

Bioeconomics of pasture resource development in sheep production systems

Karl Behrendt

BRurSc (UNE)
GradDipAgEc (UNE)

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the University of New England

January 2008

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Associate Professor Oscar Cacho (UNE), Professor James Scott (UNE) and Dr Randall Jones (NSW DPI), for all of their support, commitment and patience. Their guidance and expertise was invaluable and I feel privileged in having had the opportunity to access their skills and knowledge.

I would also like to acknowledge the Cicerone Project Board for allowing access to the data. Support was also generously provided by CSIRO Plant industry through access to the *AusFarm* software, species parameter sets and training. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Andrew Moore and Libby Salmon from CSIRO Plant Industry for their support in applying this software to the case study region.

I am also grateful for the helpful comments, suggestions and data from Dr Keith Hutchinson (UNE), Dr Andrew Alford (NSW DPI), Fiona Scott (NSW DPI) and Libuseng Mpiti-Shakhane (UNE).

Financial and extensive post-graduate support for this study was provided through the Sheep CRC and Australian Wool Innovation.

Finally and most importantly, I would like to thank my family. To my wife Kath, thank you for your encouragement, unconditional love and friendship, words cannot express my indebtedness and gratitude. To my children, Calhan, Zoe, and Connor, thank you for understanding and helping me remember what is important. Without your continued support over the past few years this would not have been possible.

Abstract

Within any grazing system managers need to decide on how to best manage the existing mosaic of pasture resources. This involves the adjustment of stocking rates and grazing management, as well as the use of inputs and existing technologies. The main technologies available to grazing managers are fertiliser, and the sowing of introduced species to improve pasture productivity, quality and persistence. These represent a series of tactical and strategic decisions that need to be made under climatic uncertainty about their degree of success in improving the persistence of desirable species, production and profits.

The process represents a complex dynamic decision problem. To address this problem a bioeconomic framework was developed that is capable of modelling the dynamic nature of pasture resource composition and production, and its response to climate and utilisation by grazing livestock. The framework integrates the sequential nature of the decision-making problems faced by sheep producers under climatic uncertainty. This is achieved by developing a paddock-level dynamic pasture resource development (DPRD) simulation model and integrating it into a seasonal stochastic dynamic programming (SDP) model. The SDP consists of four seasonal transition probability matrices which are applied sequentially to solve a recursive equation with the objective of maximising the expected net present value of the sheep enterprise in the long run.

The SDP identified optimal tactical and strategic decision rules for each season, in terms of stocking rates and pasture re-sowing as functions of the state of the pasture at the start of a season, which is defined in terms of pasture mass and botanical composition. This process was applied for three soil fertility input systems and three sheep production systems, represented as wool, wool/meat and meat production systems.

The outcomes from the process identified pasture state triggers for tactical grazing rests and management, as well as for the optimal replacement of a degraded sward. The optimal target levels for botanical composition, pasture mass and stocking rate were also derived.

Certification

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification.

I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I
ABSTRACT.....	II
CERTIFICATION.....	III
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VIII
LIST OF TABLES	XI
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	2
1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	3
1.4 THESIS DESIGN.....	4
CHAPTER 2. AN OVERVIEW OF PASTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	6
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	6
2.1.1 <i>Pasture resource development in temperate Australia</i>	6
2.1.2 <i>Degradation of the pasture resource</i>	10
2.1.3 <i>Managing and developing dynamic pasture resources</i>	12
2.2 PASTURE DYNAMICS	14
2.2.1 <i>Biodiversity</i>	15
2.2.2 <i>Competition</i>	16
2.2.3 <i>Resilience and persistence</i>	17
2.2.4 <i>Growth and production potential</i>	18
2.2.5 <i>Cyclical changes in botanical composition</i>	19
2.2.6 <i>Livestock interactions</i>	19
2.2.7 <i>Pasture dynamics and sustainability</i>	20
2.3 TECHNOLOGY AND THE PASTURE RESOURCE	21
2.3.1 <i>Fertiliser application</i>	23
2.3.2 <i>Sowing introduced species</i>	23
2.3.3 <i>Grazing management</i>	24
2.4 SUMMARY	25
CHAPTER 3. REVIEW OF PASTURE RESOURCE MODELS.....	27
3.1 INTRODUCTION	27
3.2 BIOPHYSICAL MODELS OF DYNAMIC PASTURE RESOURCES	27
3.2.1 <i>Theoretical frameworks for botanical composition change</i>	28
3.2.2 <i>Pasture and livestock system models</i>	31
3.2.3 <i>Modelling dynamic pastures for decision making</i>	34

