THE CROP INSURANCE SCHEME REGULATIONS

The Act requires growers who produce in excess of twenty tonnes of fruit in the immediate preceding season to effect Fruit Crop Insurance in respect to fruit which is to be grown for marketing as packed fruit

Packed fruit is defined as follows

"a quantity of fruit which is -

- a. Produced in any year comeening on 1st July by a grower to whom the Act apples; and
- b. measured as the equivalent standard cartons, each containing 18 kilograms of fruit, and includes any such quantity of fruit which is sold in a carton, bin, bag, or any other container, whether by way of roadside, local, mainland or overseas sale but does not include fruit which is produced for canning, juicing or any other from of processing or which is dumped."

Only 90% of the base insurable quantity of fruit can be insured. This term is defined as:-

the average quantity of packed fruit produced from the trees grown on all the land occupied by a grower in Tasmania during the 4-year period immediately preceding 1 July 1991; or

such quantity of packed fruit as the Board may pursuant to Regulation 12, determine to be the base insurable quantity of packed fruit produced by the grower.

Regulation 12 provides -

"Where a grower to whom the Act applies satisfies the Board that there was during the 4 year period or the current season a substantial change in the amount of packed fruit produced by that grower as appears to be just and equitable, having regard to the

nature of the change in the amount of packed fruit produced or to be produced by that grower."

Percent base premium paid in preceding season	Percent base premium paid for current scheme							
	Claim in preceding season	No claim in preceding season						
60	80	60						
70	90	60						
80	100	70						
90	110	80						
100	120	90						
110	130	100						
120	140	110						
130	150	120						
140	160	130						
150	160	140						
160	160	160						

Source: (Act 1982)

GROWER DISCUSSION PROFORMA

AIM OF DISCUSSION

I have been evaluating the compulsory crop insurance scheme on the basis of its impact on the businesses operating in the apple industry.

Part of the work is in talking to a couple of growers about their orchards, about their business and about their attitudes to insurance. The reason for this is people are a very important part of the evulation process.

What I would like to talk to you is about your orchard business. The information remains confidential. Some informations will be contained in my study but no reference will be made by name. My interest being in an evaluation of the scheme rather than an evaluation of the person.

QUESTIONS

General

How many years have you worked your orchard area?

What area of orchard is under your control?

Who operates this orchard area?

Family Self Company Other

Do you pack your own fruit? If no what does it cost you each year?

ORCHARD INFORMATION

New varieties

If you were to group your varieties into 4 representative varieties; Goldies, Red Dels, Older style varieties and new varieties such as Red Fuji what areas would you grow of each

you grow of each Old style varieties, eg democrat
Golden delicious
Red delicious
New varieties eg Red Fuji
What yield for a mature orchard would you expect each year and what packout? Old style varieties
Golden delicious
Red delicious
New varieties
For the four varieties what average price would you expect to receive for your first grade fruit? Old style varieties
Old style varieties
Golden delicious
·
Golden delicious
Golden delicious Red delicious
Golden delicious Red delicious New varieties In terms of growing costs which would be the cheapest variety to grow, which would be the most expensive

INSURANCE

How many times have you made a claim for damaged fruit since 1982? Do you know which year?

For what reason did you make the claim?

Hail

Frost

Other

Chances of Frost damage.

There are a few things I am looking at here; The chances of frost in your orchard at various times of the year, the number of frosts in that period and the chances that it causes damage to your crop and the amount of damage it would cause.

TIME	NUMBER	light damage	heavy damage	destroyed
Early Oct	0 -			
Late Oct	0 -			
Early Nov	0 -			
Late Nov	0 -			
Early Dec	0 -			

Damage levels

None

Low

Medium

Totally destroyed

HAIL

For hail how often would you expect a storm

occassionally

one a year

two a year
>2 a year
What level of damages do you get from hail
None
Low
Medium
High.

THE INSURANCE SCHEME

What do you think	of the current cr	rop insurance	scheme	that runs in	the apple
industry?					

What is your aim when you insure your crop under the Scheme?

Would you be interested in paying a higher premium if you knew in a bad year the payout would be covering most of your growing costs?

If crop insurance was not compulsory, would you still insure your crop?

If there was no compulsory insurance scheme would you use other methods of crop protection?

