

# livestock's long shadow

environmental issues and options



The Livestock, Environment and Development (LEAD) Initiative is supported by the World Bank, the European Union (EU), the Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (France), German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development via GTZ (Germany), the Department for International Development (United Kingdom), the US Agency for International Development (USA), the International Development Agency (Denmark), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (Switzerland), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

LEAD website: <http://www.virtualcentre.org>

## **Photographs**

Page 2 and 3: USDA / Ken Hammond  
Page 22 and 23: USDA / Dana Downic  
Page 78 and 79: FAO / R. Faidutti  
Page 124 and 125: USDA-NRCS / Gene Alexander  
Page 180 and 181: CIPAV – Photographic archive  
Page 220 and 221: FAO / H. Wagner  
Page 266 and 267: Nikolaus Schareika

# livestock's long shadow

## environmental issues and options

Henning Steinfeld  
Pierre Gerber  
Tom Wassenaar  
Vincent Castel  
Mauricio Rosales  
Cees de Haan

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

ISBN 978-92-5-105571-7

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Chief, Publishing Management Service, Information Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy or by e-mail to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

© FAO 2006

---

# Preface

The in-depth assessment presented in this document of the various significant impacts of the world's livestock sector on the environment is deliberately termed *Livestock's long shadow* so as to help raise the attention of both the technical and the general public to the very substantial contribution of animal agriculture to climate change and air pollution, to land, soil and water degradation and to the reduction of biodiversity. This is not done simply to blame the rapidly growing and intensifying global livestock sector for severely damaging the environment but to encourage decisive measures at the technical and political levels for mitigating such damage. The detailed assessment of the various environmental impacts of the sector is therefore associated with the outline of technical and policy-related action to address these impacts.

The assessment builds on the work of the Livestock, Environment and Development (LEAD) Initiative. This multi-stakeholder Initiative, coordinated by FAO's Animal Production and Health Division, was formed to address the environmental consequences of livestock production, particularly in the light of rising demand for food products of animal origin and the increasing pressure on natural resources. The LEAD Initiative brought together a broad range of research and development institutions and individuals interested in livestock–environment interactions; it has been active in a number of areas of particular concern, i.e. in land and water pollution from intensive livestock production in land degradation from overgrazing in dry lands and in livestock-induced deforestation in the humid and subhumid tropics.

While previous assessments of the livestock–environment interactions by LEAD have adopted a livestock sector perspective, i.e. investigated the impacts of the sector on the natural resources used in animal production, the current assessment sets off from the environment and determines the contribution of livestock to changes to the environment (land use and climate change, soil, water and biodiversity depletion). The benefit of this change in perspective is substantial in that it provides the framework for gauging the significant and dynamic role of the livestock sector in driving global environmental change. This in turn should assist and enhance decision-making on necessary action at all levels, from local to global, from private to public, from individual to corporate and from non-governmental to intergovernmental. Action is required: if, as predicted, the production of meat will double from now to 2050, we need to halve impacts per unit of output to achieve a mere status quo in overall impact.

LEAD has been catalysing such action, supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other donors, in a range of livestock-induced environmental “hotspots”, such as in East and Southeast Asia where solutions are designed for the sustainable management of the very large quantities of livestock waste in intensive animal production, such as in Central America where new procedures are introduced for the payment of environmental services in livestock-based land use, and such as in the United Republic of Tanzania where

---

sustainable wildlife–livestock interactions are designed. Such efforts require decisions on, and enforcement of, suitable policy instruments for enabling stakeholder engagement in economically sustainable resource use that addresses the environmental concerns at stake.

It is obvious that the responsibility for the necessary action to address the environmental damage by the livestock sector goes far beyond the sector; it also goes beyond agriculture. While the sector, and agriculture as a whole, have to live up to the challenge of finding suitable technical solutions for more environmentally sustainable resource use in animal agriculture, the decisions concerning their use clearly transcend agriculture; multisector and multiobjective decision-making is required.

It is hoped that this assessment contributes to such decision-making and to thus shrink “*Livestock’s long shadow*”.



