

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Environmental efficiency and methane abatement costs of dairy farms from Minas Gerais, Brazil

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Everton Vogel, Bernhard Dalheimer, Caetano Luiz Beber, Claudia de Mori, Julio Cesar Pascale Palhares, André Luiz Monteiro Novo (2023). Environmental efficiency and methane abatement costs of dairy farms from Minas Gerais, Brazil. FOOD POLICY, 119(August 2023), 1-11 [10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102520].

Availability:

This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/946253 since: 2023-10-26

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102520

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of: Everton Vogel, Bernhard Dalheimer, Caetano Luiz Beber, Claudia de Mori, Julio Cesar Pascale Palhares, André Luiz Monteiro Novo, *Environmental efficiency and methane abatement costs of dairy farms from Minas Gerais, Brazil, Food Policy*, Volume 119, 2023, 102520, The final published version is available online at: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102520</u>.

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<u>https://cris.unibo.it/</u>) When citing, please refer to the published version.

\mathbf{a}
•
<i>.</i>
_

Abstract

- Increasing dairy farm productivity while simultaneously mitigating greenhouse gases emissions is a common policy goal in many countries. In this paper, we assess trade-offs and synergies between these goals for pasture-based dairy farms in Brazil. We apply stochastic frontier analysis within a translog hyperbolic distance function specification, including methane emissions as an undesirable output and accounting for annual climatic types. Our results indicate that on average, farmers can improve their production by 9.4% while simultaneously reducing methane emissions by 8.7%. The adoption of more productive cows and improved pastures have a positive effect on the environmental efficiency of the farms. Farmers operating in warmer and dryer climate types tend to have lower environmental efficiency. Calculating shadow prices for methane emitted on farms indicates that the mean abatement costs of methane are US \$2,254 per tonne. Overall, by reducing inefficiency, dairy farmers can significantly increase farm production while simultaneously reducing emissions and thus contribute to national commitments to eradicate hunger and mitigate methane emissions.

Keywords: shadow price, technical efficiency, eco-efficiency, GHG mitigation, Balde cheio, Köppen classification

33 **1** Introduction

34 Dairy farming is fundamental to the economy of many countries, markedly low- and 35 middle-income countries (LMICs), where it plays a pivotal role in employment generation, 36 livelihoods and food security in rural areas (FAO, 2010; OECD-FAO, 2021). Estimates indicate 37 that worldwide 133 million farm holdings keep dairy animals (FAO and GDP, 2018). In LMICs, 38 smallholder famers also rely on milk production for a less risky and regular source of income and 39 food, adding to the income of seasonal crop harvests. Moreover, dairy activities are traditionally 40 conducted by women in many of these countries, contributing to their empowerment, income and 41 household food security (FAO et al., 2020; Ravichandran et al., 2020), especially in households 42 where men outmigrate seeking work in other regions (Ravichandran et al., 2020). In terms of 43 nutrition, milk serves as a high-quality source of protein, vitamins and minerals for humans, 44 playing an indispensable role for nutrition in LMICs, where the rate of undernourished children 45 remains high. For instance, there is strong evidence that the consumption of cow's milk and products by undernourished children has positive effects on their growth (FAO, 2013; FAO et al., 46 47 2020; Weaver et al., 2013), while households owning dairy cattle also have children with higher 48 growth and lower rates of undernourishment (FAO et al., 2020). Moreover, dairy is critically 49 important for sustain local food security in rural areas during commercial food shortages, e.g., due 50 to pandemics (OECD-FAO, 2021).

51 Concurrently, dairy farming contributes to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, which are 52 major drivers of global warming. Globally, the dairy herd is responsible for emitting around 2.1 Gt 53 of CO₂eq.¹, representing ~ 30% of all emissions in the livestock sector (Gerber et al., 2013; Herrero 54 et al., 2016). These emissions comprise carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and remarkably methane, 55 which represents more than 50% of all emissions. GHG emissions from dairy farming considerably 56 vary across countries and production systems, although a strong negative correlation between the 57 carbon footprint of milk and animal productivity has been identified (FAO and GDP, 2018; Gerber 58 et al., 2011; Vogel and Beber, 2022). Moreover, regions that present milk with a higher carbon 59 footprint (or lower productivity) are also those with higher rates of undernourished children and 60 people suffering from chronic food deprivation (FAO and GDP, 2018; Gerber et al., 2011). These

¹Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂eq.) based on the Global Warming Potential 100 years-time horizon (GWP₁₀₀).

61 findings suggest that improving the productivity of dairy cows is an effective strategy to improve 62 the environmental sustainability of dairy farms and increase food security in LMICs. Consequently, 63 dairy farmers can be considered as key players for achieving the sustainable development goals 64 (SDGs) linked to eradicating hunger and undertaking actions against climate change.

65 Globally, policy-makers face the challenge of designing strategies to mitigate GHG 66 emissions to comply with international climate commitments and national laws while maintaining and improving socioeconomic and ecosystem services provided by dairy farms (Brazil, 2021a; 67 68 Clay et al., 2020; Gerber et al., 2013; Ravichandran et al., 2020). However, the implementation of 69 such strategies at farms is complex and context-specific, generating outcomes that are likely to 70 produce synergies as much as trade-offs (Campbell et al., 2018; Clay et al., 2020; Novo et al., 71 2015). Unveiling these complexities and finding the most suited strategies is keen for the design of 72 adapted policies to promote the dairy sector and contribute to development goals in LMICs.

73 In this study, we assess economic and environmental synergies and trade-offs of pasture-74 based dairy farms managed under the influence of sustainable development strategies. We analyse a sample of Brazilian dairy farmers participating in Embrapa's ² Balde Cheio (Full Bucket-FB) 75 76 programme in the state of Minas Gerais and investigate their ability to maximise desirable outputs 77 while minimising methane emissions. We estimate a stochastic translog hyperbolic distance 78 function, allowing for asymmetric treatment of desirable and undesirable outputs in the multi-79 output production frontier (Cuesta et al., 2009; Le et al., 2020; Mamardashvili et al., 2016; Skevas 80 et al., 2018). Moreover, this approach enables identifying drivers of environmental inefficiency 81 and calculating shadow prices for methane, the most concerning GHG emitted on dairy farms 82 (Reisinger et al., 2021; UN-CCAC, 2021).

The Brazilian dairy farming is rapidly evolving and has become one of the main components of the national agri-food sector. According to the most recent agricultural census, in the 2006-2017 period the number of dairy farms in the country decreased from 1.35 M to 1.17 M farms (13%), while the number of milked animals declined by 9% from 12.7 M to 11.5 M cows, and conversely milk production increased by 70% in the same period. In 2020, national milk production reached 36.5 Mt, generating around US \$12 billion in value for farmers and placing Brazil as the third-largest dairy milk producer in the world (Embrapa, 2021; Rocha et al., 2020).

² Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (https://www.embrapa.br/en/international).

90 Moreover, national dairy production contributes to local food security in rural areas. For instance, 91 more than one-quarter of the milk produced in the country does not enter the dairy processing 92 industry (IBGE, 2018), indicating that it is either consumed directly by the household or 93 commercialised locally through short supply chains. On the environmental side, Brazilian dairy 94 farms play an important role in the conservation of grassland and key biodiversity areas in the form 95 of Legal Reserve and Permanent Preservation Areas, which are spared on farms (Embrapa 96 Territorial, 2020). Nevertheless, by hosting one of the largest dairy herds in the world, the country 97 substantially contributes to GHG emissions. In 2019, dairy farming in Brazil was responsible for 98 emitting 53.8 Mt CO₂eq., representing 2.5% of the national and 9.3% of the agri-food sector CO₂eq. 99 emissions (SEEG, 2020). Overall, the national dairy herd presents low productivity and high GHG 100 intensity, with methane accounting for almost three-quarters of all emissions (SEEG, 2020).

101 A number of studies have analysed the environmental efficiency of dairy farms. Early 102 approaches treated externalities as inputs in the production function, focusing on farmers' ability 103 to minimise the surplus of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) compounds in Dutch dairy farming 104 (Reinhard et al., 2002, 2000, 1999). Mamardashvili et al. (2016) investigated the environmental 105 efficiency and abatement costs of N surplus in Swiss dairy farms located in mountainous areas. 106 The authors applied hyperbolic and enhanced hyperbolic distance functions to investigate the 107 farmers' ability to expand the production of desirable outputs while reducing Nitrogen N pollution. 108 Applying a similar approach, Skevas et al. (2018) revisited the Dutch case to investigate the effects 109 of agri-environmental policies and production intensification on the environmental efficiency of 110 dairy farms. Adenuga et al. (2019) compared the environmental efficiency and abatement costs of 111 N surplus for dairy farms on the island of Ireland. In terms of P surplus, March et al. (2016) applied 112 the non-parametric data envelopment analysis (DEA) to assess the environmental efficiency of 113 dairy farms in Scotland, while Adenuga et al. (2020) compared farmers from Northern Ireland by 114 applying the stochastic hyperbolic distance function. Studies evaluating the environmental efficiency of dairy farmers in terms of GHG emissions have also gained attention in the dairy 115 116 sector. A pioneering study considering GHGs in the environmental efficiency of dairy farms was 117 proposed by Njuki and Bravo-Ureta (2015), who employed a quadratic directional distance 118 function with a CO₂eq. pollution index to investigate the impacts of GHG regulations in the US 119 dairy sector. The same approach was applied by Njuki et al. (2016) to study the effects of dairy 120 enterprise size on the environmental efficiency and abatment costs of CO₂eq. of dairy farms in the northeastern US. Wettemann and Latacz-Lohmann (2017) applied DEA techniques to derive
ranges of efficiencies and abatement costs for specialised dairy farms in northern Germany. Le et
al. (2020) employed the stochastic hyperbolic distance function to compare technical and
environmental efficiency and calculate CO₂eq. abatement costs for dairy production in Alberta,
Canada.

126 We expand the literature on environmental efficiency of dairy farms in multiple directions. 127 First, most studies thus far have evaluated intensive high-productive systems in developed 128 countries (e.g., Adenuga et al., 2019; Le et al., 2020; Njuki et al., 2016; Reinhard et al., 1999; 129 Skevas et al., 2018; Wettemann and Latacz-Lohmann, 2017). By contrast, we analyse pasture-130 based dairy production in Brazil, where dairy farms on average present low yields, operate with limited access to technology and face different policy incentives. Second, instead of evaluating a 131 132 CO_2 eq. index, we focus exclusively on methane emissions as an undesirable output. Thus, we 133 provide a better understating of the environmental efficiency of dairy farms in terms of the most 134 important GHG emitted in the dairy sector. In this approach, we also calculate methane-specific 135 shadow prices, providing an indication of the abatement costs of this GHG for dairy farms in Brazil. 136 This might hold interest for national policy design, particularly given the recent commitments that 137 the Brazilian government assumed to cut methane emissions as a signing party of the Global Methane Pledge.³ Finally, we include the annual climate type concept in our production function 138 139 to evaluate the effects of climatic regions on farms' environmental efficiency. This approach is 140 based on the Köppen-Geiger climate classification and might be relevant since there is increasing 141 evidence of the impact of climatic elements on the technical (Gori Maia et al., 2021; Perez-Mendez 142 et al., 2019) and environmental efficiency (Le et al., 2020; Njuki et al., 2016; Njuki and Bravo-143 Ureta, 2015) of dairy farms.

