Trends in the Accuracy of USDA Production Forecasts for Beef and Pork

DeeVon Bailey and B. Wade Brorsen

Trends in the accuracy of USDA forecasts of beef and pork production and supply
are evaluated for the period 1982–96. Findings of the study show that USDA fore-
casts underestimated production and supply in the 1980s, but this bias has now
disappeared. The variance of forecasts also has declined. Thus the accuracy of the
forecasts has improved. The most recent USDA forecasts were found to meet the
criteria of optimal forecasts, while those of the 1980s were not optimal.

Key words: beef, forecasting, pork

Introduction

The value of U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) outlook reports and forecasts has
been discussed and analyzed frequently in recent years. This is likely related to external
pressure on the U.S. government to find areas of real or perceived cost inefficiencies
within government. Also, since many private market information sources exist, some
question the need for public information such as that provided by USDA. Economists,
in particular, have been interested in the costs and benefits associated with USDA fore-
cast information and inventory reports. The literature reflects this interest through
analyses of the accuracy of this information and its impact on commodity futures
contract prices (e.g., Sumner and Mueller; Carter and Galopin 1993, 1995; Colling and
Irwin 1990, 1995; Meyer and Lawrence).

While debate about the relative value and accuracy of USDA market information has
continued, little attention has been paid to whether this information has improved over
time or whether USDA's forecasts meet Diebold and Lopez's optimal forecasts criteria.
If USDA forecasts have increased in accuracy over time, the value of the information has
potentially increased. Also, if USDA forecasts are optimal, this implies that researchers
cannot use the forecasts to make better forecasts. For example, if the forecasts were
biased (i.e., nonoptimal), one could adjust the forecasts for the bias and obtain better
forecasts.[1] The specific objectives of this study are: (*a*) to determine if USDA beef and
pork production and supply forecasts became more accurate during the 1982–96 study
period, (*b*) to identify the rate of improvement for USDA forecasts during the year being

forecasted, and (c) to assess whether USDA forecasts for beef and pork production and supply are optimal.

USDA information is used in most fundamental commodity market analyses. The accuracy of USDA forecasts is important to market participants, since accurate forecasts will contribute to efficient decision making. If it can be substantiated that USDA's forecasts exhibit steady improvement, then this finding would offer some support for continued funding, since the value of the forecasts would be greater now than in the past (ignoring possible improvements in other information sources).

Theory suggests that the availability of public forecasts such as those provided by the USDA reduces market price variation (Smyth).[2] Consequently, one possible impact of improved USDA forecasts may be reductions in commodity price variability. For example, cattle price variability has declined during the 1990s,[3] but the variance of live hog futures prices has remained basically unchanged since 1982. Improved USDA forecasts could be one source of the reduced cattle price variability. Of course, inventory management by meatpackers and feedlots through contracts or integration might contribute to reduced price variability by making beef supplies less variable. However, in their recent study investigating the role of captive supplies in beef packing, Ward et al. (p. 21) found that cash price variability is positively related to the level of captive supplies held by meatpackers. Further, although hog contracting has increased dramatically during the last 10 years, hog price variability has not changed.[4]

A second possible reason for declining cattle price variability (besides improved USDA forecasts) may be, as Purcell suggests, that beef demand is more elastic now than it was 15 years ago. We do not directly test the influence of these factors (forecasts, inventory management, or demand) on price variability other than to regress price and supply variability on a linear trend (see footnote 3). However, we believe it is important to identify the possible reasons why cattle price variability is decreasing and point out that improved price forecasts might be one of these reasons.

USDA production and supply forecasts, rather than inventory data, are analyzed here because they represent a consistent and continuous time series of forecasts. USDA inventory reports, such as *Cattle on Feed*, or *Hogs and Pigs*, provide data such as placements, marketings, and intended farrowings—and are not true forecasts.

Past Analyses of USDA Forecast Information

The USDA projects monthly estimates for total annual beef and pork production beginning approximately 17 months prior to December of the year for which the estimate is being made. Production and supply forecasts for the coming year normally begin in

---

[2] Smyth demonstrates that public price forecasts result in less price variability in a stochastic cobweb model.