Hail netting

Frost sprinklers

Methods of business protection

Crop Revenue insurance

Just grin and bear it

Put away money in a good year and hold until a bad year

SUMMARY OF CLIMATIC DATA

3.1. INCIDENCE OF FROST EVENTS AT DPIF'S GROVE RESEARCH STATION

For each month of the critical period since records began shown in Table C1, an @RISK risk discrete function was used.

for October the distribution for frost events was

=riskdiscrete(
$$\{0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9\},\{5,1,4,7,4,4,2,3,2,2\}$$
)

for November the distribution for frost events was

for December the distribution for frost events was

=riskdiscrete(
$$\{0,1,2,3,4\},\{20,10,2,4,1\}$$
)

3.2 SUMMARY OF HAIL DATA FOR 1957-1993 FOR GROVE RESEARCH STATION

The distribution developed for the simulationS for hail events was an @RISK risk discrete function.

$$=$$
riskdiscrete({0,1,2,3},{21,11,4,2})

The source information for this distribution is found in the Table C2.

Table C1
Summary of Frost Events at Grove for 1957-93

YEAR	EARLY	LATE	EARLY	LATE	EARLY
	OCT.	OCT.	NOV.	NOV	DEC
1957	4	1	5	4	0
1958	1	5	0	1	2
1959	4	5	3	1	0
1960	3	5	2	3	1
1961	11	1	0	2	0
1962	4	1	1	0	2
1963	3	0	5	0	4
1964	0	0	0	0	0
1965	3	1	0	0	0
1966	3	1	1	0	3
1967	3	2	0	0	0
1968	6	2	1	0	0
1969	4	5	3	2	0
1970	2	3	1	1	2
1971	1	1	0	0	0
1972	4	5	3	2	0
1973	4	0	0	1	0
1974	5	2	1	0	0
1975	1	4	1	2	1
1976	3	4	0	0	0
1977	1	6	6	3	4
1978	4	4	2	0	1
1979	4	2	1	0	1
1980	2	0	1	1	1
1981	1	2	4	1	0
1982	0	1	0	0	1
1983	3	0	0	0	1
1984	1	3	1	1	0
1985	2	1	0	0	0
1986	2	0	0	0	1
1987	0	0	0	0	0
1988	0	0	0	0	2
1989	0	0	0	0	1
1990	3	0	0	0	0
1991	3	0	0	0	0
1992	2	1	0	0	1
1993	0	0	1	1	0

Table C2
Hail Events at Grove 1957-93

Year	No of hail events per
	growing season
1957	0
1958	0
1959	1
1960	0
1961	1
1962	1
1963	0
1964	1
1965	3
1966	2
1967	0
1968	1
1969	1
1970	0
1971	2
1972	0
1973	0
1974	0
1975	0
1976	0
1977	2
1978	0
1979	0
1980	1
1981	0
1982	0
1983	0
1984	0
1985	0
1986	3
1987	1
1988	0
1989	1
1990	2
1991	0
1992	0
1993	1

STRUCTURE OF THE SIMULATION MODEL USED

4 5 BUSIN 6 Borrow 7 Interes 8 Interes 9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Light 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dar 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	E STUDY NUMBER:	INVESTA APPLE O	MENT AN	IALYSIS							
3 CASE 4 5 BUSIN 6 Borrow 7 Interes 8 Interes 9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree		APPLE O						1			
4 5 BUSIN 6 Borrow 7 Interes 8 Interes 9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			RCHAR	IN TASK	AINAN						
5 BUSIN 6 Borrow 7 Interes 8 Interes 9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree		THREE									
6 Borrow 7 Interes 8 Interes 9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree											
7 Interes 8 Interes 9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	NESS TYPE	Partnership									
8 Interes 9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	wings % of assets	0									
9 Loan t 10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	est rate on loans	0.11									
10 11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Light 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	est earned on property surpl	0									
11 12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Light 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	term - years	10									
12 Size 13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree											
13 Effecti 14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree											
14 Tree d 15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree		10									
15 16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Light 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	tive orchard	10									
16 CAPIT 17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	density/ha	800									
17 Land p 18 1. Ligh 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree											
18 1. Light 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	TAL COSTS										
18 1. Light 19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	price \$/ha	15000									
19 hours 20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	ght Clearing										
20 bed fo 21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree		0									
21 cost/h 22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	orming - hrs per ha	4		-							
22 2. Dan 23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tre		35						1			
23 earthw 24 excave 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tre										 	
24 excava 25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tre	works cu metres	22275						1	 	l	
25 3. Irrig 26 lines/d 27 4. Tree	vation \$/ cubic m	2					 	1	 		
26 lines/d 27 4. Tre		_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					 	 	 	
27 4. Tre	drippers mains \$/ha	5000					 	 	†		
	ee costs \$/tree						 		 	 	
	ocrat \$/tree	3.6			<u> </u>		1	 			
29 Golder	en Delicious	3.6					1	1	<u> </u>		
30 Red D		4				<u> </u>		1			
31 Red Fu		4.5				†		 	1		
	ing costs \$/tree	1.59						 	 		
33 5. Oth		-t					†		 		
34 Lime t	rner costs	Б					 	1	 	 	
35 Spread			~			 	 	 	 		

