COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS: Containment Feeding

TAKE HOME MESSAGE:

Containment feeding, allowing more control over the feeding process and more frequent monitoring of the sheep may be a more reliable way to ensure that the CS objectives are met. For it to be profitable, the marginal costs of feeding in containment need to be less than the net benefit from being in better condition at lambing. It also requires that the same average result cannot be achieved out of containment.

BACKGROUND

Persistent dry conditions, with later autumn breaks, is having a detrimental impact on pasture production has seen increased interest in containment feeding from sheep producers in the Barossa region. In partnership with Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA), Barossa Improved Grazing Group's (BIGG) conducted a Producer Demonstration Sites (PDS) to demonstrate the practices and the outcomes from containment feeding. The PDS observed 3 major sites over three consecutive seasons starting in XX.

The PDS aimed to demonstrate and assess the use of an on-farm containment area to:

- Maintain annual enterprise stocking rate
- Maintain ground cover
- Increase the reproductive rate
- Maintain condition score of the ewe to increase lamb marking percentage and maintain wool cut.

Containment feeding PDS site, ?? SA.



ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

Data from the three major sites has been used to demonstrate a methodology for analysing the financial benefits that might be gained by using containment feeding over summer and autumn for a June lambing merino ewe flock.

Producers maintained higher ground cover and reported higher individual animal production that had been achieved in previous years. The difficulty for economic analysis is how to attribute the changed outcomes to the confinement feeding practices that were employed...

Based on the 3 main PDS sites, and an assumed 40% digestibility of pasture from Jan to April, the marginal cost of containment was $0.74 to $3.70. Under the assumption that the containment fed ewes were 0.5 of a CS better off than had they not been fed, and that containment feeding was going to be a more reliable way to achieve that outcome, the net benefit of the additional CS maintained in ewes from the progeny would therefore be between ~$8 per ewe and ~$5.30 (deduct the additional cost of containment feeding from the net benefit of ewes being 0.5 of a CS better at lambing).

The economic analysis did not attempt to quantify any additional benefits to pasture persistence or soil preservation that may also accrue from containment.

For further information and detailed analysis, please visit:
www.biggroup.org.au/ewe-containment-areas/

Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment
Future Drought Fund
SA DROUGHT HUB

This project received funding from the Australian Government's Future Drought Fund

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project is supported by the South Australian Drought Resilience Adoption and Innovation Hub, through funding from the Australian Government's Future Drought Fund.



This program received funding from the Australian Government's Future Drought Fund

DISCLAIMER

Any recommendations, suggestions or opinions contained in these publications do not necessarily represent the policy or views of the South Australian Drought Resilience Adoption and Innovation Hub (SA Drought Hub). No person should act on the basis of the contents of these publications without first obtaining specific, independent, professional advice. The SA Drought Hub and contributors to these publications may identify products by proprietary or trade names to help readers identify particular types of products. The Hub does not endorse or recommend the products of any manufacturer referred to. Other products may perform as well as or better than those specifically referred to. The SA Drought Hub will not be liable for any loss, damage, cost or expense incurred or arising by reason of any person using or relying on the information in these publications.