[3] The monthly variances of percentage price changes in daily live cattle and live hog futures were regressed against linear trends. Price variance for live cattle exhibited a significant downward trend during the 1982–96 period, while the variance of live hog futures showed no significant trend during the study period.

[4] Further evidence that changes in supply variability have not been a major influence in decreasing price variability is our analysis of trends in the variability of weekly beef and pork production between 1980–97. No significant trend in beef production variability since 1980 was found, while pork production variability declined significantly during the same time period. This suggests beef inventory management has not significantly reduced supply variability, although beef price variability has declined during the last decade. At the same time, pork producers have succeeded in reducing supply variability but not price variability.

August of the preceding year. The potential value of this information depends on its accuracy, timeliness, and relevance (Lawrence). In the past, the relevance and time-liness of USDA production forecasts and inventory estimates have been tested primarily by considering the effect the release of this information has had on commodity futures contract prices (e.g., Colling, Irwin, and Zulauf; Grunewald, McNulty, and Biere; Sumner and Mueller; Colling and Irwin 1990, 1995).

These previous analyses investigated whether USDA inventory estimates and production forecasts, provided in such scheduled reports as *Cattle on Feed, Hogs and Pigs*, and *Crop Production*, represent new and significant market information that was not available prior to the release of the reports. Most of these studies conclude that USDA reports do influence the movement and direction of futures prices and, consequently, do provide valuable new information in commodity markets. However, USDA forecasts also have been criticized as being biased in some cases (Meyer and Lawrence).

While Sumner and Mueller indicate that USDA annual crop supply estimates improve during the forecasted period, we are unaware of any published research examining whether USDA forecasts for meats have improved over a period of years or within their specific forecast period. In the present study, we do not directly measure the value of information generated by the USDA production forecasts, but rather examine if there has been a systematic decline in USDA forecast errors during our 1982–96 study period.

Methods

Trends are estimated for both the mean and variance of percentage forecast errors. Trends are included across years and across forecast horizons. The following model is used to describe the trends in USDA forecast errors:

$$(1) \qquad \frac{(y_{kt} - y_{0t})}{y_{0t}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 k + \beta_2 t + \beta_3 kt + \varepsilon_{kt},$$

$$\varepsilon_{kt} \sim N\left(0, \exp(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 k + \alpha_2 t + \alpha_3 kt)\right),$$

$$k = 1, \ldots, K_t; \quad t = 1, \ldots, 15,$$

where y_{kt} is the USDA's production estimate for year t given k months before the end of the year, and y_{0t} represents actual production. K_t is the longest forecast horizon for year t. In most cases, K_t is 17, meaning that the first estimate is 17 months before the end of year t. Some values of k are not integers, since the reports were sometimes spaced irregularly. The dependent variable is the percentage forecast error (PFE). All the parameters in the mean equation (the β vector) should be zero if there is no bias in the estimates.

If $\alpha_1 < 0$, then the PFEs become systematically smaller within the USDA's 17-month forecast period. It would be unexpected if α_1 were not negative, since for $k < 12$, the USDA has some information about production in the first few months of the year. If $\alpha_2 < 0$, then USDA's forecasts have become more accurate in general since 1982.

Finally, $\alpha_3 > 0$ would indicate the variances of the PFEs during the early months of a forecast are smaller in the final years of the study period than during the initial years.[5] If this is the case, then the USDA is providing better forecasts during the early months of the forecast period, suggesting decision makers now receive better information earlier than in past years. The hypotheses regarding the signs of α_1, α_2, and α_3 are tested using the sign of the parameter estimates for the variance equation and their corresponding t-statistics.

We also determine whether USDA forecasts for beef and pork production and supply are optimal. Diebold and Lopez define optimal forecasts as having the four following criteria:

1. Optimal forecast errors have a zero mean;
2. One-step-ahead optimal forecast errors are white noise, i.e., have a zero mean and a constant variance;
3. At most, p-step-ahead optimal forecast errors are a moving average of order $p - 1$; and
4. The p-step-ahead optimal forecast error variance is nondecreasing in p.

