Benin Agriculture Productivity and profitability Measurement

Labintan Adeniyi Constant[1] and Ding Shijun[2]

1. Dr in Agricultural Economics ,

2. Prof in Agricultural Economics

Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, Wuhan, China

182# Nanhu Avenue, East Lake High-tech Development Zone, Wuhan 430073, P.R.China

Abstract

This paper explored the Benin agricultural productivity and profitability under occurred reform since 1961 to 2008. Productivity and profitability has been evaluated using the new approach developed by O'Donnell(2008).In the approach Productivity is obtain using Hick Moorsteen index decomposition into Technical Change, mix Efficiency change and Scale Efficiency Change while Profitability is obtain using productivity and Term of Trade product. To achieved the purpose of this paper, agricultural output-input quantity and prices data have been collected from FAO stat, Benin Country FAO statistical database and Benin National Agricultural Institute Database during the period 1961-2008. All data are computing using the DPIN software developed by O'Donnell (2010).

It is found that since the country national independency in 1961, Benin agriculture productivity has decreased. The decreased has been more significant after the sector liberalization while the term of trade has been much improved and profitability increased. This situation explains that after the liberalization, competiveness has decreased and monopolization increased. It can be conclude that most private stakeholder involve in the sector during post liberalization has earn more profit than invest to contribute at the sector productivity growth.

The paper indentify that the country doesn't improved agricultural productivity after the sector liberalization in opposite to the normal figure that liberalization will stimulate technology transfer and development which will improve productivity. The situation will then highlight policies maker to identify news strategy which can help to optimize the production and agriculture resources efficiency.

Key -words: Agricultural-Productivity- Profitability-Benin-Reform

Introduction

Like most Sub-Sahara economies, in Benin agricultural is a dominant sector for economic growth, food security and to poverty alleviation. Its contributes more than 20% of country's Gross Domestic Product Growth (GDP), and employs at least 60% of country's population (BAfD/OCDE, 2008) mostly women's who have access to small pieces of land (1.7 ha per 7

peoples) provides 90% of export earnings and participates in 15% of state revenue (MAEP-MDEF[1],2006). Over decades, the country's agricultural growth was on downward trend.

However, comparing to developed countries agriculture growth which have been increased highly substantially over several decade, Benin agriculture growth has decreased. This situation generates polarized debate regarding the real impact of agricultural sector growth decreased on the country poverty alleviation goals**.**

Moreover, Benin's has undergone several reforms under different political regimes since 1961.However the important reform started from 1990 with the Country openness economy and agriculture liberalization in purpose to stimulate the country economic growth. There is evidence that agricultural as key sector for the country economic growth, will certainly been affected.

The productivity question in Benin is not new topic but very little empirical study has been done in this field to evaluate the whole country agricultural productivity. Most study are sectorial studies focused only in cotton productivity (MAEP,2010;MFE[2],2010; Sekloka, et al , 2009; Nicolas.P,2011) or cassava productivity(Adekambi et al, 2010; ESC[3], 2004)

This paper aims to explore the Benin's agricultural productivity and profitability from 1961 to 2008 and evaluate the variation over that period.

The first section outlines the concepts of productivity and profitability and reviews various frameworks which assist in evaluating both factors and identified the best approach. The second section will be applied the best approach to evaluate agricultural productivity and profitability in Benin and analysis each factor variation. The last part will be for conclusion and policies.

1-Productivity and Profitability Measurement

Productivity is defined as the relationship between output generated by production and service and the input provided to produce this output (Joseph Prokopenko, 1987). According to the same author, productivity means resources (labor, capital, material, energy and information change) efficient use.

Chambers (1988) argued that productivity measurement is an approach to measure the production rate of technical change and can be conceptualized as comprising two main components. The first component is partial factor productivity (PFP) and expressed as the ratio of total output Y and any xi input used to produce that output. The second component is the total output Y ratio with summation of all input Xi

However, it is very complex most of time to quantify the exact input used to produce a certain amount of output. When the input is visible, it is in form of good and invisible when it is in form of service (Gboyega, 2000). From this point of view, it seems that various components are involved in output production and this makes more complex the exact description of input components. To overcome this complexity, a common approach is to consider labour (human resources), capital (physical and financial assets), and material as input components with time becoming the denominator of output with the assumption that capital, energy and other factors are regarded as aids to individual productivity.

(a) Furthermore, there are several methods to aggregate inputs and outputs for productivity measurement. Grosskopf (1993) conclude that there are four productivity measurement methods which could be base on frontier output or on non frontier output: (a) Econometric production models; (b) total factor productivity indices; (c) data envelope analysis (DEA); and (d) stochastic frontiers (Coelli,Rao and Battese, 1998).

Figure1: Summarized of Previous Productivity Measurement Methods

Sources: Grosskopf (1993)

The econometric methods are based on the determination of the production function or dual /cost profit function. The important benefit of this approach is that its econometric implementation yields parameter estimates of the production technology in the process of measuring productivity advancement. But it request to know the production function (ex: the Cob-Douglas production function) base on Solow growth model.

Nonetheless, the Malmquist index base on Caves, Christensen, and Diewert (1982) research and using the distance function are very good tools to measure and analyse productivity. Indeed Färe et al. (1994) proposed use of the distance function approach first proposed by Shepherd (1970) and Fare(1988) to calculate the Malmquist TFP as geometric mean of output Malmquist index and input Malmquist index. They found that the TFP can be decomposed as a product of two

forms of efficiency factors which are technical change and technical efficiency change. Fare et al (1994) utilize the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) approach. This is a nonparametric approach based on linear programming to compute these two efficiency factors. The nonparametric Malmquist index became very popular as it is easy to compute. Furthermore, the approach does not require information on cost or revenue shares to aggregate inputs or outputs, consequently, it less demanding in terms of data. Furthermore, The approach allows into changes in efficiency and technology to be broken down (Shih et al, 2003; Alejandro and Bingxin, 2008).

In addition, the method does not attract any of the stochastic assumption restrictions. Despite this, it is susceptible to the effects of data noise, and can suffer from the problem of 'unusual' shadow prices, when degrees of freedom are restricted (O'Donnell, Coelli and Timothy, 2005).

