

Beef Cattle Business Development Strategy in Tapung Hilir District, Kampar Regency

M. Zaki¹; Reno Martha²; Yusuf Mahlil³

¹²³Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai;

Email: cakayzaky@gmail.com; renomartha@universitaspahlawan.ac.id;

yusuf@universitaspahlawan.ac.id

Article history

Submitted: 2026/10/13; Revised: 2026/10/15; Accepted: 2026/10/21

Abstract

This article formulates strategic options for developing beef cattle businesses in Tapung Hilir District, Kampar Regency, Riau, Indonesia. It applies a qualitative descriptive approach based on literature review and strategic synthesis, drawing on livestock development, smallholder enterprise management, animal health, value-chain coordination, and sustainable agriculture. Because no primary field data or local statistical tables were supplied, the article does not claim to measure current herd size, farmer income, productivity, or the impact of existing programs in Tapung Hilir. The analysis proposes six connected priorities: establishing a reliable baseline; improving feeding, breeding, and preventive animal health; strengthening farmer organizations and extension; improving financial literacy and farm records; connecting farmers with market information and reliable buyers; and integrating manure management with crop production. Implementation should proceed through participatory assessment, small-scale pilots, and evidence-based expansion. Suggested monitoring indicators include reproductive performance, calf survival, mortality, average daily gain, feed cost, sale price, operating margin, group participation, and manure-management practices. The article argues that sustainable development depends not only on increasing cattle numbers but also on improving productivity, controlling costs, reducing risks, and strengthening the value retained by smallholders. The framework is intended as a practical starting point for local government, extension workers, farmer groups, financial institutions, and market actors, and should be validated against current local conditions.

Keywords

Beef Cattle; Business Development; Smallholder Farmers; Livestock Value Chain; Tapung Hilir; Kampar Regency

© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

INTRODUCTION

Beef cattle farming can support rural livelihoods through the sale of animals, household savings, employment, and the use of manure in crop production. For smallholders, cattle are often managed alongside other agricultural activities, making the enterprise closely connected to household labor, land availability, seasonal feed supplies, and access to buyers. Business development therefore requires more than increasing animal numbers: it also requires improved productivity, risk management, market coordination, and the ability to make decisions using reliable farm records (Agus & Widi, 2018; FAO, 2019)..

Tapung Hilir District is located in Kampar Regency, Riau Province. Its livestock-development context should be examined in relation to local land use, road and market access, crop-residue and forage availability, farmer institutions, and animal-health services. These factors may differ among villages and households. This article therefore treats them as issues to investigate rather than established findings about every cattle farmer in Tapung Hilir.

Smallholder cattle enterprises can face interrelated constraints. Feed availability and quality may fluctuate seasonally; reproductive performance may be limited by weak breeding management; animal-health problems can cause losses; and farmers selling individually may have limited bargaining power. Incomplete records also make it difficult to calculate production costs, assess profitability, or prepare a credible financing proposal. These constraints should be addressed as a connected system: improved genetics, for example, may not generate benefits if nutrition and health care remain inadequate.

Livestock-development literature emphasizes combining productivity improvements with accessible services, farmer capacity, market development, and environmental management (FAO, 2018; FAO, 2019). A value-chain perspective highlights relationships among input suppliers, producers, traders, processors, and consumers. Farmers may improve returns when they coordinate sales, access timely price information, and meet agreed quality and delivery requirements. Collective arrangements, however, require transparent rules and trust and should be designed with farmers rather than imposed on them (Agus & Widi, 2018; FAO, 2018; OECD-FAO, 2024)..

This article aims to formulate a practical strategy for beef cattle business development in Tapung Hilir District, Kampar Regency. It addresses three questions: what factors should be assessed before interventions are selected; what strategies can strengthen productivity, profitability, and market access; and how should

implementation be phased and evaluated? Its contribution is a locally adaptable framework for planning and field validation, not a claim that particular interventions have already produced measured impacts in the district.

METHOD

This article uses a qualitative descriptive approach based on a narrative review of literature and strategic synthesis. The scope covers smallholder livestock development, cattle nutrition and reproduction, animal health, value-chain coordination, rural enterprise management, and sustainable manure use. General principles from livestock-development guidance and applicable Indonesian institutional frameworks inform the analysis.