- 144 **2** Methods
- 145

2.1 Theoretical framework

146 The theoretical foundations for investigating production in a dynamic environment where 147 a bundle of inputs is employed to produce multiple outputs were introduced by the seminal works

³ Signatory countries committed to cutting global methane emissions by 30% from 2020 levels by 2030 (EU, 2021).

148 of Debreu (1951) and Shephard (1953, 1970). Ever since, distance functions (DF) have proved 149 very useful in the empirical measurement of efficiency, notably by Farrell (1957) (Kumbhakar and Lovell, 2003). Under this framework, an input distance function seeks the maximum radial 150 151 contraction of the input vector at a constant output. Conversely, the output distance function seeks 152 the maximum radially expansion of output vectors at given inputs (Kumbhakar and Lovell, 2003). 153 Despite being extensively applied to evaluate the production processes of marketable goods, the 154 idea of radially expanding outputs altogether is limited when undesirable by-products are part of 155 the decision-making unit outputs.

156 These limitations gave rise to further developments of the DF taking the form of directional 157 distance functions (DDFs) (Chambers et al., 1996). One of the advantages of this approach is the possibility of applying the output DDF to evaluate the environmental efficiency of decision-making 158 159 units by seeking a maximum increment in desirable outputs while simultaneously reducing 160 undesirable outputs (Chambers et al., 1998; Chung et al., 1997). This mechanism is enabled by 161 introducing a directional vector into the function in an additive form to scale desirable and 162 undesirable outputs in opposite directions (Färe et al., 2005; Färe and Grosskopf, 2000). Several 163 empirical studies evaluating environmental efficiency follow from these developments (e.g., Njuki 164 et al., 2016; Njuki and Bravo-Ureta, 2015; Picazo-Tadeo et al., 2005; Riera and Brümmer, 2022). 165 Limitations associated with the DDF include the fact that the results are subjective to the selection 166 of the directional vectors, which are normally arbitrarily chosen (Atkinson and Tsionas, 2016; 167 Holtkamp and Brümmer, 2018). Besides, it does not satisfy the property of commensurability, i.e., 168 the results are sensitive to measurement units (Peyrache and Coelli, 2009; Skevas et al., 2018).

169 Another approach to estimate the environmental efficiency is the hyperbolic distance 170 function (HDF) proposed by Färe et al. (1989), based on the work of Färe et al. (1985). Instead of 171 projecting a straight line towards the frontier, the graph representation follows a hyperbolic path 172 allowing inputs and outputs to be treated asymmetrically (Färe et al., 1985). Färe et al. (1989) 173 developed their framework applying the non-parametric DEA approach. The parametric stochastic 174 framework considering the HDF was proposed by Cuesta and Zofío (2005), while proper 175 adjustments to accommodate undesirable outputs were amended by Cuesta et al. (2009). The HDF 176 satisfies the commensurability property (Skevas et al., 2018) and overcomes the arbitrariness of 177 selecting a directional vector. Moreover, the HDF also enables calculating shadow prices for non-178 marketable by-products. One limitation often associated with the HDF is that by relying on the weak disposability assumption, it may not comply with the mass balance principle, i.e., the first
law of thermodynamics. A number of developments have been undertaken to address this limitation
(e.g., Dakpo et al., 2016; Førsund, 2021; Murty et al., 2012; Murty and Nagpal, 2020). Nonetheless,
these developments also have constraints that are not completely solved (see Ang and Dakpo, 2021;
Dakpo et al., 2016; Murty and Russell, 2021). In addition, HDF has been used in a variety of case
studies examining environmental performance and efficiency in dairy production systems, which
thus enables comparability with similar work.

To characterise the technology set with undesirable by-products, an additional vector representing undesirable outputs is appended to the traditional representation. It is then represented by a feasible combination of vectors of inputs $x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$, desirable outputs y = $(y_1, y_2, ..., y_n)$ and undesirable by-products $b = (b_1, b_2, ..., b_n)$. Following Cuesta et al. (2009), the technology can be represented by the graph set

191

194 The corresponding HDF can be defined as in eq. (2), where $D_H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b})$ represents the HDF 195 and θ is a scalar. Given the available number of inputs, the HDF represents a maximum expansion 196 of the desirable output vector and equiproportionate contraction of the undesirable output vector, 197 placing producers at the boundary of the production technology *T*.

 $T = \{(x, y, b) : x \in R_{+}^{K}, y \in R_{+}^{M}, b \in R_{+}^{R}, x \text{ can produce } (y, b)\}.$ (1)

198

199
$$D_{H}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{b}) = min\left\{\theta > 0: \left(\boldsymbol{x}, \frac{y}{\theta}, \boldsymbol{b}\theta\right) \in T\right\} (2)$$

200 $D_H(x, y, b)$ ranges between 0 and 1. If a farm presents $D_H(x, y, b) = 1$, it is located at the boundary 201 of the production possibility set and is considered environmentally-adjusted technical efficient 202 (Dalheimer, 2020). If the technology satisfies the traditional axioms, then our HDF satisfies the 203 properties P1 to P4 below (Cuesta et al., 2009; Cuesta and Zofío, 2005; Färe et al., 1985).

204

205 P1. Almost homogeneity:
$$D_H(\boldsymbol{x}, \mu \boldsymbol{y}, \mu^{-1}\boldsymbol{b}) = \mu D_H(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{b}); for \mu > 0$$

206 P2. Non-decreasing in desirable outputs: $D_H(\mathbf{x}, \lambda \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}) \le D_H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}); \lambda \in [0,1]$

207 P3. Non-increasing in undesirable outputs: $D_H(x, y, \lambda b) \le D_H(x, y, b); \lambda \ge 1$

- 208 P4. Non-increasing in inputs: $D_H(\lambda \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}) \le D_H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{b}); \lambda \ge 1$
- 209

210 Following the almost homogeneity condition and selecting a normalising output variable M, we can set $\theta = \frac{1}{v_M}$, and express $D_H(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{b})$ as 211

212
$$D_H\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \frac{\boldsymbol{y}_i}{y_M}, \boldsymbol{b}_i y_M\right) = \frac{1}{y_M} D_H(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{b}_i). (3)$$

213

214 By taking logs of both sides of eq. (3), we reach

215
$$lnD_H(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{b}_i) = lnD_H\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \frac{\boldsymbol{y}_i}{y_M}, \boldsymbol{b}_i y_M\right) + lny_{Mi}. (4)$$

216

The hyperbolic efficiency is defined as $HE_i = D_H(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{b}_i)$. We substitute and rearrange 217 218 the equation solving for lny_M , and finally append an error term v_i to capture statistical noise:

219
$$-\ln y_{Mi} = \ln D_H \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \frac{\boldsymbol{y}_i}{\boldsymbol{y}_M}, \boldsymbol{b}_i \boldsymbol{y}_M \right) - \ln H E_i + v_i. (5)$$

220 2.1.1 **Shadow price**

221 The shadow price can be interpreted as the production of desirable output that must be 222 foregone to reduce one unit of the undesirable output under analysis (Färe et al., 2005; Zhou et al., 223 2014). Shadow prices are particularly relevant for studying production systems where by-products 224 are not marketable. An ingenious approach to calculating shadow prices is based on the duality 225 between the HDF and the profitability (Return to the dollar) function (Färe et al., 2002; Färe and 226 Grosskopf, 1998).

227 Assuming that a producer seeks to maximise profit, she faces the problem described in 228 eq.(6) (Cuesta et al., 2009; Färe et al., 2002).

229

231
$$\prod(x, p_y, p_b) = \max_{x, y} \left\{ \frac{p_y y}{p_b b} \colon D_H(x, y, b) \le 1 \right\}$$
(6)

01 D

230

232 where p_y is the price of desirable output and p_b is the unknown price of the undesirable output. The 233 first-order conditions to the problem in eq. (6) are equal to eq. (7) and eq. (8), respectively.

234

235
$$\frac{p_{y}y}{p_{b}b} = \lambda \frac{\partial D_{H}}{\partial y}y = \lambda \left(\frac{\partial lnD_{H}}{\partial lny}\right) D_{H} \quad (7)$$

236

238
$$\frac{p_{y}y}{p_{b}b} = -\lambda \frac{\partial D_{H}}{\partial y}b = -\lambda \left(\frac{\partial lnD_{H}}{\partial lnb}\right)D_{H}.$$
 (8)

237

The resulting price ratio equals eq. (9), which enables calculating the shadow price of the
undesirable output b in terms of the main desirable output y_M.

241

242
$$-p_{y}\frac{\frac{\partial D_{H}}{\partial b}}{\frac{\partial D_{H}}{\partial y_{M}}} = p_{y}\frac{dy_{M}}{db}]_{D_{H}=1} (9)$$

243

It is noteworthy that the shadow price refers to the estimation at the frontier, assuming that the farmer is fully efficient, i.e., $D_H = 1$.

246 **2.2 Methane emissions**

247 Given that direct measurement of methane emissions is complex and expensive, we 248 estimate the emissions following the Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC, 249 2019a). Methane originated from enteric fermentation and manure management are the two sources 250 considered in the guidelines. Enteric fermentation emissions are derived based on the daily feed 251 intake of the herd. We calculate the daily gross energy (GE) intake and apply the simplified tier 2 252 method to calculate the daily dry matter intake (DMI) for each animal category declared by the farmers (i.e., cows, calves, heifers, bulls) (IPCC, 2019b). Finally, we apply the equations for 253 254 predicting enteric methane based on DMI described by Ribeiro et al. (2020). Forage and 255 concentrate ration information are presented in Appendix A, Tables A1 and A2, respectively.

Methane originated from manure is derived from information on manure volatile solids (VS) content and manure management system. The VS excretion is calculated based on the daily GE intake of the animals and feed quality (IPCC, 2019a). Based on expert information, we assume that 80% of the manure from animals handled on a daily basis was deposited on pastures, while the remaining 20% was deposited onto barns, milking parlour or handling areas, and thus entered the storage system. The default value of 0.19 m³ CH₄ (kg VS)⁻¹ is adopted as the maximum methane producing capacity of VS excreted (IPCC, 2019a).