The issue of shadow prices is important and is one that is not well understood among authors who apply the Malmquist DEA methods. By contrast, DEA methods in measuring productivity growth which differ from pure index approach such as Fisher and Tornkvist indexes do not require any price data. The concept is more evident in agriculture where input price data are seldom available and could at any times be distorted by the government policies.

The productivity evaluation Malmquist TFP approach based on DEA method has been applied by several scholars to evaluate several countries, regions and provinces in terms of both overall productivity and in various individual sectors over the past decades (Fare et al , 1994; David and Elliot ,1998 ; Shih-Hsun et al , 2003; Vu , 2003; Tim and Shannon , 2005 ; Carlos ,2010).

Indeed, Fare et al (1994) has applied the method to analysis productivity growth in 17 OECD countries over the period 1979-1988.They found that US productivity growth is slightly higher than an average country in the OECD region and it was due to technical change in the US agriculture sector while Japan's productivity growth is highest with almost half due to efficiency change.

Michael A. Trueblood used the method to evaluate intercountry agricultural productivity growth over the period of 1961-1991. It was the most comprehensive sample of countries in the world to date. The study found that globally, productivity declined during the 1960s and 1970s, but rebounded in the 1980s. Developing economies' productivity declined over 1961-1991 while

developed economies exhibited positive production growth, demonstrating a widening productivity gap. North America and Western Europe registered high growth while Asia and Sub-Sahara Africa registered negative growth. Differences were attributed toward policies of greater economic openness and the effectiveness of the 'Green revolution'.

Carlos(2010) used the method to evaluate Latin America and Caribbean agricultural productivity in comparison to the rest of the world during the period 1961-2007. It was found that among developing regions, Latin America and the Caribbean had the highest agricultural productivity growth during the last two decades, due particularly to improvements in efficiency and the introduction of new technologies. This has been achieved through strong land allocation and agriculture policies. This was the case in Brazil and Cuba which policies that do not discriminate against agricultural sectors and that remove price and production distortions were considered to have helped improve productivity growth.

David and Elliott (1998) have also applied the Malmquist DEA method to evaluate change in Chinese provincial agriculture productivity after the China's agricultural reform opening. They found significant variation in productivity change from year-to-year and from province-to-province. They concluded that de-collectivization in the early 1980s accounted for a significant expansion of agricultural productivity, while rural industrialization registered the opposite effect. In addition, they found that productivity was also sensitive relative grain prices, to natural disasters including flood and drought, and the proximity of a given province to coastal areas.

Shih-Hsun Hsu et al (2003) has also applied the Malmquist productivity indexes and it decomposition using DEA approach to evaluate China's 27 provinces agricultural productivity to analyze then the productivity growth in China's agricultural sector over the period1984-1999 .He found that over all the considered period TFP growth remains sluggish in China's agricultural

Similarly, Vu (2003) applies Malmquist productivity index method to measure total factor productivity (TFP) growth in Vietnamese agriculture using panel data from 60 provinces in Vietnam over the period 1985-2000. His study indicated that most of the early growth in

Vietnamese agriculture (1985-1990) was due to TFP growth, in response to incentive reforms. He also found that during the period 1990-1995, the growth rate of TFP fell and Vietnam's agricultural growth was mainly caused by drastic investment in capital while in the last period 1995-2000, TFP growth increased again, though still much lower than the period 1985-1990. Overall, TFP growth rate in the whole period is estimated 1.96 percent, contributing to 38% of Vietnam's agricultural growth.

However the Malmquist index uses to evaluate productivity has two limitations (Nin, Arndt, Hertel and Preckel, 2003) and there remains a polarized debate about the different approach employed. First, there might be cases where the distance function takes on the value of -1, in which case the Malmquist Index is not well defined. Second, there might be a reallocation factor bias in the measure, where there is movement of unallocated inputs from one activity to the other rather than technical growth.

O'Donnell (2008) has made great contribution to the literature by founding that any multiplicatively-complete TFP index can be exhaustively decomposed into the product of measures of technical change and several meaningful measures of efficiency change. The class of multiplicatively-complete TFP indexes includes the well-known Paasche, Laspeyres, Fisher, Tornquist and Hicks- Moorsteen indexes, but not the Malmquist TFP index of Caves, Christensen and Diewert (1982). O'Donnell (2008) decomposes the Hicks- Moorsteen TFP indexes into economically-meaningful measures of technical change (movements in the boundary of the production possibilities set), technical efficiency change (movements towards the boundary), and scale and mix efficiency change (movements around the boundary to capture economies of scale and scope).This is the real advantage compare to Mamlquist TFP which identify the productivity to technical change only.

Unlike some other TFP decomposition methodologies, the O'Donnell (2008) methodology does not depend on any assumptions concerning the technology, firm behavior, or the level of competition in input or output markets. These constitute one important limitation of the method as firm behavior and market variation can significantly affect the productivity.

Indeed, very few scholars applied this new approach (O'Donnell, 2008, O'Donnell, 2010a; Laurenceson and O'Donnell, 2011) but form recently more scholars start given attention.

O'Donnell (2010b) shows how data envelopment analysis (DEA) methodology can be employed to compute and decompose the distance-based Hicks-Moorsteen TFP index. He developed linear programming software called DPIN to compute all input and output to obtain all available productivity and profitability components.

O'Donnell (2008) has evaluated this new approach of TFP indexing based on Moorsteen hicks index with DEA computation approach to revaluate the TFP calculated by Coelli, Rao, O'Donnell and Battese (2005).His new TFP index alleged to be different from the famous TFP based on Malmquist index but it isn't the case as he used previous technical change and scale efficiency change index evaluated by Coelli et al (2005) to compute his new result under variable return scale.

Laurenceson and O'Donnell (2011) applied this new approach to evaluate new estimation and decomposition of provincial productivity change in China from China reform opening to 2008. They found that TFP growth during the first half of the reform period (1978-1993) can be attributed to both technical change and efficiency improvement. However, in the second half of the reform period (1994-2008) it can be attributed to technical change alone. Indeed, they also found that average levels of technical and scale efficiency fell during the second half of the reform period, particularly in inland provinces. They attribute these lower efficiency estimates to an especially high rate of technical change, not to a decline in the ability of Chinese producers to transform inputs into outputs. They conjecture that Chinese producers have been increasing their productivity levels but at a rate that leaves them lagging behind a rapidly shifting frontier.

