

## Case Study - AB-3 vs. ES-180-420

## Farm Descriptions

AB-3 is a mixed cow-calf, backgrounding, and cash crop operation located in the Rocky Mountain Natural Region of Alberta, Canada. Angus and Simmental animals are kept, and 172 head of beef cows maintain the cow-calf operation. The cow-calf enterprise is located on 2,116 acres in a grey-wooded (luvisolic) soil zone. The climate is dry and semi-arid; mean annual temperature is $3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and mean annual precipitation 450 mm , of which the majority falls April-August.


ES-180-420 is a cow-calf and finishing operation in Guijuelo, Salamanca, Spain. A beef cow herd of 180 head maintains a cross-bred cow-calf operation. The cow-calf enterprise is located on 865 ac , in which silty clay loam soils predominate. Mean annual temperature is $11.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The area is dry, with a mean annual precipitation of 382 mm , falling primarily from November through January.

## Production System and Physical Performance Indicators

## Similarities

Comparison of AB-3 and ES-180-420 was chosen due to similarities in beef cow herd size, cow weight, retained ownership of weaned animals, and number of retained animals sold per year. Both farms are situated in dry climates, though mean annual temperature is much higher on ES-180-420.

## Cow Performance and Weaning

Mature cow-weight is similar, though slightly higher on ES-180-420 (1,323 lb) than $\mathbf{A B}-3(1,290 \mathrm{lb})$. Calves are weaned older and heavier on AB-3, though 200-d adjusted weaning weight is greater for ES-180-420. As such, price per head for weaned animals is greater on AB-3, at $\$ 1,080 /$ head, as compared to $\$ 978 /$ head on ES-180-420.

While calf death loss is greater on AB-3 (8\%) than ES-180-420 (3\%), a greater number of calves are weaned per 100 cows. This suggests conception and/or pregnancy rates are lower on ES-180-420, which is supported by the greater cow herd replacement rate.

## Cattle Sales and Prices

AB-3 sells 100 head of retained calves (backgrounded) annually, while ES-180-420 sells 108 head weaned calves to the finishing operation. As AB-3 backgrounds, and ES-180-420 feeds to finish, sale weight of retained animals on AB-3 is approximately half of that on ES-180-420.

Feed
There is great disparity in the percentage of feed purchased; AB-3

|  | AB-3 | ES-180-420 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Beef cows (hd) | 172 | 180 |
| Breeds | Angus, <br> Simmental | Crosses |
| Mature cow weight (lb) | 1,290 | 1,323 |
| Weaning age (d) | 208 | 195 |
| Weaning weight (lb) | 533 | 512 |
| 200 day adjusted weaning weight (lb) | 513 | 526 |
| Weaning weight as \% mature cow weight | 41 | 39 |
| Price per head for weaners sold (\$/hd) | $\$ 1,080$ | $\$ 978$ |
| Calf death loss | $8 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Calves weaned per 100 cows (hd) | 83 | 80 |
| Replacement rate (\%) | $9 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Annual sales - retained animals (hd) | 100 | 108 |
| Sale weight - retained animals (lb) | $560-670$ | 1,217 |
| Feed purchased (\% as-is) | $1 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| Income sources | Cow-calf, | Cow-calf, |
|  | retained | retained |
|  |  | ownership | purchases only $1 \%$ of feed (as-is), where ES-180-420 purchases over half ( $56 \%$, as-is) of all feedstuffs. Both farms provide winter rations for cows outdoors. On AB-3, cows are first swath grazed in fall, then receive a hay-based winter ration supplemented with silage, straw, salt, and mineral.

ES-180-420 supplements winter grazing (44\% of diet) with other forages (45\%) and concentrates (11\%).

## Cow-calf Enterprise

## Cost and Profit

For comparison of costs and profits, a 5-year average (2016-2020) is used. Total production costs of the cow-calf enterprise (including cash cost, depreciation, and opportunity cost) on AB-3 averaged $\$ 973 /$ cow from 2016-2020. In contrast, total cost is $33 \%$ higher on ES-180-420, at $\$ 1,291 /$ cow.