The analysis was conducted in three stages. First, factors influencing smallholder cattle enterprises were grouped into production, institutional, financial, market, and environmental dimensions. Second, these dimensions were translated into strategic options relevant to district-level planning. Third, the options were organized into a phased implementation framework with suggested monitoring indicators. Strategies were assessed conceptually against five criteria: potential contribution to productivity, affordability for smallholders, feasibility through local institutions, market relevance, and environmental sustainability.

No primary survey, interviews, farm accounts, official district livestock statistics, or direct observations were supplied for this article. Accordingly, it does not present invented sample sizes, local herd totals, numerical estimates of profitability, or statistically significant relationships. The discussion of Tapung Hilir is a contextual application of general livestock-development principles. Before implementation, priorities should be checked against current data from district and village authorities, livestock officers, farmer groups, buyers, and farm households. This limitation matters because baseline conditions determine which interventions deserve priority.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Establishing a Baseline and Identifying Farm Types

A development strategy should begin with a baseline rather than assume that all farmers have the same needs. A district-level assessment should record cattle numbers by age and sex, breed or type, ownership arrangements, calving history, calf survival, animal losses, feeding practices, veterinary access, labor availability, land and forage resources, sales channels, prices received, and household production costs. It should also map seasonal feed shortages, water access, transport routes, livestock markets, input suppliers, and animal-health services.

Farmers can then be grouped by enterprise characteristics, such as households keeping a small number of animals as savings, households developing a breeding herd, and farmers specializing in fattening. These are analytical categories, not a claim about the actual distribution of farms in Tapung Hilir. Breeding enterprises need reproductive records, planned mating, and calf-survival management. Fattening enterprises need reliable feeder-cattle supply, ration planning, weight monitoring, and a clear selling strategy. A participatory problem-ranking exercise involving farmers, extension officers, village representatives, traders, and animal-health personnel can identify which constraints are most urgent and feasible to address.

2. Improving Feeding, Breeding, and Animal Health

Feed management is central to cattle productivity and business margins. Farmers should assess the quantity and quality of feed available throughout the year, rather than simply whether forage is present. Where land and water permit, options include planting suitable grasses and legumes, conserving surplus forage as hay or silage, and using locally available agricultural by-products when nutritionally appropriate and safe. Crop residues alone may not meet the needs of growing or breeding cattle; ration advice should account for animal size, physiological status, production objective, spoilage risk, and transport cost (Agus & Widi, 2018; Dung et al., 2019; FAO, 2011)..

Farmer groups may coordinate forage planting, chopping, storage, or bulk purchasing of supplements where demand is sufficient. Demonstration plots should compare costs and animal responses under local conditions. Breeding improvement should begin with management: animal identification and records of mating, calving, calf survival, and reproductive problems. Artificial insemination or controlled mating services can be strengthened where qualified technicians, follow-up, and farmer demand are available. Breed choices should reflect adaptation, feed resources, disease exposure, farmer capacity, and market objectives rather than appearance alone.

Preventive animal health should be coordinated with authorized veterinary personnel. A locally appropriate program may include vaccination where indicated, parasite control, biosecurity, sanitation, and prompt reporting of suspected infectious disease. New animals should be managed carefully before joining the herd. Farmers should be trained to seek professional diagnosis rather than rely on informal treatment alone. Records of disease events, treatments, deaths, and related costs can reveal recurring risks and improve farm decisions (WOAH, 2024; FAO, 2019)..

3. Strengthening Farmer Organizations and Extension

Farmer groups can support shared learning, service access, bulk purchasing, collective marketing, and engagement with public programs. Their effectiveness depends on active membership, transparent financial management, clear leadership responsibilities, and benefits that members recognize. Group formation alone is not evidence of success. Groups should agree on written rules, meeting schedules, contribution arrangements, and procedures for reporting income and expenditure (World Bank, 2009; FAO, 2018)..

Extension should be practical and continuous. Demonstration farms, field schools, peer learning, and regular visits can help farmers apply knowledge about feed formulation, reproduction, animal health, housing, business records, and manure handling. Training should use local examples and include women and younger household members when they participate in livestock work or financial decisions. Outcomes should be evaluated through changes in farm practices and records, not attendance lists alone.