263 2.3 Study area and data

We analyse a sample of 208 dairy farms distributed across the state of Minas Gerais (MG) in south-eastern Brazil (see Figure 1). MG has an area of ~586,522 km² and is covered by three out of six Brazilian biomes (IBGE, 2021). The state has a long tradition in milk production and is the largest milk producer in Brazil (IBGE, 2018). In 2021, MG produced a total of 9.4 Mt milk, representing 27% of the national production (Embrapa, 2021).

269



270

271 Figure 1. Location of the state of Minas Gerais and sampled municipalities

272 The cross-sectional dataset was collected in 2017 as part of Embrapa's Balde Cheio (Full Bucket-FB) programme.⁴ The FB programme was created by the Embrapa's South-Eastern 273 274 Livestock Research Centre in 1999 and aims at sustainable intensification of dairy farms in Brazil 275 through technology transfer and participatory learning. The database includes a complete 276 socioeconomic characterisation of the household and technical and economic information related 277 to the dairy enterprise. The sample includes exclusively pasture-based producers, which is the most 278 common dairy production system in Brazil. The descriptive statistics of selected farm variables are 279 presented in Table 1.

280

⁴ For a complete description of the programme and its modus operandi, see Novo et al. (2015), https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2014.945320.

Variable (N=208)	Mean	Std.Dev	Min	Max
Capital (1,000 US\$ ^a)	2.53	2.3	0.21	12.24
Purchased feed (1,000 US\$)	15.45	13.95	0.99	78.11
Other expenses (1,000 US\$)	11.76	10.84	1.08	51.65
Land (ha)	40.9	35.41	1	217
Labour (working units)	1.73	0.77	1	4
Lactating cows (N)	23.74	14.57	5	82
Herd size (N)	62.1	38.4	9	213
Milk sold (t FPCM ^b)	108.74	83.72	15.37	440.59
Animals sold (1,000 US\$)	4.66	5.11	0	29.9
Methane CH ₄ (t)	4.95	3.28	0.88	20.87
Buyer (N)	4.62	2.34	1	12
Daily milk yield (kg cow ⁻¹)	12.45	3.55	4.12	23.12
Experience (years)	20.73	13.62	2	60
Improved pasture (% of pastures)	0.15	0.18	0	1
Milk price (US\$)	0.36	0.04	0.28	0.56
Cows in the herd (%)	0.75	0.09	0.41	0.91
Technical visits (N)	13.67	4.65	0	35
Bull in the herd (yes: 1; no: 0)	0.71			
Hired labour (yes: 1; no: 0)	0.82			
Rent land (yes: 1; no: 0)	0.27			

281 Table 1. Variables overview and summary statistics

^aUSD-BRL: 3.192 (BACEN, 2022).^b Fat and protein corrected milk.

282

283 Variable selection for the environmental production function is based on recent studies 284 exploring the technical and environmental efficiency of dairy farms (e.g. Adenuga et al., 2020; Le 285 et al., 2020; Mamardashvili et al., 2016; Njuki et al., 2016; Skevas et al., 2018). The capital variable 286 represents the opportunity cost of capital invested in buildings and machinery, plus depreciation costs. Purchased feed is the sum of all feedstuffs purchased in the year including roughage, 287 288 concentrates, calve feed and mineral supplements. Other expenses include operating expenses with 289 fertilisers, veterinary services, medicines, artificial insemination costs and overheads. Land is the 290 area available for feed production, i.e., forage and grain. Labour is measured in terms of working 291 units per year. Lactating cows represents the number of lactating cows in the herd. Methane is 292 annual amount of methane emitted on the farm from enteric fermentation and manure sources (see 293 section 2.2. for details). All monetary values have been converted to 2017 US dollars by applying 294 the USD-BRL exchange rate of 3.192 (BACEN, 2022).

295 Furthermore, to investigate the influence of year-specific climate elements on 296 environmental efficiency, we include the annual climate type (ACT) in our model (Dubreuil et al., 297 2019). The ACT relies on the Köppen-Geiger climate classification algorithm, which accounts for 298 seasonal temperature and precipitation variations for grouping climatic types and regions 299 (Trewartha and Horn, 1980). Climatology data for each municipality have been retrieved from the 300 National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) Prediction of Worldwide Energy Resource (POWER) project.⁵ The 'ClimClass' R package (Eccel 301 302 et al., 2016) was employed to derive two levels of Köppen ACTs (see Table 2).

Table 2. Annual climate types (ACTs), number of farms by ACT, and summary of climate elements
 for 2017

Köppen ACT	Farms	P_total*	P_winter	P_summer	T_avg	T_w.m	T_c.m
Aw^a	87	938.6	322.4	616.2	23.6	26.6	19.2
Cw^{b}	100	967.6	211.3	756.2	20.9	23.3	16.4
Cs ^c	11	931.6	264.6	667.0	20.9	23.5	16.3
\mathbf{BS}^{d}	10	550.9	239.2	311.8	23.3	25.8	18.5

^aAw: tropical with dry winter; ^bCw: humid subtropical with dry winter; ^cCs: humid subtropical with dry summer; ^dBS: dry semi-arid; *P_total: total precipitation depth (mm); P_winter: precipitation depth in the six coldest months (mm); P_summer: precipitation depth in the six warmest months (mm); T_avg: average temperature (°C); T_w.m: average temperature of the warmest month (°C); T_c.m: average temperature of the coldest month (°C).

310

311 2.4 Empirical model

We estimate the stochastic version of the translog HDF (Cuesta et al., 2009). Stochastic frontier analysis was proposed independently by Meeusen and van Den Broeck (1977) and Aigner et al. (1977) and enables separating technical inefficiency from random disturbances beyond the control of the producers (Kumbhakar and Lovell, 2003).

Our model considers three outputs – including one undesirable – and six inputs. Letting i =1, 2...N represent the number of dairy farms, the main desirable output is represented by annual fat and protein corrected milk (FPCM) production (y_M), and the secondary desirable output is the income of animals sold (y_s). The undesirable output is methane emissions (b). The six inputs are capital (x_1), lactating cows (x_2), labour (x_3), land (x_4), feed (x_5), and other expenses (x_6). The ACT

5

https://power.larc.nasa.gov/data-access-viewer/

(c) is a four-levels controlling variable intended to gain insights into the ACT effect on
environmental efficiency. We set the ACT (Aw) as the reference, since it presents the highest mean
temperature throughout the year. The final specification for the HDF to be estimated is presented
in eq. (10). We scaled the variables by their geometric mean before taking logarithms.

$$-lny_{Mi} = \alpha_{0} + \sum_{k=1}^{6} \alpha_{k} ln(x_{ki}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{6} \sum_{l=1}^{6} \alpha_{kl} ln(x_{ki}) ln(x_{li}) + \beta_{0} ln(b_{i}^{*}) + \frac{1}{2} \beta_{00} ln(b_{i}^{*})^{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{6} \chi_{k0} ln(x_{ki}) ln(b_{i}^{*}) + \delta_{2} ln(y_{si}^{*}) + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{22} ln(y_{si}^{*})^{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{6} \gamma_{k2} ln(x_{ki}) ln(y_{si}^{*}) + \rho_{20} ln(y_{si}^{*}) ln(b_{i}^{*}) + \omega_{0} c_{i} + v_{i} + u_{i}$$

$$(10)$$

Where $b_i^* = b_i \times y_{Mi}$; $y_{si}^* = y_{si}/y_{Mi}$. The composite error term is $\varepsilon_i = v_i + u_i$, where v_i is the error term, which captures random noise and has a normal distribution $v_i N \sim (0, \sigma_{vi}^2)$, and $u_i = -lnHE_i$ is the hyperbolic inefficiency term following a half-normal distribution. Additionally, we considered heteroskedasticity in both v_i (eq.(11)) and u_i , (eq.(12)) (Caudill et al., 1995; Wang, 2002).

331

332 $\sigma_{ui}^2 = e^{z_i^2 \zeta} \quad (11)$

333
$$\sigma_{vi}^2 = e^{w_i^2 \tau}$$
 (12)

334

Where z_i is a farm-specific vector of variables that affect the variance of the inefficiency term, while w_i is a farm-specific vector of variables that affect the variance of the noise term, and ζ and τ are parameters to be estimated. A positive sign of σ_{ui}^2 indicates that the variable z_i under consideration has a positive effect on inefficiency. Similarly, if σ_{vi}^2 displays a positive sign, it suggests that the variable w_i under consideration increases production uncertainty (risk) (Mamardashvili et al., 2016; Wang, 2002). We follow the recent literature and the availability of data variables to select z and wvariables. Table 3 presents the z and w variables considered in the model and the respective expected signs.

Variable	σ_{ui}^2	sign	σ_{vi}^2	sign
Buyer	Ζ1	+	W1	-
Milk yield	Ζ.2	-	W2	+/-
Time farming	2.3	+		
Improved pasture	<i>Z</i> .4	+/-		
Cows in the herd	2.5	-		
Tech. support	Ζ6	-	<i>W</i> 3	-
Bull in the herd	2,7	+	W4	+/-
Hired labour	Ζ8	+	W5	-
Rent land	29	+	W6	+/-

344 Table 3. Variables and expected signs for evaluating heteroskedasticity

345

Following Battese and Coelli (1988), farm-specific point estimate hyperbolic efficiency (*HE_i*) scores are calculated according to the conditional distribution of u given ε :

348 $HE_i = E[e^{-u_i}|\varepsilon_i].$ (10)

349

The estimation of the distance function parameters is conducted by maximum-likelihood using the R software (R Core Team, 2019) and the 'npsf' package (Badunenko et al., 2020).

- 352
- 353 **3 Results and discussion**

354

3.1

Production technology

The first-order maximum-likelihood estimates for the production technology, determinants of environmental inefficiency and associated standard errors are presented in Table 4. The complete list of coefficients is presented in Appendix B, Table B1. All first-order coefficients presented the expected signs, with the exception of labour, which was not statistically significant. Moreover, the coefficient of undesirable output has a negative sign, confirming the existence of trade-offs between desirable and undesirable outputs.

