## Estimated economic benefit per 1 hectare

Fuel expenses			
1. Fuel spent on monitoring and controlling the sown area (about 300 ml of fuel is spent on inspecting approximately 1 ha of the sown area, on average 7 times per season)		0,3	
2. Cost per liter	USD	1,5	
3. Minimal economic gain as a result of partial substitution of preventive full scale inspections for targeting individual abnormal areas	%	30%	
Possible economic benefit of field monitoring per 1 ha (1 * 2 * 3)	USD		0,15
Payroll economics			
1. Annual payroll and taxes of an agronomist responsible for field monitoring	USD	24 000	
2. Amount of time spent on monitoring of fields	%	15%	
3. Economics of field monitoring with the Cropio system (partial substitution of preventive full scale inspections for targeting individual abnormal areas)	%	30%	
4. Number of hectares serviced by one agronomist	ha	5 000	
Direct payroll economics (1 * 2 * 3 / 4)	USD		0,22
1. Annual payroll of the specialist, responsible for consolidation and processing information in addition to reporting	USD	6 000	
2. Number of hectares serviced by a single specialist	ha	5 000	
Economics of reporting and planning work (1 / 2)	USD		1,2
Fertilizer expenses			
1. Fertilizer expenses and distribution per 1 hectare	USD	60	
2. Fertilizers economics using VRA and Cropio	%	10%	
(according to the American Precision Agriculture Institute such economy amounts for 10% + )			
Fertilizers economics per 1 ha per year (1 * 2)	USD		6,00
Measurement and analysis expenses			
1. Cost of a single soil nitrogen test (selection + analysis)	USD	15	
2. Size of area inspected for a single test	ha	10	
3. Testing frequency: one test per n-years (annual basis is a recommended regularity; at least - one test in three years)	years	3	
Nitrogen testing economics per 1 ha per year (1 / 2 / 3)	USD		0,50
1. Cost of equipment and software for yield mapping	USD	20 000	
2. Expected lifetime of the equipment	years	7	
3. Amount of hectares serviced by one item of yield mapping equipment	ha	5 000	
Equipment expenses for 1 ha per year (1 / 2 / 3)	USD		0,57

## Estimated economic benefit per 1 hectare

Fuel expenses			
1. Fuel spent on monitoring and controlling the sown area (about 300 ml of fuel is spent on inspecting approximately 1 ha of the sown area, on average 7 times per season)		0,3	
2. Cost per liter	USD	1,5	
3. Minimal economic gain as a result of partial substitution of preventive full scale inspections for targeting individual abnormal areas	%	30%	
Possible economic benefit of field monitoring per 1 ha (1 * 2 * 3)	USD		0,15
Payroll economics			
1. Annual payroll and taxes of an agronomist responsible for field monitoring	USD		
2. Amount of time spent on monitoring of fields	%		
3. Economics of field monitoring with the Cropio system (partial substitution of preventive full scale inspections for targeting individual abnormal areas)	%	30%	
4. Number of hectares serviced by one agronomist	ha_		
Direct payroll economics (1 * 2 * 3 / 4)	USD		
1. Annual payroll of the specialist, responsible for consolidation and processing information in addition to reporting	USD		
2. Number of hectares serviced by a single specialist	ha_		
Economics of reporting and planning work (1 / 2)	USD		
Fertilizer expenses			
1. Fertilizer expenses and distribution per 1 hectare	USD		
2. Fertilizers economics using VRA and Cropio	%		
(according to the American Precision Agriculture Institute such economy amounts for 10% + )			
Fertilizers economics per 1 ha per year (1 * 2)	USD		0,00
Measurement and analysis expenses			
1. Cost of a single soil nitrogen test (selection + analysis)	USD_		
2. Size of area inspected for a single test	ha_		
3. Testing frequency: one test per n-years (annual basis is a recommended regularity; at least - one test in three years)	years_		
Nitrogen testing economics per 1 ha per year (1 / 2 / 3)	USD		
1. Cost of equipment and software for yield mapping	USD_		
2. Expected lifetime of the equipment	years_		
3. Amount of hectares serviced by one item of yield mapping equipment	ha_		
Equipment expenses for 1 ha per year (1 / 2 / 3)	USD		