3.3	ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF PASTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	36
3.3.1	<i>Deterministic and stochastic</i>	36
3.3.2	<i>Descriptive and optimising models</i>	37
3.3.3	<i>Dealing with Risk</i>	38
3.3.4	<i>Biological models</i>	39
3.3.5	<i>Bioeconomic models for pasture resource development</i>	42
3.4	SUMMARY	43
CHAPTER 4. BIOECONOMIC FRAMEWORK.....		45
4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	45
4.2	DEFINING THE STRUCTURE OF THE PASTURE RESOURCE PROBLEM	45
4.3	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	47
4.3.1	<i>Bioeconomic modelling process</i>	50
4.3.2	<i>Incorporation of risk</i>	51
4.3.3	<i>Modelling botanical composition of the pasture resource</i>	52
4.3.4	<i>Modelling pasture growth</i>	53
4.3.5	<i>Modelling grazing livestock</i>	54
4.4	SOURCES OF DATA AND APPLICATION OF THE BIOECONOMIC FRAMEWORK	55
4.5	SUMMARY	56
CHAPTER 5. A DYNAMIC PASTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR SHEEP PRODUCTION SYSTEMS.....		58
5.1	INTRODUCTION	58
5.2	THE DYNAMIC PASTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT MODEL.....	58
5.2.1	<i>Economic return sub-model</i>	62
5.2.2	<i>Livestock sub-model</i>	64
5.2.3	<i>Pasture sub-model</i>	77
5.2.4	<i>Pasture composition sub-model</i>	82
5.2.5	<i>Pasture establishment</i>	87
5.2.6	<i>Soil fertility sub-model</i>	88
5.3	SUMMARY	91
CHAPTER 6. DYNAMIC PASTURE RESOURCE AND DEVELOPMENT MODEL PARAMETERISATION AND SIMULATION		92
6.1	INTRODUCTION	92
6.2	THE CICERONE PROJECT.....	92
6.3	DERIVING DPRD MODEL PARAMETERS USING <i>AUSFARM</i> SIMULATIONS	93
6.3.1	<i>Cicerone paddock simulations</i>	94
6.3.2	<i>Calibration of AusFarm</i>	101
6.3.3	<i>DPRD pasture parameters</i>	104
6.3.4	<i>Botanical composition</i>	112
6.4	VALIDATION OF THE DPRD MODEL.....	117

6.5	SIMULATION USING THE DPRD MODEL	118
6.6	SIMULATION RESULTS.....	120
6.6.1	<i>Pasture resource</i>	120
6.6.2	<i>Wool production and liveweight change</i>	125
6.6.3	<i>Economic returns and risk</i>	128
6.6.4	<i>Model sensitivity to stochastic conditions</i>	130
6.7	DISCUSSION.....	133
6.7.1	<i>Simulation results</i>	133
6.7.2	<i>Comparison of deterministic and stochastic results</i>	135
6.7.3	<i>Application of the DPRD model</i>	137
CHAPTER 7. SOLVING THE PASTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM USING STOCHASTIC DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING		138
7.1	INTRODUCTION.....	138
7.2	THE STOCHASTIC DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING MODEL.....	138
7.2.1	<i>State variables</i>	141
7.2.2	<i>Decision variables</i>	142
7.2.3	<i>Soil fertility</i>	143
7.2.4	<i>Supplementary feeding</i>	144
7.2.5	<i>Alternative sheep production systems</i>	144
7.3	NUMERICAL SOLUTION.....	146
7.3.1	<i>Number of iterations</i>	147
7.4	RESULTS.....	148
7.4.1	<i>Optimal trajectories for different input systems</i>	149
7.4.2	<i>Sensitivity to different sheep production systems</i>	152
7.4.3	<i>Optimal stocking rate decisions</i>	155
7.4.4	<i>Tactical grazing rest</i>	157
7.4.5	<i>Re-sowing decision</i>	158
7.4.6	<i>Sensitivity to changes in pasture sowing costs</i>	160
7.4.7	<i>Sensitivity to discount rate</i>	162
7.5	DISCUSSION	163
7.5.1	<i>Optimal botanical composition</i>	163
7.5.2	<i>Optimal pasture mass</i>	164
7.5.3	<i>Optimal tactical grazing management</i>	165
7.5.4	<i>Optimal re-sowing of pastures</i>	166
7.5.5	<i>Application of the SDP results</i>	167
CHAPTER 8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....		168
8.1	THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	168
8.2	DISCUSSION OF KEY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS	169
8.2.1	<i>Deterministic vs stochastic and static vs dynamic</i>	170
8.2.2	<i>Fertiliser application</i>	171