Samuel Jutzi

*Director*

*Animal Production and Health Division*

*FAO*

---

# Contents

Acknowledgements	xvi
Abbreviations and acronyms	xvii
Executive summary	xx
Chapter 1	
<b>Introduction</b>	3
1.1 Livestock as a major player in global environmental issues	4
1.2 The setting: factors shaping the livestock sector	6
1.3 Trends within the livestock sector	14
Chapter 2	
<b>Livestock in geographic transition</b>	23
2.1 Trends in livestock related land use	24
2.1.1 Overview: a regionally diverse pattern of change	24
2.1.2 Globalization drives national land-use change	27
2.1.3 Land degradation: a vast and costly loss	29
2.1.4 Livestock and land use: the “geographical transition”	31
2.2 Geography of demand	33
2.3 Geography of livestock resources	34
2.3.1 Pastures and fodder	34
2.3.2 Feedcrops and crop residues	38
2.3.3 Agro-industrial by-products	43
2.3.4 Future trends	45
2.4 Production systems: location economics at play	50
2.4.1 Historical trends and distribution patterns	51
2.4.2 Geographical concentration	57
2.4.3 Increasing reliance on transport	60

---

<b>2.5 Hotspots of land degradation</b>	63
2.5.1 Pastures and feedcrops still expanding into natural ecosystems	64
2.5.2 Rangeland degradation: desertification and vegetation changes	66
2.5.3 Contamination in peri-urban environments	68
2.5.4 Intensive feedcrop agriculture	70
<b>2.6 Conclusions</b>	74
<b>Chapter 3</b>	
<b>Livestock's role in climate change and air pollution</b>	79
<b>3.1 Issues and trends</b>	79
<b>3.2 Livestock in the carbon cycle</b>	84
3.2.1 Carbon emissions from feed production	86
3.2.2 Carbon emissions from livestock rearing	95
3.2.3 Carbon emissions from livestock processing and refrigerated transport	99
<b>3.3 Livestock in the nitrogen cycle</b>	101
3.3.1 Nitrogen emissions from feed-related fertilizer	104
3.3.2 Emissions from aquatic sources following chemical fertilizer use	105
3.3.3 Wasting of nitrogen in the livestock production chain	106
3.3.4 Nitrogen emissions from stored manure	107
3.3.5 Nitrogen emissions from applied or deposited manure	109
3.3.6 Emissions following manure nitrogen losses after application and direct deposition	111
<b>3.4 Summary of livestock's impact</b>	112
<b>3.5 Mitigation options</b>	114
3.5.1 Sequestering carbon and mitigating CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	115
3.5.2 Reducing CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation through improved efficiency and diets	119
3.5.3 Mitigating CH <sub>4</sub> emissions through improved manure management and biogas	121
3.5.4 Technical options for mitigating N <sub>2</sub> O emissions and NH <sub>3</sub> volatilization	122

---

Chapter 4	
<b>Livestock's role in water depletion and pollution</b>	125
4.1 Issues and trends	125
4.2 Water use	128
4.2.1 Drinking and servicing	128
4.2.2 Product processing	130
4.2.3 Feed production	133
4.3 Water pollution	135
4.3.1 Livestock waste	136
4.3.2 Wastes from livestock processing	149
4.3.3 Pollution from feed and fodder production	153
4.4 Livestock land-use impacts on the water cycle	162
4.4.1 Extensive grazing alters water flows	162
4.4.2 Land-use conversion	165
4.5 Summary of the impact of livestock on water	167
4.6 Mitigation options	169
4.6.1 Improved water-use efficiency	169
4.6.2 Better waste management	171
4.6.3 Land management	176
Chapter 5	
<b>Livestock's impact on biodiversity</b>	181
5.1 Issues and trends	181
5.2 Dimensions of biodiversity	183
5.3 Livestock's role in biodiversity loss	187
5.3.1 Habitat change	187
5.3.2 Climate change	195
5.3.3 Invasive alien species	196
5.3.4 Overexploitation and competition	202
5.3.5 Pollution	209
5.4 Summary of livestock impacts on biodiversity	214
5.5 Mitigation options for conservation of biodiversity	215

---

Chapter 6	
<b>Policy challenges and options</b>	221
6.1 Towards a conducive policy framework	222
6.1.1 General principles	222
6.1.2 Specific policy instruments	229
6.1.3 Policy issues in climate change	237
6.1.4 Policy issues in water	241
6.1.5 Policy issues in biodiversity	249
6.2 Policies options for addressing environmental pressure points	256
6.2.1 Controlling expansion into natural ecosystems	256
6.2.2 Limiting rangeland degradation	259
6.2.3 Reducing nutrient loading in livestock concentration areas	261
6.2.4 Lessening the environmental impact of intensive feedcrop production	263
Chapter 7	
<b>Summary and conclusions</b>	267
7.1 Livestock and environment in context	268
7.2 What needs to be done?	275
7.3 The challenge ahead	281
References	285
Annexes	
1. Global maps	321
2. Tables	359
3. Methodology of quantification and analysis	377

