
Supplementary information for CY-Bench : A comprehensive benchmark dataset for sub-national crop yield forecasting

D Paudel¹ H Baja¹ R van Bree¹ M Kallenberg¹ S Ofori-Ampofo² A Potze¹ P Poudel³
A Saleh⁴ W Anderson⁵ M von Bloh² A Castellano⁶ O Ennaji⁷ R Hamed⁸ R Laudien⁹
D Lee¹⁰ I Luna¹¹ D Masiliunas¹ M Meroni¹² S Mkahlani¹³ J Mutuku¹⁴ J Richetti¹⁵
A Ruane⁶ R Sahajpal⁵ G Shuai⁵ V Sitokonstantinou¹¹ R de S. Nôia Jr² A Srivastava¹⁶
R Strong¹⁷ L Sweet¹⁸ P Vojnović¹² A de Wit¹ M Zachow² I Athanasiadis¹
¹Wageningen Uni. & Research ²Technical Uni. Munich ³Purdue Uni. ⁴Ankara Uni.
⁵Uni. Maryland ⁶NASA ⁷Univ. Mohammed VI ⁸VU Amsterdam ⁹PIK ¹⁰Uni. Manitoba
¹¹Uni. València ¹²JRC ¹³IITA ¹⁴ICRISAT ¹⁵CSIRO ¹⁶ZALF ¹⁷Texas Uni. ¹⁸UFZ

1 1 Dataset

2 1.1 Code Access and Use

3 **Access** The complete codebase encompassing data preprocessing, model construction, training, eval-
4 uation, and data/metric visualization routines can be accessed through out publicly accessible GitHub
5 repository: <https://github.com/BigDataWUR/AgML-CY-Bench/>. A summarizing overview can
6 be found on <https://cybench.agml.org/>. We additionally provide a Python package `cybench`
7 that can be installed via the repository.

8 **Documentation** The dataset is available in Google Drive. The dataset is comprehensively docu-
9 mented using the framework of Data Cards (8). Each individual dataset subset is accompanied by a
10 dedicated Data Card located within the `data_preparation` directory of our repository.

11 **Intended use** The CY-Bench dataset offers a valuable resource for the machine learning community,
12 especially those interested in applying their expertise to real-world challenges in agriculture. Users
13 can load the dataset and train their own models, and then evaluate using a standardized scheme,
14 tailored for the context of agriculture.

15 **Contributing** AgML, the Machine Learning team of the Agricultural Model Intercomparison and
16 Improvement Project, will be responsible for maintaining the dataset. To facilitate the dataset's ongo-
17 ing growth, we've carefully crafted a process for incorporating new data or on-boarding additional
18 datasets into our benchmark.

19 **Licensing** We, the authors, take full responsibility for any violations of intellectual property rights
20 or other legal rights arising from our inclusion of data within this work. We have made our best effort
21 to ensure all materials are properly attributed or used in accordance with their licenses. CY-Bench
22 dataset is licensed under EUPL-1.2, which is compatible with all of the licenses for the datasets
23 included. The manuscript itself is licensed under CC BY 4.0.

24 **1.2 Dataset overview**

25 **Crops** CY-Bench covers two main crops, namely maize and wheat. Depending on the country,
 26 the crop names can refer to different varieties or seasons of maize and wheat. Table 1 describes the
 27 representative crop name as provided in the country-specific crop statistics. Table 2 specifies the
 28 countries under groups EU and FEWSNET.

Table 1: Defining crop names as presented in crop statistics

| Country/Region | Admin level name | Maize | Wheat |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| EU-EUROSTAT | Admin level 2 or 3 | grain maize | soft wheat |
| Africa-FEWSNET | Admin level 1 or 2 | maize | NA |
| Argentina (AR) | department | corn | wheat |
| Australia (AU) | sub-state | NA | winter wheat |
| Brazil (BR) | municipality | grain corn | grain wheat |
| China (CN) | province | grain corn | winter wheat |
| Germany (DE) | district | grain maize | winter wheat |
| India (IN) | district | maize | wheat |
| Mali (ML) | municipality | maize | NA |
| Mexico (MX) | state | white/yellow corn | NA |
| United States (US) | county | grain corn | winter wheat |