Digital tools may support animal identification, health reminders, market-price sharing, and record keeping, but they should be simple enough for farmers to use. Paper records should remain an option where connectivity, device access, or digital literacy is limited. Data should support farmers' decisions rather than merely satisfy reporting requirements.

4. Improving Finance and Business Management

Cattle enterprises require working capital for animals, feed, veterinary services, housing, transport, and labor. Credit alone does not guarantee business growth. Before borrowing, farmers need a cash-flow plan that accounts for production-cycle length, price fluctuations, animal-health risks, and household expenses. Repayment schedules should align with expected cash inflows rather than assume that cattle generate income every month (Widiati & Widi, 2016; World Bank, 2009)..

Training should introduce a simple ledger recording animal purchases, feed, medicines, breeding services, labor, transport, repairs, and sales. Farmers can use their own data to calculate gross margin and net operating returns. They should distinguish cash expenditure from family labor and home-produced feed; excluding these costs can make an enterprise appear more profitable than it is. Financial institutions and local government can support financial literacy, savings mechanisms, and suitable rural financing links, after verifying local program availability and terms. Farmers should receive transparent information about

interest, fees, collateral, repayment obligations, and default risks.

5. Developing Markets and Value-Chain Coordination

Market development should connect production decisions to actual buyer requirements. A local market assessment should identify buyers, preferred animal types and weights, seasonal demand, weighing practices, payment arrangements, transport costs, and price-setting mechanisms. Farmers need accessible information about prices and the net return after transport, fees, and other deductions (Agus & Widi, 2018; Sullivan & Diwyanto, 2007)..

Collective marketing may improve bargaining power when farmers can aggregate animals of comparable quality, use transparent weighing or grading, and negotiate as a group. However, collective sales do not automatically deliver higher prices: coordination costs, timing, animal uniformity, and buyer demand matter. A pilot can test whether group sales reduce transaction costs or improve payment reliability before expansion. Records of weights, prices, deductions, and payment dates can reduce disputes.

Partnerships with traders, livestock markets, slaughter facilities, or institutional buyers may improve predictability where demand and infrastructure permit. Arrangements should avoid leaving farmers dependent on a single buyer. Clear quality standards, animal-health documentation, humane handling, and reliable delivery schedules can strengthen trust. Market development should comply with relevant animal-movement, animal-welfare, and food-safety requirements.

6. Integrating Environmental Management

Manure can be managed as a resource rather than waste. Appropriate storage, composting, and application may contribute organic matter and nutrients to cropland. Benefits depend on handling, transport distance, labor, soil needs, and the cost of alternatives. Farmers need practical guidance on safe storage, compost maturity, application rates, and protecting wells, waterways, and drainage channels (FAO, 2018; FAO, 2019)..

Livestock housing should provide adequate drainage, ventilation, shade, clean water, and space appropriate to the animals and management system. Feed production and manure use should avoid inappropriate land conversion and pressure on sensitive habitats. A circular approach may be feasible where crop farmers and cattle keepers can exchange feed resources and manure at reasonable cost. Pilot agreements can specify quantities, quality, delivery timing, and responsibilities before the model is expanded.

7. Implementation Roadmap and Monitoring

During months 1–6, stakeholders should conduct a baseline assessment, map services and markets, identify interested farmer groups, and agree on measurable targets. Quick improvements such as better records, feed planning, and access to animal-health advice can be prioritized, while major investments should wait until key constraints are understood.

During months 7–18, selected villages can pilot demonstration farms, feed conservation, reproductive and health records, group training, and transparent marketing trials. Each pilot should have a responsible institution, budget, schedule, baseline values, and indicators. In months 19–36, practices can be adapted and expanded only when documented results show that farmers can sustain them, costs are manageable, and market demand exists. Unsuccessful pilots should be adjusted or discontinued rather than maintained simply because funds have already been spent.

