

## Case Study - BC-2 vs. CN-140-70

## Farm Descriptions

BC-2 is a cow-calf operation located in the Central Interior of British Columbia, Canada. This farm has a beef cow herd of 90 head, and keeps Angus, Hereford, Simmental, and Limousin animals. The cowcalf enterprise is located on 1,211 ac of land with clay soils in a semiarid climate. Mean annual temperature is $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and mean annual precipitation is 650 mm , with the highest rainfall in late spring/early summer.

CN-140-70 is a cow-calf and finishing operation located in Heilongjiang, China. This herd of Simmental animals is maintained by 40 head of beef cows. The cow-calf enterprise is situated on 21 ac with clay soils in a moist subtropical mid-latitude climate. Mean annual temperature is $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and mean annual precipitation is 465 mm , distributed primarily in July-August.


## Production System and Physical Performance Indicators

## Similarities

Comparison of BC-2 and $\mathbf{C N}-140-70$ was chosen as these are two small-medium size herds, located in regions with similar mean annual temperature and precipitation for homegrown feed production.

## Cow Performance and Weaning

Mature weight is considerably higher on $\mathbf{B C}-\mathbf{2}(1,340 \mathrm{lb})$ as compared to CN-140-70 (922 lb). This translates to heavier calves, with a 200-d adjusted weaning weight of 581 lb on $\mathbf{B C}-\mathbf{2}$, and 539 lb on $\mathrm{CN}-\mathbf{1 4 0 - 7 0}$. Calf death loss is low on both farms, at $3.3 \%$ BC-2 and $1.0 \%$ on CN-140-70; the former is likely higher due to predation. This likely contributes to the difference in number of calves weaned per 100 cows, at 93 calves on $\mathbf{B C}-2$ and 100 on $\mathbf{C N}-140-70$. The high weaning rate on $\mathbf{C N}-140-70$ suggests good conception and pregnancy rates on this farm.

## Cattle Sales and Prices

BC-2 sells calves at weaning, whereas $\mathbf{C N}-140-70$ retains weaned calves for the finishing enterprise. As weaners, price per head is similar, at $\$ 1,136 /$ head for $\mathbf{B C}-2$ and $\$ 1,073 /$ head for $\mathbf{C N}-\mathbf{1 4 0 - 7 0}$. This in spite of a $20 \%$ larger weaning weight on BC-2.

## Feed

BC-2 relies primarily on homegrown feeds, purchasing 3\% of feedstuffs. CN-140-70 purchases a larger share of feedstuffs, $23 \%$, but

|  | BC-2 | CN-140-70 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Beef cows (hd) | 90 | 40 |
| Breeds | Angus, <br> Hereford, <br> Simmental, <br> Limousin | Simmental |
| Mature cow weight (Ib) | 1,340 | 922 |
| Weaning age (d) | 201 | 180 |
| Weaning weight (lb) | 584 | 485 |
| 200 day adjusted weaning weight (lb) | 581 | 539 |
| Weaning weight as \% mature cow weight | 44 | 53 |
| Calf death loss | $3.3 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Calves weaned per 100 cows (hd) | 93 | 100 |
| Replacement rate (\%) | $9.4 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ |
| Price per head for weaners sold (\$/hd) | 1,136 | 1,073 |
| Sale weight (lb) | 584 | 485 |
| Feed purchased (\% as-is) | $3 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Income sources | Cow-calf | Cow-calf, <br> retained <br> ownership | is still reliant on homegrown feed. Winter feeding on $\mathbf{B C}-2$ consists of homegrown hay, grain screening pellets, salt, and mineral. Diets on CN-$140-70$ are grazed ( $56 \%$ ), supplemented with non-grass hay/silage, concentrates, and mineral. BC-2 feeds winter diets in confinement; cows on CN-140-70 have access to a winter barn.

## 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 BC-2 averaged $\$ 1,340 /$ cow. This is approximately twice the total production costs on CN-140-70, at $\$ 663 /$ cow.

