



# A cost-benefit analysis of the processing of a shelf stable cassava *fufu* in Nigeria



I. A. Ayinde<sup>1</sup>, A.O. Dipeolu<sup>1</sup>, K. Adebayo<sup>1</sup>, O.B. Oyewole<sup>1</sup>, L.O. Sanni<sup>1</sup>, A. Jumah<sup>2</sup>, A. Westby<sup>3</sup>

- 1. University of Agriculture, PMB 2240, Abeokuta, 110001, Nigeria.
- 2. 2. Institute for Advanced Studies, Stumpergasse, Vienna A -1060.
- 3. Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich, Central Avenue, Chatham ME 4 4TB, UK

#### Introduction

Cassava (Manihot esculenta Crantz) is the chief source of dietary food energy most widely grown in Nigeria (Dipeolu et al., 2003). Fufu (fermented cassava wet paste) is a widely consumed cassava product in southwest Nigeria, usually in the cooked ready-to-eat form. Other products like gari and lafim are the two most popular cassava products. The reason for this is that gari and lafun have a considerably longer and more stable shelf life than fufu (Dipeolu et al., 2001; Henry and Westby, 1999). Fufu production in its present forms (either the intermediate fermented wet paste or the ready-to-eat cooked forms) have been found to be a profitable venture (Dipeolu et al, 2000) and an enterprise that has significantly improved the livelihood of the processors in Nigeria (White et al., 2002). Nevertheless, one of the most important problems raised by the fufu processors is the low shelf life of fufu. In order to tackle this problem, Dipeolu et al., (2001) recommended the development of a shelf-stable, easily marketable form of the product that will also have the added advantage of improving the economic base of processors. In furtherance of this effort, the current study developed the dried fufu (dried cassava fufu paste) through an intermediate technology development process and pilot level validation. Apart from being more shelf stable, dried fufu has the added advantages of ease of preparation into the consumable form, and it is less bulky. Despite all these advantages, the adoption of dried fufu production as a new technology by the cassava processors is hinged especially on its profitability. This study therefore seeks to investigate the profitability of dried fufu production as a shelf stable product option for the consideration of cassava fufu processors in Nigeria. The study also determined the cost structure of production as well projected the costbenefit analysis through a five year project period.

## Material and Methods

Dried *fufu* was developed through the local fabrication of a Rotary Drier which uses electrical motor (to rotate the drying chamber or drum) and charcoal as the heat source for drying Cassava wet pastes were purchased from trained processors in the rural locations close (about 3km) to the processing plant. These pastes were pressed to about 40% moisture content using a hydraulic press and grinded before the drying process. At the pilot level, the drying process took an average of three days per batch of 240kg of wet paste and a total of 480kg of wet paste per week. Dried *fufu* produced were grinded again and packed into 1kg polyethylene bags and sold at the rate of N100.00 per kg.

Data on the output produced, input used, cost incurred in servicing equipment used in the production process and the revenue generated from the sale of output from the pilot level production were taken on daily basis. Analysis of costs and return was done per year to determine the profitability of the project, while the measurement of the project worth was determined using Cost-Benefit analysis (Gittinger, 1982).

## Results

| Table 1: Table showing the analysis of c<br>Revenue | DL.                   | % of TFC | % of TVC | % of TO  |  |
|---|-----------------------|----------|----------|--|--|
| 10,200kg of dried fufu at H-100 per kg              | 1.020.000.00          |          |          |  |  |
| COSTS   |                       |          |          |  |  |
| a) Fixed Costs                                      |                       |          |          |  |  |
| Rotary Drier  | 26,666.67             | 74.89    | 6        | 3.08   |  |
| Hydraulic Press                                     | 1,333,33              | 3.74     |          | 0.15   |  |
| Grating Machine                                     | 4,666.67              | 13.11    | 4        | 0.54   |  |
| Sealing Machine                                     | 845 50                | 2.37     | 41       | 0.10   |  |
| Plastic Bowl  | 1,095.00              | 3 08     |          | 0.13   |  |
| Rent on building                                    | 1,000.00              | 2.81     | -        | 0.12   |  |
| Total Fixed Cost (TFC)                              | 35,607.17             |          |          | 4.11   |  |
| b) Variable Costs                                   | beauties and a second |          |          | STATE OF THE PARTY |  |
| Fufu wet paste                                      | 347,000.00            |          | 41.80    | 40.08  |  |
| Polyethylene bags                                   | 7,500.00              | -        | 0.90     | 0.87   |  |
| Coal  | 37,400.00             | -        | 4.51     | 4.32   |  |
| Transportation                                      | 15,890.00             |          | 1.91     | 1.84   |  |
| Staff salary  | 360,000.00            | 2        | 43.37    | 41.59  |  |
| Dry milling of fufu                                 | 12.070.00             | 4        | 1.45     | 1.39   |  |
| Maintenance and repairs                             | 19,915.00             |          | 2.40     | 2.30   |  |
| Electricity bills                                   | 14,400.00             | (4)      | 174      | 1.66   |  |
| Water bills   | 13,200.00             | 4        | 1.59     | 1.53   |  |
| Miscellaneous                                       | 2,685.00              |          | 0.32     | 0.31   |  |
| Total Variable Cost (TVC)                           | 830,060.00            |          |          | 95.89  |  |
| l'otal Cost   | 865,667.17            |          |          |  |  |
| Profit  | 154,332.83            |          |          |  |  |
| Profit per Kg                                       | 15.13                 | 1        |          |  |  |
| Return to Investment                                | 1.18                  | -        |          |  |  |