2-Methodology and data

To achieve the purpose of this study, I will first part evaluate Benin's total aggregate output and input variation over the period 1961-2008. This will help us to quantify the amount of input use to produce a quantity of output and also the growth rate. Common classifiers of agriculture aggregated inputs (per ha) are utilized in five categories: capital (K); labor (L); energy (E);

material inputs (M); and purchased services (S). In this study:

- ✓ There physical Capital and financial capital .Here only Physical capital(X1) is consider and this include agriculture land area
- ✓ Labor(X2) include number of man day in agricultural;
- ✓ Energy is use for annual agriculture energy consumption (Power),however it is neglected component in agriculture sector in Benin;
- ✓ Materiel input here is defined as total numbers of agricultural tractor per 100km square(X3) and the quantity of fertilizer (X4)used per unit of land.
- ✓ An agricultural purchase service is indentified to farmers' wholesaler services and it is very mostly characterized by traditional purchased services which are not regulated and difficult to be quantified.

Input quantity and prices

All input data are collected from FAO statistical database while input prices of 2008 have been considered a proxy for all the period considerate and collected computing from MAEP (2010), Moussaratou, S.(2008) , and INRAB[4] statistical data 2008

Ouput data include:

- ✓ Grain(Y1) included all cereal (Maize, Sorghum, Wheat, Rice paddy, Millet);
- ✓ Vegetables and Fruit(Y2)(All vegetable and fruit);
- ✓ Animal husbandry(Y3) (Beef, Mutton, Chicken);
- ✓ Cash crop(Y4) (cotton, oil palm,) ;

Output quantity and prices:

All output quantity and prices data are collected from Benin National Institute of Agricultural Research (INRAB), FAO statistical database and FAO Benin country Statistical database.

In second part, I evaluate Benin agriculture Total Productivity Factor(TFP),Profitability

---

[4] INRAB is Benin National Agricultural Research Institute

efficiency (PROFE) and Term of Trade(TT) to see major endogen factors of Benin's agriculture productivity analyzing the same period between 1960-2008 .TPF ,PROFE and TT will be calculate based on the decomposition method propose by O'Donnell(2008).

Indeed, O'Donnell (2008) measures a firm n productivity mathematically so-called TFP_{nt} which is the product of firm maximum TFP denote TFP_t^* and other measure of efficiency. It is express as:

$$TFP_{nt} = TFP_t^* * (OTE_{nt} * OME_{nt} * ROSE) \quad （1）$$

$$\text{or} \quad TFP_{nt} = TFP_t^* * (OTE_{nt} * OSE_{nt} * RME_{nt})(2) \left.\right\} \text{ see fig3}$$

Where: $\quad OTE_{nt} = \dfrac{Q_{nt}}{\bar{Q}_{nt}}$ (output-oriented technical efficiency)

$$OTE = Q_{nt} / \bar{Q}_{ms} = \| OA \| / \| OC \| (\text{see fig2})$$

$$OSE_{nt} = \frac{\bar{Q}_{nt} / X_{nt}}{\tilde{Q}_{nt} / \tilde{X}_{nt}} \quad \text{(Output-oriented scale efficiency)(3)}$$

$$OME = \frac{\bar{Q}_{nt}}{\hat{Q}_{nt}} \quad \text{(Output-oriented mix efficiency)(4)}$$

$$OME = \frac{\bar{Q}_{nt}}{\hat{Q}_{nt}} = \| OH \| / \| OV \| (\text{See fig2})$$

$$ROSE = \frac{\hat{Q}_{nt} / X_{nt}}{Q_{nt}^* / X_{nt}^*} \quad \text{(Residual output-oriented scale efficiency)(5) and}$$

$$RME = \frac{\tilde{Q}_{nt} / \tilde{X}_{nt}}{Q_{nt}^* / X_{nt}^*} \quad \text{(Residual mix efficiency)(6)}$$

Where $\bar{Q}_{nt}$ is the maximum aggregate output that is technically feasible when? X_{nt}

is used to produce a scalar multiple of q_{nt}. $\hat{Q}_{nt}$ is the maximum aggregate output that is

feasible when using X_{nt} to produce any output vector; and $\tilde{Q}_{nt}$ and $\tilde{X}_{nt}$ are the aggregate output and input obtained when TFP is maximized subject to the constraint that the output and input vectors are scalar multiples of q_{nt} and X_{nt} respectively


Figure2 ： Output-oriented measures of efficiency.

Figure3 ： Output-oriented measures of efficiency

A similar equation holds for firm m in period s. It follows that the index that compares the TFP of firm n in period t with the TFP of firm m in period s can be writing

$$TFP_{ms,nt} = \frac{TFP_{nt}}{TFP_{ms}} = (\frac{TFP_t^*}{TFP_s^*}) \times (\frac{OTE_{nt}}{OTE_{ms}} \times \frac{OME_{nt}}{OME_{ms}} \times \frac{ROSE_{nt}}{ROSE_{ms}}) \quad (7)$$

$$= (\frac{TFP_t^*}{TFP_s^*}) \times (\frac{OTE_{nt}}{OTE_{ms}} \times \frac{OSE_{nt}}{OSE_{ms}} \times \frac{RME_{nt}}{RME_{ms}}) \quad (8)$$

Figure4: Technical changes.

Each TFP and other efficiency will be compute applying the DPNI software writing by O'Donnell (2008) base on Data Envelopment Analysis using the country agriculture input and output data collected in first part.

Moreover, the profitability amount firm n in period t and firm m in period s is express as the product of TT and TFP. Mathematically, we have:

$$PROF_{ms,nt} = \frac{PROF_{nt}}{PROF_{ms}} = \frac{P_{ms,nt}}{W_{ms,nt}} \frac{Q_{ms,nt}}{X_{ms,nt}} = TT_{ms,nt} \times TFP_{ms,nt}$$

PROF is computing directly using the DPIN. From this it is easy to deduce the Terms of Trade. There is an inverse relationship between productivity and the terms of trade which holds two interesting implications. First, it provides a rationale for microeconomic reform programs designed to increase levels of competition in agricultural output and input markets – deteriorations in the terms of trade that result from increased competition will tend to drive firms

towards points of maximum productivity. Second, it provides an explanation for the observed convergence in rates of agricultural productivity growth in regions, states and countries that are becoming increasingly integrated and/or globalised – firms that strictly prefer more income to less and who face the same technology and prices will optimally choose to operate at the same point on the production frontier, they will make similar adjustments to their production choices in response to changes in the common terms of trade, and they will thus experience similar rates of productivity change.