Cash costs include purchased feed, cost of feed production including seed and fertilizer, land rent, wages, machine and building maintenance, interest on liabilities, veterinary and medicine costs, etc. On a per-cow basis, these are equal on both farms ( $\$ 652$ on $\mathbf{B C}-2$ and $\$ 651$ on CN-140-70). However, this equates to $49 \%$ of total costs on BC-2, they account for 98\% of total costs on CN-140-70.

| Total costs of the cow-calf enterprise |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Costs ( $\$ /$ cow) | BC-2 | CN-140-70 |
| Cash costs | 652 | 651 |
| Depreciation | 186 | 1 |
| Opportunity cost | 502 | 11 |
| Land | 201 | 0 |
| Labour | 249 | 6 |
| Capital | 52 | 5 |
| Total cost | 1,340 | 663 |
| Revenue | 1,059 | 1,169 |
| Short-term profit | 407 | 519 |
| Medium-term profit | 221 | 518 |
| Long-term profit | -281 | 507 |

Opportunity costs are calculated for unpaid family labour, owned land, and capital. Opportunity costs account for $37 \%$ of total costs on BC-2, and only $2 \%$ of total costs on $\mathbf{C N}-\mathbf{1 4 0 - 7 0}$. On both farms, opportunity cost of labour makes up the largest proportion of total opportunity costs. This cost is associated with unpaid family labour, particularly on BC-2, where all labour is unpaid family labour. Opportunity cost of land is also significant on BC-2 (40\% of opportunity cost), representing potential income from other uses of owned land, such as renting to neighbours. $\mathbf{C N}-140-\mathbf{7 0}$ rents all land, thus does not incur and opportunity cost of land. Instead, opportunity cost of capital makes up the remainder (44\%) of opportunity costs on this farm.

Revenue from the cow-calf enterprise, including weaned calf and cull sales, was $\$ 1,059 /$ cow on $\mathbf{B C}-\mathbf{2}$. This is $10 \%$ less than average revenue on $\mathbf{C N}-\mathbf{1 4 0 - 7 0}$, at $\$ 1,169$. This is in contrast to the difference in total cost, which impacts profitability measures for the cow-calf enterprise.

Both farms are able to cover both cash and depreciation costs, maintaining profitability in both the shortand medium-term. Short-term profits (revenue - cash costs) averaged \$407/cow on BC-2, and \$519/cow on $\mathbf{C N}-140-\mathbf{7 0}$. Medium-term profits (revenue - cash and depreciation costs) averaged $\$ 221 /$ cow on $\mathbf{B C}-2$, and $\$ 518 /$ cow on CN-140-70. In the long-term, only CN-140-70 is able to maintain profitability, due to low percow production costs. Average long-term profits (revenue - cash, depreciation, and opportunity costs) on BC-2 were -\$281/cow, and \$507/cow on CN-140-70.

## Cost Structure

Total costs can be broken down as land, labour, capital, and non-factor costs. Due to the low per-cow costs on CN-140-70, total land, labour, capital, and non-factor costs are all higher on BC-2. Presented as percentages of total cost, there are additional differences in cost structure between the two farms.

Land costs account for a relatively small portion of total costs, at 16\% and 9\% of total costs on BC-2 and CN-140-70, respectively. Per-cow, these costs are 3.5 times greater on BC-2. This is due to the difference in cow-calf acres, as BC-2 operates on $1,211 \mathrm{ac}$, and CN-140-70 on only 21 ac . This offsets the difference in land rents, which average $\$ 122 / \mathrm{ac}$ on CN-140-70, and only \$13/ac on BC-2.

Labour costs account for 19\% of total costs on BC-2, and only 3\% of total costs on CN-140-70. Labour costs are higher on BC-2 due to greater total labour hours (1,256 hrs vs.

| Costs (\$/cow) | BC-2 | CN-140-70 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total land cost | 219 | 62 |
| Total labour cost | 249 | 18 |
| Total capital cost | 91 | 7 |
| Non-factor costs | 781 | 575 |
| Animal purchases | 21 | 0 |
| Feed | 162 | 554 |
| Machinery | 214 | 3 |
| Fuel, energy, lubricants | 109 | 3 |
| Buildings | 134 | 1 |
| Vet \& medicine | 18 | 12 |
| Insurance, taxes | 49 | 0 |
| Other inputs | 73 | 1 |
| Total costs | 1,340 | 663 | 229 hrs on CN-140-70), and higher cost of labour. Hourly wages on BC-2 are calculated as $\$ 17.82 / \mathrm{hr}$ for unpaid family labour. In contrast, wages on $\mathbf{C N}-140-70$ are $\$ 2.95 / \mathrm{hr}$ for hired labour, and calculated as $\$ 3.93 / \mathrm{hr}$ for unpaid family labour. All labour hours on BC-2 are family labour, whereas the majority (72\%) of labour hours on CN-140-70 are hired labour.