The test of criterion 1 can be undertaken using the parameter estimates of the mean equation (β). If these parameters are all zero, no bias exists in the forecast because the forecast errors have a zero mean. Criterion 2 is unlikely to be violated here, but we test it by regressing the annual PFE (January forecast) against the previous year's annual forecast. If criterion 2 is met, the current year's forecast should have no significant correlation with that of the previous year. Criterion 3 does not apply in this case, since the forecasts are monthly, but the series being forecasted is annual. Criterion 4 implies that the derivative of the variance equation with respect to k should be negative. We also plot the forecast variance over the forecast period. The variance of optimal forecasts should decline continuously throughout the forecast period if criterion 4 is met.

Data

Data are taken from the USDA World Outlook Board's *World Agricultural Supply and Demand Estimates* (*WASDE*). These forecasts typically are published on a monthly basis and estimate year-end production and supply for meats and crops.

Since 1982, *WASDE* estimates of annual beef and pork production and supply have been available beginning approximately 17 months prior to the end of the year being forecasted. The data cover the period of May 11, 1982 through August 12, 1996 (260 observations). The difference between the production and supply series is the amount of imports. Hence, differences in accuracy between production and supply are basically measures of USDA's ability to forecast imports relative to domestic production.[6]

---

[5] One can think of the interaction term (α_3) as a time-varying parameter. Mathematically, $\alpha_1 k + \alpha_3 kt$ may be written as $k(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 t)$. Thus the parameter on $k(\alpha_1)$ changes over time, and α_3 says how much it changes. Since α_1 is negative and α_3 is positive, α_1 becomes less negative over time, and the slope of the estimated variance function flattens as a result.

[6] Exports are not considered in the total supply figures.

**Figure 1. Standard deviations of USDA beef and pork production
and supply PFEs, 1982–96**

Figure 1 presents the standard deviations for the beef and pork production and
supply PFEs within their forecast periods.[7] The variability of forecast errors declines
dramatically during the forecast period. In the case of beef, the variability of the forecast
errors declines in basically a linear fashion, thus fulfilling criterion 4 for optimal fore-
casts. In contrast, pork forecast variability sometimes rises, which violates criterion 4.[8]
The inconsistency with criterion 4 could be due to random variation, and the variance
does trend downward for all four series.

Higher variability in forecast errors for pork than beef may be explained by pork's
shorter production cycle. Slaughter hogs finish at an age of about six months, but cattle
are usually well over a year old at slaughter. As a result, resources to produce beef
are committed before the forecast period. Hog numbers, however, depend on decisions
made during the forecast period, which makes forecasting during the first part of the
17-month forecast period more difficult for pork than for beef.

---

[7] Average PFEs follow almost the same pattern as the standard deviations during the forecast period.

[8] An examination of the standard deviations of the PFEs for the first seven years of the study period (1982–88) and the last
eight years (1989–96) reveals basically the same graph for beef and pork production and supply. However, during the last
eight years, the variance is much lower during the first few months of the forecast compared to the variance during the first
seven years of the study period. (This is confirmed by figure 4.)

Table 1. Estimated Trends in the Mean and Variance of USDA PFEs of Domestic Production and Total Supply of Beef and Pork, 1982–96

Independent Variable (parameter)	Beef Production	Beef Supply	Pork Production	Pork Supply
Mean Equation:				
Intercept (β_0)	-0.07617**	-0.07898**	-0.05957**	-0.06532**
	(0.00947)	(0.00816)	(0.01361)	(0.01358)
Within (β_1)	0.00438**	0.00428**	0.00328**	0.00353**
	(0.00052)	(0.00045)	(0.00075)	(0.00074)
Overall (β_2)	0.00539**	0.00626**	0.00632**	0.00679**
	(0.00107)	(0.00083)	(0.00162)	(0.00152)
Interaction (β_3)	-0.00031**	-0.00033**	-0.00035**	-0.00036**
	(0.00005)	(0.00004)	(0.00008)	(0.00008)
Variance Equation:				
Intercept (α_0)	-4.781**	-4.741**	-4.556**	-4.790**
	(0.384)	(0.384)	(0.384)	(0.384)
Within (α_1)	-0.377**	-0.386**	-0.381**	-0.361**
	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)
Overall (α_2)	-0.132**	-0.189**	-0.083**	-0.115**
	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Interaction (α_3)	0.013**	0.013**	0.014**	0.018**
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)

