

Manuscript Details

Manuscript number	COMPAG_2019_1264
Title	'Farms like Mine': A Novel Method in Peer Matching for Agricultural Benchmarking
Article type	Technical note

Abstract

To find opportunities to improve performance, comparisons between farms are often made using aggregates of standard typologies. Being aggregates, farm types in these typologies contain significant numbers of atypical enterprises and thus average figures do not reflect the farming situations of individual farmers wishing to compare their performance with farms of a 'similar' type. We present a novel method that matches a specific farm against all farms in a survey (drawing upon the Farm Business Survey sample) and then selects the nearest 'bespoke farm group' of matches based on distance (Z-score). We do this across 34 dimensions that capture a wide range of English farm characteristics, including tenure and geographic proximity. Means and other statistics are calculated specifically for that bespoke farm comparator group, or 'peer set'. This generates a uniquely defined comparator for each individual farm that could substantially improve key-performance-indicators, such as unit costs of production, which can be used for benchmarking purposes. This methodology has potential to be applied across the full range of FBS farm types and in a wider range of benchmarking contexts.

Keywords	Benchmarking; Survey & administrative datasets; Farm typologies; Peers; Performance
Corresponding Author	mark reader
Order of Authors	mark reader, Paul Wilson, Stephen Ramsden, Ian Hodge, Ben GA Lang
Suggested reviewers	Lindsey Clothier, Richard Crane, Peter Midmore, Debbie Sparkes, Charles Scott

Submission Files Included in this PDF

File Name [File Type]

Farms Like Mine_v0.8.x_CompElectAgric_CoverLetter_.docx [Cover Letter]

Farms Like Mine_v0.8.x_CompElectAgric_HighlightsOnly.docx [Highlights]

Farms Like Mine_v0.8.x_CompElectAgric_Without_TitlePage-References-Referees.docx [Manuscript File]

To view all the submission files, including those not included in the PDF, click on the manuscript title on your EVISE Homepage, then click 'Download zip file'.

Research Data Related to this Submission

There are no linked research data sets for this submission. The following reason is given:
The authors do not have permission to share data

'Farms like Mine': A Novel Method in Peer Matching for Agricultural Benchmarking

Mark A. Reader^{1*}, Paul Wilson², Stephen Ramsden², Ian D. Hodge¹, Ben G.A. Lang¹

¹ Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge

² University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonnington

Paper prepared for Computers and Electronics in Agriculture

10 July 2019

* Rural Business Unit, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge, Silver Street, CB3 9EP, England. mar58@cam.ac.uk. +44 1223 337 163 (voicemail).

Mark Reader would like to thank colleagues from the DEFRA Farm Business Survey and DEFRA Sustainable Intensification Platform, particularly Gavin Huggett from the University of Exeter. Thanks are also due to Rural Business Research; Michael Simmons and Dr Mark Hayes of the Big Data Strategic Research Initiative, University of Cambridge; the StatsLab in the Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge; Rachel J. Lawrence (farmer and former RBU research officer); Dr Belinda Clarke (AgriTech-East); Dr Cesar Revoredo (SRUC); and Dr Liang Wang (Computer Laboratory, University of Cambridge).



34 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

35 Declarations of interest: none.

36

37 **REFeree SUGGESTIONS**

38 Richard Crane - Reading - r.t.crane@reading.ac.uk // +44 (0) 118 378 8963

39 Peter Midmore - Aberystwyth - pxm@aber.ac.uk // +44 (0) 1970 622251

40 Charles Scott - Newcastle - charles.scott@ncl.ac.uk // +44 (0) 191 208 6657

41 Debbie Sparks - Nottingham - debbie.sparkes@nottingham.ac.uk // +44 (0) 115 951 6074

42 Lindsey Clothier - DEFRA - lindsey.clothier@defra.gov.uk //

Highlights

- In benchmarking, comparing to 'average farms' (or to 'average firms') includes many farms with unrelated enterprises.
- This will bias and distort key-performance-indicators for which benchmarking comparisons are desired.
- So we propose a novel method, which matches (Z-score) on dimensions used to categorise farms.
- And then, calculates results for a 'bespoke farm group' - a uniquely defined comparator group - after the farmer has entered their details.
- This method has potential to be applied across the full range of farm types in the (UK/EU) Farm Business Survey and in a wider range of benchmarking contexts.