361	The first-order coefficients in the translog HDF may directly be interpreted as elasticities
362	(Cuesta et al., 2009). Thus, we observe that the number of lactating cows has the largest distance
363	elasticity, followed by feed and other expenses. Land and capital exhibit very low elasticities when
364	compared with the other inputs. This is in line with most recent studies evaluating environmental
365	efficiency in dairy farming (e.g., Adenuga et al., 2020, 2019; Mamardashvili et al., 2016; Skevas
366	et al., 2018). In terms of outputs, we observe that the desirable by-product income from livestock
367	sold has a small contribution to the production function, which is expected in dairy enterprises
368	(e.g., Le et al., 2020). In addition, the undesirable output presents a large elasticity and the expected
369	negative sign, indicating that increases in methane emissions will shift farms away from the
370	production frontier, consequently reducing their environmental efficiency (Skevas et al., 2018).
371	
372	
373	
374	
375	
376	
377	
378	
379	
380	
381	
382	
383	
384	
385	
386	
387	
388	
389	
390	
391	

Technology	D_H ^a		SE
α_0 (Intercept)	-0.218	***	0.040
α_1 (Capital)	-0.043	***	0.012
α_2 (Lactating cows)	-0.207	***	0.051
α_3 (Labour)	0.012		0.023
α_4 (Land)	-0.019	*	0.009
α_5 (Feed)	-0.154	***	0.028
α_6 (Other expenses)	-0.111	***	0.024
β_1 (Methane)	-0.257	***	0.029
δ_2 (Animals sold)	0.005	**	0.002
$\omega_1(Cw)$	-0.042	**	0.013
$\omega_2(Cs)$	-0.034	*	0.015
ω_3 (BS)	-0.031		0.024
Heteroskedasticity in σ_{μ}^2			
ζ_0 (Intercept)	3.881	**	1.425
ζ_1 (Buyer)	0.092		0.059
ζ_2 (Milk yield)	-0.481	***	0.074
ζ_3 (Time farming)	-0.015		0.010
ζ_4 (Improved pasture)	-1.773	*	0.880
ζ_5 (Cows in the herd)	-3.807	*	1.631
ζ_6 (Tech. support)	-0.055		0.036
ζ_7 (Bull in the herd)	0.239		0.312
ζ_8 (Hired labour)	0.695	*	0.370
ζ_9 (Rent land)	-0.107		0.342
Heteroskedasticity in σ_n^2			
τ_0 (Intercept)	-16.849	***	2.457
τ_1 (Buyer)	0.335	*	0.137
τ_2 (Milk yield)	0.683	***	0.123
τ_3 (Tech. support)	0.014		0.065
τ_4 (Bull in the herd)	-1.905	**	0.065
τ_5 (Hired labour)	-0.721		0.629
τ_6 (Rent land)	1.110	*	0.642
Log_Likelihood	236.15		
Mean EE	0.9141		
Std.Dev	0.0873		

392 Table 1. First-order parameters and heteroskedasticity model estimates

393 394

397 Despite the contrasting characteristics of Aw and BS (dry semi-arid) in terms of 398 precipitation, we find no differences between the two climate types. The mean annual rainfall in 399 the municipalities classified as BS was 58% of the volume of rain received by farmers in Aw (see

^{***}p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.1; * Since the estimation of the production function is based on a distance function, the expected signs for first-order input variables are expected to be negative while outputs are expected to be positive.

³⁹⁵ 396

400 Table 2). However, in terms of temperature, the two climate types are similar, presenting a
401 difference of 0.3°C in the annual average temperature.

It is also noteworthy that we identified BS ACT in MG. Previous studies using older 402 403 Climate Normals data found no semi-arid climate types in the state (e.g., Alvares et al., 2013). 404 However, in our updated Köppen-Geiger model, we determine municipalities that presented dry 405 semi-arid conditions. These results are consistent with more recent climatology studies, which also 406 identify BS climate types in MG (e.g., Dubreuil et al., 2019; Martins et al., 2018). The presence of 407 BS climate types in MG can be seen as evidence of climate change unfolding in the northern region 408 of the state (Dubreuil et al., 2019). This trajectory is likely to continue for the coming years and 409 further pressure milk productivity and environmental efficiency in the region.

410 **3.2** Technical-environmental performance and determinants

411 The mean environmental efficiency of the sample is depicted in Figure 2 and was 0.91, 412 ranging from 0.61 to 0.99, indicating that most farmers in the sample exhibit high environmental 413 efficiency. These results suggest that on average, farmers can increase outputs by 9.4% (1/0.91) 414 while simultaneously reducing methane emissions by 8.7% (1-0.91). By reducing inefficiency, 415 farmers could meaningfully contribute to national commitments for reducing methane emissions 416 and still benefit by increasing farm output at the same time. For instance, if the farmers in our 417 sample completely eliminate inefficiency, it would represent an annual reduction of methane 418 emissions of 86 tonnes. Moreover, since the farmers in our sample are already engaged in a 419 programme intended to improve farm productivity, we expect that improving the performance of 420 the average smallholder milk producer in MG can achieve higher contributions to mitigating 421 methane emissions.

422



424 Figure 1. Environmental efficiency scores of dairy farms from Minas Gerais

425 To put in perspective the effect of the exogenous variables on environmental inefficiency,

426 we present their marginal effects in Table 5.

427

423

428 Table 2. Marginal effects of determinants of inefficiency

Variable	Mean	Std.Dev	Min	Max
Buyer	0.005	0.004	0.000	0.024
Milk yield ^a	-0.024	0.022	-0.127	-0.001
Time farming	-0.001	0.001	-0.004	0.000
Improved pasture	-0.088	0.083	-0.468	-0.004
Cows in the herd	-0.188	0.178	-1.006	-0.009
Technical support	-0.003	0.003	-0.014	0.000
Bull in the herd	0.012	0.011	0.001	0.063
Hire labour	0.034	0.032	0.002	0.184
Rented area	-0.005	0.005	-0.028	0.000

^{429 &}lt;sup>a</sup> Variables in bold presented significance in the heteroskedasticity model, p < 0.1.

430

Milk yield presents a negative significant influence on environmental inefficiency, which is expected and in line with previous literature (Le et al., 2020; Mamardashvili et al., 2016; Reinhard et al., 2002; Shortall and Barnes, 2013), and can be associated to some extent with the genetic quality of the herd (Le et al., 2020). Therefore, our results confirm the evidence that increasing milk yield per cow is crucial for both the economic and environmental efficiency of dairy farms. Low-yield dairy cows in LMICs is one of the most pressing issues regarding the sustainability of dairy farms (González-Quintero et al., 2022; Novo et al., 2013; Vogel and Beber, 438 2022). Nevertheless, improving dairy farms in practice warrants a systems-thinking approach. For
439 instance, the successful adoption of high-productive breeds depends on several factors, such as
440 suitable feed supply, climate and rearing conditions that attend the requirements of the selected
441 breed, and farmers with know-how to manage high-yielding animals (Novo et al., 2015).

442 The share of improved pasture has a negative influence on environmental inefficiency. This 443 is expected since improved pastures produce more forage per unit of land, thus reducing land use. 444 Additionally, improved pastures tend to have higher digestibility and lower natural detergent fibre, 445 which in turn contributes to a lower feed conversion rate (FCR) and methane production from 446 enteric fermentation. It is unsurprising that pasture improvement ranks first in the list of activities 447 that farmers shall focus on to improve farms' sustainability in the FB programme (Novo et al., 448 2015). Our results are supported by a considerable body of literature providing evidence that 449 sustainable intensification of degraded and low-quality pastures positively contributes to land 450 sparing, soil carbon storage, and reduction of GHG intensity of beef and dairy cattle (IPCC, 2019c; 451 O'Brien et al., 2016; Oliveira et al., 2021; Ruviaro et al., 2015).

The share of lactating cows among cows in the herd has a negative effect on inefficiency. This result provides evidence that adjusting herd structure to reach the best productive performance possible also improves the environmental efficiency of dairy farms. Fundamentally, this is a key indicator in dairy farms and should ideally be around 84% (Bachman and Schairer, 2003; Kuhn et al., 2006). Nonetheless, most dairy farms in Brazil are short of reaching this level.

We find that contracting labour has a significant positive effect on farms' inefficiency. This somewhat confirms the entrepreneurial view that farms exclusively run by the family receive better care, leading to higher efficiency. Family labour is also less expensive as it is normally informal and does not include social security expenses. The traditional efficiency literature reports no pattern regarding the influence of the share of family labour on efficiency (Zhu and Lansink, 2010).

Remarkably, we observe the existence of trade-offs between production efficiency and risk for some variables. Milk yield presented a significant negative sign in the *z*-model and a significant positive sign in the *v*-model, suggesting that adopting more productive cows increases efficiency but also production risk. There are many factors that can contribute to these results, such as the fact that animals with higher production are more susceptible to diseases and metabolic disorders, inflicting abrupt and unexpected drops in production and increasing expenses with treatments (Brito et al., 2021; Knaus, 2009). They are also more demanding in terms of diet, requiring a higher 469 level of managerial skills to provide a balanced diet year-round, according to animals' categories 470 and productive cycle (Brito et al., 2021; Hoischen-Taubner et al., 2021). Moreover, the capital 471 invested in more productive animals is higher, which also increases losses in case of unexpected 472 culling (Hoischen-Taubner et al., 2021). The same pattern was found for renting land, which 473 significantly increases production risk but is beneficial to production efficiency. While renting land 474 is associated with contractual expenses, we expect that farmers use rented land to produce high-475 quality pasture or silage, such that it improves farm environmental efficiency. Conversely, the 476 presence of breeding bulls in the herd significantly reduces risk, but at the same time has a negative 477 effect on environmental efficiency.

478

3.3 Shadow price of methane emissions

479 The farm-specific shadow price for methane emissions is calculated with respect to the 480 desirable output milk by using the sample mean of milk price. Since input and output variables 481 have been normalised to estimate the production frontier, we adjust the shadow price by 482 multiplying the result of eq. (9) by the ratio of the desirable output by the undesirable output 483 (Mamardashvili et al., 2016). The resulting mean shadow price value is US \$2,254, suggesting that 484 the opportunity cost of reducing an extra tonne of methane emitted in terms of foregone milk 485 production would be around 6.2 t FPCM. Moreover, to compensate for all methane emitted by the 486 farms in our sample, it would cost on average \$11,160 per farm. These results indicate that 487 compensating costs are high, representing almost one-quarter of farms' revenue. Therefore, under 488 the present technology, improving farming efficiency is the most cost-effective path to mitigate the 489 emissions of dairy farms. Notwithstanding, the shadow price calculation assumes that farms are 490 operating on the production boundary, and thus shadow price values for inefficient farms may be 491 overestimated (Adenuga et al., 2019).

