, 25 years) possibly~~
17 ~~indicate a slight decline of transpiration rates at advanced stand age., particularly among~~
18 medium aged plantations. Overall, stand transpiration rates increased linearly with increasing
19 stand water conductive area ($R^2 = 0.42$, $P = 0.01$). On the palm level, there was a linear
20 relationship between water use and trunk height ($R^2 = 0.32$, $P = 0.03$), but stand transpiration
21 did not have a linear relationship with average stand trunk height due to decreasing stand
22 densities with increasing stand age; instead, as for transpirations vs. stand age, a Hill function
23 explained the relationship between transpiration and stand trunk height best ($R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.44$, $P <$
24 0.01) (also see summary in Table 2).

25 On comparably sunny days, the stand-level transpiration among the 15 oil palm stands varied
26 12-fold, from 0.2 mm day^{-1} in a 2-year old to 2.5 mm day^{-1} in a 12-year old stand. A large
27 part of this spatial variability was explained by different stand variables when applying the
28 Hill function. Stand age explained 45% of the observed spatial variability of stand
29 transpiration (i.e. $R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.45$ at $P < 0.01$, [Appendix Fig. 1](#)~~Fig. 3d~~), and variables correlated
30 to stand age, i.e. by average stand trunk height and by stand water conductive area, explained
31 44% and 43%, respectively (Table 2). Much of the remaining variability in stand transpiration
32 rates could be explained by varying stand densities (variations of up to 30% between stands of
33 similar age, see Table 1). Thus, when shifting from the stand level to the palm level, up to
34 60% of the spatial variability in palm water use rates could be explained by age and correlated

1 variables (see Fig. 3c and Table 2). Much of the variability that remains on the palm level is
2 induced by three stands where palm water use was much higher ($> 150 \text{ kg day}^{-1}$) than in the
3 other 12 stands ($< 125 \text{ kg day}^{-1}$); excluding these three stands from the analysis, 87% of the
4 spatial variability in palm water use rates could be explained by age (Table 3).

5 Evapotranspiration rates derived from the eddy covariance technique for the 2-yr-old stand
6 (PA) were 2.8 mm day^{-1} (average of three sunny days); the contribution of sap flux derived
7 transpiration was 8%. For the 12-year old stand (PTPN6), the evapotranspiration estimate was
8 4.7 mm day^{-1} ; transpiration amounted to about 53%.

9 **3.3 Drivers of oil palm water use**

10 Radiation peaked between 12 and 1 pm while vapor pressure deficit peaked at around 3 pm;
11 the diurnal course of sap flux densities on three sunny days except for the 2-yr-old stand (PA)
12 showed an early peak of sap flux density (10 to 11 am), which then decreased throughout the
13 rest of the day (Fig. 4a and 4b, respectively). Thus, there was a varying and partly pronounced
14 hysteresis in the leaf-level response of transpiration to VPD (Fig. 4c). It was small in the 2-
15 year old stand (PA). In contrast, it was very pronounced in the 12-year old PTPN6 stand (high
16 water use, commercial plantation), where a very sensitive increase of water use rates with
17 increasing VPD during the morning hours was observed, reaching a peak in water use rates at
18 only about 60% of maximum daily VPD. After that, water use rates declined relatively
19 consistently throughout the day, despite further rises in VPD. The same pattern was observed
20 in most of the stands; we present values for the oldest stand (HAR_old, 25 years) and another
21 12-year old stand (BO3, low water use, smallholder plantation) as further examples. The
22 hysteresis in the transpiration response to radiation (Fig. 4d) was generally less pronounced
23 than for VPD.

24 The day-to-day behavior of oil palm leaf water use rates to environmental drivers (i.e. VPD,
25 radiation) seemed 'buffered', i.e. already relatively low VPD and radiation lead to relatively
26 high water use rates (except for in the 2-yr-old stand), while even strong increases in VPD
27 and radiation only induced rather small further increases in water use rates (Fig. 5). For the 2-
28 year-old stand (PA), leaf water use rates over time were almost constant (about 0.4 kg day^{-1}),
29 regardless of daily environmental conditions. Likewise, the water use rates of the remaining
30 stands were relatively insensitive to increases in VPD, i.e. two-fold increases in VPD only led
31 to 1.1- to 1.2-fold increases in water use rates (Fig. 5). A similarly buffered water use
32 response to radiation was observed for the 12-year old small-holder stand (BO3) and the 25-

1 year old stand (HAR_old), i.e. 1.5- and 1.3-fold increases, respectively, for two-fold increases
2 in radiation. The water use response to fluctuations in radiation of the 12-year old commercial
3 stand (PTPN6) was more sensitive, i.e. two-fold increases in radiation induced 1.8-fold
4 increases in water use rates (Fig. 5). The PTPN6 stand also had the highest absolute water use
5 rates among the studied stands.

6

7 **4 Discussion**

8 **4.1 Oil palm transpiration over age**

9 Among 13 studied productive oil palm stands (i.e. > 4 years old) stand transpiration rates
10 varied more than two-fold. The observed range (1.1–2.5 mm day⁻¹) compares to transpiration
11 rates derived with similar techniques in a variety of tree-based tropical land-use systems, e.g.
12 ~~an *Acacia mangium* plantations~~ on Borneo (~~2.3–3.9 mm~~3mm day⁻¹ for stands of
13 ~~varying relatively low~~ density, Cienciala et al., 2000), cacao monocultures and agroforests
14 with varying shade tree cover on Sulawesi (0.5–2.2 mm day⁻¹, Köhler et al., 2009, 2013) and
15 reforestation and agroforestry stands on the Philippines and in Panama (0.6–2.5 mm day⁻¹,
16 Dierick and Hölscher, 2009; Dierick et al., 2010). The highest observed values for oil palm
17 stands (2.0–2.5 mm day⁻¹, PTPN6, BO5, and HO2 stands) compare to or even exceed values
18 reported for tropical forests (1.3–2.6 mm day⁻¹; Calder et al., 1986; Becker, 1996; McJannet
19 et al., 2007), suggesting that oil palms can transpire at substantial rates under certain, yet
20 unexplained site or management conditions despite e.g. a much lower biomass per hectare
21 than in natural forests (Kotowska et al., 2015).

22 In the 15 studied oil palm stands, stand-level transpiration rates increased almost 8-fold from
23 an age of two years to a stand age of five years; they then remained relatively constant with
24 further increasing age, but were highly variable among ~~medium-aged-productive stands. In~~
25 ~~our study region, oil palm~~ plantations. ~~The contradictory results found in are commonly~~
26 ~~cleared and replaced at an age of max. 25–30 years due to constrictions in fruit harvest with~~
27 ~~further increasing palm height; the oldest studied stand was 25 years old. In contrast to~~
28 previous studies for dicot tree mono-cultural stands of varying age, ~~i.e., we thus did not find,~~
29 after a relatively early peak, lower stand transpiration rates with increasing stand age (e.g.
30 Jayasuriya et al., 1993; Roberts et al., 2001; Vertessy et al., 2001; Delzon and Loustau, 2005),
31 ~~could be explained by two reasons: firstly, the studied time scales were). Asides from the~~

1 productivity-related artificial short oil palm lifespan in our studied stands as opposed to much
2 larger time-scales in studies on tree stands (e.g. comparison of 10- and 91-year old stands in
3 Delzon and Loustau, 2005) ~~than~~, this is also related to differences in ~~our oil palm study~~
4 ~~(stand age 2–25 years); secondly, establishment:~~ oil palms are commonly planted in a fixed,
5 relatively large grid, which results in a less pronounced reduction of stand density with
6 increasing stand age ~~as~~ than in dicot tree stands, which are often established at much higher
7 stand densities and consequently show higher density-dependent mortality rates. After an
8 initial steep rise of transpiration at a very young plantation age, stand transpiration thus does
9 not seem to vary considerably over the life span of a certain oil palm plantation, which
10 contrasts with the water use characteristics of tree plantations.