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ı ı	J	К
36				·····				1			
37	6. Machinery	price	deprec	life	salvage					İ	
	Workshop	10000	375	20	2500					<u> </u>	
	70 hp tractor	60000	4500	10	15000						
40	40 hp 2nd hand	0	0	10	0						1
41	Sprayer	18000	1350	10	4500						
42	Slasher/mower	1500	56.25	20	375						
43	Fertiliser spreader	1500	56.25	20	375						
44	Trailer	1000	37.5	20	250						
45	Pump	3500	262.5	10	875						
46											
47											
48	OVERHEAD COSTS										1
49	Council rates	1200									
50	Accountant fees	1500									
51	Bank charges	1200									
52	Permanent labour	0									
53	Registrations	1500									
54	Fuel and oil	1500									7
55	R&M machinery @3%	2865									
56											
57	FARM DRAWINGS	35000									
58											
59	VARIETAL INFORMATION										
60		Proportion		Yield	Packout	Price 1st	Proc	Juice			
61	Democrat	6%		3200	80%	14.66667	3	2			
62	Golden Delicious	14%		3000	80%	17.66667	3	2			
63	Red Delicious	72%		2850	85%	19.33333	3	2			
64	Red Fuji	8%		2400	70%	29	3	2			
65		100%									
66	PROCESSING PROPORTION										
67		Can	Juice								
68	Democrat	50%	50%								
69	Golden Delicious	67%	33%								
70	Red Delicious	0%	100%								
71	Red Fuji	67%	33%								
72											

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	J	К
73										
74	PROCESS EQUIVALENT PRICE \$/Ctn									
75	Democrat	2.50								
76	Golden Delicious	2.67								
77	Red Delicious	2.00								
78	Red Fuji	2.67								
79										
80	INSURANCE PAYOUT									
81	Processing	1.7		·						
	Juicing	2.3								
83	Destroyed	2								
84										
85										
86	GROWING COSTS									
87	Democrat	3.25	0							
88	Golden Delicious	2.6	0							
89	Red Delicious	3	0							
90	Red Fuji	4	0							
91										
92	INSURANCE COSTS c/1st ctn									
93	Democrat	0.16								
94	Golden Delicious	0.16								
95	Red Delicious	0.16								
96	Red Fuji	0.16								
97										
98	MARKETING COSTS (Pack and freight)									
99	Democrat	10	0							
100	Golden Delicious	10	0							
101	Red Delicious	12	0							
102	Red Fuji	12	0							
103										
104	PROCESSING COSTS (Sort and freight)								
	Democrat	1.25								
	Golden Delicious	1.25								
	Red Delicious	1.25								
	Red Fuji	1.25								
109										

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	н	ī	J	К
110		1			-						
111		<u> </u>									
	Yield as % of mature production	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	YIELD BASE WHOLE FARM										
114	Democrat	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920
115	Golden Delicious	4200	4200	4200	4200	4200	4200	4200	4200	4200	4200
116	Red Delicious	20520	20520	20520	20520	20520	20520	20520	20520	20520	20520
	Red Fuji	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920	1920
118	TOTAL YIELD	28560	28560	28560	28560	28560	28560	28560	28560	28560	28560
119											
	INSURED YIELD										
	Democrat	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4	1382.4
	Golden Delicious	3024	3024	3024	3024	3024	3024	3024	3024	3024	3024
	Red Delicious	15698	15698	15698	15698	15698	15698	15698	15698	15698	15698
	Red Fuji	1210	1210	1210	1210	1210	1210	1210	1210	1210	1210
	TOTAL INSURED YIELD	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314
126											
127		2									
128		1									
	FROST INFORMATION	1									
130	YEAR	1									
	FROST OCT	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
_	FROST NOV	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	FROST DEC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
134											
	SEVERITY OCTOBER										
	DAMAGE PARAMETERS	VALUE		DAMAGE							
	None	0.1		0							
	Light	0.4		0.3							
	Moderate	0.8		0.5							
	Wiped out	1	•	1							
141		 									
142											
	SEVERITY NOVEMBER	<u> </u>									
	DAMAGE PARAMETERS	VALUE		DAMAGE							
	None	0.3		0							
146	Light	0.6		0.2							