|  | Jan.   | Feb   | March   | April   | Mag   | June   | July   | Aug   | Sept  | Oct   | Nov.   | Dec.   |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| A) INPLOW<br>Output (Kg)<br>Revenue  | 812<br>81,200  | 720<br>72,000   | 785   | 390<br>89,000   | 860<br>86,000   | 920<br>92,000  | 960<br>96,000  | 85,000  | 980   | 745<br>74,500   | 888  | 890<br>89,000  |
| B) OUTFLOW  1. Overhead  Costs  Rotary Dries  Rydranie Peess  Grating  machine  Sealing  machine  Plastic bowls  Rent paid on  both  Overhead Cost  Overhead Cost                                | 400,000<br>20,000<br>70,000<br>8,455<br>990<br>1,000<br>500,445                          | 1,000   | 1,000   | 1,000   | 1,000   | 1,000  | 1,200<br>1,000<br>2,200  | 1,000   | 1,000<br>1,000  | 1,000<br>1,000  | 1,000<br>1,000   | 1,000  |
| 2. Creational Costs Costs Fujib wet par in Polyethyle me bage Coal Transport Staff salary and waces Milling of fujie Minth mance & myane Electricity bills Water balls mircellamsous Operational | 31,800<br>7,500<br>4,500<br>1,250<br>30,000<br>830<br>1,390<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>380,170 | 22,000<br>2,500<br>1,800<br>30,000<br>620<br>1,803<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>250<br>41,275 | 30,000<br>2,000<br>800<br>30,000<br>580<br>1,700<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>360<br>47,740 | 32,000<br>2,730<br>1,720<br>30,000<br>720<br>1,680<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>120<br>71,298 | 30,000<br>3,000<br>1,200<br>30,000<br>830<br>1,550<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>180<br>49,000 | 97,000<br>9,500<br>950<br>30,000<br>1,200<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>11,100<br>125<br>78,275 | 34,000<br>3,500<br>400<br>30,000<br>950<br>1,250<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>71,500 | 26,000<br>2,400<br>600<br>30,000<br>1,300<br>1,220<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>190<br>64,200 | 20,000<br>2,000<br>2,000<br>30,000<br>1,200<br>1,180<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>250<br>48,930 | 22,000<br>2,300<br>1,250<br>30,000<br>1,000<br>1,300<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>125<br>60,275 | 25,200<br>3,420<br>30,000<br>860<br>1,640<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>140<br>42,968 | 27,000<br>4,350<br>30,000<br>1,750<br>1,800<br>1,200<br>1,100<br>463<br>48,366 |
| Cast<br>Net Flow   | 499,415  | 9,725   | 9,760   | 6,710   | 15,920  | 12,725   | 22,300   | 19,800  | 8,070   | 13,225  | 18,840   | 19,635   |
| UMULATIVE  | 499,415  | 489,690   | 479,930   | 463,220   | 447,220   | 424,575  | 412,275  | 392,475   | 374,405   | 361,180   | 242,340  | 222,705  |

