#### <u>Sow Management: Exactly How Many</u> Litters/Sow Should I be Targeting?

Glynn Tonsor Dept. of Agricultural Economics Michigan State University

Gilts to Sows 101 2008 Professional Pork Producers Symposium February 21, 2008



#### Identify "rules of thumb" for sow culling

Examine sensitivity to:

- Cost of replacement gilts
- Feed ration prices
- Conception rates
- Weaned pig values

### **Parity Distribution**

Parity prior to culling <sup>a</sup>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Percent of farrowings fr	om each i	parity (ste	eady-state	e parity dis	tribution)					
Parity 1	100%	54%	38%	31%	26%	23%	21%	20%	18%	18%
Parity 2		46%	33%	27%	23%	20%	19%	17%	16%	15%
Parity 3			29%	23%	20%	17%	16%	15%	14%	13%
Parity 4				20%	17%	15%	14%	13%	12%	11%
Parity 5					15%	13%	12%	11%	10%	10%
Parity 6						11%	10%	10%	9%	9%
Parity 7							9%	8%	8%	7%
Parity 8								7%	7%	6%
Parity 9									6%	5%
Parity 10										5%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average parity <sup>b</sup>	1.00	1.46	1.90	2.32	2.70	3.07	3.40	3.76	4.05	4.32
								/ /		
										3

### **Parity Distribution**

Parity prior to culling <sup>a</sup>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	-		-		-	-		-	-	
Percent of farrowings fi	rom each	parity (ste	eady-state	parity dis	tribution)					
Parity 1	100%	54%	38%	31%	26%	23%	21%	20%	18%	18%
Parity 2		46%	33%	27%	23%	20%	19%	17%	16%	15%
Parity 3			29%	23%	20%	17%	16%	15%	14%	13%
Parity 4				20%	17%	15%	14%	13%	12%	11%
Parity 5					15%	13%	12%	11%	10%	10%
Parity 6						11%	10%	10%	9%	9%
Parity 7							9%	8%	8%	7%
Parity 8								7%	7%	6%
Parity 9									6%	5%
Parity 10										5%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average parity <sup>b</sup>	1.00	1.46	1.90	2.32	2.70	3.07	3.40	3.76	4.05	4.32
										4

# What number of litters/sow do you think maximizes returns over total costs?



Key Assumptions: Cost-Return Analysis

Sow herd size is constant (1,200 hd)

Conception rate is 86% of prior parity's
 80% for 1<sup>st</sup> parity sows; 20% for 10<sup>th</sup>

Total pigs weaned/sow/year
 Maximized at 8<sup>th</sup> parity; similar for 5<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup>

#### **Cost-Return Budget**

Parity Prior to Culling <sup>a</sup>	1	2	3	4	5
A. TOTAL VARIABLE COSTS	\$54.44	\$40.55	\$36.24	\$34.19	\$33.18
B. TOTAL FIXED COSTS	\$8.53	\$8.15	\$7.96	\$7.85	\$7.78
C. TOTAL COSTS PER PIG SOLD	\$62.97	\$48.70	\$44.20	\$42.04	\$40.96
D. GROSS RETURNS PER PIG SOLD	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01
E. RETURNS OVER VARIABLE COSTS (D - A), \$/hd	(\$20.43)	(\$6.54)	(\$2.22)	(\$0.18)	\$0.83
F. RETURNS OVER TOTAL COSTS (D - C), \$/hd	(\$28.96)	(\$14.68)	(\$10.18)	(\$8.03)	(\$6.95)
G. NET RETURN ON INVESTMENT	-32.1%	-14.1%	-8.1%	-5.2%	-3.7%
Parity Prior to Culling <sup>a</sup>	6	7	8	9	10
A. TOTAL VARIABLE COSTS	\$32.48	\$32.17	\$31.93	\$31.88	\$32.04
B. TOTAL FIXED COSTS	\$7.73	\$7.71	\$7.69	\$7.71	\$7.74
C. TOTAL COSTS PER PIG SOLD	\$40.21	\$39.87	\$39.62	\$39.59	\$39.77
D. GROSS RETURNS PER PIG SOLD	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01
E. RETURNS OVER VARIABLE COSTS (D - A), \$/hd	\$1.53	\$1.85	\$2.08	\$2.13	\$1.98
F. RETURNS OVER TOTAL COSTS (D - C), \$/hd	(\$6.20)	(\$5.86)	(\$5.61)	(\$5.57)	(\$5.76)
	(40.20)	(00.007	(00.01)		(ψ0.10)