11 The observed substantial stand-to-stand variability of transpiration among the 15 stands,
12 particularly among medium aged plantations, could to 60% be explained by the variables
13 stand age and density, and up to 87% when excluding three stands with much higher water
14 use. ~~On comparably sunny days, the stand-level transpiration among the 15 oil palm stands~~
15 ~~varied 12 fold, from 0.2 mm day⁻¹ in a 2-year old to 2.5 mm day⁻¹ in a 12-year old stand. A~~
16 ~~large part of this spatial variability could be explained by stand age (45%), and thus also by~~
17 ~~variables that were correlated to stand age, i.e. by average stand trunk height (44%) and by~~
18 ~~stand water conductive area (42%). Much of the remaining variability in stand transpiration~~
19 ~~rates could be explained by varying stand densities (variations of up to 30% between stands of~~
20 ~~similar age). Thus, when shifting from the stand level to the palm level, up to 60% of the~~
21 ~~spatial variability in palm water use rates could be explained by age and correlated variables.~~
22 ~~Much of the variability that remains on the palm level is induced by three stands where palm~~
23 ~~water use was much higher (> 150 kg day⁻¹) than in the other 12 stands (< 125 kg day⁻¹);~~
24 ~~excluding these three stands from the analysis, 87% of the spatial variability in palm water~~
25 ~~use rates could be explained by age (Hill function).~~ The remaining unexplained variability as
26 well as the high water use rates in the three mentioned stands could be related to differences
27 in site and soil characteristics. However, all studied stands were located in comparable
28 landscape positions (i.e. upland sites of little or medium inclination) and on similar mineral
29 soils, i.e. loam or clay Acrisols of generally comparable characteristics (Allen et al., ~~in~~
30 ~~review~~2015; Guillaume et al., 2015). Differences in management intensity could also
31 contribute to the remaining unexplained variability of stand transpiration rates over age.
32 The E.g., on P-deficient soils such as the Acrisols of our study region (Allen et al., 2015),
33 fertilization can greatly increase oil palm yield (Breure, 1982) and thus total primary
34 productivity, which could consequently lead to a higher water use of oil palms. Accordingly,

1 the highest observed transpiration value in our study came from a stand in an intensively and
2 regularly fertilized, high yielding commercial plantation. Thus, there may be a trade-off
3 between management intensity, and hence yield, on the one hand, and water use of oil palms
4 on the other hand. This trade-off is of particular interest in the light of the continuing
5 expansion of oil palm plantations (FAO, 2014) and increasing reports of water scarcity in oil
6 palm dominated areas (Obidzinski et al., 2012; Larsen et al., 2014)

7 **4.2—Oil palm transpiration vs. evapotranspiration**

8 **4.2 Evapotranspiration rates under sunny conditions derived from and the** 9 **contribution of transpiration**

10 Our eddy-covariance measurements were 2.8 mm day⁻¹ at PA (2-years old) derived
11 evapotranspiration estimates of 2.8 and 4.7 mm day⁻¹ at PTPN6 (12-years old). Sap flux
12 derived transpiration estimates for the same (on sunny days, in 2- and 12-year old stands,
13 respectively) compare very well to the range reported for oil palms in other studies: For 3–4
14 year old stands in Malaysia, eddy-covariance derived values of 1.3 mm day⁻¹ and 3.3–3.6 mm
15 day⁻¹ were reported for the dry and rainy season, respectively (Henson and Harun, 2005). For
16 mature stands, a value of 3.8 mm day⁻¹ was given, derived by the same technique (Henson,
17 1999). Micrometeorologically-derived values for 4–5 year old stands in Peninsular India were
18 2.0–5.5 mm day⁻¹ during the dry season (Kallarackal et al., 2004). A catchment-based
19 approach suggested values of 3.3–3.6 mm day⁻¹ for stands in Malaysia between 2 and 9 years
20 old (Yusop et al., 2008); evapotranspiration rates derived from the Penman-Monteith equation
21 and published data for various stands were 1.3–2.5 mm day⁻¹ in the dry season and 3.3–6.5
22 mm day⁻¹ in the rainy season (Radersma and Ridder, 1996). The values reported in most
23 available studies as well as our values overlap in a corridor from about 3 mm day⁻¹ to about 5
24 mm day⁻¹; this range compares to evapotranspiration rates reported for rainforests in South
25 East Asia (e.g. Tani et al., 2003a; Kumagai et al., 2005). Considering that oil palm stands e.g.
26 have much lower stand densities and biomass per hectare than natural tropical forests
27 (Kotowska et al., 2015), this indicates a quite high evapotranspiration from oil palms at both
28 the individual and the stand level. —were 0.2 mm day⁻¹ at PA and 2.5 mm day⁻¹ at
29 PTPN6; Additionally to the previously discussed relatively high water use of oil palms under
30 certain site or management conditions, the high evapotranspiration from oil palm can be
31 explained by substantial additional water fluxes to the atmosphere. These fluxes (i.e. the
32 differences between evapotranspiration and transpiration estimates, 2.6 and) were substantial

1 | in both the 2-year old and the 12-year old oil palm stand, i.e. 2.6 and 2.2 mm day⁻¹,
2 | respectively, were substantial. The. In the 2-year old PA stand the contribution of palm
3 | transpiration to total evapotranspiration was very low (8%) in the 2-year old PA stand (%,
4 | Fig. 6). Thus, the The majority of water fluxes to the atmosphere came from evaporation (e.g.
5 | from the soil, interception) and transpiration by other plants. The spaces between palms
6 | (planting distance approx. 8 × 8 m) were covered by a dense, up to 50 cm high grass layer at
7 | the time of study (approx. 60% ground cover); transpiration rates from grasslands can exceed
8 | those of forests (e.g. review in McNaughton and Jarvis, 1983; Kelliher et al., 1992) and could
9 | well account for 1–2 mm day⁻¹ to (partly) explain the observed difference of 2.6 mm day⁻¹
10 | between evapotranspiration and transpiration estimates in the PA stand. The 2-year old oil
11 | palms were still very small (average trunk height 0.3 m, overall height 1.8 m) and had a low
12 | average number of leaves (, 24 as opposed to an average of 37 ± 1 (mean ± SD) between the
13 | 15 studied stands); further, leaves were much smaller than in mature stands. Leaf area index
14 | (LAI) of 2-year old oil palm stands was reported be at least 5-fold lower (LAI < 1) than in
15 | mature stands of similar planting density as our study plots (Henson and Dolmat, 2003). The
16 | very low observed water use of the oil palms in PA (12 kg day⁻¹ per palm compared to
17 | approx. 100 kg day⁻¹ per palm in mature stands) and the consequent very low contribution of
18 | palm transpiration to evapotranspiration thus do not seem contradictory.

