

Economic Analysis of Tropical Forages in Livestock Systems in the Eastern Plains of Colombia



Burkart, Stefan¹; Enciso, Karen¹; Gutiérrez, Jhon Freddy¹; Arango, Jacobo¹; Peters, Michael¹

CONTACT Dr. Stefan Burkart
s.burkart@cgiar.org

¹International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), Tropical Forages Program, Cali, Colombia

This poster is being presented at "Tropentag 2016: Solidarity in a competing world — fair use of resources"; September 18 - 21 2016, Vienna, Austria

Introduction

- 70% of the Colombian livestock production are characterized by extensive production systems, which usually show low productivity levels, low land use efficiency and often lack environmental sustainability
- This is related to native grasses and degraded pastures that generate limited forage supply, both in volume and quality, especially in the dry season
- With their high potential for mitigation of and adaptation to climate change and their ability to increase productivity levels, technologies such as improved forages and silvo-pastoral systems can be viable alternatives for sustainable cattle production
- The establishment of such technologies implies higher investment and management costs for the producer, which limits in many cases their adoption

Objectives

To evaluate the financial viability of the implementation of improved forage technologies in livestock systems, in this case of improved pastures and scattered trees associated with improved pastures, and to compare them to the traditional production system with native or naturalized pastures

Materials & Methods

- Research took place in 2015 in the Casanare Department in the Eastern Plains of Colombia as a part of the research project "*Clima y Sector Agropecuario Colombia no-Adaptación para la sostenibilidad productiva*" between CIAT and the Colombian Ministry of Agriculture (MADR)
- Data sources: Field measurements; expert consultations; secondary data and literature review
- Economic Analysis:

1

Construction of a discounted cash-flow model (10 year period) taking into account the factors associated to the benefits (animal productivity in kg/ha/yr) and the costs related to the initial investment and management

2

Development of a simulation model (software @Risk-Decision Tools Suite of Paladise) for analyzing the different associated risk factors

3

Estimation of profitability indicators for different scenarios: Net Present Value (NPV), Internal Rate of Return (IRR), Probability of NPV<0



Photo *Brachiaria humidicola* in the Eastern Plains of Colombia Source: Tropical Forages Program, CIAT

Table 1 Productive parameters, investment and management costs per production system

	Improved Pasture ¹	Scattered Trees + Improved Pastures ²	Native Pasture ³
Productive parameters ha ⁻¹ year ⁻¹			
Animal stocking rate (AU/ha)	2	2	0.27
Live-weight gain (g/animal/day)	130-445	310-486	77-258
Animal productivity (Kg/ha/year)	294-402	352-480	18-37
Investment and management costs ⁴			
Initial investment (US\$/ha ⁻¹) ⁵	1,090	1,187	0
Management costs (US\$/ha ⁻¹ year ⁻¹) ⁶	179	231	12.7

¹Species *Brachiaria humidicola*, *Brachiaria decumbens*; ²Improved pastures such as *Brachiaria humidicola*, *Brachiaria decumbens* associated with shadow trees; ³Native Savanna species such as *Axonopus Purpureus*; ⁴Representative Market Exchange Rate for 2016; ⁵Pasture establishment and fencing costs (inputs, machinery, labor); ⁶Costs for fertilization, weed control, pruning and trimming, fence maintenance and controlled burning (only for native pasture)

- In comparison with native pastures, improved pastures on average allow:
- Increases in animal stocking rate of **86%** and in animal productivity of **42%**
- In comparison with a pasture monoculture, the use of scattered trees on average allows:
- Increases in animal productivity between **15** and **20%**

- Compared to native pastures, improved pastures on average increase the NPV by 86% and show an IRR higher than the opportunity costs (16%)

Table 2 Profitability indicators per production system

	Scenarios	NPV ⁴	IRR	Probability(NPV<0)
Improved Pastures	N ¹	\$ 49.78	18%	48,60%
	O ²	\$ 290.3	32%	10,14%
	P ³	\$ 40.1	18%	50,77%
Scattered Trees + Improved Pastures	N ¹	\$ -120.6	13%	97,60%
	O ²	\$ 25.17	17%	65,63%
	P ³	\$ -258.86	9%	100,00%
Native Pastures		\$ 18.19	--	11,23%

¹Normal Scenario: A reduction of pasture cover of 45% in the fifth year was assumed; ²Optimistic Scenario: A reduction of pasture cover of 30% in the fifth year was assumed; ³Pessimistic Scenario: A reduction of pasture cover of 70% in the fifth year was assumed; ⁴Real Discount Rate = 16%

- The system with scattered trees is not profitable resulting from the high initial investment necessary (e.g., tree protection during the first year, slow tree growth delaying improvement of productive parameters). However, this study focused only on the benefits with regard to animal productivity and did not consider additional income that might result from planting trees (e.g., firewood, timber, fruits, eco-system services)
- The profitability indicators are highly sensitive to variations in meat sales prices

Conclusions

- The technologies evaluated in this study showed to be an alternative to improve production efficiency and profitability of livestock farms
- However, strategies and / or incentives need to be developed that aim at reducing the high initial costs of systems in association with scattered trees

References

Arango, J., Gutiérrez, J.F, Mazabel, L., Pardo, P., Enciso, K., Burkart, S., ... Serrano, G. (2015). Estrategias tecnológicas para mejorar la productividad y competitividad de la actividad ganadera: Herramientas para enfrentar el cambio climático, 58.

Pardo, O., Rincon, A., & Dieter, H. (1999). Alternativas forrajeras para los llanos Orientales de Colombia. Villavicencio, Meta, Colombia.

Pérez, R. A., & Vargas, O. M. (2001). Características de la sabana nativa y su potencial de producción bovina en la llanura inundable de Arauca. Boletín Técnico N° 25 (Primera Ed). Santa Bárbara de Arauca, Arauca: Corpoica.

Acknowledgements
This work was funded by the Colombian Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR)
We acknowledge the support of Germán Serrano (MADR) and FEDEGAN
This work was undertaken as part of the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), which is a strategic partnership of CGIAR and Future Earth
This work was done as part of the CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish
We thank all donors that globally support the work of the program through their contributions to the CGIAR system