#### **Cost-Return Budget**

Parity Prior to Culling <sup>a</sup>		1	2	3	4	5
A. TOTAL VARIABLE COSTS		\$54.44	\$40.55	\$36.24	\$34.19	\$33.18
B. TOTAL FIXED COSTS		\$8.53	\$8.15	\$7.96	\$7.85	\$7.78
C. TOTAL COSTS PER PIG SOLD		\$62.97	\$48.70	\$44.20	\$42.04	\$40.96
D. GROSS RETURNS PER PIG SOLD		\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01
E. RETURNS OVER VARIABLE COSTS (D ·	- A), \$/hd	(\$20.43)	(\$6.54)	(\$2.22)	(\$0.18)	\$0.83
F. RETURNS OVER TOTAL COSTS (D - C)	, \$/hd	(\$28.96)	(\$14.68)	(\$10.18)	(\$8.03)	(\$6.95)
G. NET RETURN ON INVESTMENT		-32.1%	-14.1%	-8.1%	-5.2%	-3.7%
Parity Prior to Culling <sup>a</sup>		6	7	8	9	10
A. TOTAL VARIABLE COSTS		\$32.48	\$32.17	\$31.93	\$31.88	\$32.04
B. TOTAL FIXED COSTS	Oply \$0	10	\$7.71	\$7.69	\$7.71	\$7.74
C. TOTAL COSTS PER PIG SOLD	between	7 <sup>th</sup> &	\$39.87	\$39.62	\$39.59	\$39.77
D. GROSS RETURNS PER PIG SOLD	10 <sup>th</sup> pari	ties	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01	\$34.01
E. RETURNS OVER VARIABLE COSTS (D	- A), \$/hd	\$1.53	\$1.85	\$2.08	\$2.13	\$1.98
F. RETURNS OVER TOTAL COSTS (D - C)	, \$/hd	(\$6.20)	(\$5.86)	(\$5.61)	(\$5.57)	(\$5.76)
G. NET RETURN ON INVESTMENT		-2 7%	-2.2%	-1.9%	-1.8%	-2.0%

Which factor do you think most impacts the optimal # of litters/sow?



#### Sensitivity Analysis: Cost of Replacement Gilt

				<u>Parity</u>	ı Pi	rior to Cu	ıllin	<u>g:</u>		
		1		2		3		4		5
			<u> </u>	Return ov	/er	Total Co	sts	<u>;, \$/hd</u>		
Cost of Replacement Gilt (\$/hd) Sensitivity:										
\$169 (25% Lower)	\$	(19.64)	\$	(9.80)	\$	(6.73)	\$	(5.27)	\$	(4.56)
\$225 (Base)	\$	(28.96)	\$	(14.68)	\$	(10.18)	\$	(8.03)	\$	(6.95)
\$281 (25% Higher)	\$	(38.28)	\$	(19.57)	\$	(13.64)	\$	(10.78)	\$	(9.33)
		6		7		8		9		10
Cost of Replacemen	t Gilt (\$	/hd) Sen	siti	vity:						
\$169 (25% Lower)	\$	(4.09)	\$	(3.91)	\$	(3.80)	\$	(3.87)	\$	(4.11)
\$225 (Base)	\$	(6.20)	\$	(5.86)	\$	(5.61)	\$	(5.57)	\$	(5.76)
\$281 (25% Higher)	\$	(8.31)	\$	(7.80)	\$	(7.41)	\$	(7.27)	\$	(7.41)

#### Sensitivity Analysis: Feed Ration Prices

		Parity Prior to Culling:								
		1		2		3		4		5
			Return ov	′er	Total Co					
Cost of Diets (\$/ton) Sen	sitiv	vity:								
Diets 25% Lower	\$	(26.09)	\$	(11.88)	\$	(7.39)	\$	(5.22)	\$	(4.12)
Base	\$	(28.96)	\$	(14.68)	\$	(10.18)	\$	(8.03)	\$	(6.95)
Diets 25% Higher	\$	(31.77)	\$	(17.43)	\$	(12.92)	\$	(10.77)	\$	(9.71)
		6		7		8		9		10
Cost of Diets (\$/ton) Sen	sitiv	vity:								
Diets 25% Lower	\$	(3.35)	\$	(2.97)	\$	(2.69)	\$	(2.61)	\$	(2.75)
Base	\$	(6.20)	\$	(5.86)	\$	(5.61)	\$	(5.57)	\$	(5.76)
Diets 25% Higher	\$	(8.99)	\$	(8.68)	\$	(8.46)	\$	(8.47)	\$	(8.71)

Sensitivity Analysis: Conception Rates

4 Scenarios Considered:

10% enhancement at all parities
 <u>10%</u> reduction at all parities

3. 40% enhancement at parity 10
1. No change at P1, accelerating increase to P10
4. 40% reduction at parity 10
1. No change at P1, accelerating decrease to P10

