

University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, Food and Environment *Cooperative Extension Service*

Presented By: Jordan Shockley, Ph.D. Farm Management Specialist UK Agricultural Economics

PRECISION AGRICULTURE ECONOMICS AND DECISION MAKING – BEYOND PROFITABILITY

THE SITE-SPECIFIC NATURE OF PRECISION AGRICULTURE ECONOMICS

- What is profitable for me may NOT be profitable for my neighbor
- What is profitable on one parcel of land may NOT be profitable on another
- Just like your soils, there's variability







IMPORTANCE OF FOLLOWING A DECISION MAKING FRAMEWORK

- Does the precision technology support your goals and mission of the business?
- Many options to implementing precision agriculture
- Different levels of adoption

and Environment

Agricultural Economics



Smart

Data Driven Technologies



Big Data & Telematics





7 STEPS TO DECISION MAKING



Source: Kay, R. D., W. M. Edwards and P. Duffy, 2004: Farm Management. McGraw-Hill, Boston.

Economic Cost Considerations

- Initial investment cost
- Annual subscription(s)
- Service and maintenance costs
- Operating costs
- Economic Benefit Considerations
 - Input savings
 - Yield/Quality increases
 - Value of better management decisions





Other Key Considerations

Impanter and the second s













Beyone Be







BEYOND PROFITABILITY!









Beyond Profit Benefits







4. ANALYZE THE ALTERNATIVES AND MAKE A DECISION

- Are you financially capable of making the investment?
- Tools for analyzing the alternative:
 - Partial Budgeting (Simple)
 - Investment analyses (Advanced)
 - Return on Investment (ROI)
 - Net Present Value (NPV)
 - Internal Rate of Return (IRR)
 - Whole farm planning (Expert)





PARTIAL BUDGETING FOR DECISION MAKING

- Convenient and practical method for analyzing the profit potential of partial changes in the overall whole farm plan
- Compares the profitability of one alternative, typically what is being done now, with a proposed change or new alternative
- Focuses on the costs and benefits realized by the producer
- Partial Budgeting Tool: <u>https://www.extension.iastate.edu/agdm/wholefarm/html/c1-50.html</u>





PARTIAL BUDGET FORMAT

- Additional Costs: cost that do not exist at current time but will be incurred if the change is made
- Reduced Revenue: revenue that is currently received but which will be lost or reduced if the change is made
- Additional Revenue: revenue to be received only if the alternative is adopted
- Reduced Costs: costs that are now incurred which would be eliminated if the change is made





PARTIAL BUDGET FRAMEWORK

Problem:

Additional Costs:

Additional Revenue:

Reduced Revenue:

Reduced Costs:

A. Total additional costs and reduced revenue

\$

B. Total additional \$ revenue and reduced costs \$

Net Change in Profit (B – \$ A)



UAV's (a.k.a. Drones)



Source: www.kinze.com

Multi-hybrid Planters



High-Speed Planters







UAV's (a.k.a. Drones)



Source: www.kinze.com

Multi-hybrid Planters



High-Speed Planters





- Looking into purchasing a new planter
 - Option 1: "Traditional" 12-Row Planter
 - Option 2: High-Speed 12-Row Planter
- High-Speed planter technology costs an <u>additional</u> \$26,400 compared to "traditional" 12-Row Planter
 - Annual ownership cost of \$1800 in depreciation and \$1300 in interest (@6.75% interest, 8 year economic useful life and 45% salvage value)
- Increased annual repairs and maintenance cost of \$1500
- Average annual yield benefit of \$5,700 due to timely planting
- Annual operating cost savings (labor) of \$3,000





Problem: Purchase high-speed planter technology			
Additional Costs:		Additional Revenue:	
Ownership Costs			
Depreciation	\$1,800	Timely Planting	\$5,700
Interest	\$1,300	Operating Cost Savings	\$3,000
Operating Costs			
Repairs	\$1,500		
Reduced Revenue:		Reduced Costs:	
None		None	
A. Total additional costs and reduced revenue	\$4,600	B. Total additional revenue and reduced costs	\$8,700
			\$4,600
		Net Change in Profit (B – A)	\$4,100