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to apply the HDF to derive the shadow price of methane from dairy farms, making a cross-study comparison very limited. Scaling our results to CO₂eq. by applying the conversion factor of 27.2 (Masson-Delmotte et al., 2021), we reach a value of US \$83 per one tonne of CO₂eq. The results from studies evaluating whole-farm CO₂eq. emissions considerably vary. For instance, Njuki and Bravo-Ureta (2015) reported values ranging from US \$43 to US \$950 per tonne of CO₂eq. for US dairy production. The mean value 498 reported for milk production in Germany was $165 \in (US \$186)^6$ per tonne of CO₂eq. (Wettemann

499 and Latacz-Lohmann, 2017), while Le et al. (2020) reported a value of Can 308.29 (US 230)⁷

500 per tonne of CO₂eq. in Canada. Naturally, direct comparisons are not only limited by differing 501 environmental efficiency models but also by regional milk prices and assumptions in modelling

502 GHG emissions, which considerably differ across studies.

503

4

Policy implications

504 Dairy farming is a key agricultural activity to support several SDGs in rural areas. More 505 specifically, it can contribute to achieving the targets from SDG 1 (no poverty), 2 (zero hunger), 506 12 (responsible consumption and production) and 13 (climate action). In the present study, we 507 evaluate dairy farmers' capability to manage their activities towards higher productivity and lower 508 methane emissions. Reducing methane and other GHG emissions from dairy farming is a priority 509 for meeting long-term climate goals (Gerber et al., 2013; IPCC, 2019c; Key and Tallard, 2012; 510 Reisinger et al., 2021). However, this cannot be achieved at the expense of reducing milk 511 production and availability, especially in LMICs, where milk plays a fundamental role in infant 512 nutrition, food security and income generation (FAO, 2019; Grenov and Michaelsen, 2018; Hemme 513 and Otte, 2010; Tricarico et al., 2020). Therefore, developing policies and mechanisms that reach 514 these goals simultaneously is highly desirable.

515 There is a growing body of literature supporting the notion that the higher environmental 516 efficiency of dairy farms can be achieved across countries and production systems. However, it is 517 in LMICs where the greatest benefits (marginal effects) can be achieved in terms of both reduced 518 GHG emissions and increased food production (FAO and GDP, 2018; Gerber et al., 2013). The 519 present study adds to this literature by identifying simple management decisions that could improve 520 the environmental efficiency of pasture-based dairy farms (e.g., increasing the share of improved 521 pastures at the farm and adjusting herd composition). These results are very likely to be true across 522 other regions and countries with similar production systems. For example, Ravichandran et al. 523 (2020) identified that many smallholder producers in India did not adopt such simple technologies 524 as feeding troughs and practices such as chopping of forage. While production technologies and 525 knowledge to overcome such production barriers exists and are already available in Brazil and

⁶

https://www.exchangerates.org.uk/EUR-USD-spot-exchange-rates-history-2017.html

https://www.exchangerates.org.uk/CAD-USD-spot-exchange-rates-history-2020.html

526 many other countries, there remains a huge gap between availability and adoption. Therefore, 527 incentive mechanisms and research focusing on context-specific technology and knowledge 528 transfer is urgently required to bridge this gap in LMICs. Moreover, while there are technologies 529 and practices towards low-carbon dairy farming that could be adopted by farmers with zero or very 530 low expenses, e.g., rotational grazing, others will inevitably require affordable financing 531 instruments, e.g., pasture improvement through seeding of more productive and nutritive grass 532 species or genetic improvement of herds.

533 Furthermore, our results indicate that increasing the milk production of cows improves the 534 environmental efficiency of dairy farming. This is considered one of the most important 535 achievements that dairy farmers should seek to reduce the carbon footprint intensity of milk 536 (Gerber et al., 2011; Herrero et al., 2016). This goal can be reached based on two pathways: first, 537 to increase the milk production of the actual herd by increasing the quality of cows' diet, and 538 improving herd and animal management; and second, the adoption of animals with higher genetic 539 merit for producing milk, which can be achieved by either crossing the actual herd with more 540 productive animals – normally through artificial insemination – or replacing animals in the herd 541 with more productive animals (Novo et al., 2015; Ravichandran et al., 2020). Replacing low-542 producing animals with more productive ones is very appealing in terms of both increasing food 543 production and reducing GHG emissions. However, policy-makers should be aware that promoting 544 the adoption of high-productive breeds does not solve the problem per se. Improving smallholder 545 dairy farming must follow a planned sequence of steps based on a system thinking approach. 546 Therefore, programmes aimed at the sustainable intensification of dairy farming. For example, Full 547 Bucket in Brazil (Novo et al., 2015) and MilkIT in India and Tanzania (Ravichandran et al., 2020) 548 normally first opt to implement strategies to improve the production of the actual herd through 549 feeding, herd management, animal sanity and proper manure handling (Beber et al., 2019; Vogel 550 and Beber, 2022). This approach takes some time to implement, requiring farmers to acquire the 551 know-how to manage and feed more productive and demanding animals, which are promoted in a 552 next step in the intervention cycle (Novo et al., 2015).

In the case of the Full Bucket programme, the transformation of dairy farms into showcase units (model farms) is a key strategy for creating learning clusters at the village level. In addition, technicians are trained to provide farmers with tailored support, developing strategies based on the actual farm endowments and accounting for the socioeconomic characteristics of the household. 557 This and similar programmes are considered successful cases for the sustainable intensification of 558 dairy farming, increasing food security, nutrition, women's empowerment, improving the overall livelihood of smallholders and reducing environmental impacts of dairy farms across LMICs 559 560 (Gerber et al., 2013; Novo et al., 2013; Ravichandran et al., 2020). Despite being very effective, 561 the implementation of programmes with this design requires some time to show satisfactory results 562 (3+ years) (Novo et al., 2015, 2013; Ravichandran et al., 2020). Moreover, their development must be sustained by complimentary supply chain operations and market opportunities, which are 563 564 sometimes limited in LMICs (Beber et al., 2019; de Mendonça et al., 2020; Ravichandran et al., 2020). 565

566 Furthermore, promoting sustainable intensification strategies at the farm level and closing 567 efficiency gaps may not be sufficient to meet global methane emission reduction targets on time. The pledge of reducing global methane emissions by 30% from 2020 levels by 2030 will require 568 569 an extra effort by countries with large livestock herds, such as Brazil and India. Pricing instruments 570 such as carbon and methane taxes have been suggested as an alternative to drive the reduction of 571 externalities in the livestock sector (Key and Tallard, 2012). The shadow price found in the present 572 study provides an indication of the abatement cost for methane emitted by pasture-based dairy 573 farms in Brazil, which can support research for understanding the impacts of implementing pricing 574 instruments in the dairy sector in the tropics. Nonetheless, the implementation of emission taxes in 575 LMIC should be considered last, since the heterogeneity across farms may render the 576 implementation of non-discriminatory emissions taxes. Moreover, advanced certification and 577 monitoring platforms would be necessary to implement methane taxes while avoiding negative 578 spill overs in terms reducing food security (FAO, 2019; Key and Tallard, 2012). Given the possible 579 issues associated with the adoption of methane taxes, policy measures of incentivisation should be 580 prioritised, e.g., payments for environmental services and other conservation-inducing incentives.

Another set of solutions that have gained importance in recent years concerns on-farm carbon storage (Brazil, 2021b; COWI et al., 2020; IPCC, 2019c). Pasture improvement is at the centre of this approach for less productive dairy farms, as it generates important synergies. For instance, pasture improvement promotes carbon storage in biomass and soil as well as the production of forage with higher digestibility, consequently favouring animal productivity and the reduction of methane emissions from livestock (Congio et al., 2018; Cortner et al., 2019; O'Brien et al., 2016). Following pasture improvement, the adoption of integrated production systems has 588 also been promoted as an important carbon farming strategy (e.g., silvopastoral, livestock-forestry 589 and crop-livestock-forestry). The use of fast-growing trees species on farms can also create 590 synergies in many ways. They have strong potential to capture carbon in biomass through 591 photosynthesis. In addition, experimental studies in Brazil have shown that implementing trees on 592 pastures creates microclimates that protect pastures from heat and frost. This microclimate also 593 improves animals' thermal comfort, reducing energy use for maintenance and increasing milk 594 production (Brazil, 2021a; Cortner et al., 2019; Resende et al., 2020; Salton et al., 2014). This set 595 of actions has been extensively supported by financing incentives in Brazil through the Low Carbon 596 Agriculture (ABC) plan (Brasil, 2012; Brazil, 2021b).

597 The ABC plan has led to significant reductions in GHG emissions in the country, the 598 development of low-carbon and adaptation research and successful certifications schemes, e.g., 599 Low Carbon Brazilian Beef (Brazil, 2021b, 2021a; Resende et al., 2020). Despite the effectiveness 600 of the cases developed in Brazil, the low rate of adoption of financial incentives for adopting low-601 carbon practices in the country is a sign of lacking governance to couple financial incentives and 602 technological transfer at the farm level (Cortner et al., 2019). Moreover, implementing 603 silvopastoral and forestry integration on dairy farms may require on-farm structural changes, 604 increasing the complexity of the farming systems. This in turn will require even higher technical 605 and managerial skills as well as financial resources for farmers. This clearly indicates the need to 606 develop and expand technology and knowledge transfer programmes based on holistic approaches 607 guided by multidisciplinary teams, as well as the access to credit to improve feeding strategies and 608 genetics of the dairy herd to reach satisfactory levels of productivity and reduction of GHG 609 emissions.

610 Given the stark heterogeneity of dairy farms across countries and regions, defining and 611 benchmarking satisfactory levels of productivity must take into account regional pedoclimatic 612 conditions for milk production as well as the socioeconomic conditions of farmers in the region 613 (FAO and GDP, 2018; Gerber et al., 2011; Vogel and Beber, 2022). The greatest benefits from 614 increasing dairy cow productivity can be achieved in systems with animals producing less than 2 615 tonnes FPCM year. Gains are still significant in systems producing between 2 and 5 t FPCM per 616 year, while increasing productivity above 5 tonnes FPCM per cow per year will produce only small 617 marginal reductions in the carbon footprint of milk (FAO and GDP, 2018; Gerber et al., 2011). 618 Farms in our sample presented a production of ~3.7 t FPCM per cow per year, which is about one tonne higher than the national average (IBGE, 2018). Thus, we can infer that commercial pasturebased farms in Brazil striving to achieve 5 t FPCM per cow per year could remarkably increase
milk outputs while reducing the GHG intensity of milk.

622 **5** Conclusion

623 Dairy farming has a crucial function in generating farm income, providing food security 624 and employment, as well as safeguarding livelihoods in rural areas in many LMICs. Nevertheless, 625 dairy farming is also an important contributor to GHG emissions, which is an externality of global 626 concerns. Low productive cows in adverse climate settings as much as inadequate management 627 practices compromise farm productivity and are also likely to affect their environmental 628 performance. However, research on the environmental performance of dairy farming is limited to 629 developed countries and high-productive systems. In this paper, we have addressed this gap and 630 analysed the environmental performance of pasture-based dairy production in MG state in Brazil. 631 The stochastic translog HDF was applied considering methane emissions as an undesirable output. 632 This approach allowed us to derive farms' specific environmental efficiency scores, identify key 633 variables that affect efficiency and risk in milk production, and derive the economic/environmental 634 trade-off in the form of the shadow price for methane.