#### Sensitivity Analysis: Conception Rates Uniform 10% Changes



#### Sensitivity Analysis: Increasing Conception Rates Changes (0-40%)



#### Sensitivity Analysis: Conception Rates

		<u>Parity Prior to Culling:</u>								
		1		2		3		4		5
			ŀ	Return ov	/er	Total Co	sts	, \$/hd		
Conception Rate Sensitiv	/ity:									
Base	\$	(28.96)	\$	(14.68)	\$	(10.18)	\$	(8.03)	\$	(6.95)
Base +10%	\$	(25.88)	\$	(12.89)	\$	(8.89)	\$	(6.94)	\$	(5.77)
Base -10%	\$	(33.05)	\$	(17.07)	\$	(12.13)	\$	(9.59)	\$	(8.31)
Base to +40% at P10	\$	(28.96)	\$	(14.35)	\$	(9.65)	\$	(7.53)	\$	(6.25)
Base to -40% at P10	\$	(28.96)	\$	(15.29)	\$	(10.98)	\$	(9.02)	\$	(7.98)
		6		7		8		9		10
Conception Rate Sensitiv	/ity:									
Base	\$	(6.20)	\$	(5.86)	\$	(5.61)	\$	(5.57)	\$	(5.76)
Base +10%	\$	(5.01)	\$	(4.80)	\$	(4.56)	\$	(4.75)	\$	(4.75)
Base -10%	\$	(7.63)	\$	(7.38)	\$	(7.16)	\$	(7.17)	\$	(7.15)
Base to +40% at P10	\$	(5.46)	\$	(5.09)	\$	(4.90)	\$	(4.84)	\$	(4.95)
Base to -40% at P10	\$	(7.44)	\$	(6.95)	\$	(6.82)	\$	(6.82)	\$	(7.10)

### Sensitivity Analysis: Weaned Pig Values

		Parity Prior to Culling:									
		1		2		3		4		5	
			<u> </u>	Return ov	/er	Total Co	sts	s, \$/hd			
Weaned Pig Value (\$/hd)	Se	ensitivity:									
\$25.50 (-25%)	\$	(37.47)	\$	(23.20)	\$	(18.70)	\$	(16.54)	\$	(15.46)	
\$34.01 (Base)	\$	(28.96)	\$	(14.68)	\$	(10.18)	\$	(8.03)	\$	(6.95)	
\$42.50 (+25%)	\$	(20.47)	\$	(6.20)	\$	(1.70)	\$	0.46	\$	1.54	
		6		7		8		9		10	
Weaned Pig Value (\$/hd)	Se	ensitivity:									
\$25.50 (-25%)	\$	(14.71)	\$	(14.37)	\$	(14.12)	\$	(14.09)	\$	(14.27)	
\$34.01 (Base)	\$	(6.20)	\$	(5.86)	\$	(5.61)	\$	(5.57)	\$	(5.76)	
\$42.50 (+25%)	\$	2.29	\$	2.63	\$	2.88	\$	2.91	\$	2.73	

#### Summary

9<sup>th</sup> Parity Strategy = max ROTC
 Little difference between 7-10 parities

Sensitivity analysis
 Returns certainly effected;
 But selection of parity schedule is rather insensitive

Are you the only representative (coworkers, employees, etc.) from your operation using a "clicker?"



## How many sows/gilts do you currently have in your operation?

		14%	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%	4.407
1.	<= 99							14%
2.	100 - 249							
3.	250 – 499							
4.	500 - 999							
5.	1,000 – 1,999							
6.	2,000 - 4,999							
7.	>= 5,000	11-99,00 <sup>-2</sup>	A9 0500	299 , 00 <sup>0</sup>		2999 - 0-A		,000
					100	2002	1	/ 19

# How far did you travel to attend this meeting?

1.	< 2	25 r	nile	S	
2.	26	- 5	0 n	hiles	S
3.	51	- 7	5 n	hiles	S
4.	76	_ 1	00	mile	es
5.	101		150	) m	iles
6.	151	] \	200	) m	iles
7.	> 2	200	mi	les_	



The quality of information provided by this program was "excellent."

- 1. Strongly Disagree
- 2. Disagree
- 3. Somewhat disagree
- 4. Somewhat agree
- 5. Agree
- 6. Strongly Agree

What value do you place on this program in terms of improvements in your operation?

\$0
 \$1-\$100
 \$101-\$499
 \$500-\$999
 \$1,000-\$4,999
 \$5,000 or higher

Overall, how useful was the <u>Sow Management: Exactly How Many</u> <u>Litters/Sow Should I be Targeting</u> presentation to you and your operation?

- 1. Entirely Useless
- 2. Useless
- 3. Somewhat Useless
- 4. Somewhat Useful
- 5. Useful
- 6. Extremely Useful

#### **Questions** ???

#### Tonsor's website: http://www.msu.edu/user/gtonsor/