Table 2: List of countries under groups EU and FEWSNET

| Group | Country name (country code) : Admin level | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| EU (n=22) | Austria (AT) : 2 | Belgium (BE) : 2 | Bulgaria (BG) : 2 |
| | Czech Republic (CZ) : 3 | Denmark (DK) : 3 | Estonia (EE) : 3 |
| | Greece (EL) : 3 | Spain (ES) : 3 | Finland (FI) : 3 |
| | France (FR) : 3 | Croatia (HR) : 2 | Hungary (HU) : 3 |
| | Ireland (IE) : 2 | Italy (IT) : 3 | Lithuania (LT) : 3 |
| | Latvia (LV) : 3 | Netherlands (NL) : 2 | Poland (PL) : 2 |
| | Portugal (PT) : 2 | Romania (RO) : 3 | Sweden (SE) : 3 |
| | Slovakia (SK) : 3 | | |
| FEWSNET (n=12) | Angola (AO) : 1 | Burkina Faso (BF) : 2 | Ethiopia (ET) : 2 |
| | Lesotho (LS) : 1 | Madagascar (MG) : 2 | Malawi (MW) : 2 |
| | Mozambique (MZ) : 1 | Niger (NE) : 2 | Senegal (SN) : 2 |
| | Chad (TD) : 1 | South Africa (ZA) : 1 | Zambia (ZM) : 2 |
| | | | |

29 **1.3 Data source selection**

30 Our selection of data sources was guided by the recommendations of a panel of experts.
 31 A detailed justification for our choices, including a discussion of alternative options consid-
 32 ered, is available on https://github.com/BigDataWUR/AgML-CY-Bench/blob/main/data_
 33 preparation/DATA-SOURCES-SELECTION.md.

34 **1.4 Data preparation**

35 The script that implements the preparation workflow as outlined in section 3.2 *Predictor data* and
 36 summarized in *Figure 3* of the main paper is given in predictor_data_prep.r

Table 3: Overview of dataset sizes for maize. NOTE: Yield data is available for most countries earlier than 2003. 2003 cutoff is due to soil moisture data starting from 2003. Some countries (e.g. EE, FI, IE, LV, MX) have no data after aligning with predictor data.

| SN | Crop, Country | Nr. years | Min year, max year | Nr. admin regions | Nr. data samples |
|----|---------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1 | maize, AO | 15 | 2003, 2017 | 18 | 240 |
| 2 | maize, AR | 21 | 2003, 2023 | 317 | 5564 |
| 3 | maize, AT | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 9 | 162 |
| 4 | maize, BE | 10 | 2011, 2020 | 11 | 85 |
| 5 | maize, BF | 16 | 2003, 2019 | 45 | 540 |
| 6 | maize, BG | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 6 | 108 |
| 7 | maize, BR | 21 | 2003, 2023 | 4017 | 70691 |
| 8 | maize, CN | 20 | 2003, 2022 | 31 | 610 |
| 9 | maize, CZ | 16 | 2005, 2020 | 14 | 212 |
| 10 | maize, DE | 19 | 2003, 2021 | 280 | 3362 |
| 11 | maize, DK | 10 | 2011, 2020 | 7 | 22 |
| 12 | maize, EE | 0 | NA | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | maize, EL | 11 | 2009, 2019 | 40 | 440 |
| 14 | maize, ES | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 47 | 830 |
| 15 | maize, ET | 14 | 2003, 2020 | 68 | 774 |
| 16 | maize, FI | 0 | NA | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | maize, FR | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 92 | 1628 |
| 18 | maize, HR | 16 | 2005, 2020 | 2 | 32 |
| 19 | maize, HU | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 20 | 359 |
| 20 | maize, IE | 0 | NA | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | maize, IN | 15 | 2003, 2017 | 543 | 6605 |
| 22 | maize, IT | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 102 | 1691 |
| 23 | maize, LS | 18 | 2004, 2021 | 10 | 163 |
| 24 | maize, LT | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 10 | 150 |
| 25 | maize, LV | 0 | NA | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | maize, MG | 6 | 2005, 2010 | 22 | 132 |
| 27 | maize, ML | 15 | 2003, 2017 | 24 | 360 |
| 28 | maize, MW | 6 | 2018, 2023 | 4 | 16 |
| 29 | maize, MX | 0 | NA | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | maize, MZ | 17 | 2004, 2022 | 10 | 159 |
| 31 | maize, NE | 17 | 2003, 2021 | 26 | 244 |
| 32 | maize, NL | 13 | 2008, 2020 | 12 | 126 |
| 33 | maize, PL | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 17 | 301 |
| 34 | maize, PT | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 5 | 90 |
| 35 | maize, RO | 18 | 2003, 2020 | 42 | 736 |
| 36 | maize, SE | 10 | 2007, 2020 | 1 | 10 |
| 37 | maize, SK | 12 | 2007, 2018 | 8 | 94 |
| 38 | maize, SN | 13 | 2003, 2015 | 40 | 401 |
| 39 | maize, TD | 15 | 2003, 2017 | 17 | 231 |
| 40 | maize, US | 20 | 2003, 2022 | 2223 | 32510 |
| 41 | maize, ZA | 19 | 2004, 2022 | 9 | 167 |
| 42 | maize, ZM | 14 | 2004, 2017 | 71 | 994 |