19 | At PTPN6 (12 years old) transpiration rates (2.5 mm day⁻¹) as well as the contribution of
20 | transpiration to evapotranspiration (53%) were much higher than in the 2-year old stand (PA);
21 | also, total evapotranspiration was almost 70% higher (4.7 mm day⁻¹); The sum of
22 | evaporation (e.g. from the soil) and transpiration by other plants was of similar magnitude
23 | (2.2 mm day⁻¹, i.e. 15% lower) as in PA. Due to the intense management, there was very little
24 | ground vegetation in inter-rows present in the PTPN6 stand. However, the abundant trunk
25 | epiphytes in butts of pruned leaf petioles that remain on the trunks of mature oil palms may
26 | contribute significantly to non-palm transpirational water fluxes. Additionally, oil palm trunks
27 | were reported to have a large potential external water storage capacity (up to 6 mm, Merten et
28 | al., submitted in revision) for stemflow water after precipitation events; the mentioned butts of
29 | pruned leaf petioles constitute ‘chambers’ filled with humus, water and epiphytes, which can
30 | remain moist for several days following rainfall events. On dry, sunny days of high
31 | evaporative demand, the (partial) drying out of these micro-reservoirs may significantly
32 | contribute to water fluxes from evaporation. This is supported by the diurnal course of all
33 | water fluxes except oil palm transpiration at PTPN6 (calculated by subtracting hourly
34 | transpiration from evapotranspiration rates), which closely followed VPD until its 3 pm peak,

1 but then declined rapidly, ~~suggesting~~. Generally, our comparison of eddy-covariance derived
2 evapotranspiration and sap-flux derived transpiration suggests significant other water fluxes
3 to the atmosphere than transpiration (e.g. from evaporation) that are still marginal during the
4 morning hours, reach their peak at the time VPD peaks and are extremely sensitive to
5 decreasing VPD in the afternoon.

6 ~~Our eddy covariance derived evapotranspiration estimates of 2.8 and 4.7 mm day⁻¹ (on sunny~~
7 ~~days, in 2- and 12-year old stands, respectively) compare very well to the range reported for~~
8 ~~oil palms in other studies: For 3-4 year old stands in Malaysia, eddy covariance derived~~
9 ~~values of 1.3 mm day⁻¹ and 3.3-3.6 mm day⁻¹ were reported for the dry and rainy season,~~
10 ~~respectively (Henson and Harun, 2005). For mature stands, a value of 3.8 mm day⁻¹ was~~
11 ~~given, derived by the same technique (Henson, 1999). Micrometeorologically derived values~~
12 ~~for 4-5 year old stands in Peninsular India were 2.0-5.5 mm day⁻¹ during the dry season~~
13 ~~(Kallaraackal et al., 2004). A catchment-based approach suggested values of 3.3-3.6 mm day⁻¹~~
14 ~~for stands in Malaysia between 2 and 9 years old (Yusop et al., 2008); evapotranspiration~~
15 ~~rates derived from the Penman-Monteith equation and published data for various stands were~~
16 ~~1.3-2.5 mm day⁻¹ in the dry season and 3.3-6.5 mm day⁻¹ in the rainy season (Radersma and~~
17 ~~Ridder, 1996). None of these studies contradict our eddy covariance derived~~
18 ~~evapotranspiration rates for the PA and PTPN6 stands; the values reported from most studies~~
19 ~~as well as our values overlap in a corridor from about 3 mm day⁻¹ to about 5 mm day⁻¹. This~~
20 ~~range compares to evapotranspiration rates reported for rainforests in South East Asia (e.g. In~~
21 ~~our study, transpiration amounted to only 8% and 53% of evapotranspiration in the two year-~~
22 ~~old and the 12 year-old oil palm stand, respectively (Tani et al., 2003a; Kumagai et al., 2005).~~
23 ~~Considering that oil palm stands e.g. have much lower stand densities and biomass per hectare~~
24 ~~than natural forests (Kotowska et al. 2015), this indicates a quite high evapotranspiration from~~
25 ~~oil palms at both the individual and the stand level. In our study, transpiration amounted to~~
26 ~~53% of evapotranspiration in the 12 year old oil palm stand, which is lower than values~~
27 reported e.g. for mature coconut stands (68%, Rouspard et al., 2006) and rainforests in
28 Malaysia (81-86%, Tani et al., 2003b). The low relative contribution of palm transpiration to
29 total evapotranspiration in oil palm stands could be due to relatively high water fluxes from
30 evaporation, e.g. after rainfall interception. Interception was reported to be substantially
31 higher in oil palm stands in the study region (28%, Merten et al., submitted in revision) than
32 e.g. in rainforests in Malaysia (12-16%, Tani et al., 2003b) and Borneo (18%, Dykes, 1997).
33 The high water losses from interception paired with the relatively high water use of oil palms

1 ~~under certain conditions and the consequent high total evapotranspirational fluxes from oil~~
2 ~~palm plantations~~ could contribute to reduced water availability at the landscape level in oil
3 palm dominated areas, ~~e.g. during pronounced dry periods~~ (Merten et al., ~~submitted in~~
4 ~~revision~~).

5 **4.3 Micro-meteorological drivers of oil palm water use**

6 ~~We~~ At the diurnal scale, we examined the relationship between water use rates and VPD and
7 radiation ~~on the intra-daily scale~~ (hourly averages of three sunny days, Fig. 4): In all
8 examined oil palm stands except the very young stand (PA, 2 years old), under comparable
9 sunny conditions, the intra-daily transpiration response to the mentioned environmental
10 drivers was characterized by an early peak (10am–11am), before radiation (12am–1pm) and
11 VPD (2pm–3pm) peaked; after this early peak of water use rates, however, they subsequently
12 declined consistently throughout the day, regardless of further increases of radiation and VPD
13 (Fig. 4). For most thus far examined dicot tree species, peaks in water use rates coincide with
14 peaks in radiation (e.g. Zeppel et al., 2004; Köhler et al., 2009; Dierick et al., 2010; Horna et
15 al., 2011); however, a similar behavior as in oil palms, i.e. early peaks of transpiration
16 followed by consistent declines, has been reported, but not yet explained, for *Acer rubrum* L.
17 (Johnson et al., 2011) and some tropical bamboo species (Mei et al., in ~~preparation~~ review).
18 Due to the early peaks, considerable hysteresis in the oil palm transpiration response to VPD
19 was observed in all examined stands except for PA (2 years old). ~~Similar findings have~~ In
20 studies on tree species, pronounced hysteresis has been reported ~~for some tropical tree~~
21 ~~species, e.g. for eucalyptus trees in Australia during the dry season in connection with high~~
22 ~~stand water use rates (O’Grady et al., 1999; Zeppel et al., 2004); during the rainy season,~~
23 ~~hysteresis was much smaller. Likewise, large hysteresis was found) or~~ for *Nothofagus fusca*
24 Hook. f. on clear, but not on cloudy days (Meinzer et al., 1997). ~~This was discussed in the~~
25 ~~context of~~ The underlying eco-hydrological mechanisms remain yet unexplained; potentially,
26 the development of water stress (Kelliher et al., 1992) and potentially, decreasing leaf
27 stomatal conductance and assimilation rates over the course of a day (Eamus and Cole, 1997).
28 ~~Stomatal sensitivity to VPD may increase in the afternoon, resulting in stomata closure and~~
29 ~~hence lower water use rates (Zeppel et al., 2004); this may potentially be due to; Williams et~~
30 ~~al., 1998; Zeppel et al., 2004) or~~ changes in leaf water potential, soil moisture content or
31 xylem sap abscisic acid content (Prior et al., 1997; Thomas et al., 2000; Thomas and Eamus,
32 2002) ~~or a decline in soil could play a role. For oil palms, no eco-physiological studies are~~
33 ~~available yet~~ to canopy resistance (Williams et al., 1998; Zeppel et al., 2004); also, the assess