'Farms like Mine': A Novel Method in Peer Matching for Agricultural Benchmarking

[The AUTHOR] would like to thank colleagues from the DEFRA Farm Business Survey and DEFRA Sustainable Intensification Platform, particularly Gavin Huggett from the University of Exeter. Thanks are also due to Rural Business Research; Michael Simmons and Dr Mark Hayes of the Big Data Strategic Research Initiative, University of Cambridge; the StatsLab in the Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge; Rachel J. Lawrence (farmer and former RBU research officer); Dr Belinda Clarke (AgriTech-East); Dr Cesar Revoredo (SRUC); and Dr Liang Wang (Computer Laboratory, University of Cambridge).



'Farms like Mine': A Novel Method in Peer Matching for Agricultural Benchmarking

Abstract

To find opportunities to improve performance, comparisons between farms are often made using aggregates of standard typologies. Being aggregates, farm types in these typologies contain significant numbers of atypical enterprises and thus average figures do not reflect the farming situations of individual farmers wishing to compare their performance with farms of a 'similar' type. We present a novel method that matches a specific farm against all farms in a survey (drawing upon the Farm Business Survey sample) and then selects the nearest 'bespoke farm group' of matches based on distance (Z-score). We do this across 34 dimensions that capture a wide range of English farm characteristics, including tenure and geographic proximity. Means and other statistics are calculated specifically for that bespoke farm comparator group, or 'peer set'. This generates a uniquely defined comparator for each individual farm that could substantially improve key-performance-indicators, such as unit costs of production, which can be used for benchmarking purposes. This methodology has potential to be applied across the full range of FBS farm types and in a wider range of benchmarking contexts.

Keywords Benchmarking, Survey & administrative datasets, Farm typologies, Peers, Performance

JEL code Micro Analysis of Farm Firms, Farm Households, and Farm Input Markets Q120

INTRODUCTION

Individual farmers face considerable problems when attempting to compare their individual performance with the performance of other farms: every farm is different, with a number of different enterprises, generating a variety of different income streams. However, it is clearly helpful for individual farmers to be able to have some standard against which to judge their performance, in order to identify areas in which they may be underperforming, and thus which aspects of the business could be improved. Benchmarking is an increasingly popular approach in efforts to enable farmers to increase their incomes and levels of productivity (e.g. Camp 1989, Jack 2009, Vitale et al. 2019, Wilson et al. 2005) or to reduce their ecological footprint (e.g. de Olde et al. 2016, de Snoo 2006, Halberg et al. 2005, Mu et al. 2017, Lynch et al. 2018). Currently, farms are usually categorised and compared using typologies that require a minimum level of a particular type of farming (an 'enterprise' such as dairy, or combinations of similar enterprises such as cereal crops). For example, in the European FADN/RICA classification (European Commission 2013), 'Specialist COP' (cereals-oilseeds-pulses, also called 'Cereals Farms' in Britain) are farms that have above a minimum level of cereals, oilseeds and protein crops as measured by 'Standard Output' i.e. the financial share of the different enterprises on the farm. However, the remaining outputs may be very

different: two Cereals Farms may meet the threshold to be labelled ‘Cereals’, but have different enterprises as their remaining output. The result is that each farm type contains significant quantities of ‘atypical’ enterprises. This is a problem when benchmarking as comparisons are normally made using averages (typically the mean) – atypical enterprises will appear as relatively small amounts (e.g. land area) that are not representative of either the overall sample or the small number of farms that have these atypical enterprises. For example, there were 30 cattle and 69 sheep on the 2017 mean ‘General Cropping’ farm in England¹: this will be atypical for most farms of this type, as they will have no livestock, whereas a few may have substantial numbers of animals. The General Cropping farm classification most closely approximates to what is termed a ‘mixed farm’ i.e. a farm type with a relatively large number of enterprises. However, there is also a tendency to assume that a farm is mixed where there are small numbers within a particular enterprise (to take an extreme example, a farm with cereal crops and a single sheep is not a ‘mixed’ farm). Many farmers may not even know the type under which their farm falls, or are close to the cut-off point between thresholds for farm types and thus fall within two possible farm type categories.

From the above discussion, it is our contention that comparator groups based on standard typologies are flawed. An improvement would be to have alternative comparator groups that make better use of information contained within available datasets to match farms with similar characteristics. To do this we introduce the innovation of matching to ‘farms like mine’, where matching is primarily on land use areas and livestock numbers contained in farm survey datasets. We thus demonstrate a novel method for the identification of benchmark performance indicators that can provide more relevant and useful standards for farm management decision-making.