Cash costs include purchased feed, costs of feed production including seed and fertilizer, land rent, wages, machine and building maintenance, interest on liabilities, veterinary and medicine costs, etc. These costs make up the largest proportion of total costs on both farms, at $66 \%$ of total cost on AB-3, and 89\% of costs on ES-180-420.

| Total costs of the cow-calf enterprise |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Costs $(\mathbf{\$} /$ cow) | AB-3 | ES-180-420 |  |
| Cash costs | 646 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 4 9}$ |  |
| Depreciation | 118 | 30 |  |
| Opportunity cost | 209 | 112 |  |
| Land | 144 | 19 |  |
| Labour | 50 | 75 |  |
| Capital | 15 | 19 |  |
| Total cost | $\mathbf{9 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 9 1}$ |  |
| Revenue | $\mathbf{1 , 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 8}$ |  |
| Short-term profit | 372 | -181 |  |
| Medium-term profit | 254 | -211 |  |
| Long-term profit | 46 | -323 |  |



Opportunity costs are calculated for owned land, unpaid family labour, and capital. Overall, opportunity costs are considerably different between farms. These costs account for $22 \%$ of total costs on $\mathbf{A B}-3$, and $9 \%$ of total costs on ES-180-420. Moreover, the composition of total opportunity cost also differs. On AB-3, the greatest opportunity cost is that for land (69\%). AB-3 owns $42 \%$ of total farmland, thus these costs represent potential revenue lost from other land uses, such as renting owned land to neighbours. Meanwhile, the greatest contributor to opportunity cost on ES-180-420 is that of labour. This is associated with higher family labour hours, and calculated wages for family labour, on this farm.

Revenue from the cow-calf enterprise, including weaned calf and cull animal sales, averaged $\$ 1,018 /$ cow on AB-3, and a similar $\$ 968 /$ cow on ES-180-420 over the 5 -year period. Where AB-3 had significantly lower percow costs, this farm also receives $5 \%$ higher revenue per-cow compared to ES-180-420, which results in stark differences in profitability of the respective cow-calf enterprises.

Where AB-3 is profitable in the short-, medium-, and long-terms, ES-180-420 is unprofitable in all terms over the 5 -year period. Short-term profits (revenue - cash costs) averaged \$372/cow for AB-3, and -\$181/cow on ES-18-420. In the medium-term (revenue - cash and depreciation costs), profits averaged \$254/cow on AB-3, and -\$211/cow on ES-180-420. AB-3 remains profitable in the long term, just covering costs with an average long-term profit (revenue - cash, depreciation, and opportunity costs) of $\$ 46 / c o w$. Meanwhile, long-term profits averaged -\$323/cow on ES-180-420.

## Cost Structure

Total costs can be broken down as land, labour, capital, and non-factor costs. Total land, labour, and non-factor costs are higher per-cow on ES-180-420, while total capital costs are higher on AB-3. However, as percentages of total cost, these categories make for similarly composed total costs between the two farms.

Land costs account for $29 \%$ of total cost on AB-3, and $24 \%$ of total cost on ES-180-420. Land rent and rent calculated for owned land are both significantly higher on ES-180-420, averaging $\$ 74 / \mathrm{ha}$, as compared to an average of $\$ 24 / \mathrm{ha}$ on $\mathbf{A B}-3$. However, this is offset by the difference in cow-calf land acres, where AB-3 maintains 2,116 ac, as compared to ES-180-420's 856 ac, resulting in similar per-cow land costs.

Labour costs account for $7 \%$ of total costs on AB-3, and a similar 11\% of total costs on ES-180-420, despite being almost half that of ES-180-420 on a per-cow basis. These higher

| Costs (\$/cow) | AB-3 | ES-180-420 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total land cost | 284 | 314 |
| Total labour cost | 72 | 142 |
| Total capital cost | 70 | 22 |
| Non-factor costs | 547 | 813 |
| Animal purchases | 73 | 32 |
| Feed | 213 | 575 |
| Machinery | 105 | 16 |
| Fuel, energy, lubricants | 22 | 42 |
| Buildings | 40 | 0 |
| Vet \& medicine | 34 | 54 |
| Insurance, taxes | 14 | 42 |
| Other inputs | 45 | 25 |
| Total costs | 973 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 9 1}$ | labour costs on ES-180-420 can be attributed to a greater number of labour hours (1,616 hr vs. 894 hr on AB-3). AB-3 relies primarily on unpaid family labour ( $78 \%$ of all labour hours), while hired and unpaid family labour account for an equal share of hours on ES-180-420. Wages (paid and calculated for unpaid labour) average slightly higher on ES-180-420, at $\$ 16.80 / \mathrm{hr}$, as compared to $\$ 15.72 / \mathrm{hr}$ on AB -3.

Capital costs account for the smallest proportion of total costs, at 7\% and 2\% of total costs on AB-3 and ES-180-420, respectively. On AB-3, 79\% of capital costs are interest on liabilities, where on ES-180-420, the majority (83\%) of capital costs are interest on liabilities.