1 these potential underlying reasons for the observed pronounced diurnal transpirational
2 hysteresis. A contribution of stem water storage to transpiration in the morning ~~may play a~~
3 ~~role~~could be another potential explanation (Waring and Running, 1978; Waring et al., 1979,
4 Goldstein et al., 1998). ~~The latter may~~ It could explain the ~~pronounced hysteresis in the water~~
5 ~~use response of oil palms to VPD as well as the unusually~~ early peak followed by a steady
6 decline of transpiration regardless of VPD and radiation patterns, ~~which could be the~~
7 ~~result~~decline being the consequence of eventually depleted trunk water storage reservoirs.
8 Other (palm) species were reported to have substantial internal trunk water storage capacities
9 (e.g. Holbrook and Sinclair, 1992; Madurapperuma et al., 2009), which can contribute to
10 sustain relatively high transpiration rates despite limiting environmental conditions (e.g.
11 Vanclay, 2009).

12 ~~In~~ At the day-to-day scale, in all 15 oil palm stands, the ~~day-to-day~~ response of water use
13 rates ~~particularly~~ particularly to changes in VPD seemed 'buffered', i.e. near-maximum daily
14 water use rates were reached at relatively low VPD, but better environmental conditions for
15 transpiration (i.e. higher VPD) did not induce strong increases in water use rates (i.e. 1.2-fold
16 increase in water use for a two-fold increase in VPD). Likewise, for both photosynthesis rates
17 (Dufrene and Saugier, 1993) and water use rates (Niu et al., 2015) of oil palm leaves, linear
18 increases with increasing VPD were reported at relatively low VPD, until a certain threshold
19 (1.5–1.8 kPa) was reached, after which no further increases in photosynthesis and water use
20 rates, respectively, occurred. For tropical tree and bamboo species, more sensitive responses
21 to fluctuations in VPD, i.e. 1.4- to 1.7-fold increases and more than two-fold increases,
22 respectively, have been reported (e.g. Köhler et al., 2009; Dierick et al., 2010, Komatsu et al.,
23 2010). However, a similar 'levelling-off' effect of water use rates at higher VPD, as observed
24 for the oil palm stands in our study, has been reported for Moso bamboo stands in Japan (in
25 contrast to coniferous forests in the same region, where water use had a linear relationship
26 with VPD, Komatsu et al., 2010). ~~Likewise, a sigmoid relationship between sap flux densities~~
27 ~~and an environmental index basing on temperature, humidity, radiation and wind speed, i.e.~~
28 ~~no further increases of sap flux densities past a certain threshold in environmental conditions,~~
29 ~~were reported for 10 tropical forest tree species in Costa Rica (O'Brien et al., 2004).~~ For both
30 ~~photosynthesis rates (Dufrene and Saugier, 1993) and water use rates (Niu et al.,~~ The hydraulic
31 limitations 'buffering' (2015) of oil palm leaves, linear increases with increasing VPD were
32 reported at relatively low VPD, until a certain threshold (1.5–1.8 kPa) was reached, after
33 which no further increases in photosynthesis and water use rates, respectively, occurred. ~~The~~
34 ~~hydraulic limitations buffering~~ the day-to-day oil palm water use response to VPD are yet to

1 be explained. As soil moisture was non-limiting, they are likely of micrometeorological or
2 eco-physiological nature. The early peaks of water use rates and the consequent strong
3 hysteresis to VPD on the intra-daily level, which may point to a depletion of internal trunk
4 water storage reservoirs early in the day as a possible reason for substantially reduced oil
5 palm water use rates at the time of diurnally optimal environmental conditions, give some
6 first indications of the direction that further studies could take.

7 ~~As to VPD, the day-to-day water use response to fluctuations in radiation of the studied oil~~
8 ~~palm stands seemed buffered, i.e. two-fold increases in radiation resulted in less than 1.5-fold~~
9 ~~increases in water use. The only exception among the 15 studied stands was the commercial,~~
10 ~~high water use PTPN6 stand, where increases in radiation induced almost 1:1 linear increases~~
11 ~~in water use, which is similar to the day-to-day behavior reported for several tropical tree~~
12 ~~species and a bamboo species (Köhler et al., 2009; Dierick et al., 2010).~~

14 5 Conclusions

15 The study provides first insights into eco-hydrological characteristics of oil palms at varying
16 spatial and temporal scales and first estimates of oil palm stand transpiration rates across an
17 age gradient. ~~The contribution of transpiration to total evapotranspiration was also assessed.~~
18 ~~We found that water use rates per leaf and palm increased 5-fold from an age of two years to a~~
19 ~~stand age of approx. 10 years and then remained relatively constant. Likewise, stand~~
20 ~~transpiration rates increased almost 8-fold from an age of two years to a stand age of five~~
21 ~~years and then remained constant with further increasing age, but were highly variable among~~
22 ~~medium-aged plantations. Across all~~ In some of the studied stands, ~~oil palm~~ transpiration
23 ~~varied 12-fold. Other~~ was quite high, i.e. higher than values reported for some tropical
24 rainforests. There may be a potential trade-off between water use and management intensity
25 of oil palm plantations. Total evapotranspirational water fluxes from a two and a 12 year-old
26 oil palm plantation were also relatively high, i.e. other water fluxes besides transpiration,
27 (e.g. from the soil, grasses and epiphytes,) contributed substantially and variably to
28 evapotranspiration, ~~reducing the large. This reduced a 12-fold~~ difference in transpiration
29 between the two stands ~~transpiring at the lowest and highest rates, respectively,~~ to a less than
30 two-fold difference in evapotranspiration. In the diurnal course, most oil palms showed a
31 strong hysteresis between water use and VPD. On the day-to-day basis this results in a
32 relatively low variability of oil palm water use regardless of fluctuations in VPD and
33 radiation. In conclusion, oil palm dominated landscapes show some spatial variations in

1 (evapo)transpiration rates, e.g. due to varying age-structures and stand densities, but the
2 ~~temporal day-to-day~~ variability of oil palm transpiration is rather low. ~~Stand transpiration rates~~
3 ~~of some oil palm stands compare to or even exceed values reported for tropical forests,~~
4 ~~indicating high water use of oil palms under~~ Under certain site or management conditions. ~~For~~
5 ~~a comprehensive understanding of landscape level hydrological consequences of the~~
6 ~~continuing oil palm expansion, this will have to, (evapo)transpirational water fluxes from oil~~
7 ~~palms can~~ be ~~addressed further~~ substantial.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 This study was supported by a grant from the German Research Foundation (DFG, CRC 990,
3 A02, A03). Furong Niu received a scholarship from the China Scholarship Council (CSC);
4 Afik Hardanto received a scholarship from the Indonesian-German Scholarship Program
5 (IGSP). The authors thank Pak Heri Junedi and Pak Agusta Herdhata for constructive
6 cooperation in the project. The authors also thank Surya Darma Tarigan for data on the
7 external trunk water storage capacity of oil palm trunks, Dodo Gunawan for providing long-
8 term climatic data and Martyna Kotowska for stand structural data. A big ‘Thank you!’ also to
9 everyone in Göttingen, Bogor and Jambi that made this work possible. Terimakasih!