Monitoring should combine production, financial, institutional, market, and environmental indicators. Production measures may include calving rate, calf survival, mortality, average daily gain for fattening cattle, and completeness of health records. Financial measures may include feed cost per animal, total production cost, sale price, gross margin, and net operating return. Institutional measures may include active group membership and demonstrated practice changes; market measures may include the number of buyers accessed, payment delays, and net price received after selling costs. Environmental measures may include adoption of manure-management practices and evidence of safe storage and application (OECD-FAO, 2024; FAO, 2018)..

Every indicator requires a clear definition, baseline, data source, collection frequency, and responsible person. Numerical targets should be established only after baseline data are collected. Key risks include seasonal feed shortages, disease outbreaks, price volatility, excessive borrowing, and inactive farmer groups. Feed reserves, veterinary coordination, diversified buyers, conservative cash-flow planning, transparent group accounts, and periodic review can help manage these risks. Overall, the strategy is a coordinated system linking animal performance with cost control, farmer capability, market access, and environmental safeguards.

CONCLUSION

Beef cattle business development in Tapung Hilir District, Kampar Regency, should follow an integrated approach that improves productivity while strengthening the commercial and institutional capacity of smallholders. The main priorities are to establish a reliable baseline; improve feeding, breeding, and

preventive animal health; strengthen farmer organizations and extension; develop financial literacy and farm records; improve market information and bargaining opportunities; and integrate manure management with crop production.

Implementation should proceed through baseline assessment, small-scale pilots, and evidence-based expansion. Monitoring should track production, costs, returns, farmer participation, market outcomes, and environmental practices. Since this article is based on literature and strategic synthesis rather than original field data, it cannot establish current conditions or measured impacts in Tapung Hilir. The framework should be validated with farmers, local authorities, livestock officers, buyers, and financial institutions before resources are committed. Future field research should measure farm-level costs and returns, compare conditions across villages and enterprise types, and evaluate which interventions generate sustainable gains for participating households.

REFERENCES

- Agus, A., & Widi, T. S. M. (2018). Current situation and future prospects for beef cattle production in Indonesia—A review. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 31(7), 976–983. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.18.0233>
- Dung, D. V., Roubík, H., Ngoan, L. D., Phung, L. D., & Ba, N. X. (2019). Characterization of smallholder beef cattle production system in Central Vietnam—Revealing performance, trends, constraints, and future development. *Tropical Animal Science Journal*, 42(3), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.5398/tasj.2019.42.3.253>
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2011). *The state of the world's land and water resources for food and agriculture (SOLAW): Managing systems at risk*. FAO.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2018). *Sustainable food systems: Concept and framework*. FAO. <https://www.fao.org/3/ca2079en/CA2079EN.pdf>
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2019). *The future of livestock in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. FAO. <https://www.fao.org/3/ca5002en/ca5002en.pdf>
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2023). *The status of women in agrifood systems*. FAO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc5343en>
- Government of Indonesia. (2014). *Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 41 of 2014 concerning amendments to Law Number 18 of 2009 on Animal Husbandry and Animal Health*.

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development & Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2024). OECD-FAO agricultural outlook 2024–2033. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/4c5d2cfb-en>
- Rusdiana, S., & Soeharsono. (2017). Kesiapan usaha sapi potong dalam menghadapi pasar global. *Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Peternakan*, 27(1), 1–12.
- Sullivan, G. M., & Diwyanto, K. (2007). A value chain assessment of the livestock sector in Indonesia. United States Agency for International Development.
- Sutarno, & Setyawan, A. D. (2016). The diversity of local cattle in Indonesia and the efforts to develop superior indigenous cattle breeds. *Biodiversitas*, 17(1), 275–295. <https://doi.org/10.13057/biodiv/d170138>
- Widiati, R., & Widi, T. S. M. (2016). Production systems and income generation from the smallholder beef cattle farming in Yogyakarta Province, Indonesia. In *Proceedings/academic publication on livestock production systems*. [Bibliographic details should be verified against the original publication record].
- World Bank. (2009). *Minding the stock: Bringing public policy to bear on livestock sector development*. World Bank.
- World Organisation for Animal Health. (2024). Terrestrial animal health code. WOA. <https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/standards/codes-and-manuals/terrestrial-code-online-access/>
- World Organisation for Animal Health. (2023). *Animal welfare and beef cattle production systems: Relevant standards and guidance*. WOA. <https://www.woah.org/>