Non-factor costs are the largest contributors to total costs, accounting for $56 \%$ and $64 \%$ of total cost on AB-3 and ES-180-420, respectively. On both farms, feed costs are the largest component of non-factor costs. As AB-3 relies primarily on homegrown feeds, feed costs are associated with homegrown feed, including fertilizer ( $\$ 75 /$ cow), seed ( $\$ 61 /$ cow), herbicide ( $\$ 27 /$ cow), and other land inputs (\$29/cow). On ES-180-420, feed costs are associated entirely with purchased feed. Other differences in non-factor costs include higher costs associated with animal purchases (13\% of non-factor costs), machinery (19\%) and buildings (7\%) on AB-3, as compared to ES-180-420 (4\%, 2\% and 3\% of non-factor, respectively). High machinery costs on AB-3 may be associated with the reliance on home-grown feeds. A similar share of non-factor costs is associated with fuel (4\% and 5\%), veterinary and medical costs ( $6 \%$ and 7\%), and insurance and taxes ( $3 \%$ and 5\%) on AB-3 and ES-180-420, respectively.

## Whole Farm

## Other Farm Enterprises

In addition to the cow-calf operation, AB-3 generates additional farm revenue from retained ownership (backgrounding) and cash crop enterprises. ES-180-420 also receives additional farm revenue from a retained ownership (finishing) enterprise with 420 head.

## Cost and Profit

On AB-3, the cash crop enterprise contributes the largest share of total revenue (44\%), followed by the cow-calf (29\%) and backgrounding (24\%) enterprises. Additional farm revenue accounts for $3 \%$ of total revenue, and a very small proportion (0.4\%) is from government payments. On ES-180-420, the majority of farm revenue comes from the finishing enterprise (74\%). A similar share of revenue is from the cow-calf enterprise (12\%) and government payments (13\%).

Similar to farm revenue, the greatest share of total farm expenses on AB-3 is attributed to the cash crop enterprise (33\%). The cow-calf enterprise, meanwhile, accounts for only $7 \%$ of total farm expenses. The backgrounding enterprise (24\%), wages, rent, and interest (18\%), and depreciation (15\%) are all more significant contributors to total farm costs on AB-3. Meanwhile, on ES-180-420, the majority of total farm expenses can be attributed to the finishing enterprise (74\%), and only $11 \%$ to the cow-calf enterprise.

| Whole-farm cost and profit |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Costs (\$) | AB-3 | ES-180-420 |
| Revenue | 589,358 | $1,025,182$ |
| Market revenue | 173,554 | 146,065 |
| Cow-calf | 148,030 | 879,116 |
| Retained ownership | 267,774 | 0 |
| Cash crop | 16,680 | 0 |
| Other farm revenue | 2,240 | 155,185 |
| Government payments | $\mathbf{6 0 8 , 2 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 8 0 , 3 6 6}$ |
| Total farm revenue | 74,135 | 37,473 |
| Expenses | 14,550 | 73,440 |
| Depreciation | 85,892 | 85,440 |
| Fixed costs | 32,532 | 126,415 |
| Wages, rent, interest | 115,656 | 882,014 |
| Cow-calf | 158,309 | 0 |
| Retained ownership | 481,076 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 8 6 , 5 6 3}$ |
| Crop production |  |  |
| Total farm costs | 127,202 | $-6,197$ |
| Profits | 201,331 | 31,276 |
| Net income |  |  |

As with the cow-calf enterprise, AB-3 remains profitable at the whole-farm level over the 5 -year period, with an average net income of $\$ 127,202^{\text {a }}$, and average net cash farm income of $\$ 201,331^{\text {b }}$. While $\mathbf{E S}-\mathbf{1 8 0} \mathbf{- 4 2 0}$ operates an unprofitable cow-calf enterprise, and has an average net income of $-\$ 6,197^{\text {a }}$, a profitable finishing enterprise allows the farm to achieve an average net farm cash income of $\$ 31,276^{\text {b }}$.
${ }^{\text {a This is }}$ whole farm profitability, calculated as Market returns (+ coupled payments) (+ decoupled payments) - whole-farm costs +/- changes in inventory +/- capital gains/losses. Whole-farm costs include Direct costs enterprises, overhead costs, paid labour, paid rents, paid interest, depreciation

Net cash farm income $=$ Whole farm profitability + depreciation + changes in inventory + capital gains/losses.