10

11 **References**

- 12 Allen, K., Corre, M., Tjoa, A., and Veldkamp, E.: Soil nitrogen-cycling response to
13 conversion of lowland forests to oil palm and rubber plantations in Sumatra, Indonesia,
14 PLoS ONE, [in review](#)10, e0133325, 2015.
- 15 Baldocchi, D.: Assessing the eddy covariance technique for evaluating carbon dioxide
16 exchange rates of ecosystems: past, present and future, *Global Change Biol.*, 9, 479–492,
17 doi: 10.1046/j.1365–2486.2003.00629.x, 2003.
- 18 Banabas, M., Turner, M. A., Scotter, D. R., and Nelson, P. N.: Losses of nitrogen fertiliser
19 under oil palm in Papua New Guinea: 1. Water balance, and nitrogen in soil solution and
20 runoff, *Aust. J. Soil Res.*, 46, 332–339, doi:10.1071/SR07171, 2008.
- 21 Barnes, A. D., Jochum, M., Mumme, S., Haneda, N. F., Farajallah, A., Widarto, T. H., and
22 Brose, U.: Consequences of tropical land use for multitrophic biodiversity and ecosystem
23 functioning, *Nat. Commun.*, 5, 5351, doi:10.1038/ncomms6351, 2014.
- 24 Becker, P.: Sap flow in Bornean heath and dipterocarp forest trees during wet and dry
25 periods, *Tree Physiol.*, 16, 295–299, doi:10.1093/treephys/16.1-2.295, 1996.
- 26 [Breure, C. J.: Factors affecting yield and growth of oil palm tenera in West New Britain,](#)
27 [Oléagineux, 37, 213–227, 1982.](#)
- 28 Calder, I. R., Wright, I. R., and Murdiyarso, D.: A study of evaporation from tropical rain
29 forest-West Java, *J. Hydrol.*, 89, 13–31, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(86)90139-3, 1986.
- 30 Cienciala, E., Kučera, J., and Malmer, A.: Tree sap flow and stand transpiration of two
31 *Acacia mangium* plantations in Sabah, Borneo, *J. Hydrol.*, 236, 109–120,
32 doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(00)00291-2, 2000.
- 33 Comte, I., Colin, F., Whalen, J. K., Grünberger, O., and Caliman, J. P.: Agricultural practices
34 in oil palm plantations and their impact on hydrological changes, nutrient fluxes and water
35 quality in Indonesia, in: *Advances in Agronomy Volume 116, Advances in Agronomy,*
36 Elsevier, 71–124, 2012.
- 37 Delzon, S. and Loustau, D.: Age-related decline in stand water use: sap flow and transpiration
38 in a pine forest chronosequence, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 129, 105–119,
39 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2005.01.002, 2005.

- 1 Dierick, D. and Hölscher, D.: Species-specific tree water use characteristics in reforestation
2 stands in the Philippines, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 149, 1317–1326,
3 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.03.003, 2009.
- 4 Dierick, D., Kunert, N., Köhler, M., Schwendenmann, L., and Hölscher, D.: Comparison of
5 tree water use characteristics in reforestation and agroforestry stands across the tropics, in:
6 *Tropical Rainforests and Agroforests under Global Change*, Tschardtke, T., Leuschner,
7 C., Veldkamp, E., Faust, H., Guhardja, E., Bidin, A. (Eds.), Environmental Science and
8 Engineering, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 293–308, 2010.
- 9 Drescher, J., Rembold, K., Allen, K., Faust, H., Jaya, N.S., Knohl, A., Meijide, A., Melati, D.,
10 Pérez-Cruzado, C., Steinebach, S., Wiegand, K., Qaim, M., Alamsyah, Z., Basir, M.,
11 Basri, Z., Buchori, D., Fauzi, A., Irawan, B., Malarisang, S., Siregar, I.Z., Rauf, A.,
12 Tasman, A., Tjoa, A., Zulkarnain, Z., Scheu, S and Kreft, H.: Ecological and
13 socioeconomic functions of tropical lowland rainforest transformation systems: an
14 integrative approach, in preparation, 2015.
- 15 Dufrene, E. and Saugier, B.: Gas exchange of oil palm in relation to light, vapour pressure
16 deficit, temperature and leaf age, *Funct. Ecol.*, 97–104, 1993.
- 17 Dykes, A. P.: Rainfall interception from a lowland tropical rainforest in Brunei, *J. Hydrol.*,
18 200, 260–279, 1997.
- 19 Eamus, D. and Cole, S.: Diurnal and seasonal comparisons of assimilation, phyllode
20 conductance and water potential of three *Acacia* and one *Eucalyptus* species in the Wet-
21 Dry tropics of Australia, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 45, 275–290, doi:10.1071/BT96020, 1997.
- 22 FAO: FAOSTAT online statistical service. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
23 Nations, Rome, Italy. Available via URL. [http:// http://faostat3.fao.org/](http://faostat3.fao.org/). (last access: 19
24 March 2015), 2014.
- 25 Goldstein, G., Andrade, J. L., Meinzer, F. C., Holbrook, N. M., Cavelier, J., Jackson, P., and
26 Celis, A.: Stem water storage and diurnal patterns of water use in tropical forest canopy
27 trees, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 21, 397–406, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1998.00273.x, 1998.
- 28 Granier, A.: Une nouvelle méthode pour la mesure du flux de sève brute dans le tronc des
29 arbres, *Ann. For. Sci.*, 42, 193–200, 1985.
- 30 Guillaume, T., Muhammad, D., and Kuzyakov, Y. (2015). Losses of soil carbon by
31 conversion of tropical forest to plantations: Erosion and decomposition estimated by
32 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, *Glob. Change Biol.*, doi:10.1111/gcb.12907, 2015.
- 33 Henson, I. E.: Notes on oil palm productivity. IV. Carbon dioxide gradients and
34 evapotranspiration, above and below the canopy, *J. Oil Palm Res.*, 11, 33–40, 1999.
- 35 Henson, I. E. and Dolmat, M. T.: Physiological analysis of an oil palm density trial on a peat
36 soil, *J. Oil Palm Res.*, 15, 1–27, 2003.
- 37 Henson, I. E. and Harun, M. H.: The influence of climatic conditions on gas and energy
38 exchanges above a young oil palm stand in north Kedah, *J. Oil Palm Res.*, 17, 73–91,
39 2005.
- 40 Holbrook, N. M. and Sinclair, T. R.: Water balance in the arborescent palm, *Sabal palmetto*.
41 II. Transpiration and stem water storage, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 15, 4, 401–409, 1992.
- 42 Hollinger, D. Y., Kelliher, F. M., Schulze, E. D., and Köstner, B. M. M.: Coupling of tree
43 transpiration to atmospheric turbulence, *Nature*, 371, 60–62, doi:10.1038/371060a0, 1994.