37 2 Supplementary results

38 For figures and data visualizations we kindly refer to the results folder of our GitHub repository.

Table 4: Overview of dataset size for wheat. NOTE: Yield data is available for most countries earlier than 2003. 2003 cutoff is due to soil moisture data starting from 2003.

| SN | Crop, Country | Nr. years | Min year, max year | Nr. admin regions | Nr. data samples |
|----|---------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1 | wheat, AR | 21 | 2003,2023 | 266 | 4429 |
| 2 | wheat, AT | 18 | 2003,2020 | 9 | 135 |
| 3 | wheat, AU | 20 | 2003,2022 | 20 | 270 |
| 4 | wheat, BE | 18 | 2003,2020 | 11 | 183 |
| 5 | wheat, BG | 10 | 2010,2020 | 6 | 45 |
| 6 | wheat, BR | 20 | 2003,2022 | 1296 | 18498 |
| 7 | wheat, CN | 20 | 2003,2022 | 26 | 473 |
| 8 | wheat, CZ | 18 | 2003,2020 | 14 | 232 |
| 9 | wheat, DE | 19 | 2003,2021 | 365 | 5751 |
| 10 | wheat, DK | 14 | 2006,2020 | 10 | 136 |
| 11 | wheat, EE | 11 | 2005,2020 | 5 | 45 |
| 12 | wheat, EL | 17 | 2003,2019 | 43 | 629 |
| 13 | wheat, ES | 18 | 2003,2020 | 46 | 557 |
| 14 | wheat, FI | 17 | 2004,2020 | 18 | 93 |
| 15 | wheat, FR | 18 | 2003,2020 | 89 | 1524 |
| 16 | wheat, HR | 13 | 2008,2020 | 2 | 25 |
| 17 | wheat, HU | 18 | 2003,2020 | 20 | 297 |
| 18 | wheat, IE | 5 | 2010,2020 | 3 | 11 |
| 19 | wheat, IN | 15 | 2003,2017 | 494 | 6168 |
| 20 | wheat, IT | 18 | 2003,2020 | 94 | 1252 |
| 21 | wheat, LT | 18 | 2003,2020 | 10 | 144 |
| 22 | wheat, LV | 16 | 2003,2018 | 5 | 57 |
| 23 | wheat, NL | 18 | 2003,2020 | 12 | 207 |
| 24 | wheat, PL | 18 | 2003,2020 | 17 | 275 |
| 25 | wheat, PT | 17 | 2004,2020 | 5 | 85 |
| 26 | wheat, RO | 18 | 2003,2020 | 39 | 387 |
| 27 | wheat, SE | 17 | 2003,2020 | 17 | 246 |
| 28 | wheat, SK | 2 | 2017,2018 | 6 | 10 |
| 29 | wheat, US | 21 | 2003,2023 | 1937 | 21791 |

3 Related work

Table 5 shows a summary of related work to go along with *Section 2* of the main text.