Table 2: Table showing the measurement of project worth of dried fufu production over

| Y.ess | Overhead<br>Cost (OC) | Increm ental<br>Cost (IC) | Gross Cost<br>(GC)<br>(GC+IC) | Gross<br>Revenue<br>(GR) | Increm ental<br>Net benefit<br>(OR-OC) | Discount<br>Factor<br>(21%) | Discounted<br>Gross cost   | Discounted<br>Gross<br>Revenue | Discounted<br>Incremental<br>Net benefit |
|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 1     | 312,645.00            | 830,060.00                | 1,342,705.00                  | 1,020,000.00             | -322,705.00                            | 0.326                       | 1,109,07433                | 842,520.00                     | -266,554.33                              |
| 2     |                       | 250,450.00                | 250,450.00                    | 1,250,000.00             | 399,550.00                             | 0.683                       | 580,857.35                 | 853,750.00                     | 272,892.65                               |
| 3     |                       | 860,123.00                | 360,123.00                    | 1,632,450.00             | 772,327.00                             | 0.565                       | 485,969.50                 | 922,334.25                     | 436,364.75                               |
| 4     | *                     | 890,225.00                | 890,225.00                    | 1,650,253.00             | 760,028.00                             | 0.467                       | 415,735.08                 | 770,668.15                     | 354,933.07                               |
| Total | les s                 | 950,630.00                | 930,638.00                    | 1,823,400.00             | 872,750.00                             | 0.386                       | 366,950 B9<br>2,958,586.35 | 703,832.40<br>4,093,104.80     | 336,882.31<br>1,134,518,45               |

NET PRESENT WORTH + #1, 134,518.45
BENEFIT-COST RATIO - 1.38
CALCULATED INTERNAL RATE OF RETURN - 1.18%

### Discussion and Conclusion

Profitability of dried fufu production: The

profitability of dried fufu is presented in table 1. Fixed cost items as a percentage of total cost stand at 4.11%. While variable cost as a percentage of total cost stand at 95.89%. This implies that variable cost items exert more strain on the investment on dried fufu production than the fixed cost items. Therefore, processors should take note of these costs as very important items in the production process. Measurement of project worth. The cash flow analysis of the project is shown in table 2. The results indicate that the project would not pay back the capital investment in year 1 but would pay back in year 2 (table 3), while for the remaining years the project would continue to yield profit. Moreover, the overall picture of the project worth is shown in table 3 where it is revealed that the project has a positive net present worth of 1,134,518.45 Naira indicating that the project is profitable. The benefit-cost ratio of 1.84 also indicates that for every N1 spent, a profit of 0.38 Naira is made. Furthermore, the internal rate of return calculated for this project stand at 118%. This is an indication that the project ceteris paribus can still break even if it sources loan at an interest rate of 118%, but this is impracticable since the un-official interest rate for bank lending in Nigeria is between 35% and 45%. Despite the fact that production was not done at full capacity at the pilot level of this project, the overall picture of the dried fufu production gives an indication that it would be a worthwhile intervention towards improving the livelihoods of cassava processors in Nigeria because it was found to be a profitable venture. This suggests that it will be worthwhile if this technology is introduced to the target processors as a way of improving their livelihood and also chart a new development in the utilisation of cassava through value addition. Success of this intervention at the processor level however calls for intervention in the areas of availability of constant supply of electricity, cassava roots for the wet paste, a ready market and funding.

#### References

Dipeolu, A. O., Ayinde, I.A., Adebayo, K., Oyewole, O. B., Sanni, L. O., Pearce, D. M., White, J. L. and Westby, A. (2000). "Viability analysis of cassava processing in south-western Nigeria". Report submitted to the Department For International Development. Project A0898, December, 2000. Dipeolu, A. O., Ayinde, I.A., Adebayo, K., Oyewole, O. B., Sanni, L. O., Pearce, D. M., Wandschneider, T. S., White, J. L., Tomlins, K. and Westby, A. (2001). "Commercialisation of fufir Some issues of marketing in Ogun and Lagos States of Nigeria". African Crop Science Conference Proceedings, Vol. 5. pp 739-745. African Crop Society.

Dipcolu, A. O., Ayinde, I.A., Adebayo, K., Oyewole, O. B., Sanni, L. O., Pearce, D. M., Wandschneider, T. S., White, J. L. and Westby, A. (2003). "Challenges facing the cassava industries in meeting urban food needs in Nigeria". Paper presented at the Food Africa International Working Meeting, 5-9 May, 2003, Yaounde, Cameroon.

Gittinger, J. P. (1982). Economic analysis of agricultural projects. Second edition. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press for the Economic Development Institute for the World Bank.

Henry, G. and Westby, A. (1999). Global cassava end uses and markets: Current situation and recommendations for further study. FAO, Rome, Italy.

White, J. L., Adebayo, K., Dipeolu, A. O., Ayinde, I.A., Oyewole, O. B., Sanni, L. O., Westby, A., Wandschneider, T. S., and Tomlins, K. (2002). "Fufu processing and livelihoods in Ogun State, Nigeria". Report of a baseline study as part of Project A0898 carried out for the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). April 2002.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT