CONTEXT PROFILE

SWEDEN

FARMER
Hulda Wirsén & Johan Liljebäck - Stora Mu

INNOVATION
Improving the grazing system step by step

Video

MAIN DOMAIN OF THE INNOVATION
Improvement of grassland management

SOIL TYPE
Loam

FINANCE/INVESTMENT
High

AGROCLIMATIC AREA
Boreal

MANAGEMENT
Pasture dairy

MARKET
Global

CLIMATE
Moderate rainfall

TECHNICAL
Computer-based

SOCIAL
Full-time farmer

All contents of this document are expert opinions of the G4AE Scientific Technical Working Group

CONTEXT PROFILE

SWEDEN

Case Study: SE_02	Agroclimatic Zone								
Item (Key Innovation Elements)	**Alpine**	**Atlantic Central**	**Atlantic North**	**Atlantic South**	**Boreal**	**Continental North**	**Continental South**	**Mediterranean North**	**Mediterranean South**
High milk production, 13,200 kg/cow ECM	+	+++	++	++	+++	++	++	++	+
High ley production during growing season as located closed to polar circle	X	++	++	X	+++	++	X	X	X
Whole barley silage	+	+++	+	++	+++	+++	+++	++	+

+++ **Strong transferability**

++ **Slightly limited transferability**

\+ **Very limited transferability**

X **Generic information/not relevant**

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission . Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

Implementation Gaps

- System too intensive for some areas
- High land prices
- Insufficient understanding of agroecological impact
- Heat and dryness as limiting factors

Research Gaps

- How to measure sustainable intensification of livestock production
- How to improve financial viability of agroecological approaches
- How to sustain permanent grassland under dry conditions

Suggestions to Adapt

- Tailor approaches to individual farm conditions
- Extensification of the system

Grazing4AgroEcology

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission . Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

INVESTMENT COSTS

Total initial investment costs at start up:	mid
• Initial authorisation costs (e.g. sanitary, veterinary, etc.)	not applicable/not known
• Initial advisory costs	low
• Initial buildings and machineries	mid
• Initial certification costs	not applicable/not known
• Initial working capital (personal qualification, marketing and promotion, etc.)	not applicable/not known

ON-GOING COSTS

On-going advisory costs	low
On-going certification costs	low
On-going buildings and machinery costs	low
On-going working capital	low

BENEFITS RELATIVE TO ORIGINAL SYSTEM

- **Economic**

Reduction in energy consumption (electricity; fuel consumption)	not applicable/not known
Reduction in input use (fertilizers; pesticides; feed) etc.	high
Payback period	mid
Product value added	mid
Additional farm income through agroecological/agri-environmental payment schemes	not applicable/not known

- **Environmental**

Animal feed self-sufficiency increase	high
Biodiversity increase	high
Improved nitrogen cycling	high
Soil regeneration	high
Animal health and welfare improvement	mid

- **Social**

Workload reduction	mid
Engagement of young generation	mid

Grazing AgroEcology

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission . Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

Literature

- None

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission . Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.