Table of Contents

8.2.3	<i>Sowing pastures</i>	172
8.2.4	<i>Tactical grazing management</i>	174
8.2.5	<i>Implications at the whole farm level</i>	176
8.3	FUTURE RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES.....	177
REFERENCES		179
APPENDICES.....		192
APPENDIX A	: THE CICERONE PROJECT INC. FARMLET EXPERIMENT	192
APPENDIX B	: AUSFARM SIMULATION OF CICERONE PADDock A3 (MANAGEMENT SCRIPT & PASTURE VARIABLE SETTINGS).....	195
APPENDIX C	: ESTIMATES OF PASTURE GROWTH PARAMETERS.....	200
APPENDIX D	: PREDICTION OF THE LIVESTOCK HARVEST IMPACT COEFFICIENT, A_{SC}	202
APPENDIX E	: DYNAMIC PASTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT MODEL (MATLAB CODE).....	203
APPENDIX F	: STOCHASTIC DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING MODEL (MATLAB CODE).....	212

List of Figures

Figure 2-1: Climatic regions of Australia (BOM, 2005).....	7
Figure 2-2: Change in botanical composition of temperate native grasslands of open Eucalyptus woodlands in south-eastern Australia, adapted from Wolfe and Dear (2001) and Garden and Bolger (2001). Asterisks denote introduced and naturalised species.....	8
Figure 2-3: National average stocking rate (—), area used for sown pastures (—) and the area of pasture fertilised (—) in Australia (ABS, 2001; Crofts, 1997). National average stocking rate (DSE/ha) calculated from national cattle and sheep numbers over the area used for grazing enterprises (ABARE, 2004a; ABS, 2002).....	11
Figure 2-4: The stability and resilience of phalaris pastures from 1964 to 1991 on the Northern Tablelands of NSW (Wolfe and Dear (2001) after Hutchinson (1992)).	17
Figure 4-1: Sequential decision making. Adapted from Trebeck and Hardaker (1972).	46
Figure 4-2: Bioeconomic modelling framework.....	48
Figure 5-1: A diagrammatic outline of the Dynamic Pasture Resource Development simulation model at the paddock level.	59
Figure 5-2: Diagrammatic outline of the livestock sub-model. Numbers and variables indicate the corresponding equations.	65
Figure 5-3: Diagrammatic outline of the pasture sub-model. Numbers and variables indicate the corresponding equations.	78
Figure 5-4: Sigmoid pasture growth curve	80
Figure 5-5: Diagrammatic outline of pasture composition sub-model. Numbers and variables indicate the corresponding equations.	83
Figure 5-6: Influence of ρ_C and area occupied by desirable species on their rate of expansion in a season; $\rho_C = 0.9$ (\blacktriangle), $\rho_C = 0.45$ (\bullet), $\rho_C = 0.17$ (\blacksquare), $\kappa = 0.95$ and $FE = 1.0$	85
Figure 5-7: Livestock harvesting impact $h(s)$ (—) and predicted rates of expansion by desirable species within the sward; $\rho_C = 0.9$ (\blacktriangle), $\rho_C = 0.45$ (\bullet), $\rho_C = 0.17$ (\blacksquare), $\kappa = 0.95$, $FE = 1.0$; when $UX_D = 0.45$ and $\lambda_{SC} = 0.17$	86
Figure 5-8: Diagrammatic outline of the soil fertility sub-model. Numbers and variables indicate the corresponding equations.	88
Figure 6-1: Mean daily maximum (—) and minimum (—) temperatures ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) for Armidale NSW, over the years of 1968 to 2006 (source: <i>AusFarm</i> based on Bureau of Meteorology daily climate records for Armidale, NSW).....	95
Figure 6-2: Mean monthly rainfall (mm) for Armidale NSW, over the years of 1968 to 2006, +/- one standard deviation shown in the error bars.	96
Figure 6-3: Changes in botanical composition summarised as the proportion of functional groups for Cicerone Project Paddock A3, based on classification of individual species outlined in Table 6-1.....	99
Figure 6-4: Proportion of desirable (—) and undesirable (—) species groups for the Cicerone Project Paddock A3 based on classification of individual species outlined in Table 6-1.....	99
Figure 6-5: Continuous <i>AusFarm</i> simulated data and experimental data from the Cicerone Project database indicating change in pasture mass over time for paddock A3. Predicted <i>AusFarm</i> (—) and Cicerone Project observed (\blacklozenge) pasture mass data (available from March 2003 to December 2006). The period between the vertical dashed lines indicates the period for which livestock movement records were available.....	103
Figure 6-6: Observed Cicerone Project pasture mass data plotted against paired <i>AusFarm</i> simulation output for paddock A3 for the period of March 2003 to December 2006.....	104

Figure 6-7: AusFarm simulation observations for desirable (■) and undesirable (♦) species groups, and the fitted sigmoid growth curve for desirable (—) and undesirable (— —) species groups, for each season in 2004.	108
Figure 6-8: Distribution of estimated values of $SM\alpha_{it}$ and $SM\gamma_{it}$ from 30 years of growth coefficients for desirable and undesirable species groups.....	109
Figure 6-9: Proportion of dry matter in each digestibility pool for Desirable and Undesirable species groups, (—) 0.8, (—) 0.7, (—) 0.6, (—) 0.5, (—) 0.4, and (—) 0.3.	110
Figure 6-10: Average daily decay rates for desirable (—) and undesirable (—) swards.	111
Figure 6-11: Predicted change in botanical composition from Hutchinson (<i>pers. comm.</i>) unpublished data.	114
Figure 6-12: Observed Cicerone Project paddock A3 pasture composition data (proportion desirable species, X_D) plotted against predicted data.....	116
Figure 6-13: Cumulative distribution functions for mean pasture mass under stochastic simulations of different stocking rate, fertiliser and pasture sowing management strategies. Sown/Low fertiliser/SR15 (—), Sown/High fertiliser/SR27 (— —), Sown/moderate fertiliser/SR12 (—), and degraded/Moderate fertiliser/SR15 (— —).	124
Figure 6-14: Relationship between mean pasture mass and persistence of desirable species measured as the proportion of desirables in the sward after 10 years of grazing under different rates of fertiliser application (High, Moderate, and Low) for a degraded (D) and sown pasture (S)...	125
Figure 6-15: Average annual wool production, change in liveweight and average annual gross margin in relation to stocking rate in deterministic (▲) and stochastic simulations (■), at application rates of 42 (— —), 125 (— —) and 250kg/ha (—) of single superphosphate.	127
Figure 6-16: Risk -efficient frontier (solid line) for different combinations of stocking rate, fertiliser and pasture sowing management strategies. Efficient sets are all operating on degraded pasture and are identified by stocking rate and fertiliser level (SR/LP=42, MP=125, and HP=250kg single superphosphate/ha/year). Sown pasture combinations are indicated by triangles (▲) and degraded pasture by circles (●)	130
Figure 6-17: Percentage difference between stochastic and dynamic simulation output for wool production and Present Value on degraded pasture under different stocking rates and 125kg/ha single superphosphate application. Combinations of climate and botanical composition conditions are: deterministic climate/static botanical composition (♦); stochastic climate/static botanical composition (▲); and deterministic climate/dynamic botanical composition (■) .	132
Figure 7-1: Relationship between the sum of squared deviations (d_K) of probabilities and iterations for a given initial state.	148
Figure 7-2: Optimal trajectories for high, moderate and low phosphorus input systems, for the initial states of 0.15 desirable/900kg DM/ha (—); 0.75 desirable/900kg DM/ha (—); 0.15 desirable/2500kg DM/ha (—); and 0.75 desirable/2500kg DM/ha (—), under the base merino wether wool production system.	150
Figure 7-3: Index of present values, V , for each sheep production system under different levels of fertiliser input. For each system PV Index =1 with 0.05 proportion desirables. Low input system (■), Moderate input system (♦) and High input system (▲).....	154
Figure 7-4: Mean optimal seasonal stocking rates (hd/ha) under different sheep production systems, wool (□), wool:meat (■) and meat (■).....	155
Figure 7-5: Stocking Rate contour plots showing the relationship between the state of the pasture resource, in terms of season, pasture mass and proportion of desirables, on the optimal stocking rate decision for the moderate input wool system. ■ = grazing rest, ■ ≤ 14, ■ ≤ 27, ■ ≤ 40, ■ > 40 hd/ha, * indicates regions where re-sowing is the optimal decision.	157
Figure 7-6: Tactical grazing rests (when $sr = 0$ hd/ha) as determined by pasture state, in terms of initial pasture mass and the proportion of desirables, for each season under a moderate input wool production system. Seasons are 1 = autumn, 2 = winter, 3 = spring and 4 = summer. Box plot cell means linked and indicated by joining line (—).....	158