N-tester expenses				N-tester expenses
1. Depreciation of N-tester per 1 ha per year (USD 3 000 / 5 years / 5000 hectares) (based on the 5 year expected lifetime of one tester used on 5 thousand hectares)	USD	0,12		1. Depreciation of N-tester per (based on the 5 year expected li
2. Payroll of the specialist working with N-tester per 1 ha	USD	0,10		2. Payroll of the specialist wo
(2 months per year, USD 250 per month - based on the test for the second and third soil fertilization)				(2 months per year, USD 250 pe
N-tester economics (1+2)	USD		0,22	N-tester economics (1+
Losses due to inaccurate weather forecasting				Losses due to inaccurate
1. Average cost of fertilizer and protective crop substances per hectare	USD	75		1. Average cost of fertilizer an
2. Possible % of losses due to inaccurate weather forecasting (according to the survey the figure is in between 5% and 15%)	%	2,5%		2. Possible % of losses due to (according to the survey the figu
Reduction of losses through precise weather forecasting	USD		1,88	Reduction of losses the
Insurance expenses				Insurance expenses
1. Insurance expenses for 1 hectare (not compensated by the government)	USD	2,8		1. Insurance expenses for 1 h
2. Possible % of economic benefit due to the high credibility of client profile (as a result of data submitted on historical field performance and real time crop conditions during the insurance-application process).	%	5%		2. Possible % of economic be data submitted on historical fi insurance-application process
Insurance economics (1 * 2)	USD		0,14	Insurance economics (
Collateral control expenses				Collateral control expense
1. Size of the loan per 1 hectare secured by the future harvest (usually, future harvest value discounted)	USD	280		1. Size of the loan per 1 hecta (usually, future harvest value dis
2. Possible decrease of the loan interest rate due to decrease of banking cost for collateral observation and control	%	0,1%		2. Possible decrease of the lo observation and control
3. Loan duration (usually 9 month - period from sowing to realization of harvested produce)	month	9		3. Loan duration (usually 9 month - period from so
Economics of the loan interest rate (1 * 2 * (3/12))	USD		0,21	Economics of the loan
Increase of the yield in problem zones				Increase of the yield in p
1. Average % of abnormal vegetation zones in the total field structure (insufficient amount of seeding material, improper application rate of fertilizers and/or crop protection substances, suboptimal allocation of fertilizers and seeding material throughout the field, other technological errors)	%	5%		1. Average % of abnormal ver (insufficient amount of seeding in substances, suboptimal allocation technological errors)
2. % of losses in problem field zones	%	30%		2. % of losses in problem field
3. Average yield for crops growing in problem field zones	t/ha	4		3. Average yield for crops gro
4. Price for one tonne of crop harvested from the problem field zone	USD/t	140		4. Price for one tonne of crop
Increase of the yield due to timely identification and management of problem zones (1*2*3*4)	USD		8,40	Increase of the yield du problem zones (1*2*3*4
Increase of the average yield due to VRA				Increase of the average y
1. Average harvest value from 1 hectare (for example, winter wheat)	USD/ha	560		1. Average harvest value from (for example, winter wheat)
2. % increase in yield through the balanced and differentiated seeding and soil fertilization in accordance with individual vegetation structure	%	1%		2. % increase in yield through accordance with individual ve
Minimum yield increase (1*2)	USD		5,60	Minimum yield increase
Cost efficiency				Cost efficiency
Up-to-date information	USD/ha			Up-to-date information
Reliable information	USD/ha			Reliable information
Timely information	USD/ha			Timely information
Additional profits resulting from greater efficiency	USD			Additional profits resul

er per 1 ha per year (USD 3 000 / 5 years / 5000 hectares) ted lifetime of one tester used on 5 thousand hectares)	USD	_
t working with N-tester per 1 ha	USD	_
50 per month - based on the test for the second and third soil fertilization)		
(1+2)	USD	0,00
rate weather forecasting		
er and protective crop substances per hectare	USD	
ue to inaccurate weather forecasting	%	_
through precise weather forecasting	USD	0,00
r 1 hectare (not compensated by the government)	USD	_
ic benefit due to the high credibility of client profile (as a result of cal field performance and real time crop conditions during the ocess).	%	
es (1 * 2)	USD	0,00
enses		
nectare secured by the future harvest <i>e discounted)</i>	USD	_
he loan interest rate due to decrease of banking cost for collateral	%	
om sowing to realization of harvested produce)	month	_
an interest rate (1 * 2 * (3/12))	USD	0,00
n problem zones		
Il vegetation zones in the total field structure ing material, improper application rate of fertilizers and/or crop protection cation of fertilizers and seeding material throughout the field, other	%	_
field zones	%	
s growing in problem field zones	t/ha	
crop harvested from the problem field zone	USD/t	
due to timely identification and management of 3*4)	USD	0,00
ge yield due to VRA		
from 1 hectare	USD/ha	_
ough the balanced and differentiated seeding and soil fertilization in al vegetation structure	%	_
ase (1*2)	USD	0,00
	USD/ha	_
	USD/ha	_
	USD/ha	_
sulting from greater efficiency	USD	