- 1 Horna, V., Schuldt, B., Brix, S., and Leuschner, C.: Environment and tree size controlling
2 stem sap flux in a perhumid tropical forest of Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, *Ann. For. Sci.*,
3 68, 1027–1038, doi:10.1007/s13595-011-0110-2, 2011.
- 4 Jayasuriya, M., Dunn, G., Benyon, R., and O'Shaughnessy, P. J.: Some factors affecting water
5 yield from mountain ash (*Eucalyptus regnans*) dominated forests in south-east Australia,
6 *J. Hydrol.*, 150, 345–367, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(93)90116-Q, 1993.
- 7 Johnson, D. M., McCulloh, K. A., Meinzer, F. C., Woodruff, D. R., and Eissenstat, D. M.:
8 Hydraulic patterns and safety margins, from stem to stomata, in three eastern U.S. tree
9 species, *Tree Physiol.*, 31, 659–668, doi:10.1093/treephys/tpr050, 2011.
- 10 Kallarackal, J., Jeyakumar, P., and George S. J.: Water use of irrigated oil palm at three
11 different arid locations in Peninsular India, *J. Oil Palm Re.*, 16, 45–53, 2004.
- 12 Kelliher, F. M., Köstner, B., Hollinger, D. Y., Byers, J. N., Hunt, J. E., McSeveny, T. M.,
13 Meserth, R., Weir, P. L., and Schulze, E. D.: Evaporation, xylem sap flow, and tree
14 transpiration in a New Zealand broad-leaved forest, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 62, 53–73,
15 doi:10.1016/0168-1923(92)90005-O, 1992.
- 16 Köhler, M., Dierick, D., Schwendenmann, L., and Hölscher, D.: Water use characteristics of
17 cacao and *Gliricidia* trees in an agroforest in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, *Ecohydrol.*, 2,
18 520–529, doi:10.1002/eco.67, 2009.
- 19 Köhler, M., Hanf, A., Barus, H., and Hölscher, D.: Cacao trees under different shade tree
20 shelter: effects on water use, *Agrofor. Syst.*, 88, 63–73, 2013.
- 21 Komatsu, H., Onozawa, Y., Kume, T., Tsuruta, K., Kumagai, T., Shinohara, Y., and Otsuki,
22 K.: Stand-scale transpiration estimates in a Moso bamboo forest: II. Comparison with
23 coniferous forests, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 260, 1295–1302,
24 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2010.06.040, 2010.
- 25 Kotowska, M. M., Leuschner, C., Triadiati, T., Meriem, S., and Hertel, D.: Quantifying
26 above- and belowground biomass carbon loss with forest conversion in tropical lowlands
27 of Sumatra (Indonesia), *Glob. Change Biol.*, doi: 10.1111/gcb.12979, 2015.
- 28 Kumagai, T., Saitoh, T. M., Sato, Y., Takahashi, H., Manfroi, O. J., Morooka, T., Kuraji, K.,
29 Suzuki, M., Yasunari, T., and Komatsu, H.: Annual water balance and seasonality of
30 evapotranspiration in a Bornean tropical rainforest, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 128, 81–92,
31 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2004.08.006, 2005.
- 32 [Larsen, R. K., Jiwan, N., Rompas, A., Jenito, J., Osbeck, M., Tarigan, A.: Towards 'hybrid
33 accountability' in EU biofuels policy? Community grievances and competing water
34 claims in the Central Kalimantan oil palm sector, *Geoforum*, 54, 295–305, 2014.](#)
- 35 Madurapperuma, W. S., Costa, W. de, Sangakkara, U. R., and Jayasekara, C.: Estimation of
36 water use of mature coconut (*Cocos nucifera* L.) cultivars (CRIC 60 and CRIC 65) grown
37 in the low country intermediate zone using the compensation heat pulse method (CHPM),
38 *J. Natn. Sci. Foundation Sri Lanka*, 37, 175–186, doi:10.4038/jnsfsr.v37i3.1211, 2009.
- 39 [Mauder, M. and Foken, T.: Impact of post-field data processing on eddy covariance flux
40 estimates and energy balance closure, *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 15, 97–609,
41 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1127/0941-2948/2006/0167>, 2006.](#)
- 42 McJannet, D., Fitch, P., Disher, M., and Wallace, J.: Measurements of transpiration in four
43 tropical rainforest types of north Queensland, Australia, *Hydrol. Process.*, 21, 3549–3564,
44 doi: 10.1002/hyp.6576, 2007.

- 1 McNaughton, K. G. and Jarvis, P. G.: Water deficits and plant growth: Predicting effects of
2 vegetation changes on transpiration and evaporation, Academic press, New York, 1983.
- 3 Mei, T., Fang, D., Röhl, A., Niu, F., Hendrayanto, and Hölscher, D.: Water use characteristics
4 of four tropical bamboo species derived from sap flux measurements, [Front. Plant Sci.](#), in
5 [preparationreview](#), 2015.
- 6 Meijide, A., Röhl, A., Herbst, M., June, T., Hölscher, D., and Knohl, A.: Water and energy
7 fluxes in oil palm plantations: effect of environmental variables and oil palm age, in
8 preparation, 2015.
- 9 Meinzer, F. C., Hinckley, T. M., and Ceulemans, R.: Apparent responses of stomata to
10 transpiration and humidity in a hybrid poplar canopy, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 20, 1301–1308,
11 doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1997.d01-18.x, 1997.
- 12 Merten, J., Röhl, A., Guillaume, T., Meijide, A., Tarigan, S., Agusta, H., Dislich, C., Dittrich,
13 C., Faust, H., Gunawan, D., Hein, J., Hendrayanto, Knohl, A., Kuzyakov, Y., Wiegand,
14 K., and Hölscher, D.: Water scarcity and oil palm expansion: social views and
15 environmental processes, ~~submitted to~~ *Ecol. Soc.*, [in revision](#), 2015.
- 16 [Morgan, P. H., Mercer, L. P., and Flodin, N. W.: General model for nutritional responses of
17 higher organisms, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 72, 4327–4331, 1975.](#)
- 18 Niu, F., Röhl, A., Hardanto, A., Meijide, A., Köhler, M., Hendrayanto, and Hölscher, D.: Oil
19 palm water use: calibration a sap flux method and a field measurement of scheme, *Tree
20 Physiol.*, [35, 563–573](#), doi: 10.1093/treephys/tpv013, 2015.
- 21 [Obidzinski, K., Andriani, R., Komarudin, H., and Andrianto, A.: Environmental and social
22 impacts of oil palm plantations and their implications for biofuel production in Indonesia,
23 *Ecol. Soc.*, 17, 25, 2012.](#)
- 24 O'Brien, J. J., Oberbauer, S. F., and Clark, D. B.: Whole tree xylem sap flow responses to
25 multiple environmental variables in a wet tropical forest, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 27, 551–
26 567, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2003.01160.x, 2004.
- 27 O'Grady, A. P., Eamus, D., and Hutley, L. B.: Transpiration increases during the dry season:
28 patterns of tree water use in eucalypt open-forests of northern Australia, *Tree Physiol*, 19,
29 591–597, doi:10.1093/treephys/19.9.591, 1999.
- 30 Prior, L. D., Eamus, D., and Duff, G. A.: Seasonal trends in carbon assimilation, stomatal
31 conductance, pre-dawn leaf water potential and growth in *Terminalia ferdinandiana*, a
32 deciduous tree of northern Australian savannas, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 45, 53–69,
33 doi:10.1071/BT96065, 1997.
- 34 Radersma, S. and Ridder, N. de: Computed evapotranspiration of annual and perennial crops
35 at different temporal and spatial scales using published parameter values, *Agric. Water
36 Manage.*, 31, 17–34, doi:10.1016/0378-3774(95)01235-4, 1996.
- 37 Renninger, H. J., Phillips, N., and Hodel, D. R.: Comparative hydraulic and anatomic
38 properties in palm trees (*Washingtonia robusta*) of varying heights: implications for
39 hydraulic limitation to increased height growth, *Trees*, 23, 911–921, doi:10.1007/s00468-
40 009-0333-0, 2009.
- 41 Renninger, H. J., Phillips, N., and Salvucci, G. D.: Wet- vs. dry-season transpiration in an
42 Amazonian rain forest palm *Iriartea deltoidea*, *Biotropica*, 42, 470–478,
43 doi:10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00612.x, 2010.