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ı	J	K
147	Moderate	0.9		0.4							
148	Wiped out	1		1							
149							*				
150											
151	SEVERITY DECEMBER										
152	DAMAGE PARAMETERS	VALUE		DAMAGE							
153	None	0.5		0							
154	Light	0.8		0.1							
	Moderate	0.95		0.2							
	Wiped out	1		1							
157											
	YEAR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	SEVERITY OCTOBER										
	TRIANG(0,.2,1)	0.310613	0.310613	0.3106129	0.3106129	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613
	None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
	Light	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
163	Moderate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wiped out	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
165											
166											
	SEVERITY NOVEMBER										
168	TRIANG(0,.2,1)	0.310613	0.310613	0.3106129	0.3106129	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613
169	None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Light	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Moderate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
	Wiped out	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
173											
174											
	SEVERITY DECEMBER										
	TRIANG(0,.2,1)	0.310613	0.310613	0.3106129	0.3106129	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613	0.310613
	None	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Light	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Moderate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
180	Wiped out	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
181											
182	DAMAGE OCTOBER										
183	None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н		J	к
194	Light A	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
	Moderate	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3		0.3
	Wiped out	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	damage magnitude	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
188		0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
	DAMAGE NOVEMBER										
	None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Light	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
	Moderate	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
	Wiped out	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	damage magnitude	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
195		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
	DAMAGE DECEMBER										
	None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Light	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Moderate	0		0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wiped out	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	damage magnitude	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö
202		 									——————————————————————————————————————
	DAMAGE HAIL EVENTS	0									
	Hail Distribution	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
205		Value	Damage								——— <u> </u>
	none	0									
	light	0.4	0.2	-							
	moderate	0.7	0.35								
	severe	0.9	0.55								
210			0.00								
	DAMAGE TRIAG	0.243524	0.243524	0 2435244	0.2435244	0 243524	0.243524	0 243524	0.243524	0.243524	0.243524
212						0.2.002.	0.2,002,	0.210021	0.210021	0.210021	0.2 (002)
	HAIL DAMAGE LEVEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL HAIL DAMAGE	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
215		1							= =====================================		
	YIELD DAMAGED 1ST GRADE	1									
	FROST	<u> </u>			·				l		
	OCTOBER	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394
	NOVEMBER	4263	4263	4263	4263	4263	4263	4263	4263	4263	4263
	DECEMBER	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н		J	К
221	HAIL										
222	OCTOBER-MARCH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
223											
224	DAMAGE ACTUAL	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394
225	THRESHOLD VALUE	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
226	THRESHOLD DAMAGE	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
227	DAMAGE ABOVE THRESHOLD	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394
228							Ī				
229	DAMAGE BY VARIETY										
230	Democrat	415	415	415	415	415	415	415	415	415	415
231	Golden Delicious	907	907	907	907	907	907	907	907	907	907
232	Red Delicious	4709	4709	4709	4709	4709	4709	4709	4709	4709	4709
233	Red Fuji	363	363	363	363	363	363	363	363	363	363
234	TOTAL DAMAGE CHECK	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394	6394
235	NET 1ST GRADE										
236	Democrat	968	968	968	968	968	968	968	968	968	968
237	Golden Delicious	2117	2117	2117	2117	2117	2117	2117	2117	2117	2117
238	Red Delicious	10988	10988	10988	10988	10988	10988	10988	10988	10988	10988
239	Red Fuji	847	847	847	847	847	847	847	847	847	847
240											
241	INSURANCE PREMIUMS										
242	PRODUCTION BASE	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314	21314
243											
244	CLAIM ON INSURANCE	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ
	MAXIMUM PREMIUM	N	N	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ
	MINIMUM PREMIUM	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	PREMIUM WITH NO CLAIM	0.144	0.176	0.208	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
	PREMIUM WITH CLAIM	0.192	0.224	0.256	0.288	0.288	0.288	0.288	0.288	0.288	0.288
	MAX PREMIUM	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256
	MIN PREMIUM	0.096	0.096	0.096	0.096	0.096	0.096	0.096	0.096	0.096	0.096
251											
252	PREMIUM BASE	0.16	0.192	0.224	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256	0.256
253		CAPITA	L NEEDE	D							
254											
255	CAPITAL INVESTMENT										
256	LAND DEVELOPMENT										