Notes: Single and double asterisks (*) denote significantly different from zero at the 5% and 1% levels, respectively. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

Results

In equation (1) we defined a model with multiplicative heteroskedasticity. The model was first estimated with maximum likelihood using the HET command in SHAZAM (White et al.).[9] The rescaled residuals had considerable autocorrelation.[10] Plots indicated that autocorrelation was slow to decline since forecast errors in a given year tended to be all negative or all positive. An error components model was used to obtain estimates and standard errors of β adjusted for the autocorrelation. PROC MIXED of SAS (SAS Institute, Inc.) was used to estimate the models in table 1.

Table 1 reports the parameter estimates of equation (1) for forecasts of domestic production and total supply of beef and pork. The parameter estimates for all four models are similar. The production and supply estimates were expected to be similar, since supply equals production plus imports.

The forecast errors are not optimal, since all of the parameters in the mean equation are significant (criterion 1), and therefore the forecasts are biased. In the early years of

---

[9] We also estimated a linear regression of absolute value of the percentage forecast errors against k and t. The conclusions were unchanged. We report the maximum-likelihood estimates because they are slightly more asymptotically efficient.

[10] Because the exogenous variables are the same in all four models using equation (1) in this study (beef and pork production and supply) and the variance is rescaled to one, the parameters in the variance equation of all four models will have the same standard errors.

Figure 2. Predicted PFEs for beef production with 95% confidence intervals, 1983 and 1996

the study period, USDA's forecasts during the first few months of the forecast period underestimated production and supply by 5–7%. But the bias disappeared by the end of the year being forecasted. For years at the end of the study period, the net effect of the four coefficients in the mean equation is approximately zero. This indicates that more recent USDA forecasts are unbiased and that the systematic errors in earlier forecasts appear to have been corrected. This is confirmed in figures 2 and 3, where the estimated mean PFEs for beef and pork production, respectively, in 1983 and 1996 are plotted against the number of months within the forecast period.[11] The confidence interval for 1996 includes zero for both beef and pork, but 1983 exhibits a statistically significant negative bias for both meats.

The variance of USDA forecast errors, as expected, declines during the forecast period for all four series (table 1). This is evidenced by the negative parameter estimates for the within-period trend. Forecasts also have improved with the passage of time for beef production and beef supply, since the parameter estimates for these models have

---

[11] The years 1983 and 1996 were selected because 1983 was the first complete forecast year in the study and 1996 was the last.

Figure 3. Predicted PFEs for pork production with 95% confidence intervals, 1983 and 1996

a significant negative overall trend. Although pork production and supply forecasts also improved between 1982 and 1996, the improvement is only statistically significant with pork supply.

The coefficients in the variance equation are the percentage changes in variance with respect to a change in time. The time change over the entire period is 15 years, so the percentage changes in variance are quite large. The predicted standard deviations in 1996 were less than one-half of what they were in 1982. This reduction in the variability of forecast errors occurs primarily early in the forecast period when forecast errors are the largest (interaction term) (figure 4). This may help farmers, buyers, and processors allocate resources more efficiently, since forecasts over horizons as long as the gestation periods of cows and pigs are more accurate now than before. There is little reduction in variability in forecast errors for the end of the year being forecasted.

Criterion 2 for optimal forecasts is met for all but the beef supply series (table 2). Since all four models fail to meet criterion 1, and the pork models violate criterion 4, USDA's forecasts were not optimal over the entire study period. However, USDA forecasts for beef and pork production and supply appear to meet the optimality criteria during the last few years of the study period.