635 Therefore, this study concludes that farmers can improve farms' environmental 636 performance by increasing milk and animal liveweight outputs while simultaneously reducing 637 methane emissions and thus contribute to the Brazilian commitments for reducing methane 638 emissions simply by becoming more efficient in the use of current level of inputs. On average, 639 farmers can improve the environmental efficiency of their farms by increasing the milk yield of 640 cows, increasing the share of improved pastures on farms and adjusting the herd structure. The 641 study also provides evidence that dairy farmers operating in tropical and semi-arid climates are at 642 a disadvantage compared with farmers from areas with a humid subtropical climate. These results 643 reinforce the necessity of considering regional climate types for designing agri-environmental 644 policies and instruments. The shadow price found in this study is within the range reported in the 645 literature and was considerably high in terms of farm revenue, suggesting that mechanisms other 646 than pricing should be given priority for reducing methane emissions in dairy farms. Given the 647 importance and sensitivity of dairy farming for food security and infant nutrition in LMICs, climate 648 policies for the dairy sector must take a precautionary approach in this regard. While the development of dairy farming in LMICs must be driven by multiple strategies, providing long-term
 technical support and knowledge transfers must be at the core of policy strategies.

Finally, we discuss some limitations of our study. Our sample exclusively comprised 651 652 farmers taking part in a voluntary opt-in programme designed to improve farm efficiency, and thus 653 extrapolating our results for the whole population of dairy farmers in Brazil warrants caution due 654 to possible selection bias issues. Nonetheless, given the actions promoted by the FB program, we 655 expect that smallholder farmers not engaged in the programme will on average display lower 656 environmental performance than those who participate. The cross-sectional characteristic of our 657 database did not allow us to explore the dynamics in climate and annual extreme weather conditions 658 faced by farmers in MG. Moreover, due to the limited number of observations, we derived a two-659 level ACT, which includes a main climate group and the seasonal precipitation characteristics. 660 Further studies considering three-level ACT classification are expected to provide further insights 661 into the climate influence on the efficiency of dairy farms. Due to the lack of feasible measurement 662 techniques, it was necessary to calculate methane emissions indirectly and based on assumptions, 663 e.g., manure deposition. This certainly added some uncertainty to our results. Finally, this study 664 focused exclusively on methane, which is currently the most concerning externality in the Brazilian 665 dairy sector, and it is necessary to further explore trade-offs between methane and other undesirable 666 outputs in future studies in the Brazilian conditions.

- 667
- 668
- 669
- 670

References

Adenuga, A.H., Davis, J., Hutchinson, G., Donnellan, T., Patton, M., 2019. Environmental
Efficiency and Pollution Costs of Nitrogen Surplus in Dairy Farms: A Parametric Hyperbolic
Technology Distance Function Approach. Environ. Resour. Econ. 2019 743 74, 1273–1298.
doi:10.1007/S10640-019-00367-2

Adenuga, A.H., Davis, J., Hutchinson, G., Patton, M., Donnellan, T., 2020. Modelling
environmental technical efficiency and phosphorus pollution abatement cost in dairy farms.
Sci. Total Environ. 714. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136690

Aigner, D., Lovell, C.A.K., Schmidt, P., 1977. Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier
production function models. J. Econom. 6. doi:10.1016/0304-4076(77)90052-5

- Alvares, C.A., Stape, J.L., Sentelhas, P.C., De Moraes Gonçalves, J.L., Sparovek, G., 2013.
 Köppen's climate classification map for Brazil. Meteorol. Zeitschrift 22, 711–728.
 doi:10.1127/0941-2948/2013/0507
- Ang, F., Dakpo, K.H., 2021. Comment: Performance measurement and joint production of intended
 and unintended outputs. J. Product. Anal. 55. doi:10.1007/s11123-021-00606-z
- Atkinson, S.E., Tsionas, M.G., 2016. Directional distance functions: Optimal endogenous
 directions. J. Econom. 190. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2015.06.006
- 687 BACEN, 2022. Banco Central do Brasil. Exchange rate:
 688 https://www.bcb.gov.br/estabilidadefinanceira/historicocotacoes [WWW Document].
- Bachman, K.C., Schairer, M.L., 2003. Invited review: Bovine studies on optimal lengths of dry
 periods. J. Dairy Sci. doi:10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(03)73902-2
- Badunenko, O., Mozharovskyi, P., Kolomiytseva, Y., 2020. npsf: Nonparametric and Stochastic
 Efficiency and Productivity Analysis.
- Battese, G.E., Coelli, T.J., 1988. Prediction of firm-level technical efficiencies with a generalized
 frontier production function and panel data. J. Econom. 38. doi:10.1016/03044076(88)90053-X
- Beber, C.L., Carpio, A.F.R., Almadani, M.I., Theuvsend, L., 2019. Dairy supply chain in Southern
 Brazil: Barriers to competitiveness. Int. Food Agribus. Manag. Rev.
 doi:10.22434/IFAMR2018.0091
- Brasil, 2012. Plano Setorial de Mitigação e de Adaptação às Mudanças Climáticas para a
 Consolidação de uma Economia de Baixa Emissão de Carbono na Agricultura. Plano ABC.
 Brasília.
- Brazil, 2021a. Adapting to climate change: Strategies for Brazilian agricultural and livestock
 systems. https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/sustentabilidade/plano-abc/arquivo-
- 704 publicacoes-plano-abc/adapting-to-climate-change-strategies-for-brazilian-agricultural-and-
- 705 livestock-systems.pdf.
- Brazil, 2021b. Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply: Plan for adaptation and low
 carbon emission in agriculture strategic vision for a new cycle / Secretariat for Innovation,
 Rural Development and Irrigation. https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/s.
- 709 Brito, L.F., Bedere, N., Douhard, F., Oliveira, H.R., Arnal, M., Peñagaricano, F., Schinckel, A.P.,
- 710 Baes, C.F., Miglior, F., 2021. Review: Genetic selection of high-yielding dairy cattle toward

- 711 sustainable farming systems in a rapidly changing world. Animal.
 712 doi:10.1016/j.animal.2021.100292
- Campbell, B.M., Hansen, J., Rioux, J., Stirling, C.M., Twomlow, S., Wollenberg, E. (Lini), 2018.
 Urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (SDG 13): transforming agriculture
- and food systems. Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.06.005
- Caudill, S.B., Ford, J.M., Grqpper, D.M., 1995. Frontier estimation and firm-specific inefficiency
 measures in the presence of heteroscedasticity. J. Bus. Econ. Stat. 13.
 doi:10.1080/07350015.1995.10524583
- Chambers, R.G., Chung, Y., Färe, R., 1998. Profit, directional distance functions, and Nerlovian
 efficiency. J. Optim. Theory Appl. 98. doi:10.1023/A:1022637501082
- Chambers, R.G., Chung, Y., Färe, R., 1996. Benefit and distance functions. J. Econ. Theory 70.
 doi:10.1006/jeth.1996.0096
- Chung, Y.H., Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., 1997. Productivity and undesirable outputs: A directional
 distance function approach. J. Environ. Manage. 51. doi:10.1006/jema.1997.0146
- Clay, N., Garnett, T., Lorimer, J., 2020. Dairy intensification: Drivers, impacts and alternatives.
 Ambio. doi:10.1007/s13280-019-01177-y
- Congio, G.F.S., Batalha, C.D.A., Chiavegato, M.B., Berndt, A., Oliveira, P.P.A., Frighetto, R.T.S.,
 Maxwell, T.M.R., Gregorini, P., Da Silva, S.C., 2018. Strategic grazing management towards
 sustainable intensification at tropical pasture-based dairy systems. Sci. Total Environ. 636.
 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.301
- Cortner, O., Garrett, R.D., Valentim, J.F., Ferreira, J., Niles, M.T., Reis, J., Gil, J., 2019.
 Perceptions of integrated crop-livestock systems for sustainable intensification in the
 Brazilian Amazon. Land use policy. doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.01.006
- COWI, Ecologic-Institute, IEEP, 2020. Analytical Support for the Operationalisation of an EU
 Carbon Farming Initiative: Lessons learned from existing result-based carbon farming
 schemes and barriers and solutions for implementation within the EU. Report to the European
 Commission, DG Climate .
- Cuesta, R.A., Lovell, C.A.K., Zofío, J.L., 2009. Environmental efficiency measurement with
 translog distance functions: A parametric approach. Ecol. Econ. 68.
 doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.02.001
- 741 Cuesta, R.A., Zofío, J.L., 2005. Hyperbolic efficiency and parametric distance functions: With
 - 28

- application to Spanish savings banks. J. Product. Anal. doi:10.1007/s11123-005-3039-3
- Dakpo, K.H., Jeanneaux, P., Latruffe, L., 2016. Modelling pollution-generating technologies in
 performance benchmarking: Recent developments, limits and future prospects in the
 nonparametric framework. Eur. J. Oper. Res. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2015.07.024
- Dalheimer, B., 2020. Economic Policy in Global Commodity Markets Methods, Efficiency and
 Trade-offs. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.53846/goediss-8253
- de Mendonça, B.S., Bánkuti, F.I., Pozza, M.S.D.S., Perez, H.L., Siqueira, T.T. da S., 2020. A
- typology of corporate and family dairy farms in eastern Goiás, Brazil. Cienc. Rural.
 doi:10.1590/0103-8478cr20190285
- 751 Debreu, G., 1951. The Coefficient of Resource Utilization. Econometrica 19. doi:10.2307/1906814
- 752 Dubreuil, V., Fante, K.P., Planchon, O., Sant'Anna Neto, J.L., 2019. Climate change evidence in
- 753 Brazil from Köppen's climate annual types frequency. Int. J. Climatol. 39.
 754 doi:10.1002/joc.5893
- Eccel, E., Zollo, A.L., Mercogliano, P., Zorer, R., 2016. Simulations of quantitative shift in bioclimatic indices in the viticultural areas of Trentino (Italian Alps) by an open source R
 package. Comput. Electron. Agric. 127. doi:10.1016/j.compag.2016.05.019
- Embrapa, 2021. Anuário do leite 2021. https://www.embrapa.br/en/busca-de-publicacoes//publicacao/1132875/anuario-leite-2021-saude-unica-e-total.
- Embrapa Territorial, 2020. Agricultura e preservação ambiental: uma análise do cadastro ambiental
 rural [WWW Document]. URL www.embrapa.br/car
- EU, 2021. Launch by United States, the European Union, and Partners of the Global Methane
 Pledge to Keep 1.5C Within Reach [WWW Document].
 https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_21_5766.
- FAO, 2019. Five practical actions towards low-carbon livestock, Food and Agriculture
 Organization of the United Nations.
- FAO, 2013. Milk and dairy products in human nutrition. Food and Agriculture Organization(FAO).
- FAO, 2010. Status of and Prospects for Smallholder Milk Production- A Global Perspective, by T.
- Hemme and J. Otte. Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- FAO, GDP, 2018. Climate change and the global dairy cattle sector The role of the dairy sector
 in a low-carbon future, Journal of Environment Quality.

