



Typology change – effects of the transition from SGM to SO

21st PACIOLI-workshop,
23-25 September 2013

Agriculture
and Rural
Development



Content

- *Legal framework*
- *Calculation parameters*
- *Main figures for the comparison*
- *Results, conclusions*

Agriculture
and Rural
Development



Legal framework

- ***Change in typology from accounting year 2010 on***
(SGM: 85/377, SO: 1242/2008)
 - Standard output replaced Standard Gross Margin
 - Type of farming, Economic size class definitions
- ***New FADN thresholds***
(SGM:1859/82; SO: 1291/2009)
- ***FSS reference***
(SGM: 571/88; SO: 1166/2008)



Calculation parameters

- *2009 reference year for comparison*
- *Typologies calculated with SGM2004 and SO2004*
- *FSS2007 population used*
- *Selection plan 2010 (SO-based) applied for 2009*





Database features for 2009

- *SGM 2009:*
 - 80.185 sample farms
 - 4.948.379 farms in population
 - 5.152 clusters
 - 61,7 as average weight
- *SO 2009:*
 - 79.590 sample farms
 - 5.250.067 farm in population
 - 5.117 clusters
 - 66,0 as average weight

Agriculture
and Rural
Development



Sample and weight distribution in 2009 by TF8

Sample distribution 2009 TF8_SGM	TF8_SO								All TF
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1 – Field crops	85%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	12%	100%
2 - Horticulture	1%	99%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
3 - Wine	2%	0%	97%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	100%
4 – Permanent crops	3%	7%	2%	86%	0%	0%	0%	2%	100%
5 - Milk	0%	0%	0%	0%	94%	5%	0%	1%	100%
6 – Grazing livestock	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%	86%	0%	2%	100%
7 – Pigs/poultry	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	99%	1%	100%
8 - Mixed	1%	0%	0%	0%	7%	10%	15%	67%	100%

Weight distribution 2009 TF8_SGM	TF8_SO								All TF
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1 – Field crops	81%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	17%	100%
2 - Horticulture	1%	99%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
3 - Wine	2%	0%	97%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
4 – Permanent crops	3%	2%	1%	92%	0%	0%	0%	1%	100%
5 - Milk	0%	0%	0%	0%	91%	8%	0%	1%	100%
6 – Grazing livestock	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	88%	0%	3%	100%
7 – Pigs/poultry	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	97%	3%	100%
8 - Mixed	2%	0%	0%	0%	5%	11%	7%	74%	100%

Agriculture
and Rural
Development



Sample and weight distribution in 2009 by ESC

Sample distribution 2009		ESC_SO													
ESC_SGM	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	All ESC	
1	59%	39%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
2	2%	70%	24%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
3	0%	37%	54%	7%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
4	0%	10%	68%	18%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
5	0%	3%	38%	47%	10%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
6	0%	1%	9%	54%	33%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
7	0%	1%	1%	9%	52%	34%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
8	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	38%	53%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
9	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	43%	47%	7%	1%	1%	0%	0%	100%	
10	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	14%	27%	15%	18%	17%	8%	100%	

Weight distribution 2009		ESC_SO													
ESC_SGM	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	All ESC	
1	55%	43%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
2	1%	69%	28%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
3	0%	50%	44%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
4	0%	17%	70%	10%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
5	0%	10%	45%	36%	8%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
6	0%	4%	19%	50%	25%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
7	0%	1%	2%	11%	52%	31%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
8	0%	0%	0%	1%	6%	40%	50%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
9	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	46%	44%	6%	1%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
10	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	22%	29%	14%	14%	13%	5%	100%	

Agriculture
and Rural
Development



Sample and population sizes in 2009 by TF8 and by typology

	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population
	SGM		SO		Common SGM-SO	
1	23 841	1 498 522	20 459	1 131 150	19 846	1 069 973
2	4 811	164 613	5 532	189 428	4 705	159 217
3	3 912	231 260	3 963	236 957	3 754	218 824
4	7 383	853 193	6 384	736 216	6 203	719 215
5	12 418	502 822	13 849	644 807	11 670	457 726
6	10 471	610 260	10 964	774 254	8 848	523 667
7	4 508	138 903	6 480	220 110	4 468	133 589
8	12 841	948 806	11 959	1 317 144	8 536	692 192
Total	80 185	4 948 379	79 590	5 250 067	68 030	3 974 403