Table 5: Overview of related work. The predictor acronyms are mapped as W-weather, SR- surface reflectance variables from remote sensing observations, VI-vegetation indices

| Reference | Bench mark | Coverage | Prediction unit | Time span | Data structure | Yield | Predictor | | | |
|-----------------|------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------|-----------|----|----|------|
| | | | | | | | W | SR | VI | Soil |
| (9) | ✓ | Argentina | county | 2005 - 2016 | image (histograms) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | | USA Brazil | | | | | | | | |
| (3) | | Nepal | district | 2016 - 2018 | image | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| (10) | | China | province | 2016 - 2021 | image | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| (4) | | Global | pixel | 1981 - 2016 | image | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| (2) | | Germany | district | 1979 - 2021 | tabular | ✓ | | | | |
| (6) | | Netherlands | province | 1994 - 2018 | tabular | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| (7) | | USA | county/ pixel | 2000 - 2018 | tabular | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| (5) | | USA | county | 1980 - 2018 | tabular | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| (1) | | USA | pixel | 1999 - 2018 | image | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| CY-Bench | ✓ | Mutil-country | sub-national | varies | tabular | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |

41 **References**

- 42 [1] Jillian M Deines, Rinkal Patel, Sang-Zi Liang, Walter Dado, and David B Lobell. A million
43 kernels of truth: insights into scalable satellite maize yield mapping and yield gap analysis from
44 an extensive ground dataset in the US corn belt. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 253:112174,
45 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2020.112174.
- 46 [2] Christoph Duden, Christina Nacke, and Frank Offermann. German yield and area data for 11
47 crops from 1979 to 2021 at a harmonized spatial resolution of 397 districts. *Scientific Data*, 11,
48 01 2024. doi: 10.1038/s41597-024-02951-8.
- 49 [3] Ruben Fernandez-Beltran, Tina Baidar, Jian Kang, and Filiberto Pla. Rice-Yield Prediction
50 with Multi-Temporal Sentinel-2 Data and 3D CNN: A Case Study in Nepal. *Remote Sensing*,
51 13(7):1391, 2021.
- 52 [4] Toshichika Iizumi and Toru Sakai. The global dataset of historical yields for major crops
53 1981–2016. *Scientific Data*, 7(1):97, 2020.
- 54 [5] Saeed Khaki, Lizhi Wang, and Sotirios V Archontoulis. A CNN-RNN framework for crop yield
55 prediction. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 10:1750, 2020. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2019.01750.
- 56 [6] Dilli Paudel, Hendrik Boogaard, Allard de Wit, Sander Janssen, Sjouke Osinga, Christos
57 Pylianidis, and Ioannis N Athanasiadis. Machine learning for large-scale crop yield forecasting.
58 *Agricultural Systems*, 187:103016, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.agrsy.2020.103016.
- 59 [7] Dilli R. Paudel, Diego Marcos, Allard de Wit, Hendrik Boogaard, and Ioannis N. Athanasiadis. A
60 weakly supervised framework for high resolution crop yield forecasts. *Environmental Research
61 Letters*, 18(9):094062, 2023. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/acf50e.
- 62 [8] Mahima Pushkarna, Andrew Zaldivar, and Oddur Kjartansson. Data cards: Purposeful and trans-
63 parent dataset documentation for responsible ai. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference
64 on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1776–1826, 2022.
- 65 [9] Christopher Yeh, Chenlin Meng, Sherrie Wang, Anne Driscoll, Erik Rozi, Patrick Liu, Jihyeon
66 Lee, Marshall Burke, David Lobell, and Stefano Ermon. Sustainbench: Benchmarks for
67 monitoring the sustainable development goals with machine learning. In *Thirty-fifth Conference
68 on Neural Information Processing Systems, Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 12
69 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=5HR3vCylqD>.
- 70 [10] Y. Zhao, S. Han, J. Zheng, H. Xue, Z. Li, Y. Meng, X. Li, X. Yang, Z. Li, S. Cai, and G. Yang.
71 Chinawheatyield30m: a 30 m annual winter wheat yield dataset from 2016 to 2021 in china.
72 *Earth System Science Data*, 15(9):4047–4063, 2023. doi: 10.5194/essd-15-4047-2023.