LIMITATIONS TO PARTIAL BUDGETS

- Only compare the present management plan with one alternative at a time
- If many alternatives, need many partial budgets
- Uses one set of price and yield expectations. If variable, cash flow could become an issue
- Ignores time value of money (use the advanced tools)
 - Capital Budgeting Analysis Return on Investment (ROI)
 - Tool for evaluating the profitability of investments
 - Capital Budgeting Analysis: <u>https://farmdoc.illinois.edu/fast-tools/capital-budgeting</u>





BE <u>CAUTIOUS</u> WITH ROI

- Don't trust blanket ROI claims!
 - Remember: The economics of precision ag are site specific
- Ask <u>HOW</u> ROI was calculated
- Simple Rate of Return is often used which is WRONG and WORTHLESS
 - Average Annual Profit / Average Investment
- Capital Budgeting Analysis Return on Investment (ROI)
 - Capital Budgeting Analysis: <u>https://farmdoc.illinois.edu/fast-tools/capital-budgeting</u>







- Automatic section control on sprayer
 - Smaller field size and irregular shaped fields proves more profitable
 - Field shape becomes less important as field area increases
 - ROI Range: -3% 239%
- Guidance on sprayer
 - Large square fields more profitable
 - ROI Range: 43% 66%

Sources:

- Shockley, Jordan, Carl Dillon, Tim Stombaugh, and Scott Shearer. "Whole farm analysis of automatic section control for agricultural machinery." *Precision Agriculture* 13, (2012): 411-420.
- Smith, Craig, Kevin Dhuyvetter, Terry Kastens, Dietrich Kastens, and Logan Smith. "Economics of precision agricultural technologies across the Great Plains." Journal of the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, (2013): 185-206







- Automatic section control on sprayer
 - Diminishing returns as the number of nozzles controlled increases
 - 5 sections controlled
 - ROI Range: 15% 206% Average: 98%
 - Individual nozzle control
 - ROI Range: -10% 96% Average: 38%

Source:

- Smith, Craig and Kevin Dhuyvetter. "Determining the economically optimal level of control on sprayers and planters." Journal of the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, (2016): 1-21





- Improving efficiency reduces economic risk:
 - Machinery efficiency
 - E.g., High speed planting reducing production risk
 - Input efficiency



- E.g., 4R and reducing overlap reduces production and marketing risk
- Technologies that reduce the potential of variability in profits, reduce economic risk!

Source:

Shockley, Jordan, Carl Dillon, and Tim Stombaugh. "A whole farm analysis of the influence of auto-steer navigation on net returns, risk, and production practices." *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 43, 1 (February 2011): 57-75.







- Reducing crop production inputs through precision technologies reduces your carbon footprint
- Use partial budgeting and break-even analysis to determine a break-even yield for CRP enrollment.
- Meld economics with yield maps to create a spatial CRP enrollment map

Source:

- Dillon, Carl, Jordan Shockley, and Joe Luck. "A spatial economics decision making guide for conservation reserve program." In GIS Applications in Agriculture, Volume 4: Conservation Planning. T. Mueller and G. Sassenrath, eds. pp. 233-244. 2015
- Brown, Rachael, Carl Dillon, Jack Schieffer, and Jordan Shockley. "The carbon footprint and economic impact of precision technology on a corn and soybean farm." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* (September 2015) DOI: 10.1080/21606544.2015.1090932





Economically Feasible VS. **Financially Feasible**

CONCLUSION

- Does this decision support your mission and goals of the business?
- Follow the decision-making process
- Think deeper than direct input savings and investment costs
- Consider factors beyond profitability
- Use all the tools at your disposal
- Look forward to a short video on using Excel to determine ROI of precision ag technologies
- The economics of precision ag is site specific!!!





THANK YOU!

Jordan Shockley, Ph.D.

Phone: 859,218,4391

Email: jordan.shockley@uky.edu

http://agecon.ca.uky.edu/person/jordan-shockley