Figure 7-7: Comparison of changes to the state of the pasture when re-sow decisions are optimal under different pasture sowing costs for the moderate input wool system. Seasons are 1 = autumn, 2 = winter, 3 = spring and 4 = summer. Box plot cell means linked and indicated by joining line (—) and grand mean indicated by broken line (---). 161

Figure 7-8: Effect of discount rate on the optimal proportion of desirables for each season under a moderate input wool production system. Discount rates are 3% (x), 4.94% (▲), 7% (♦) and 10% (■). 162

List of Tables

Table 3-1: A chronological sample of published studies in the area of pasture resource development and management.....	40
Table 5-1: Major components of the sub-models	60
Table 5-2: DPRD model parameters and constants	60
Table 6-1: Classification of dominant pasture species into desirable, undesirable, and functional groups. Boldest species indicate those representative species used in the <i>AusFarm</i> simulations.....	97
Table 6-2: DSE ratings applied to livestock grazing Cicerone farmlet paddocks. Sourced from Davies (2005).....	100
Table 6-3: Simulated cutting periods for the recording of residual dry matter and post-cutting daily pasture growth rate.....	105
Table 6-4: Seasonal values of Y_{max} (kg DM/ha) applied to each year and seasonal group of observations.	106
Table 6-5: Summary of coefficient estimates and statistics for 2004.	107
Table 6-6: Pasture quality parameters, δ_{Udp} and δ_{Ddp} , the proportions of dry matter in each digestibility pool applied for each season for the desirable and undesirable sward components.....	111
Table 6-7: Daily pasture decay rates, σ_D and σ_U , for desirable and undesirable swards.	112
Table 6-8: Estimated α_S , ρ_S and cumulative intrinsic rate of growth ρ_H for the 'Big Ridge' site. $FE = 1.0$ and $\kappa_C = 0.95$	114
Table 6-9: Intrinsic rate of desirable population growth, ρ_C	115
Table 6-10: Predicted values of λ_{SC} used in the DPRD model.	116
Table 6-11: Supplementary feeding decision rules applied in the DPRD model with the quantity offered being <i>SDM</i>	119
Table 6-12: Results of the stochastic simulation experiments (mean of 300 iterations with one standard deviation in parenthesis). SS is single superphosphate.	121
Table 6-13: Results of the deterministic simulation experiments. Proportion of desirables at end of simulation is 0.44 and 0.95 for degraded and sown pastures. SS is single superphosphate....	123
Table 6-14: Mean percentage differences in performance measures between the stochastic/dynamic base case and different combinations of deterministic climatic and static botanical composition conditions.....	132
Table 7-1: State variables and their boundaries.....	141
Table 7-2: Summary of state vector, z	142
Table 7-3: Decision variables that make up the decision vector \mathbf{u}_t^s	143
Table 7-4: Derivation of wool and meat value adjustment factors for different sheep production systems from industry gross margins. Gross margin data sourced from Davies and Scott (2007).....	145
Table 7-5: Optimal target levels for the proportion desirables, pasture mass and stocking rate, under alternative sheep production and input systems.....	151
Table 7-6: Mean present values (\$/ha) for different input and sheep production systems under optimal management across all states of pasture mass and proportions of desirables (coefficient of variation as % in parenthesis).	153
Table 7-7: Maximum pasture mass quantities below which re-sowing becomes the optimal decision for each season, input, sheep production system and proportion of desirables.	159

Acronyms and Abbreviations

DPRD	Dynamic Pasture Resource Development
DM	Dry Matter
DSE	Dry Sheep Equivalent
HRTPZ	High Rainfall Temperate Pasture Zone
SDP	Stochastic Dynamic Programming
TPM	Transition Probability Matrix