- 1 Richardson, A. D., Hollinger, D. Y., Burba, G. G., Davis, K. J., Flanagan, L. B., Katul, G. G.,
2 Munger, J. W., Ricciuto, D. M., Stoy, P. C., Suyker, A. E., Verma, S. B., and Wofsy, S.
3 C.: A multi-site analysis of random error in tower-based measurements of carbon and
4 energy fluxes, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 136, 1–18, 10.1016/j.agrformet.2006.01.007, 2006.
- 5 Roberts, S., Vertessy, R., and Grayson, R.: Transpiration from *Eucalyptus sieberi* (L.
6 Johnson) forests of different age, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 143, 153–161, doi:10.1016/S0378-
7 1127(00)00514-4, 2001.
- 8 Rouspard, O., Bonnefond, J. M., Irvine, M., Berbigier, P., Nouvellon, Y., Dazat, J., Taga, S.,
9 Hamel, O., Jourdan, C., Saint-André, L., Mialet-Serra, I., Labouisse, J. P., Epron, D.,
10 Joffre, R., Braconnier, S., Rouzière, A., Navarro, M., and Bouillet, J. P.: Partitioning
11 energy and evapo-transpiration above and below a tropical palm canopy, *Agric. For.*
12 *Meteorol.*, 139, 252–268, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2006.07.006, 2006.
- 13 Ryan, M. G., Phillips, N., and Bond, B. J.: The hydraulic limitation hypothesis revisited, *Plant*
14 *Cell Environ.*, 29, 367–381, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2005.01478.x, 2006.
- 15 Tani, M., Nik, A. R., Ohtani, Y., Yasuda, Y., Sahat, M. M., Kasran, B., Takanashi, S.,
16 Noguchi, S., Yusop, Z., and Watanabe, T.: Characteristics of energy exchange and surface
17 conductance of a tropical rain forest in peninsular Malaysia, in: Pasoh, Okuda, T.,
18 Manokaran, N., Matsumoto, Y., Niiyama, K., Thomas, S. C., Ashton, P. S. (Eds.),
19 Springer Japan, Tokyo, 73–88, 2003a.
- 20 Tani, M., Nik, A. R., Yasuda, Y., Noguchi, S., Shamsuddin, S. A., Sahat, M. M., and
21 Takanashi S.: Long-term estimation of evapotranspiration from a tropical rain forest in
22 Peninsular Malaysia, in *Water Resources Systems - Water Availability and Global*
23 *Change: Proceedings of an International Symposium (Symposium HS02a) Held During*
24 *IUGG 2003, the XXIII General Assembly of the International Union of Geodesy and*
25 *Geophysics: at Sapporo, Japan, International Assn of Hydrological Sciences, 30 June to*
26 *11 July, 2003, no. 280, pp. 267, , 2003b.*
- 27 Thomas, D. S. and Eamus, D.: Seasonal patterns of xylem sap pH, xylem abscisic acid
28 concentration, leaf water potential and stomatal conductance of six evergreen and
29 deciduous Australian savanna tree species, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 50, 229–236,
30 doi:10.1071/BT01045, 2002.
- 31 Thomas, D. S., Eamus, D., and Shanahan, S.: Influence of season, drought and xylem ABA
32 on stomatal responses to leaf-to-air vapour pressure difference of trees of the Australian
33 wet-dry tropics, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 48, 143–151, doi:10.1071/BT98090, 2000.
- 34 Vanclay, J. K.: Managing water use from forest plantations, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 257, 385–
35 389, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.09.003, 2009.
- 36 Vertessy, R. A., Watson, F. G., and O'Sullivan, S. K.: Factors determining relations between
37 stand age and catchment water balance in mountain ash forests, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 143,
38 13–26, doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(00)00501-6, 2001.
- 39 Waring, R. H. and Running, S. W.: Sapwood water storage: its contribution to transpiration
40 and effect upon water conductance through the stems of old-growth Douglas-fir, *Plant*
41 *Cell Environ.*, 1, 131–140, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.1978.tb00754.x, 1978.
- 42 Waring, R. H., Whitehead D., and Jarvis, P. G.: The contribution of stored water to
43 transpiration in Scots pine, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 2, 309–317, doi:10.1111/j.1365-
44 3040.1979.tb00085.x, 1979.

- 1 Williams, M., Malhi, Y., Nobre, A. D., Rastetter, E. B., Grace, J., and Pereira, M. G. P.:
2 Seasonal variation in net carbon exchange and evapotranspiration in a Brazilian rain
3 forest: a modelling analysis, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 21, 953–968, doi:10.1046/j.1365-
4 3040.1998.00339.x, 1998.
- 5 Yoder, B. J., Ryan, M. G., Waring, R. H., Schoettle, A. W., and Kaufmann, M. R.: Evidence
6 of reduced photosynthetic rates in old trees, *For. Sci.*, 40, 513–527, 1994.
- 7 Yusop, Z., Chong, M. H., Garusu, G. J., and Ayob, K.: Estimation of evapotranspiration in oil
8 palm catchments by short-term period water-budget method, *Malaysian J. Civ. Eng.*, 20,
9 160–174, 2008.
- 10 Zeppel, M., Murray, B. R., Barton, C., and Eamus, D.: Seasonal responses of xylem sap
11 velocity to VPD and solar radiation during drought in a stand of native trees in temperate
12 Australia, *Funct. Plant Biol.*, 31, 461–470, doi:10.1071/FP03220, 2004.
- 13 Zimmermann, M. H.: The monocotyledons: their evolution and comparative biology IV.
14 Transport problems in arborescent monocotyledons, *Q. Rev. Biol.*, 48, 314–321,
15 doi:10.1086/407593, 1973.

Table 1. Stand locations, characteristics and study periods

Plot code	Location/Village name (Jambi province, Indonesia)	Age (yrs)	Study region	Latitude (S)	Longitude (E)	Altitude (m)	Stand type	Study period	Average radiation/VPD of three selected days (MJ m ⁻² day ⁻¹ /kPa)	Average radiation/VPD of the full measurement period (MJ m ⁻² day ⁻¹ /kPa)	Additional comments
			(H = Harapan, B = Bukit Duabelas)				(S = small holding, C = company)				
PA	Pompa Air	2	H	01°50'7.62"	103°17'44.22"	75	S	15 October 2013– 14 January 2014	21.6/1.4	16.6/1.1	<u>Parallel eddy covariance measurements; same days used for analysis</u>
HAR_yg	Bungku	3	H	01°55'38.5"	103°15'40.4"	63	S	28 September 2013– 24 October 2013	21.8/1.6	17.6/1.2	
BD_yg	Pematang Kabau	5	B	01°58'50.0"	102°36'18.4"	55	S	09 July 2013– 03 August 2013	17.4/1.5	12.3/1.2	
BO5	Lubuk Kepayang	9	B	02°06'48.9"	102°47'44.5"	65	S	01 September 2013– 22 September 2013	20.4/1.6	15.4/1.1	
HO4	Pompa Air	10	B	01°47'12.7"	103°16'14.0"	48	S	18 July 2013– 05 August 2013	19.9/1.4	16.0/1.0	