.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н	ı l	J	K
257	Land	150000					1				
258	Bed forming	1400									
259	Dam building	44550									
260	Irrigation pipes/drippers	50000									
261											
262	MACHINERY										
263	Workshop	10000									
	70 hp tractor	60000									
265	40 hp 2nd hand	0									
	Sprayer	18000									
267	Slasher/mower	1500									***************************************
268	Fertiliser spreader	1500									
269	Trailer	1000									
	Pump	3500									
271											
	trees 50% in yrs 1 & 2										
273	Democrat	864									
	Golden Delicious	4032									
	Red Delicious	23040									
	Red Fuji	2880									
	planting cost	6360									
278											
	TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS	378626	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
280											
	YEAR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
282	<u> </u>										
_	VARIABLE COSTS										
	Democrat	6240	6240	6240	6240	6240	6240	6240	6240	6240	6240
	Golden Delicious	10920	10920	10920	10920	10920	10920	10920	10920	10920	10920
	Red Delicious	61560	61560	61560	61560	61560	61560	61560	61560	61560	61560
	Red Fuji	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680
288											
	INSURANCE COSTS										
	Democrat	221	221	221	221	221	221	221	221	221	221
	Golden Delicious	484	484	484	484	484	484	484	484	484	484
	Red Delicious	2512	2512	2512	2512	2512	2512	2512	2512	2512	2512
293	Red Fuji	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194

•

	T	В			- 1	F		····	, ,		
294	Α	- B	С	D	E	<u> </u>	G	н	!		К
	PACK AND SELLING COSTS										
	Democrat - Firsts	9677	9677	9677	9677	9677	9677	9677	9677	9677	9677
	Golden Delicious - firsts	21168	21168	21168		21168			21168		
	Red Delicious - firsts	109885	109885	109885	21168		21168	21168		21168	21168
	Red Fuji - firsts				109885	109885	109885	109885	109885	109885	109885
300	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8467	8467	8467	8467	8467	8467	8467	8467	8467	8467
	SORT AND SELLING COSTS	1050	4050								4070
_	Democrat - process	1056	1056	1056	1056	1056	1056	1056	1056	1056	1056
	Golden Delicious - process	2310	2310	2310	2310	2310	2310	2310	2310	2310	2310
	Red Delicious - process	10388	10388	10388	10388	10388	10388	10388	10388	10388	10388
	Red Fuji - process	1224	1224	1224	1224	1224	1224	1224	1224	1224	1224
306											
	TOTAL VARIABLE COSTS	253985	253985	253985	253985	253985	253985	253985	253985	253985	253985
308							-				
	OVERHEAD COSTS										
	Council rates	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
311	Accountant fees	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500
	Bank charges	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
313	Permanent labour	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
314	Registrations	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500
315	Fuel and oil	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500
316	Repairs and maintenance	2865	2865	2865	2865	2865	2865	2865	2865	2865	2865
317											
318	Depreciation	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5	6637.5
319											
320	TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
321				-							
322	TOTAL GROWING COSTS	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810
323											
324	TOTAL MARKETING COSTS	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175
325											
326	TOTAL OVERHEAD COSTS	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5	16402.5
327	 										
	TOTAL ALL COSTS	270387.6	270387.6	270387.56	270387.56	270387.6	270387.6	270387.6	270387.6	270387.6	270387.6
329											
330											
330	4 <u> </u>					L					

	Α	В	С	D	E	F]	G	н	ī	J	К
331		PROFIT AN	ID LOSS	STATEMEN	Т						
332											
333	YEAR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
334											
335	REVENUE										
336	1. First Grade										
337	Democrat	14193	14193	14193	14193	14193	14193	14193	14193	14193	14193
338	Golden Delicious	37397	37397	37397	37397	37397	37397	37397	37397	37397	37397
339	Red Delicious	212444	212444	212444	212444	212444	212444	212444	212444	212444	212444
340	Red Fuji	24555	24555	24555	24555	24555	24555	24555	24555	24555	24555
341	2. Processing										
342	Democrat	2381	2381	2381	2381	2381	2381	2381	2381	2381	2381
343	Golden Delicious	5562	5562	5562	5562	5562	5562	5562	5562	5562	5562
344	Red Delicious	19063	19063	19063	19063	19063	19063	19063	19063	19063	19063
345	Red Fuji	2866	2866	2866	2866	2866	2866	2866	2866	2866	2866
346											
347	3. Insurance										
348	Democrat	829	829	829	829	829	829	829	829	829	829
349	Golden Delicious	1722	1722	1722	1722	1722	1722	1722	1722	1722	1722
350	Red Delicious	10831	10831	10831	10831	10831	10831	10831	10831	10831	10831
	Red Fuji	689	689	689	689	689	689	689	689	689	689
352											
353	INTEREST EARNED		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
354											
355											
	TOTAL REVENUE	332531	332531	332531	332531	332531	332531	332531	332531	332531	332531
357		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	LESS										
	COST OF GOODS SOLD										
360	GROWING COSTS	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810	89810
361											
362	MARKETING COSTS	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175	164175
363											
364	GROSS PROFIT/(LOSS)	78546	78546	78546	78546	78546	78546	78546	78546	78546	78546
365	less										
	Overhead costs	16403	16403	16403	16403	16403	16403	16403	16403	16403	16403
367	Interest paid overdraft										