3-Result and Discussion

Benin has done a great effort since several years to achieve the country food demand. This is showed by the country grain, vegetable and meat output and output per ha variation since 1961.

Grain Production

In Benin grain production is characterize by maize, rice, sorghum and millet. Maize is the major grain crop production in Benin and its large number of varieties allows the production under climatic conditions reaching from sub humid to semi-arid. It grows in all parts in the country rotationally depending on the local consumption patterns and comparative advantages of other products (Valerien O. Pede, 2005) mostly grow maize is most grow in the south region.

✓ Grain output generally has increased slowly from 1960 until today with some fall and maize is the highest output production. While the output per ha has also increase slowly since 1960 with major fall in 1977, 1988 and 2008.This is illustrated by the graph2a and graph2b below.

✓ Vegetable and fruit output has also known slow increased from 1961 with the higher pick in 1990(500000 MT) of fruit. Idem for the output per ha which fall since 1996 until today. Over all the period fruit production output is higher than vegetable. This illustrated by the graph3a and graph3b below.

✓ Meat production output rise since 1961 until nowadays in average but with constant production from 1963to 1986 (2000MT) before to rose, while the meat output per capita has

decreased from 1966(13T/ha) to 1986(8T/ha) before to rise. This is illustrated by the graph4a and graph4b below.

✓ Cash crop production has also fluctuate over the whole period with slow rise since 1961, two pick in 1997 and 2005 before to fall since 2005.Cotton seed was more important in term of quantity than palm oil. This is demonstrated by the graph5a and graph5b below. Indeed, there is inverse relationship between palm kernel and palm oil. This is emphasized by the graph5c below.

However, this cannot be achieved without input improvement. Agriculture labor, land, fertilizer and machines used have fluctuated significantly over the years.

✓ Agricultural lands have considerably increased from 1961 at 2005 and fall slowly since 2005.This is emphasized by the graph6 below.

✓ Agriculture machine has significantly decreased from 1961(0.75 tractor per 100km) to 1978(0.65 tractor per 100km) and increased from 1978 to his pick in 1 tractor per 100 km in 1996 before to fall until 2000 to his constant level. This is presented by the graph7 below.

✓ Fertilizers used over all the period varied in switchback. This describe by the graph8a and graph8b below.

✓ Labor in general has increased considerably over the period. This is emphasized by the graph9.

In general, it is fund that over decades Benin agriculture grain has increased, while vegetable output per ha decreased and livestock per ha increased. Look at the variation of Benin agriculture input, it could be concluded that all the production has been achieved using very intensive labor. Land expansion increased but the mechanization is still very archaic with high punt of fertilizer used.

Graph2a: Benin Grain Output Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph2b: Benin Grain Output per ha Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph3a: Benin Vegetable Output Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph3b: Benin Vegetable Output per ha Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph4a: Benin Meat Output Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph4b: Benin Meat Output per ha Variation between 1961 and 2008

Meat Output per ha

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database.

Graph5a: Benin Cash Crop Output Variation between 1961 and 2008

Cash crop Output

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph5b: Benin Cash Crop Output Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database.

Graph5c: Benin Kernel-Plam oil Output Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph6: Benin Agricultural Land Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph7: Benin Agricultural Machine Used Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph8a: Benin Fertilizer Used Variation between 1961 and 2008

Fertilizer use(Tonne metric)

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Graph8b: Benin Fertilizer Used per ha Variation between 1961 and 2008

Fertilizer use per ha

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database.

Graph9: Benin Agricultural Labor Forces Variation between 1961 and 2008

Source: Emphasize is mine from FAO statistical database

Moreover indexes that measure change in Benin agricultural profitability (PROF), productivity (TFP) and term of trade (TT) variation between the review period has been very remarkable presented .This is illustrated by figure5 and figure6 below. Both figure are obtain using the DPIN result presented in appendices Table1 and Table2.

The Analysis of Fig5, analysis showed that Profitability decreased by 77, 55% from 1961 to 1990 before the agriculture liberalization and increased by 22.67% between 1990 and 2008 after the liberalization. However Productivity increased by 77.99% between 1961 and 1990 and decreased at 31.68% during 1990-2008 while the Term of trade increased at 12.19% during 1961-1990 and increased by 79.58% between 1990 and 2008.

This is consistent with the inverse relationship between productivity and terms of trade. The improvement of term of trade in Benin explain the lack of competiveness in the sector and the increased of agriculture profitability while the productivity decreased significantly.

In a related development, it justifies the conclusion that over the period of liberalization of the agriculture sector during 1990, there has been limited private sector involvement and investment. It is also consistent with this finding that the big gap that we can observe result in agriculture output prices that are much higher that agriculture input prices and with the global economic crisis the figures take on a deeper meaning.

Moreover, evidence of this type of optimizing duality response can be observed regarding the index of technical change and output- oriented efficiency change presented in Fig6:

It can be seen that important components of Benin agricultural TFP change have been change in OSME= OME* ROSE but not change in Technical Change. Meaningful, OME and ROSE have been important index in TFP change index.

Indeed, an average of OME and ROSE has felled since 1961 during the pre reform and felled more during the post reform. OME and ROSE failed by 60.82% between 1961 and 1990 and by 55.7% between 1990 and 2008.

We can conclude that the decreased of productivity during the post reform has not been due to any change of Benin agricultural producer production ability but due to multiples lack of good management.

Figure5: Indexes Measuring Changes in Profitability, TFP and the Terms of Trade in Benin Agricultural.