METHODOLOGY

In the UK, the Farm Business Survey (FBS) has ten ‘robust’ farm types, where type is determined by an enterprise or combination of enterprises that exceed a threshold of two thirds of total farm output. Outputs are standardised to reflect a ‘normal farm in average conditions’ (Defra 2018). For example, Dairy Farms are ‘holdings on which dairy cows account for more than two thirds of their total Standard Output (SO)’; Cereal Farms are ‘holdings on which cereals and combinable crops [...] account for more than two thirds of the total SO’. A ‘General Cropping’ or ‘Mixed Farm’ is effectively a farm that does not fit into any of the other FBS categories, as no single or defined combination of enterprises meets the two thirds threshold (Defra *ibid*).

As noted in the introduction, the problem for an individual farm manager is that these farm types will probably have different characteristics to his/her farm. To address this problem we use a methodology that is normally used for clustering with smaller number of dimensions (Piegorsch 2015). The method matches farms to all farms in the comparator group (the survey sample) and then selects the nearest neighbours (on Z-score), in 34 dimensions for England. The matching procedure includes almost all characteristic enterprises for farms in England, including tenure (e.g. rented or owner-occupied) and geographic proximity. Means and other statistics are then calculated immediately following the user entering their own

¹ www.farmbusinesssurvey.co.uk/regional/Reports-on-Farming-in-the-Regions-of-England.asp

farm business data, which then generates the bespoke ‘peer set’, along with the average data for that peer set² - to which the user can then compare their own performance. Peer sets are a minimum of 25 farms in our case (as we have a large sample), or more if the total summed distance is less than one Z-score across the 34 dimensions (in English farming). Euclidean, Mahalanobis, and other distance metrics (including Manhattan Block) (Piegorsch 2015) were also tested in the methodological development stage. The Euclidean method was deemed the optimal, as described below.

Euclidean distances are:

$$d_i = \text{SQRT}(\text{SUM}(\mathbf{X}_{ij} - x_j)^2)$$

$$x_j = (\text{MyFarm}_j - \text{SampleMean}_j) / \text{SampleSD}_j$$

$$\mathbf{X}_{ij} = (\mathbf{Y}_{ij} - \text{SampleMean}_j) / \text{SampleSD}_j$$

Where d_i is a vector of 1-to-n sums of normalised distances, away from each farm in the sample of n farms. $\mathbf{X}_{ij}$ is a matrix of j standardised variables (the 34 dimensions chosen for England) by i, the 1-to-n, farms (the sample n). x_j is a vector of the j standardised variables for ‘my farm’ (x); $\mathbf{Y}_{ij}$ is the matrix of un-standardised 1-to-n sample, i, values (for each j variables). SD is standard deviation. The peer set is then chosen by selecting 25 farms that have the smallest Euclidean distance or are within one Z-score (across the 34 dimensions for England).

RESULTS:

The ‘farms like mine’ methodology outlined above generates a bespoke peer comparator data set; hence, results from the approach are specific to the individual farm business data that users enter into the system. The FBS provides a wide range of candidate variables that can be used to generate the bespoke peer set of comparator data. To test the approach, for England we chose 34 dimensions as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Variables chosen for peer-matching of farms in England

<i>Land Use (hectares):</i>	<i>Livestock (average head over year):</i>
winter wheat area	other male cattle 1 to 2years
winter barley area	other female cattle 1 to 2years
spring barley area	other male cattle over2years
other cereals area	heifers
oilseeds area	dairy cows
peas beans area	beef cows
potatoes area	ewes
sugar beet area	other sheep
other arable crops area	
fodder crops area	breeding sows*

² www.benchmarkmyfarm.co.uk

<i>fallow area</i> <i>uncropped area</i> <i>temporary grass area</i> <i>permanent grass area</i> <i>sole rough grazing principle area</i> <i>top fruit area</i> <i>outdoor vegetable area</i>	<i>store pigs*</i> <i>broilers*</i> <i>laying flock*</i> <i>growing pullets*</i>
Other characteristic variables:	<i>organic area fully* (ha)</i> <i>Easting (metres, OGS grid)†</i> <i>Northing (metres, OGS grid)†</i> <i>Tenanted area (percentage)</i>