	•										
	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ŀ	J	K
	Interest paid loans	0									
369											
	NET INCOME BEFORE TAX	62144	62144	62144	62144	62144	62144	62144	62144	62144	62144
371		<u> </u>									
	NON DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSES	ļ									
	Managers labour	35000	35000	35000	35000	35000	35000	35000	35000	35000	35000
	Capital repayments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Taxation paid	18643	18643	18643	18643	18643	18643	18643	18643	18643	18643
376											
	NET INCOME AFTER TAX	8500	8500	8500	8500	8500	8500	8500	8500	8500	8500
378											
	CUMULATIVE CASHFLOW	8500	17001	25501	34002	42502	51003	59503	68004	76504	85005
380	J										
381		 									
382	CTATELLY OF ACCETS AND HADI										
	STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABIL	ITIES									
	ASSETS	070000	070000	070000	070000	070000	070000			070000	07000
		378626	378626	378626	378626	378626	378626	378626	378626	378626	378626
	Machinery	91000	84362.5	77725	71087.5	64450	57812.5	51175	44537.5	37900	31262.5
387	Working capital account	8500.476	17001	25501	34002	42502	51003	59503	68004	76504	85005
388	TOTAL ACCETS	460626	462000	456051	440744	442076	426420	420004	400404	446536	400000
390	TOTAL ASSETS	469626	462989	456351	449714	443076	436439	429801	423164	416526	409889
390		 									
	LIABILITIES	 									
_	Capital loans	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Overdraft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Interest paid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
396	Intelest haid			 			- 0				
	TOTAL LIABILITIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
398				- 0				- 0			
	EQUITY	469626	462988.5	456351	449713.5	443076	436438.5	429801	423163.5	416526	409888.5
400		700020	,5255.5	40001	770710.0	440070	700700.0	723001	723103.8	710020	+00000.0
	EQUITY %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
401	EQUIT 76	100 /6	100 /6	100 %	10076	100 76	100 76	10076	10076	10076	100 %

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Biennial Bearing

Apple trees that are not managed properly tend toward biennial bearing. In an "on" year there would be high numbers of smaller fruit and in an "off" year there would be lower numbers of larger fruit. A way to combat biennial bearing trees is by thinning (q.v).

Bin

A measure of fruit containing approximately 20 cartons of fruit. Net fruit weight would be in the order of 360 kg but does vary depending on the size of fruit. A bin of small fruit would weigh more than a bin of large fruit because there are less air spaces around the fruit.

Bushel

Volume of fruit equivalent to an 18 kg carton.

Carton

There are two sizes of cartons used in the industry, an Australian Standard Carton measuring 500 mm by 300 mm by 290 mm and carrying a maximum of 216 58 mm diameter fruit carton and a Scoresby or Standard carton. Packed cartons can weigh 18-20 kg.

Count

Way of expressing the size of apples. An apple of 80 count would be approximately 140 mm in diameter and a weight 180 g. The count is used to describe the number of fruit per carton. Therefore for an 80 count there would be 80 apples per carton. Fruit size range is from 64 per carton to 216 per standard carton (see carton).

Frost Sprinklers

Frost is triggered by low temperatures and so sensors in orchard areas trigger sprays that douse the trees in water which then freezes protecting the trees from the damaging effects of frost. The reason for spraying water onto trees is that the water freezes on the surface of the plant thereby protecting the water contained plant cells that if frozen breaks the cell membrane causing damage (Douglas 1995).

Packout

The percentage of fruit that is packed as first grade fruit. Normally expressed as a percentage but can also be expressed as number of cartons (qv) per bin (qv). For example Red Delicious ranges from 75 percent to 90 percent packout or 15 to 19 cartons per 20 carton bin.