Figure6: Output-Oriented Components of TFP Change

4-Conclusion

It can be concluded that during the period after independence (1961), Benin's agricultural productivity fell and that fall took on more significance after the beginning of the openness period (economic reform period in1990). However, since 1990, the term of trade has strongly extremely improved due to a lack of competiveness. Indeed, very limited private involvement in the sector has led the sector to be more protectionists with profit taking prominence over developing economic potential in the sector. This explains the low private investment in the agriculture sector and the necessity of urgent policy action to be taken by government in the sector, particularly in light of the recent food crisis in 2008.Agricultural liberalization does not assist Benin to improve food production or to encourage sustainable development of the sector – a sector key to Benin's economic growth.

5-References

[1]-Alejandro, N. P. and Bingxin, Y. (2008). " An Updated Look at The Recovery of Agriculture Productivity in Sub-Sahara Africa". IFPRI Discussion Paper 00787 August 2008.

[2]-Adekambi, S.; Adegbola, P. ; Gelele, E.; Agli, C. K.   et Tamegno, B. (2010), " Contribution of agricultural technology to productivity improvement: case study of high yield cassava varieties in Benin,''.Contributed Paper presented at the Joint 3rd African Association of Agricultural Economists (AAAE) and 48th Agricultural Economists Association of South Africa (AEASA) Conference, Cape Town, South Africa, September 19-23, 2010.

[3]-BAfD/OCDE report (2008). Perspectives Economiques en Afrique. OCDE, Paris, P165-176. Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage et de la Pêche , (MAEP) (2009). Mise en Place d'un Model D'équilibre Sectorielle Pour L'analyse De La Politique Agricoles Au Benin, September 2009.

 [4]-Carlos, E. L. (2010). "Agricultural Productivity Growth, Efficiency Change and Technical Progress in Latin America and the Caribbean". Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) working paper series186. May 20102010.

[5]-Coelli, T.J., Prasada Rao, D.S., and Battese, G.E. (1998), An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, 271 pp.

[6]-Chambers, R. G. 1988. Applied production analysis, a dual approach. Cambridge University Press, New York. 331 p.

[7]-Coelli, T., Rao, D. and Battese, G. (2005). "An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis.", Books Second Edition, New York: Springer publisher.

[9]-Caves, D. W, Christensen, Laurits ,R .   Diewert, W. E.(1982). "The Economic Theory of Index Numbers and the Measurement of Input, Output, and Productivity,".   Econometrica, Econometric Society, vol. 50(6), pages 1393-1414, November.

[10]-David, K.   and Elliott, P.(1998)."Productivity in Chinese Provincial Agriculture". Journal of Agricultural Economics Volume 49, Issue 3, pages 378–392, September 1998. Article first published online: 5 NOV 2008 DOI: 10.1111/j.1477-9552.1998.tb01279.

[11]-Equipe Sectoriel de Contrepartie Du Benin (ESC)(2004) . Strategy Sectoriel De Developpement   et De La Promotion Des Exportations & Et Plan D'action Marketing Export du Secteur Manioc. http://www.abepec.bj/Strat%E9gie%20fili%E8re%20maniocREVIM_1.pdf

[12] Fare, R., (1988). "Fundamental of production theory". Heidelberg : Springer-Verlag.

[13]-Fa re, R., Grosskopf, S., Norris, M. and Zhang, Z. (1994). "Productivity growth, technical

progress, and efficiency change in industrialized countries". American Economic Review 84(1),66–83.

[14]-Gboyega, A. O(2000) . "Concept and Measurement Of Productivity". Department of Economics University of Ibadan Ibadan. http://www.mendeley.com/research/concept-measurement-productivity-4/#page-1

[15]-Grosskopf, S. (1993). "Efficiency and Productivity" in Fried, H.O, Knox, C. L. L. and Shelton, S. S 'The Measurement of Productive Efficiency: Techniques and Applications'. New York : Oxford University Press, pp. 160-194.

[16]-Joseph, P. (1987). International Labour Office Productivity management: a practical handbook, Page 94.   Business & Economics - 287 pages

[17]-Laurenceson J., O'Donnell, & C.J. 2011. New Estimates and a Decomposition of Provincial Productivity Change in China," CEPA Working Papers Series WP042011, School of Economics, University of Queensland, Australia.

[18]-Ministere De L'Agriculture, De L'Elevage Et De La Peche –Ministere Du Developpement De L'Economie Et Des Finance (MAEP-MDEF, 2006) .Stratégie Pour L'Atteinte   De L'Objectif   N°1 Des OMD Au BENIN , Décembre 2006 http://www.bj.undp.org/docs/omd/OMD_Agriculture.pdf

[19]-MAEP (2010). "Rapport De L'etude Pour La Proposition Du Prix Plancher Du Cotton Graine Campagne 2010-2011". Office National De Soutien Des Revenue Agricole.

[20]-MFE (2010), "Evaluation Ex-Ante De La Mise En ŒUVRE Des   Stratégie De Relance Du Pole Coton-Textile   Au BENIN''.

[21]-Michael A. Trueblood , Jay Coggins. "Intercountry Agiculture Efficiency and Productivity: Malquist Index Approach."U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service and University of Minnesota, Dept. of Applied Economics http://faculty.apec.umn.edu/jcoggins/documents/Malmquist.pdf

[22]-Moussaratou, S.(2008). "Déterminants du prix de la terre agricole au Bénin ". Institut de l'économie agro-alimentaire et des ressources naturelles, Université de Bonn I M P E T U S Sous-projet B4 - 03/2008.

[23]-Nicolas, P. (2011), "Durabilité et productivité: Une introduction au Système Better Cotton''. Gestionnaire de Programme   Afrique et Amérique latine – BCI   27 Juin 2011, Cotonou – Benin,Better Cotton Initiative(BCI) Working Paper.

[24]-Nin, A., C. Arndt, T.W. Hertel, and P.V. Preckel et al. 2003. "Bridging the Gap between Partial and Total Factor Productivity Measures using Directional Distance Functions." American Journal of Agricultural Economics 85(4): 928-942.

[25]-O'Donnell, Christopher J. & Coelli, Timothy J., 2005. "A Bayesian approach to imposing curvature on distance functions," Journal of Econometrics, Elsevier, vol. 126(2), pages 493-523, June.