In Table 1, note that * represents double weighting (of the Z-score) within the Euclidean-based optimisation approach, while † refers to weighting at 0.6. These alternative weightings were adopted following extensive testing of the approach in order to appropriately capture and represent enterprises that occur less frequently within the test dataset for England. The corollary to this is the lower weighting attributed to geographical dimensions. Farms that are geographically far away will be matched very closely on all other dimensions and farms that are in close proximity may diverge more in other dimensions. However, note that the closest matches will be chosen in all cases, ensuring that, where farms match on both enterprise mix and close geographical proximity, these will always be chosen with the bespoke peer set in preference to farms with close enterprise mix matches, that are geographically far from the individual farm business (as entered by the user of the system). The simplest distance metric (namely Euclidean), on Z-scores (of farms with the enterprise only), was found to be superior to others, in terms of closer peer sets (by inspection).

As an example, in the putative farm in Table 2 (below), the coefficient of variation (SD/MEAN), of farm income per farm, was reduced by 27% points (or 1/6) for the FBS2016 peer match set (n=28, <1 Z-score away) compared to the CEREALS farm type sample (n=353)

Table 2. Putative Suffolk, upland, arable farm (as matched for calculation of Farm Income)

Winter wheat area (ha)	70
Winter barley area	20
Oilseeds area	30
Temporary grass area	2
Permanent grass area	4
Uncropped area	5
TENANTED_PCT (%)	45
EASTING (m)	565000
NORTHING (m)	215000
{ - all other variables match on 0 - }	

146 **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS:**

147 This paper has demonstrated a new approach to benchmarking. While this has been applied to
148 farms, there is no reason in principle why it should not be applied in benchmarking in other
149 sectors (e.g. Camp 1989, ten Raai 2009), from survey or administrative datasets.

150 However, the need for benchmarking in agriculture is clear for a range of reasons. The rate of
151 productivity increase in the UK is low (Baráth and Fertő 2017). Allowing for uncontrollable
152 farm diversity due to environmental factors - such as altitude, soil type and weather - it is
153 clear from the FBS that performance varies considerably between similar farms. Political
154 developments such as Brexit (Ward 2019) and a potentially more stringent financial
155 environment gives an added urgency to the need to increase farm productivity and incomes,
156 through techniques such as Benchmarking.

157 ‘Farms like mine’ i.e. matched to closest-peers gives a better framework for comparison
158 precisely because the peer set is closer - in scale and mix of enterprises, tenure, proximity and
159 so forth - to ‘my farm’ than to the broader industry aggregate farm types. It will also be
160 perceived as closer by farm managers and thus will make benchmarking more attractive as a
161 management technique. Key-performance indicators such as cost per litre of milk or per
162 tonne of wheat become more meaningful because the comparison is made to a more relevant
163 set than is the case for comparisons with standard farm type groupings.

164 These improvements are reflected in the reduced dispersion and systematic bias in
165 benchmarking values, e.g. in the reduction in variability of the Farm Income indicator above.
166 Matching leads to groupings that feature farms that do not include features found in the
167 aggregate farm type categories: from other regions (which differ in climate, soils and
168 markets); from other sizes and scales of operation; and, as we know, from the presence of
169 atypical enterprises. The improved matching is also likely to manifest itself in management
170 effects: ‘farms like mine’ are more likely to have more in common from a management-
171 decision-making perspective.

172 In the case of General Cropping farms in particular, average figures, from farms with a large
173 range of enterprises, will compromise the usefulness of benchmark comparisons with
174 farmers’ own farms. By contrast, with ‘farms like mine’, these peer sets of more similar
175 farms (as outlined using the approach described here) provide more relevant comparisons.

176 Options for future development would be: i) selection of different variables for matching, ii)
177 doing more to understand farmers’ objectives, and developing matching around those
178 objectives (be they climate, ecosystem, farm-income, or economic - e.g. Total Factor
179 Productivity), iii) systematic analysis of the weighting criteria for the different variables; iv)
180 more extensive and systematic testing of comparisons (for dispersion, bias, and
181 presence/absence of extraneous enterprises) from ‘peer-sets’ against ‘industry-aggregates’;
182 and v) finding new technologies or enterprises that might be added in particular
183 circumstances - and then extending matching to encompass these alongside or instead of the
184 34 dimensions we use for England.

185

186 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

187 Declarations of interest: none.