Pollinators Cross Pollination

Few varieties of apples can self pollinate. Most need a pollinator that flowers at the same time to enable commercial crops to be grown. In recent orchard plantings the ratio of the main variety to a pollinator is 9 trees per pollinator tree. Another way of pollinating is to graft a branch of a pollinator onto the tree needing pollination.

Reworking

Grafting of new budwood to existing trees or rootstock to change varieties without grubbing out and replanting orchard areas.

Russet

A skin disorder of apples that results in the skin taking on a corky texture brown in colour. Russet can be caused by chemical scalding or natural causes. Significant percentages of an apple's skin affected by russet will cause the apple to be downgraded in price or processed.

Thinning

The practice of decreasing the number of fruit per tree either by use of chemicals or physically hand thinning trees. It is by utilising thinning technology - both chemical and physical that the biennial cropping characteristic of apple trees is decreased. If fruit numbers are not decreased after fruit set, the resultant crop could be made up of large numbers of fruit of a diameter of less than 30 mm which have no commercial value in the fresh fruit market.

Typey

Each variety has a certain shape. Some may be conical meaning its wide at the stem end and narrower at the calyx end. The shapes of common varieties are

Red Delicious - Conical and blocky
Golden Delicious - Slightly conical
Red Fuji - Round
Johnagold - similar to Golden Delicious but with red blush

Wind rub or Limb rub

A problem that develops when there is repeated rubbing of limbs across fruit. It results in a brownish area of skin and sometimes bruising. This leads to downgrading of fruit to the processing markets.

REFERENCES

- Act (1982) Tasmanian Apple and Pear Industry (Crop Insurance) Act. Tasmanian Government Printer, Hobart.
- Anderson, J.R, Dillon J.L., Hardaker J.B. (1988) Agricultural Decision Analysis. Printery, University of New England, Armidale.
- Anderson, J.R and Hardaker J.B. (1988) Preparation of Reports on Research in Agricultural Economics. 8th edition. University of New England, Armidale.
- Anon. (1995) 'Hail canopy gives more than shelter' Horticultural News. 17(4), 8.
- ABS (1987) Agriculture Tasmania 1965-1986. ABS Catalogue Number 7112.6, ABS, Hobart.
- ABS (1993) Summary of Crops Australia 1992-93. ABS Catalogue Number 7330.0, ABS, Hobart.
- ABS (1994) Summary of Crops Australia 1993-94. ABS Catalogue Number 7330.0, ABS, Hobart.
- AHC (1994) 'Tree system boost for crops.' Apple and Pear News 46, 4.
- BAE (1986) Crop and Rainfall Insurance: A BAE Submission to the IAC. Australian Government Printing Service, Canberra.
- Bharat, Ramaswami. (1993) 'Supply response to agricultural insurance; risk reduction and moral hazard.' <u>American Journal of Agricultural Economics</u> 75(4), 914-25.
- Bright, Francis (1994a) 'How efficient is your orchard?' <u>Pome Fruits Newsletter</u>. Number 21 February 1994, 2. Department of Primary and Industry and Fisheries, Hobart.
- Bright, Francis (1994b) 'What are your production costs? <u>Pome Fruits Newsletter</u>. Number 21 February 1994, 21. Department of Primary and Industry and Fisheries, Hobart.

- Bright, Francis (1994c) 'Prices in the Sydney market' <u>Pome Fruits Newsletter</u>. Number 22 May 1994, 55. Department of Primary and Industry and Fisheries, Hobart.
- Bureau of Meteorology (1995) <u>Climaticalogical Data Grove 94069.</u> Data Summary of all years on record ending 1992.
- Carne, W.M. (1948) The Non-parsitic Disorders of Apple Fruits in Australia. Bulletin No 238. Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Melbourne.
- Chambers, Robert G. (1989) 'Insurability and moral hazard in agricultural insurance markets.' <u>American Journal of Agricultural Economics</u> 71(3), 604-15.
- Department of Agriculture (1982) The Tasmanian Apple Industry A Report for the Minister. Department of Agriculture, Hobart. (confidential).
- Douglas, Fiona (1995) 'Can you afford not not protect your crop?' Good Fruit and Vegetables 5(9), 25-26.
- DPIF (1992) Agstats Tasmania Principal Statistics Relative to Primary Industries. A compilation of ABS Statistics. DPIF, Hobart.
- Ferguson, G A. (1968) The application of crop insurance: A case study of the Tasmanian apple and pear crop insurance scheme. B.Ag.Ec thesis, University of New England, Armidale.
- Goodwin, Barry K. (1993) 'An empircial analysis of the demand for multiple peril crop insurance.' American Journal of Agricultural Economics 75(2), 425-434.
- Gordon, Ron (1994) <u>The Bottom Line: An Investment Appraisal of Two Apple Production Systems</u>, <u>Batlow and District</u>. New South Wales Agriculture, Tumut.
- Halcrow, H.G. (1949) 'Actuarial structures for crop insurance.' <u>Journal of Farm</u> Economics 31(3), 418-444.