- FAO, GDP, IFCN, 2020. Dairy's Impact on Reducing Global Hunger, Dairy's Impact on Reducing
 Global Hunger.
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., 2000. Theory and Application of Directional Distance Functions. J.
 Product. Anal. doi:10.1023/A:1007844628920
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., 1998. Shadow Pricing of Good and Bad Commodities. Am. J. Agric. Econ.
 80. doi:10.2307/1244563
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Lovell, C.A.K., 1985. The Measurement of Efficiency of Production, The
 Measurement of Efficiency of Production. doi:10.1007/978-94-015-7721-2
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Lovell, C.A.K., Pasurka, C., 1989. "Multilateral productivity comparisons
 when some outputs are undesirable: A nonparametric approach." Rev. Econ. Stat. 71.
 doi:10.2307/1928055
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Noh, D.W., Weber, W., 2005. Characteristics of a polluting technology:
 Theory and practice. J. Econom. 126. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2004.05.010
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Zaim, O., 2002. Hyperbolic efficiency and return to the dollar. Eur. J. Oper.
 Res. 136. doi:10.1016/S0377-2217(01)00022-4
- Farrell, M.J., 1957. The Measurement of Productive Efficiency. J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. A 120.
 doi:10.2307/2343100
- Førsund, F.R., 2021. Performance measurement and joint production of intended and unintended
 outputs. J. Product. Anal. 55. doi:10.1007/s11123-021-00599-9
- Gerber, P., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., Falcucci, A., Tempio,
 G., FAO, 2013. Tackling Climate Change Through Livestock, Most.
- Gerber, P., Vellinga, T., Opio, C., Steinfeld, H., 2011. Productivity gains and greenhouse gas
 emissions intensity in dairy systems. Livest. Sci. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2011.03.012
- González-Quintero, R., van Wijk, M.T., Ruden, A., Gómez, M., Pantevez, H., Castro-Llanos, F.,
 Notenbaert, A., Arango, J., 2022. Yield gap analysis to identify attainable milk and meat
 productivities and the potential for greenhouse gas emissions mitigation in cattle systems of
- 799 Colombia. Agric. Syst. 195. doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103303
- 800 Gori Maia, A., Silveira, R.L.F. da, Veneo Campos Fonseca, C., Burney, J., Cesano, D., 2021.
- 801 Climate resilience programmes and technical efficiency: evidence from the smallholder dairy
- farmers in the Brazilian semi-arid region. Clim. Dev. doi:10.1080/17565529.2021.1904812
- 803 Grenov, B., Michaelsen, K.F., 2018. Growth Components of Cow's Milk: Emphasis on Effects in

- 804 Undernourished Children. Food Nutr. Bull. 39. doi:10.1177/0379572118772766
- Hemme, T., Otte, J., 2010. Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative Status and Prospects for
 Smallholder Milk Production A Global Perspective, Food and Agriculture Organization of the
 United Nations.
- Herrero, M., Henderson, B., Havlík, P., Thornton, P.K., Conant, R.T., Smith, P., Wirsenius, S.,
 Hristov, A.N., Gerber, P., Gill, M., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Valin, H., Garnett, T., Stehfest, E.,
- 810 2016. Greenhouse gas mitigation potentials in the livestock sector. Nat. Clim. Chang.
 811 doi:10.1038/nclimate2925
- Hoischen-Taubner, S., Habel, J., Uhlig, V., Schwabenbauer, E.M., Rumphorst, T., Ebert, L.,
 Möller, D., Sundrum, A., 2021. The whole and the parts—a new perspective on production

diseases and economic sustainability in dairy farming. Sustain. 13. doi:10.3390/su13169044

815 Holtkamp, A.M., Brümmer, B., 2018. Environmental efficiency of smallholder rubber production,

816 in: International Association of Agricultural Economists. doi:10.22004/ag.econ.277518

- 817 IBGE, 2021. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística IBGE Cidades [WWW Document].
 818 Cidades. URL https://www.ibge.gov.br/cidades-e-estados/pr.html
- 819 IBGE, 2018. Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics. Censo agropecuário 2017. Censo
 820 agropecuário.
- 821 IPCC, 2019a. 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas
 822 Inventories. IPCC, Switzerland.
- 823 IPCC, 2019b. Chapter 10: Emissions from livestock and manure management, in: Calvo Buendia,
- E., Tanabe, K., Kranjc, A., Baasansuren, J., Fukuda, M., Ngarize, S., Osako, A., Pyrozhenko,
- Y., Shermanau, P., Federici, S. (Eds.), 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for
 National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Volume 4 Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use.
 Switzerland.
- 828 IPCC, 2019c. Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change, desertification,
 829 land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in
 830 terrestrial ecosystems, IPCC. Switzerland.
- Key, N., Tallard, G., 2012. Mitigating methane emissions from livestock: A global analysis of
 sectoral policies. Clim. Change 112. doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0206-6
- Knaus, W., 2009. Dairy cows trapped between performance demands and adaptability[†]. J. Sci.
 Food Agric. 89. doi:10.1002/jsfa.3575

- Kuhn, M.T., Hutchison, J.L., Norman, H.D., 2006. Effects of length of dry period on yields of milk
 fat and protein, fertility and milk somatic cell score in the subsequent lactation of dairy cows.
- 837 J. Dairy Res. 73. doi:10.1017/S0022029905001597
- 838 Kumbhakar, S.C., Lovell, K.C.. ., 2003. Stochastic frontier analysis. Cambridge university press.

839 Le, S., Jeffrey, S., An, H., 2020. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Technical Efficiency in Alberta

- B40 Dairy Production: What Are the Trade-Offs? J. Agric. Appl. Econ. 52.
 B41 doi:10.1017/aae.2019.41
- Mamardashvili, P., Emvalomatis, G., Jan, P., 2016. Environmental performance and shadow value
 of polluting on swiss dairy farms. J. Agric. Resour. Econ. 41. doi:10.22004/ag.econ.235154
- March, M.D., Toma, L., Stott, A.W., Roberts, D.J., 2016. Modelling phosphorus efficiency within
 diverse dairy farming systems Pollutant and non-renewable resource? Ecol. Indic. 69.
 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.05.022
- 847 Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S.L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y.,
- Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M.I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J.B.R., Maycock,
 T.K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., B., Z., 2021. Climate Change 2021: The Physical
 Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the
 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press.
- Meeusen, W., van Den Broeck, J., 1977. Efficiency Estimation from Cobb-Douglas Production
 Functions with Composed Error. Int. Econ. Rev. (Philadelphia). 18. doi:10.2307/2525757

854 Mukherjee, D., Bravo-Ureta, B.E., De Vries, A., 2013. Dairy productivity and climatic conditions:

- Econometric evidence from South-eastern United States. Aust. J. Agric. Resour. Econ. 57.
 doi:10.1111/j.1467-8489.2012.00603.x
- Murty, S., Nagpal, R., 2020. Measuring output-based technical efficiency of Indian coal-based
 thermal power plants: A by-production approach. Indian Growth Dev. Rev. 13.
 doi:10.1108/IGDR-05-2018-0058
- Murty, S., Robert Russell, R., Levkoff, S.B., 2012. On modeling pollution-generating technologies.
 J. Environ. Econ. Manage. 64. doi:10.1016/j.jeem.2012.02.005
- Murty, S., Russell, R.R., 2021. A commentary on "Performance measurement and joint production
 of intended and unintended outputs" by Finn Førsund. J. Product. Anal. 55.
 doi:10.1007/s11123-021-00603-2
- 865 Njuki, E., Bravo-Ureta, B.E., 2015. The economic costs of environmental regulation in U.S. Dairy

- 866 farming: A directional distance function approach. Am. J. Agric. Econ. 97.
 867 doi:10.1093/ajae/aav007
- Njuki, E., Bravo-Ureta, B.E., Mukherjee, D., 2016. The good and the bad: Environmental
 efficiency in northeastern U.S. dairy farming. Agric. Resour. Econ. Rev.
 doi:10.1017/age.2016.1
- Novo, A., Jansen, K., Slingerland, M., 2015. The novelty of simple and known technologies and
 the rhythm of farmer-centred innovation in family dairy farming in Brazil. Int. J. Agric.
 Sustain. 13. doi:10.1080/14735903.2014.945320
- 874 Novo, A.M., Slingerland, M., Jansen, K., Kanellopoulos, A., Giller, K.E., 2013. Feasibility and 875 competitiveness of intensive smallholder dairy farming in Brazil in comparison with soya and 876 sugarcane: Case study of the Balde Cheio Programme. Agric. Syst. 877 doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2013.06.007
- 878 O'Brien, D., Geoghegan, A., McNamara, K., Shalloo, L., 2016. How can grass-based dairy farmers
 879 reduce the carbon footprint of milk?, in: Animal Production Science. doi:10.1071/AN15490
- 880 OECD-FAO, 2021. OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021–2030, OECD-FAO Agricultural
 881 Outlook 2021–2030.
- 882 Oliveira, P.P.A., Rodrigues, P.H.M., Praes, M.F.F.M., Pedroso, A.F., Oliveira, B.A., Sperança, 883 M.A., Bosi, C., Fernandes, F.A., 2021. Soil carbon dynamics in Brazilian Atlantic forest 884 converted into pasture-based dairy production systems. Agron. J. 113. 885 doi:10.1002/agj2.20578
- Perez-Mendez, J.A., Roibas, D., Wall, A., 2019. The influence of weather conditions on dairy
 production. Agric. Econ. (United Kingdom) 50. doi:10.1111/agec.12474
- 888 Peyrache, A., Coelli, T.J., 2009. A Multiplicative Directional Distance Function, No. WP02/2009.
- Picazo-Tadeo, A.J., Reig-Martínez, E., Hernández-Sancho, F., 2005. Directional distance functions
 and environmental regulation. Resour. Energy Econ. 27. doi:10.1016/j.reseneeco.2004.07.001
- R Core Team, 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Found. Stat.
 Comput.
- Ravichandran, T., Teufel, N., Capezzone, F., Birner, R., Duncan, A.J., 2020. Stimulating
 smallholder dairy market and livestock feed improvements through local innovation platforms
 in the Himalayan foothills of India. Food Policy 95. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2020.101949
- 896 Reinhard, S., Knox Lovell, C.A., Thijssen, G.J., 2000. Environmental efficiency with multiple