Capital costs account for the smallest share of total costs, at 7\% of total costs on BC-2 and 1\% of total costs on CN-140-70. On both farms, the majority of capital costs ( $57 \%$ and $73 \%$ for BC-2 and CN-140-70, respectively) are own capital, followed by interest on liabilities.

BC-2


CN-140-70


Non-factor costs make up the largest proportion of total costs, at $58 \%$ and $87 \%$ of total costs on BC-2 and CN-140-70, respectively. The greatest non-factor cost on BC-2 is machinery ( $27 \%$ of non-factor and $16 \%$ of total costs), which may be expected where there is a reliance on homegrown feeds. The next largest cost on BC-2 are feed costs, which account for $21 \%$ of non-factor costs and $12 \%$ of total costs. These include purchased feedstuffs, land improvement, and seed costs on this farm. Feed costs also account for $96 \%$ of non-factor and $84 \%$ of total costs on CN-140-70, and are primarily associated with purchased feed. The remainder of non-factor costs on this farm are veterinary and medical costs ( $2 \%$ of non-factor costs), machinery (1\%), and fuel, energy, and lubricants (1\%). Other significant non-factor costs on BC-2 are buildings (17\%), and fuel, energy, and lubricants (14\%).

## Whole Farm

## Other Farm Enterprises

In addition to the cow-calf enterprise, $\mathbf{C N}-140-70$ operates a finishing operation of 140 head. Both farms also gain additional revenue from other farm activities.

## Cost and Profit

Total farm revenue on BC-2 averaged $\$ 100,018$ over the 5 -year period. The majority of this (95\%) is market revenue from the cow-calf enterprise, with the remainder from other farm activities. In contrast, total farm revenue on CN-140-70 averaged \$531,017, over 5 times that on BC-2. On this farm, the retained ownership enterprise accounts for $91 \%$ of total farm revenue, with only $9 \%$ attributed to the cow-calf enterprise.

Average total farm expenses were $\$ 76,305$ on $\mathbf{B C}$-2. The largest sources of farm expenses were fixed costs ( $48 \%$ of total expenses), depreciation ( $22 \%$ ), and the cowcalf enterprise ( $21 \%$ ). On CN-140-70, 85\% of expenses are incurred by the retained ownership enterprise, and only $6 \%$ by the cow-calf enterprise.

Both farms are able to maintain whole-farm profitability over the 5-year term. Despite negative long-term profits for the cow-calf enterprise, whole-farm net income on BC-2

| Whole-farm cost and profit |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Costs (\$) | BC-2 | CN-140-70 |
| Revenue |  |  |
| Market revenue | 95,321 | 529,253 |
| Cow-calf | 95,321 | 46,772 |
| Retained ownership | 0 | 482,481 |
| Other farm revenue | 4,505 | 1,764 |
| Change in inventory | 193 | 0 |
| Total farm revenue | 100,018 | 531,017 |
| Expenses |  |  |
| Depreciation | 16,782 | 483 |
| Fixed costs | 36,287 | 1,370 |
| Wages, rent, interest | 5,281 | 34,104 |
| Cow-calf | 16,232 | 22,441 |
| Retained ownership | 0 | 344,143 |
| Crop production | 1,722 | 4,623 |
| Total farm costs | 76,305 | 407,025 |
| Profits |  |  |
| Net income | 23,714 | 123,993 |
| Net cash farm income | 40,298 | 122,712 | averaged $\$ 23,714^{\text {a }}$, and net cash farm income averaged $\$ 40,298^{\text {b }}$. CN-140-70, with a profitable cow-calf enterprise, and the addition of the finishing enterprise, averaged a net income of $\$ 123,993^{a}$, while net cash farm income averaged $\$ 122,712^{\text {b }}$.

[^0]
[^0]:    Net cash farm income $=$ Whole farm profitability + depreciation + changes in inventory + capital gains/losses.