[26]-O'Donnell, C.J. (2008). An aggregate quantity-price framework for measuring and decomposing productivity and profitability change, Centre for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis.Working Papers WP07/2008. University of Queensland, Queensland.

[27]-O'Donnell C.J. (2010) "Nonparametric Estimates Of The Components Of Productivity And Profitability Change In U.S. Agriculture".Centre for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis Working Paper Series No. WP02/2010.

[28]-O'Donnell, C.J. (2010). DPIN Version 1.0: a program for decomposing productivity index numbers. Centre for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis Working Papers WP01/2010. University of Queensland, Queensland.

[29]-Shih-Hsun , H., Ming-Miin, Y. and Ching-Cheng, C.(2003). "An Analysis of Total Factor Productivity Growth in China's Agricultural Sector". Paper prepared for presentation at the American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada, July 27-30, 2003.

[30]-Shephard, R. W., (1970). "Theory of cost and production functions". Princeton: Princeton University Press,

[31]-Sekloka, E. , Hougni, A. , Katary .A., Djaboutou M.and J. Lançon,(2009). " I 875.3 et H 769.5 variétés prometteuses de coton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) sélectionnées au Bénin ''. Benin : Bulletin de la Recherche Agronomique du Bénin Numéro 63 – Mars 2009.

[32]-Tim Coelli & Shannon Walding, 2005. "Performance Measurement in the Australian Water Supply Industry," CEPA Working Papers Series WP012005, School of Economics, University of Queensland

[33]-Valerien,O. P. and Andrew, M. M. (2005). "Integration In Benin Maize Market: An Application OF Threshold Cointegration Analysis" Presentation Paper during the American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Providence, Rhode Island, July 24-27, 2005.

[34]-Vu Hoang Linh,(2003). "Vietnam's Agriculture Productivity: A Malquist Index Approach". VDF Working Paper 090.

Appendice:

Table1: Benin Country's Agricultural Input-Ouput Quantiy and Prices

							Hicks-Moorsteen Indexes: firm n in period t relative to firm n in period t-1								
OTE	OSE	OME	ITE	ISE	IME	MaxTFP	dPROF	dTT	dTFP	dTech	dEff	dOTE	dOSE	dOME	dROS
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.7386									
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.6432	0.9799	1.0914	0.8978	0.9451	0.95	1	1	1	0.9
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.6591	0.9398	0.7774	1.209	1.0097	1.1974	1	1	1	1.19
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.6603	1.0184	1.3609	0.7483	1.0007	0.7478	1	1	1	0.74
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.6374	1.003	1.155	0.8684	0.9862	0.8805	1	1	1	0.88
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.63	0.9566	0.814	1.1752	0.9955	1.1805	1	1	1	1.18
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.523	1.0353	1.856	0.5578	0.9343	0.597	1	1	1	0.59
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.4912	0.9302	0.9215	1.0094	0.9791	1.0309	1	1	1	1.03
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.3801	0.9223	1.0713	0.861	0.9255	0.9303	1	1	1	0.93
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.3724	1.0114	1.0511	0.9622	0.9944	0.9677	1	1	1	0.96
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.2725	0.8448	0.8838	0.9559	0.9272	1.0309	1	1	1	1.03
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.2775	1.069	1.0986	0.9731	1.0039	0.9693	1	1	1	0.96
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.416	1.1269	0.9282	1.2141	1.1085	1.0953	1	1	1	1.09
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.3834	0.9531	0.9644	0.9882	0.9769	1.0115	1	1	1	1.01
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.3873	0.824	0.6187	1.3319	1.0029	1.3281	1	1	1	1.32
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.3945	0.9209	0.8199	1.1232	1.0052	1.1174	1	1	1	1.11
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.4401	1.1005	0.9076	1.2125	1.0327	1.1741	1	1	1	1.17
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5877	1.3295	1.5844	0.8391	1.1025	0.7611	1	1	1	0.76
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5778	0.9216	0.7597	1.2131	0.9938	1.2207	1	1	1	1.22
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5464	0.8851	0.6964	1.271	0.9801	1.2969	1	1	1	1.29
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9415	0.3123	1.1173	0.2795	0.6088	0.4591	1	1	1	0.45
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9107	0.9274	0.9832	0.9432	0.9673	0.9751	1	1	1	0.97
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9614	1.0076	1.1955	0.8428	1.0556	0.7984	1	1	1	0.79
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9492	1.1724	1.2667	0.9256	0.9874	0.9374	1	1	1	0.93
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9323	1.0622	1.1542	0.9203	0.9821	0.9371	1	1	1	0.93
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9668	0.9203	0.8428	1.092	1.037	1.053	1	1	1	1.05
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.8353	0.7974	0.9575	0.8328	0.864	0.9638	1	1	1	0.96
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.0747	1.2858	0.9254	1.3894	1.2865	1.08	1	1	1	1.0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.6134	1.0481	0.4875	2.1501	1.5013	1.4321	1	1	1	1.43
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9672	0.8797	2.2893	0.3842	0.5995	0.641	1	1	1	0.64
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.0411	1.073	0.9946	1.0788	1.0764	1.0023	1	1	1	1.00
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9387	0.9753	1.1785	0.8276	0.9017	0.9178	1	1	1	0.91
1	1	1	1	1	1	1.0268	1.0546	0.9073	1.1624	1.0939	1.0626	1	1	1	1.06
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.9754	0.9502	0.9899	0.9599	0.9499	1.0106	1	1	1	1.01
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.8349	1.069	1.3441	0.7953	0.856	0.9291	1	1	1	0.92
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.922	0.9384	0.8401	1.117	1.1044	1.0114	1	1	1	1.01
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.7924	1.0362	1.1003	0.9417	0.8594	1.0957	1	1	1	1.09
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.7363	0.901	0.9898	0.9103	0.9292	0.9796	1	1	1	0.97
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.6123	1.0669	1.3401	0.7961	0.8315	0.9574	1	1	1	0.95
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.751	0.9778	0.7213	1.3556	1.2267	1.1051	1	1	1	1.10
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.7776	0.9582	0.9344	1.0254	1.0354	0.9904	1	1	1	0.99
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.7071	0.9932	1.1654	0.8522	0.9094	0.9371	1	1	1	0.93