- environmentally detrimental variables; estimated with SFA and DEA. Eur. J. Oper. Res. 121.
 doi:10.1016/S0377-2217(99)00218-0
- Reinhard, S., Lovell, C.A.K., Thijssen, G., 2002. Analysis of environmental efficiency variation.
 Am. J. Agric. Econ. 84. doi:10.1111/1467-8276.00053
- 901 Reinhard, S., Lovell, C.A.K., Thijssen, G., 1999. Econometric Estimation of Technical and
- 902 Environmental Efficiency: An Application to Dutch Dairy Farms. Am. J. Agric. Econ. 81.
 903 doi:10.2307/1244449
- Reisinger, A., Clark, H., Cowie, A.L., Emmet-Booth, J., Gonzalez Fischer, C., Herrero, M.,
 Howden, M., Leahy, S., 2021. How necessary and feasible are reductions of methane
 emissions from livestock to support stringent temperature goals? Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A
 Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 379. doi:10.1098/rsta.2020.0452
- 908 Resende, L. de O., Müller, M.D., Kohmann, M.M., Pinto, L.F.G., Cullen Junior, L., de Zen, S.,
- 909 Rego, L.F.G., 2020. Silvopastoral management of beef cattle production for neutralizing the
- 910 environmental impact of enteric methane emission. Agrofor. Syst. 94. doi:10.1007/s10457911 019-00460-x
- Ribeiro, R.S., Rodrigues, J.P.P., Maurício, R.M., Borges, A.L.C.C., Reis e Silva, R., Berchielli,
 T.T., Valadares Filho, S.C., Machado, F.S., Campos, M.M., Ferreira, A.L., Guimarães Júnior,
 R., Azevêdo, J.A.G., Santos, R.D., Tomich, T.R., Pereira, L.G.R., 2020. Predicting enteric
- 915 methane production from cattle in the tropics. Animal 14. doi:10.1017/S1751731120001743
- Riera, F.S., Brümmer, B., 2022. Environmental efficiency of wine grape production in Mendoza,
 Argentina. Agric. Water Manag. 262, 107376. doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2021.107376
- 918 Ruviaro, C.F., de Léis, C.M., Lampert, V. do N., Barcellos, J.O.J., Dewes, H., 2015. Carbon
- 919 footprint in different beef production systems on a southern Brazilian farm: a case study. J.

920 Clean. Prod. 96, 435–443. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.01.037

- 921 Salton, J.C., Mercante, F.M., Tomazi, M., Zanatta, J.A., Concenço, G., Silva, W.M., Retore, M.,
- 922 2014. Integrated crop-livestock system in tropical Brazil: Toward a sustainable production
- 923
 system.
 Agric.
 Ecosyst.
 Environ.
 190,
 70–79.

 924
 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.09.023

 </t
- 925 SEEG, 2020. Análise das emissões brasileiras de gases de efeito estufa e suas implicações para as
 926 metas climáticas do Brasil 1970 2020.
- 927 Shephard, R.W., 1970. Theory of cost and production functions. Princeton University Press.

- 928 Shephard, R.W., 1953. Cost and production functions. By Ronald W. Shephard, Princeton 929 University Press, 1953, 104 Nav. 171–171. pp. Res. Logist. Q. 1. 930 doi:10.1002/nav.3800010218
- Shortall, O.K., Barnes, A.P., 2013. Greenhouse gas emissions and the technical efficiency of dairy
 farmers. Ecol. Indic. 29. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.01.022
- 933 Skevas, I., Zhu, X., Shestalova, V., Emvalomatis, G., 2018. The impact of agri-environmental
 934 policies and production intensification on the environmental performance of Dutch dairy
- 935 farms. J. Agric. Resour. Econ. 43. doi:10.22004/AG.ECON.276503
- 936 Trewartha, G.T., Horn, L.H., 1980. An introduction to climate. Fifth edition. An Introd. to Clim.
 937 Fifth Ed.
- Tricarico, J.M., Kebreab, E., Wattiaux, M.A., 2020. MILK Symposium review: Sustainability of
 dairy production and consumption in low-income countries with emphasis on productivity
 and environmental impact. J. Dairy Sci. doi:10.3168/jds.2020-18269
- 941 UN-CCAC, 2021. United Nations Environment Programme and Climate and Clean Air Coalition
 942 (2021). Global Methane Assessment: Benefits and Costs of Mitigating Methane Emissions.
 943 Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme.
- Valadares Filho, S.C., Lopes, S.A., Silva, B. de C., Chizzotti, M.L., Bissaro, L.Z., 2020. CQBAL
 4.0. Tabelas Brasileiras de Composição de Alimentos para Ruminantes [WWW Document].
 2018. URL www.cqbal.com.br
- Vogel, E., Beber, C.L., 2022. Carbon footprint and mitigation strategies among heterogeneous
 dairy farms in Paraná, Brazil. J. Clean. Prod. 349, 131404. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.131404
- Wang, H.J., 2002. Heteroscedasticity and non-monotonic efficiency effects of a stochastic frontier
 model. J. Product. Anal. 18. doi:10.1023/A:1020638827640
- Weaver, C., Wijesinha-Bettoni, R., McMahon, D., Spence, L., 2013. Milk and dairy products as
 part of the diet, Milk and dairy products in human nutrition.
- Wettemann, P.J.C., Latacz-Lohmann, U., 2017. An efficiency-based concept to assess potential
 cost and greenhouse gas savings on German dairy farms. Agric. Syst. 152.
 doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2016.11.010
- Zhou, P., Zhou, X., Fan, L.W., 2014. On estimating shadow prices of undesirable outputs with
 efficiency models: A literature review. Appl. Energy 130.
 doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.02.049

959 Zhu, X., Lansink, A.O., 2010. Impact of CAP Subsidies on Technical Efficiency of Crop Farms in

960 Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. J. Agric. Econ. 61. doi:10.1111/j.1477-961 9552.2010.00254.x

962

Appendix A 963

964

965 Table A1

Forage characteristics 966

0					
Name	Туре	DM	NDF	TDN	СР
Zea mays	Silage	31.2	54.0	63.2	7.2
Saccharum officinarum L.	Fresh forage	28.9	53.5	62.8	2.8
Brachiaria.spp	Fresh forage	35.4	71.5	50.1	6.4
Cynodon spp.	Fresh forage	27.9	75.6	59.1	12.1
Panicum spp.	Fresh forage	28.0	70.4	58.0	10.2
Pennisetum purpureum Schum.	Fresh forage	22.04	64.91	63.66	10.78
Generic Intensive	Fresh forage	25.98	70.31	60.26	11.04
DM. dry matter (0/ fresh matter). NDE: noutrol	datargant f	Shor (0/ DM)	TDN: tota	digastible

967 DM: dry matter (% fresh matter); NDF: neutral detergent fiber (%DM); TDN: total digestible 968 nutrients (% DM); CP: crude protein (% DM). Based on Valadares Filho et al. (2020).

969

970 Table A2

Concentrate ration formulation for lactating cows and other cattle 971

Ingredient	Lactating cows	Other cattle	
Maize meal (%)	63.00	40.00	
Soybean meal (%)	24.28	20.00	
Soybean hulls (%)	2.00	5.00	
Rice meal (%)	6.75	32.58	
Dicalcium phosphate (%)	1.12	1.53	
Limestone (%)	1.07	0.00	
Salt (%)	0.79	0.78	
Urea (%)	1.00	0.10	

0.051

9	7	2
		_

973				
974				
975				
976				
977	Appendix B			
978				
979	Table B1			
980	Parameter estimates of the	e hyperbolic distanc	e function	n
	Technology	$D_H \operatorname{CH}_4$		SE
	α0 (Intercept)	-0.218	***	0.040
	α1 (Capital)	-0.043	***	0.012

-0.207

 $\alpha 2$ (Lactating cows)

α3 (Labour)	0.012		0.023
α4 (Land)	-0.019	*	0.009
a5 (Feed)	-0.154	***	0.028
α6 (Other expenses)	-0.111	***	0.024
β1 (Methane)	-0.257	***	0.029
β00	0.239		0.236
α11	0.054	***	0.016
α22	2.518	***	0.581
α33	-0.023		0.117
α44	-0.004		0.011
α55	0.001		0.084
α66	0.060		0.053
α12	-0.103	*	0.059
α13	0.005		0.029
α14	0.023	*	0.011
α15	0.010		0.031
α16	0.129	***	0.033
α23	-0.265		0.173
α24	-0.026		0.064
α25	-0.863	***	0.178
α26	0.051		0.144
α34	0.025		0.023
α35	-0.323	***	0.063
α36	0.105	*	0.047
α45	0.051	*	0.021
α46	-0.057	**	0.019
α56	0.102	*	0.052
δ2(Animals sold)	0.005	**	0.002
δ22	0.001	**	0.001
χ10	-0.043		0.029
χ20	-0.682	*	0.348
χ30	0.230	*	0.094
χ40	0.005		0.037
χ50	0.317	**	0.114
χ60	-0.152		0.093
γ12	0.002	*	0.001
γ22	0.016	***	0.005
γ32	-0.011	***	0.002
γ42	0.003	***	0.001
γ52	0.001		0.003
γ62	0.005	**	0.002
ρ20	-0.008	***	0.003
ω2	-0.042	**	0.013
ω3	-0.034	*	0.015
ω4	-0.031		0.024

Heteroskedasticity in σ_u^2

ζ0 (Intercept)	3.881	**	1.425	
ζ1 (Buyers)	0.092		0.059	
ζ2 (Milk yield)	-0.481	***	0.074	
ζ 3 (Time farming)	-0.015		0.010	
ζ4 (Intensive pasture)	-1.773	*	0.880	
$\zeta 5$ (Cows in the herd)	-3.807	*	1.631	
ζ6 (Tech. support)	-0.055		0.036	
ζ 7 (Bull in the herd)	0.239		0.312	
ζ8 (Hire labour)	0.695	*	0.370	
ζ9 (Rent land)	-0.107		0.342	
Heteroskedasticity in σ_v^2				
τ0 (Intercept)	-16.849	***	2.457	
τ1 (Buyers)	0.335	*	0.137	
τ2 (Milk yield)	0.683	***	0.123	
τ 3 (Bull in the herd)	0.014		0.065	
τ4 (Hire labour)	-1.905	**	0.629	
τ5 (Rent land)	-0.721		0.642	
Log_Likelihood	236.15			
Mean EE	0.9141			
Std.Dev	0.0873			