BO4	Dusun Baru	11	B	02°03'01.5"	102°45'12.1"	34	S	06 August 2013– 26 August 2013	22.9/1.8	17.6/1.4	
BO3	Lubuk Kepayang	12	B	02°04'15.2"	102°47'30.6"	71	S	03 July 2013– 30 SeptemberSep 2013	21.8/1.8	16.1/1.2	
PTPN6	PT. Perkebunan Nusantara 6	12	H	01°41'34.8"	103°23'27.6"	70	C	19 July 2014– 20 December 2014	19.7/1.4	16.7/1.1	<u>Parallel eddy covariance measurements; same days used for analysis</u>
BO2	Lubuk Kepayang	13	H	02°04'32.0"	102°47'30.7"	84	S	10 June 2013– 04 July 2013 25 SeptemberSep 2013–	24.9/2.1	20.5/1.7	
HO2	Bungku	14	H	01°53'00.7"	103°16'03.6"	55	S	19 November 2013 09 August 2013–	21.3/1.5	17.0/1.2	
HO1	Bungku	16	H	01°54'35.6"	103°15'58.3"	81	S	30 August 2013 07 December 2013–	22.3/1.9	18.5/1.5	
HO3	Pompa Air	17	H	01°51'28.4"	103°18'27.4"	64	S	19 January 2014 15 November 2013–	16.7/1.0	13.0/0.8	
PTHI	PT.Humusindo	18	H	01°57'43.2"	103°15'50.3"	59	C	04 December 2013 14 July 2013–	17.5/1.1	17.4/1.1	
BD_old	Pematang Kabau	22	B	01°57'22.4"	102°33'39.9"	73	S	30 July 2013 30 SeptemberSep 2013–	15.1/1.4	11.8/1.2	
HAR_old	Bungku	25	H	01°56'41.5"	103°16'41.9"	43	S	2013– 01 November 2013	21.1/1.6	17.1/1.2	

1 **Table 2.** Summary table of results for all 15 oil palm stands. R^2 and P values for linear
 2 regression and fitting a Hill function, respectively, are presented to explain variability in
 3 water use characteristics (i.e. maximum sap flux density, leaf water use, palm water use and
 4 stand transpiration) by the stand variables age, trunk height and sapwood area.

	<u>Maximum sap flux density</u>		<u>Leaf water use</u>		<u>Palm water use</u>		<u>Stand transpiration</u>	
	<u>Linear fit</u>	<u>Hill function</u>	<u>Linear fit</u>	<u>Hill function</u>	<u>Linear fit</u>	<u>Hill function</u>	<u>Linear fit</u>	<u>Hill function</u>
<u>Age</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.16^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2 = 0.31^*$</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.61^{**}$</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.59^{**}$</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.45^{**}$</u>
<u>Trunk height</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.15^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2 = 0.37^*$</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.62^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2 = 0.32^*$</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.61^{**}$</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.44^{**}$</u>
<u>Sapwood area</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.02^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2 = 0.41^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.60^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2 = 0.39^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.61^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2 = 0.42^{**}$</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} = 0.43^{**}$</u>

5 * for $P \leq 0.05$, ** for the $P \leq 0.01$, n.s. for no significant relationship ($P > 0.05$).

1 **Table 3.** Summary table of results for 12 oil palm stands, i.e. excluding three stands of yet
 2 unexplained much higher water use (PTPN6, BO5, and HO2). R^2 and P values for linear
 3 regression and fitting a Hill function, respectively, are presented to explain variability in
 4 water use characteristics (i.e. maximum sap flux density, leaf water use, palm water use and
 5 stand transpiration) by the stand variables age, trunk height and sapwood area.

	<u>Maximum sap flux density</u>		<u>Leaf water use</u>		<u>Palm water use</u>		<u>Stand transpiration</u>	
	<u>Linear model</u>	<u>Hill function</u>	<u>Linear model</u>	<u>Hill function</u>	<u>Linear model</u>	<u>Hill function</u>	<u>Linear model</u>	<u>Hill function</u>
<u>Age</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.16**</u>	<u>$R^2 =$ 0.67**</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.86**</u>	<u>$R^2 =$ 0.63**</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.87**</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.75**</u>
<u>Trunk height</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.13**</u>	<u>$R^2 =$ 0.60**</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.82**</u>	<u>$R^2 =$ 0.56**</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.86**</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.77**</u>
<u>Sapwood area</u>	n.s.	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.01**</u>	<u>$R^2 =$ 0.68**</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.80**</u>	<u>$R^2 =$ 0.64**</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.85**</u>	<u>$R^2 =$ 0.61**</u>	<u>$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.69**</u>

6 * for $P \leq 0.05$, ** for the $P \leq 0.01$, n.s. for no significant relationship ($P > 0.05$).

1 **Figure captions**

2 **Figure 1.** Locations of the studied oil palm stands in Jambi province, Sumatra, Indonesia.

3 **Figure 2.** The change of stand density (a), average number of leaves per palm (b), average
4 trunk height (c), and stand water conductive area (d) over age in the 15 studied oil palm
5 stands.

6 **Figure 3.** The change of maximum hourly sap flux density (a), average leaf water use (b),
7 average palm water use (c) and stand transpiration (d) over stand age. Data of the different
8 levels derived from simultaneous sap flux measurements on at least 13 leaves per stand;
9 values of three sunny days averaged.

10 **Figure 4.** Diurnal course of vapor pressure deficit (VPD) and radiation (R_g) (a) and of sap
11 flux density in four oil palm stands (b). Leaf water use plotted against hourly averages of
12 normalized VPD (c) and R_g (d). Average water use estimates based on at least 13 leaves
13 measured simultaneously; average water use rates, VPD and radiation of three sunny days,
14 each point represents one hourly observation. Data are from the locations PA (2 years old,
15 black arrows), BO3 (12 years old, low water use, red arrows), PTPN6 (12 years old, high
16 water use, blue arrows) and HAR_old (25 years old, green arrows). Data were normalized by
17 setting the maximum to one.

18 **Figure 5.** The day-to-day response of leaf water use rates in four different oil palm stands to
19 changes in average daytime vapor pressure deficit (VPD) (a) and integrated daily radiation
20 (R_g) (b) taken from the closest micrometeorological station from the respective plots. Data of
21 at least 20 days per plot, each point represents one day. Leaf water use rates are from the
22 locations PA (2 years old, black circles), BO3 (12 years old, low water use, red circles),
23 PTPN6 (12 years old, high water use, blue circles) and HAR_old (25 years old, green circles).
24 Significant linear relationships are indicated with solid ($P < 0.05$) and dotted ($P < 0.1$) lines.
25 regression functions are provided in the figure.

26 **Figure 6.** Normalized diurnal pattern of vapor pressure deficit (VPD), radiation (R_g),
27 transpiration (T) and evapotranspiration (E_T) in a 2-year-old (PA) (a) and a 12-year-old
28 (PTPN6) (c) oil palm stand; absolute hourly values of E_T and T in PA (b) and PTPN6 (d).
29 Eddy covariance and sap flux density measurements were conducted in parallel to derive
30 evapotranspiration and transpiration rates, respectively. Values of three sunny days averaged.

31 Appendix Figure 1. The change of maximum hourly sap flux density (a), average leaf water
32 use (b), average palm water use (c) and stand transpiration (d) over stand age. Data of the

1 | different levels derived from simultaneous sap flux measurements on at least 13 leaves per
2 | stand; values of three sunny days averaged. The provided fits are Hill functions (dotted lines).