Appendice:

Table1: Benin Country's Agricultural Input-Ouput Quantiy and Prices

1	1	1	1	1	1	0.6731	1.0233	1.0475	0.9769	0.9518	1.0263	1	1	1	1.02
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.7101	1.0406	0.9806	1.0611	1.0551	1.0057	1	1	1	1.00
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.6594	0.9404	1.0161	0.9255	0.9285	0.9967	1	1	1	0.99
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.6565	0.9453	0.9832	0.9615	0.9956	0.9658	1	1	1	0.96
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.6294	1.0667	1.0992	0.9705	0.9587	1.0123	1	1	1	1.01
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.6425	1.0981	1.0464	1.0493	1.0208	1.0279	1	1	1	1.02
1	1	1	1	1	1	0.6582	1.1349	1.1165	1.0165	1.0245	0.9922	1	1	1	0.99

Indexes: firm n in period t relative to firm n in period 1												
	dTT	dTFP	dTech	dEff	dOTE	dOSE	dOME	dROSE	dOSME	dITE	dISE	dIM
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
9799	1.0914	0.8978	0.9451	0.95	1	1	1	0.95	0.95	1	1	
9209	0.8484	1.0855	0.9543	1.1375	1	1	1	1.1375	1.1375	1	1	
9379	1.1546	0.8123	0.955	0.8506	1	1	1	0.8506	0.8506	1	1	
9407	1.3335	0.7054	0.9418	0.749	1	1	1	0.749	0.749	1	1	
8999	1.0855	0.829	0.9375	0.8842	1	1	1	0.8842	0.8842	1	1	
9316	2.0148	0.4624	0.876	0.5279	1	1	1	0.5279	0.5279	1	1	
8666	1.8567	0.4667	0.8577	0.5442	1	1	1	0.5442	0.5442	1	1	
7993	1.989	0.4018	0.7938	0.5062	1	1	1	0.5062	0.5062	1	1	
8084	2.0906	0.3867	0.7893	0.4899	1	1	1	0.4899	0.4899	1	1	
6829	1.8478	0.3696	0.7319	0.505	1	1	1	0.505	0.505	1	1	
7301	2.03	0.3596	0.7348	0.4895	1	1	1	0.4895	0.4895	1	1	
8228	1.8843	0.4366	0.8145	0.5361	1	1	1	0.5361	0.5361	1	1	
7841	1.8172	0.4315	0.7957	0.5423	1	1	1	0.5423	0.5423	1	1	
6461	1.1243	0.5747	0.7979	0.7203	1	1	1	0.7203	0.7203	1	1	
.595	0.9218	0.6455	0.8021	0.8048	1	1	1	0.8048	0.8048	1	1	
6548	0.8366	0.7827	0.8283	0.9449	1	1	1	0.9449	0.9449	1	1	
8706	1.3255	0.6568	0.9132	0.7192	1	1	1	0.7192	0.7192	1	1	
8023	1.007	0.7967	0.9075	0.8779	1	1	1	0.8779	0.8779	1	1	
7101	0.7012	1.0127	0.8894	1.1386	1	1	1	1.1386	1.1386	1	1	
2217	0.7835	0.283	0.5415	0.5227	1	1	1	0.5227	0.5227	1	1	
2056	0.7703	0.267	0.5238	0.5096	1	1	1	0.5096	0.5096	1	1	
2072	0.9209	0.225	0.5529	0.4069	1	1	1	0.4069	0.4069	1	1	
2429	1.1664	0.2083	0.546	0.3814	1	1	1	0.3814	0.3814	1	1	
.258	1.3462	0.1917	0.5362	0.3574	1	1	1	0.3574	0.3574	1	1	
2375	1.1346	0.2093	0.5561	0.3764	1	1	1	0.3764	0.3764	1	1	
1893	1.0863	0.1743	0.4805	0.3628	1	1	1	0.3628	0.3628	1	1	
2434	1.0053	0.2422	0.6181	0.3918	1	1	1	0.3918	0.3918	1	1	
2552	0.4901	0.5207	0.928	0.5611	1	1	1	0.5611	0.5611	1	1	
2245	1.1219	0.2001	0.5563	0.3596	1	1	1	0.3596	0.3596	1	1	
2409	1.1159	0.2158	0.5988	0.3605	1	1	1	0.3605	0.3605	1	1	
2349	1.315	0.1786	0.5399	0.3308	1	1	1	0.3308	0.3308	1	1	
2477	1.1932	0.2076	0.5906	0.3515	1	1	1	0.3515	0.3515	1	1	

Table1: Benin Country's Agricultural Input-Ouput Quantiy and Prices

2354	1. 1811	0. 1993	0. 561	0. 3553	1	1	1	0. 3553	0. 3553	1	1
2516	1. 5875	0. 1585	0. 4802	0. 3301	1	1	1	0. 3301	0. 3301	1	1
2361	1. 3337	0. 177	0. 5303	0. 3339	1	1	1	0. 3339	0. 3339	1	1
2447	1. 4675	0. 1667	0. 4557	0. 3658	1	1	1	0. 3658	0. 3658	1	1
2204	1. 4524	0. 1518	0. 4235	0. 3584	1	1	1	0. 3584	0. 3584	1	1
2352	1. 9464	0. 1208	0. 3522	0. 3431	1	1	1	0. 3431	0. 3431	1	1
0. 23	1. 4039	0. 1638	0. 432	0. 3792	1	1	1	0. 3792	0. 3792	1	1
2203	1. 3119	0. 168	0. 4472	0. 3755	1	1	1	0. 3755	0. 3755	1	1
2188	1. 5289	0. 1431	0. 4067	0. 3519	1	1	1	0. 3519	0. 3519	1	1
2239	1. 6014	0. 1398	0. 3871	0. 3612	1	1	1	0. 3612	0. 3612	1	1
. 233	1. 5704	0. 1484	0. 4084	0. 3633	1	1	1	0. 3633	0. 3633	1	1
2191	1. 5957	0. 1373	0. 3793	0. 3621	1	1	1	0. 3621	0. 3621	1	1
2071	1. 5689	0. 132	0. 3776	0. 3497	1	1	1	0. 3497	0. 3497	1	1
. 221	1. 7245	0. 1281	0. 362	0. 354	1	1	1	0. 354	0. 354	1	1
2426	1. 8045	0. 1345	0. 3695	0. 3639	1	1	1	0. 3639	0. 3639	1	1
2754	2. 0148	0. 1367	0. 3786	0. 361	1	1	1	0. 361	0. 361	1	1