Figure 4. Predicted variances for beef and pork production PFEs, 1983 and 1996

Table 2. Test for One-Step-Ahead Forecast Errors as White Noise (Criterion 2)

Independent Variable	Beef Production	Beef Supply	Pork Production	Pork Supply
Intercept	-0.00858	-0.00570	-0.00472	-0.00044
	(0.00990)	(0.00890)	(0.01531)	(0.01038)
Lagged annual PFE	0.44994	(0.60346*	-0.24715	-0.02228
	(0.28610)	(0.25850)	(0.26020)	(0.26100)

Notes: A single asterisk (*) denotes significantly different from zero at the 5% level. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

Conclusions

This study sought to determine whether or not USDA forecasts of domestic production and total supplies of beef and pork have become more accurate and if they are optimal forecasts. Our findings show the most recent USDA forecasts are optimal forecasts. A significant downward bias was found for both beef and pork forecasts of production and supply in the early years of the study period, but the bias is no longer present. The forecast error variability of USDA forecasts has declined during the 1982–96 study period. This reduction in variability could be due to improvements in USDA's forecast procedures or to changes in the markets, which made quantities or demand easier to forecast.

The variability of beef forecasts has declined more than the variability of pork forecasts. This reduced forecast error variability is a possible explanation for the reduced beef price variability, which also has occurred. The efficient gathering and dissemination of relevant market information helps to reduce long-run price swings, and thus reduces risk for both buyers and sellers in livestock markets. Most studies have found that USDA forecasts offer new and valuable information in the marketplace. Our investigation confirms that this information has improved with the passage of time.

References

Carter, C. A., and C. A. Galopin. "Informational Content of Government Hogs and Pigs Reports." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 75(August 1993):711–18.

———. "Informational Content of Government Hogs and Pigs Reports: Reply." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 77(August 1995):703–05.

Colling, P. L., and S. H. Irwin. "The Reaction of Live Hog Futures Prices to USDA Hogs and Pigs Reports." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 72(February 1990):84–94.

———. "Informational Content of Government Hogs and Pigs Reports: Comment." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 77(August 1995):689–702.

Colling, P. L., S. H. Irwin, and C. R. Zulauf. "Futures Price Responses to the USDA Cold Storage Report." Work. pap., Dept. of Agr. Econ., Ohio State University, 1996.

Diebold, F. X., and J. A. Lopez. "Forecast Evaluation and Combination." In *Handbook of Statistics*, Vol. 14: *Statistical Methods in Finance*, eds., G. S. Maddala and C. R. Rao, pp. 241–68. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1998.

Grunewald, O., M. S. McNulty, and A. W. Biere. "Live Cattle Futures Response to *Cattle on Feed* Reports." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 73(February 1993):131–37.

Lawrence, D. B. "Models for the Assessment of the Value of Forecast Information." *J. Forecasting* 10(1991):425–43.

Meyer, S. R., and J. D. Lawrence. "Comparing USDA Hogs and Pigs Reports to Subsequent Slaughter: Does Systematic Error Exist?" In *Proceedings of NCR Conference on Applied Commodity Price Analysis, Forecasting, and Market Risk Management*, ed., M. Hayenga, pp. 19–35. Ames IA: Iowa State University Press, 1988.

Purcell, W. D. *Agricultural Futures and Options: Principles and Strategies.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1991.

SAS Institute, Inc. *Getting Started with PROC MIXED.* Cary NC: SAS Institute, Inc., 1994.

Smyth, D. J. "Effect of Public Price Forecasts on Market Price Variation: A Stochastic Cobweb Example." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 55(February 1973):83–88.

Sumner, D. A., and R. A. E. Mueller. "Are Harvest Forecasts News? USDA Announcements and Futures Market Reactions." *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 71(February 1989):1–8.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, World Outlook Board. *World Agricultural Supply and Demand Estimates.* USDA, Washington DC. Various monthly issues, 1982–96.

Ward, C. E., T. C. Schroeder, A. P. Barkley, and S. R. Koontz. "Role of Captive Supplies in Beef Packing." Pub. No. GIPSA-RR-96-3, USDA/Packers and Stockyards Programs, Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration, Washington DC, May 1996.

White, K. J., S. D. Wong, D. Whistler, and S. A. Haun. *SHAZAM Econometrics Computer Program: User's Reference Manual*, Version 7.0. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1993.