- Hughes, Jack. (1994) 'An assessment of high and medium density planting systems for royal gala in Hawkes Bay.' The Orchardist December 1994, 20-24.
- Kirby, Michael C., Sinden J.A. and Kaine G.W. (1993) 'Appraisal of agroforestry investment under uncertainty: a South Australian case study.' <u>Australian Forestry 56(2)</u>, 109-119.
- Lee, Ivan M. (1953) 'Temperature insurance an alternative to frost insurance.'

 <u>Journal of Farm Economics</u> 35(1),15-28.
- Makeham J.P. and Malcolm L.R. (1993) *The Farming Game Now*. Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.
- Milham, Nicholas P. (1992) Financial Structure and risk management of woolgrowing farms: a dynamic stochastic budgeting approach. Masters of Economics dissertation. University of New England, Armidale.
- Miranda, Mario J. (1991) 'Area yield crop insurance reconsidered.' <u>American Journal of Agricultural Economics</u> 73(2), 233-42.
- Middleton, Simon. (1995) 'Hail netting creates new orchard environment' <u>Pome</u>

 <u>Fruit Australia.</u> Australian Apple and Pear Growers Association, Melbourne.
- Morgan, Joan and Richards, Alison. (1993), *The Book of Apples*. Ebury Press Ltd, London.
- Nelson, Carl H. and Loehman, Edna. (1987), 'Further toward a theory of agricultural insurance' <u>American Journal of Agricultural Economics</u> 69(3), 523-31.
- O'Loughlin, John (1994) 'The changing apple industry' <u>Pome Fruits Newsletter</u>. Number 23 November 1994, 119. Department of Primary and Industry and Fisheries, Hobart.
- O'Loughlin, John (1995) 'Minimum return per bin required in a new planting' <u>Pome Fruits Bulletin</u>. Number 2 July 1995, 62-63. Department of Primary and Industry and Fisheries, Hobart.

- Pullar, D, Cadman, R, Lewis I and Morey P (1993) Winning the Race. Apples Case Study No 1. International Competitivenss in Australian Horticulture. for Horticultural Policy Council 1993, Canberra.
- Quiggin, J (1986) 'A note on the viability of rainfall insurance.' <u>Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics</u> 30(1), 63-69.
- Raskin, R and Cochran M.J. (1986) A Users Guide to the Generalized Stochastic Dominance Program for the IBM PC. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.
- Richardson, B.D, Bourke C.J, Hunt D.M. (1975) Review of the Pome Fruits Industry of Tasmania. Department of Agriculture, Hobart.
- Skees, Jerry R and Reed, Michael R. (1986) 'Rate making for farm level crop insurance: Implications for adverse selection <u>American Journal of Agricultural Economics</u> 66(3), 653-659.
- Tasmanian Government (1981) Statutory Rules, No. 212 Office of the Parliamentary Council. Government Printer, Hobart.
- Tasmanian Government (1982) Statutory Rules, No. 159 Office of the Parliamentary Council. Government Printer, Hobart.
- Tasmanian Government (1993a) Tasmanian Government Insurance Office (Sale) Act, No 27. Government Printer, Hobart.
- Tasmanian Government (1993b) Statutory Rules, No. 163 Office of the Parliamentary Council. Government Printer, Hobart.
- Tasmanian Government (1994) Statutory Rules, No 124 Office of the Parliamentary Council. Government Printer, Hobart.
- Thompson, David. (1995) 'An approach for analysing financial viability and risk on farms.' Paper distributed to the On Farm Risk Management Working Group (OFRMWG) a Sub Committee of the Standing Committee on Agricultural and Resource Management (SCARM). CARE, University of New England, Armidale.

- Thompson, John (1988) 'Fruit crop insurance' Apple and Pear Liaison Notes Special Edition. Number 77, October 1988, Department of Agriculture, Hobart.
- Van Putten, Ingrid (1995) Gross Margin Analysis of Tasmania Apple Varieties, DPIF Hobart funded by Horticultural Research Development Corporation (in press/forthcoming).