Table 2

Periods	49
Firms	1
Outputs	4
Inputs	4
Prices	
CRS	
end	

Obs	Period	Firm	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	X1	X2	X3	X4	
1	1	1	625. 7468	79. 75035	13. 48821	22. 5316	1442	1. 506395	0. 409847	64	1
2	2	1	627. 5646	78. 65937	10. 84131	21. 26678	1462	1. 485788	0. 408345	64	1
3	3	1	582. 8736	77. 59784	12. 14575	22. 06037	1482	1. 465737	0. 286775	64	1
4	4	1	610. 7335	77. 89614	11. 98402	23. 23227	1502	1. 44622	0. 539281	66	1
5	5	1	618. 111	76. 87254	11. 82654	22. 89446	1522	1. 427216	0. 722733	66	1
6	6	1	618. 111	75. 3866	11. 59794	22. 42203	1552	1. 399628	0. 483247	70	1
7	7	1	666. 78	73. 49246	11. 30653	20. 44726	1592	1. 364461	1. 567211	72	1
8	8	1	626. 6451	73. 36621	11. 09741	25. 55677	1622	1. 339225	1. 840937	74	1
9	9	1	596. 8553	71. 1775	10. 54482	27. 36927	1707	1. 272538	2. 659637	76	1
10	10	1	614. 5558	72. 37985	10. 4227	31. 44751	1727	1. 257801	3. 300521	78	1
11	11	1	526. 6697	71. 75014	10. 12943	27. 298	1777	1. 22241	2. 982555	80	1
12	12	1	585. 7607	72. 49585	9. 961262	25. 21423	1807	1. 202115	3. 290537	82	1
13	13	1	686. 7826	72. 63273	9. 852217	23. 63638	1827	1. 188956	2. 395183	84	1
14	14	1	666. 047	72. 42865	9. 693053	24. 1179	1857	1. 169748	2. 466882	86	1
15	15	1	545. 7908	71. 42857	9. 488666	27. 56038	1897	1. 145083	1. 272536	88	1
16	16	1	511. 2741	72. 13285	9. 340944	31. 64625	1927	1. 127256	1. 037883	92	1
17	17	1	593. 5894	75. 88145	9. 197752	22. 17362	1957	1. 109976	0. 562085	94	1
18	18	1	845. 2038	75. 11381	9. 104704	18. 75459	1977	1. 098747	0. 971168	98	1
19	19	1	784. 5348	77. 36605	9. 01352	20. 80689	1997	1. 087743	0. 665999	100	1
20	20	1	708. 9096	78. 93439	8. 880118	24. 94079	2027	1. 071644	0. 425259	105	1
21	21	1	174. 5341	79. 72776	8. 750608	22. 62262	2057	1. 078972	1. 344677	108	1
22	22	1	166. 4137	80. 86124	8. 61244	23. 40396	2090	1. 08453	1. 483254	115	1

Appendice:

Table1: Benin Country's Agricultural Input-Ouput Quantiy and Prices

23	23	1	164.9459	100.9524	8.571429	28.98894	2100	1.101852	2.571429	120	1
24	24	1	209.4328	85.30806	8.530806	40.06186	2110	1.120326	3.488626	125	1
25	25	1	225.7279	89.20188	11.79343	38.32401	2130	1.134585	5.396244	130	1
26	26	1	201.4338	86.75799	11.33333	48.68825	2190	1.1276	4.940183	135	1
27	27	1	162.3612	88.18182	11.28182	30.36816	2200	1.183081	4.304091	140	1
28	28	1	214.0234	90.04525	16.27149	40.5915	2210	1.24183	3.128507	145	1
29	29	1	212.5297	229.9505	15.55405	36.76231	2220	1.307558	1.486486	150	1
30	30	1	199.9544	91.18943	16.07048	45.63608	2270	1.353402	4.847137	155	1
31	31	1	208.8668	92.54386	19.79386	50.8487	2280	1.419347	5.182895	158	1
32	32	1	212.2904	93.68192	20.00436	44.43623	2295	1.486323	6.67756	162	1
33	33	1	213.2632	97.41379	19.93879	67.75316	2320	1.506226	7.430172	165	1
34	34	1	214.2433	93.33333	19.27417	61.48679	2400	1.490741	7.10625	169	1
35	35	1	236.8759	92.46032	19.04365	76.9379	2520	1.449515	14.28571	172	1
36	36	1	214.7541	79.33579	17.70849	95.34483	2710	1.371464	11.3214	175	1
37	37	1	267.2511	78.27093	16.60554	77.07013	2890	1.306228	13.48374	178	1
38	38	1	251.6255	66.22951	15.73443	69.72698	3050	1.255009	12.36295	182	1
39	39	1	286.9905	54.00322	14.37556	72.75471	3110	1.24866	18.23151	182	1
40	40	1	282.8721	67.50798	14.84632	66.39777	3195	1.235437	11.01721	182	1
41	41	1	263.353	55.34211	14.50444	75.24594	3265	1.23022	9.525268	182	1
42	42	1	253.743	51.60297	14.69599	86.52148	3365	1.216774	14.21724	182	1
43	43	1	284.2468	55.48168	13.80387	73.70984	3467	1.20341	13.79896	182	1
44	44	1	298.3115	56.30978	15.31427	75.73249	3567	1.191477	13.41211	182	1
45	45	1	279.6064	55.88182	15.79403	63.96347	3520	1.227904	13.59119	182	1
46	46	1	241.5542	58.98171	17.18441	64.38562	3335	1.317674	14.34513	182	1
47	47	1	278.9782	57.81677	17.4021	53.17436	3340	1.336494	14.32365	182	1
48	48	1	326.4147	60.53019	16.37732	53.01915	3395	1.334479	14.09161	182	1
49	49	1	380.5201	54.37597	16.37732	56.92685	3300	1.391414	14.49727	182	1