Agriculture
and Rural
Development



General reasons for SR change between SGM and SO

- *Contribution of the various factors to the change of Standard Results variables:*
 - **reclassification of farms,**
 - **threshold effect,**
 - **change in the reference population,**
 - **change in the clusters and in the composition of the weights**

Agriculture and Rural Development



Main variables for both typologies in 2009 by TF8 (limited to TF cross-sections)

TF8	Labour input (AWU)		UAA (ha)		Livestock units (LU)		Total output (€)		Intermediate consumption (€)		Gross income (€)	
	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO
1	1,50	1,46	47,36	48,89	1,97	1,99	48 927	49 282	32 096	32 712	30 700	31 071
2	3,38	3,19	5,21	5,23	0,31	0,31	163 380	136 942	86 670	70 772	78 543	68 033
3	1,82	1,74	13,65	14,11	0,16	0,14	72 984	67 457	25 535	24 400	49 339	45 116
4	1,35	1,34	8,86	9,63	0,22	0,21	25 796	24 605	8 712	8 453	20 394	19 655
5	1,87	1,79	39,53	34,42	56,22	49,02	90 677	78 199	62 504	54 088	45 019	38 943
6	1,52	1,52	54,54	47,33	52,85	47,57	44 902	40 499	32 918	29 284	30 029	27 215
7	1,96	1,89	20,96	20,23	221,28	204,93	200 497	184 085	140 845	127 904	67 458	63 404
8	1,69	1,59	25,82	19,97	23,64	18,03	35 468	26 891	25 702	19 292	17 785	13 578
Total	1,66	1,62	33,10	30,10	26,83	24,55	57 833	51 049	36 569	32 442	31 933	28 390

Agriculture and Rural Development

Main variables for both typologies in 2009 by TF8 (not limited to TF cross-sections)

TF8	Labour input (AWU)		UAA (ha)		Livestock units (LU)		Total output (€)		Intermediate consumption (€)		Gross income (€)	
	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO	SGM	SO
1	1,49	1,46	42,91	47,44	4,85	2,03	45 442	47 754	30 499	31 524	27 723	30 215
2	3,34	3,18	5,19	6,04	0,33	0,48	159 688	141 540	84 567	71 847	76 953	71 602
3	1,79	1,67	13,91	13,83	0,31	0,14	70 505	63 307	24 853	23 093	47 690	42 268
4	1,36	1,33	9,28	9,81	0,45	0,24	27 810	24 466	10 109	8 514	20 950	19 569
5	1,86	1,80	39,75	33,78	57,06	44,63	89 005	72 180	61 614	49 831	44 172	36 189
6	1,55	1,52	51,22	44,70	50,44	44,11	46 193	40 209	32 935	29 309	30 150	26 140
7	1,93	1,80	20,46	26,58	213,76	172,72	193 611	161 571	135 918	115 307	65 288	55 728
8	1,67	1,57	30,13	21,48	32,55	17,78	44 748	28 172	32 852	20 340	21 385	14 261
Total	1,64	1,61	32,12	29,68	25,83	24,18	55 919	50 321	35 390	32 000	30 936	27 959

Specific impacts at TF8 level on Output data

- **TF1** – Slight output increase in SO mainly due to weighting effects
- **TF2** – Output decrease in SO due to significant weight impacts, which is softened by farms with big output re-classified from TF4 in SO
- **TF3** – Output decrease in SO caused by limited weighting effect, which is slightly amplified by farms with small output re-classified from TF1, and TF4 in SO
- **TF4** – Slight output decrease in SO further increased by farms referred above as becoming TF2 in SO with relatively big outputs
- **TF5** – Output decrease in SO mainly due to weighting effects, and partially by farms with smaller outputs re-classified from TF6 and TF8 in SO



Specific impacts at TF8 level on Output data

- **TF6** – Output decrease in SO mainly due to weighting effects
- **TF7** – Output decrease in SO caused by the combination of weighting effects, and the re-classification of farms from TF8 with smaller outputs
- **TF8** - Output decrease in SO as the results of weighting effects further increased by several farms re-classified from SGM TF8 to SO TF7 with relatively big output values
- **All activities** – An average 10% decrease in output between SGM and SO mainly due to weighting effects.



Conclusions

- The biggest impact of the typology change as seen in the example of the Output, and consequently of the Income data is generated by the new clusters, and consequently by the new weights.
- Reclassifications of farms between Types of Farming do not change the direction of the original difference between the SGM and the SO figures caused by weighting, they have limited overall effects at TF level.



Thank you for your attention!

Agriculture
and Rural
Development