---

# Tables

<u>1.1</u>	Urbanization rates and growth rates	7
<u>1.2</u>	Changes in food consumption in developing countries	10
<u>1.3</u>	Use of feed concentrate	12
<u>1.4</u>	Key productivity parameters for livestock in different world regions	14
<u>1.5</u>	Past and projected trends in consumption of meat and milk in developing and developed countries	15
<u>1.6</u>	Developing country trends in livestock production in 2005	16
<u>2.1</u>	Regional trends in land use for arable land, pasture and forest from 1961 to 2001	26
<u>2.2</u>	Estimates of the global extent of land degradation	30
<u>2.3</u>	Estimates of all degraded land in dry areas	30
<u>2.4</u>	Livestock and total dietary protein supply in 1980 and 2002	34
<u>2.5</u>	Estimated remaining and converted grasslands	35
<u>2.6</u>	Land ownership and access rights on pastoral land, possible combinations and resulting level of access security for the livestock keeper	36
<u>2.7</u>	Land use and land ownership in the United States	37
<u>2.8</u>	Supply and recycling of food by-products in Japan	45
<u>2.9</u>	Global livestock population and production in different production systems	53
<u>2.10</u>	Livestock population and production in different production systems in developing countries	54
<u>2.11</u>	Livestock population and production in different agro-ecological zones	55
<u>2.12</u>	Trade as a share of total production for selected products	61
<u>2.13</u>	Contribution of livestock to soil erosion on agricultural lands in the United States in 2001	74
<u>3.1</u>	Past and current concentration of important greenhouse gases	82

---

<u>3.2</u>	Atmospheric carbon sources and sinks	85
<u>3.3</u>	Chemical fertilizer N used for feed and pastures in selected countries	87
<u>3.4</u>	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuel burning to produce nitrogen fertilizer for feedcrops in selected countries	88
<u>3.5</u>	On-farm energy use for agriculture in Minnesota, United States	89
<u>3.6</u>	Livestock numbers (2002) and estimated carbon dioxide emissions from respiration	96
<u>3.7</u>	Global methane emissions from enteric fermentation in 2004	97
<u>3.8</u>	Global methane emissions from manure management in 2004	99
<u>3.9</u>	Indicative energy costs for processing	100
<u>3.10</u>	Energy use for processing agricultural products in Minnesota, United States, in 1995	101
<u>3.11</u>	Estimated total N <sub>2</sub> O emission from animal excreta	110
<u>3.12</u>	Role of livestock in carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide emissions	113
<u>3.13</u>	Global terrestrial carbon sequestration potential from improved management	118
<u>4.1</u>	Water use and depletion by sector	126
<u>4.2</u>	Drinking-water requirements for livestock	129
<u>4.3</u>	Service water requirements for different livestock types	130
<u>4.4</u>	Water use for drinking-water requirements	131
<u>4.5</u>	Water use for service water requirements	132
<u>4.6</u>	Water use and depletion in tanning operations	133
<u>4.7</u>	Evapotranspiration of water for production of barley, maize, wheat and soybean (BMWS) for feed	136
<u>4.8</u>	Nutrient intake and excretions by different animals	137
<u>4.9</u>	Estimated relative contribution of pig waste, domestic wastewater and non-point sources to nitrogen emissions in water systems	139
<u>4.10</u>	Ranges of BOD concentration for various wastes and animal products	140

---

<u>4.11</u>	Global N and P application on crops and pasture from chemical fertilizer and animal manure	147
<u>4.12</u>	Estimated N and P losses to freshwater ecosystems from manured agricultural lands	148
<u>4.13</u>	Heavy metal inputs to agricultural land in England and Wales in 2000	149
<u>4.14</u>	Typical waste water characteristics from animal processing industries	152
<u>4.15</u>	Pollution loads discharged in effluents from tanning operations	153
<u>4.16</u>	Mineral fertilizer consumption in different world regions between 1980 and 2000	154
<u>4.17</u>	Contribution of livestock production to agricultural N and P consumption in the form of mineral fertilizer in selected countries	155
<u>4.18</u>	Estimated N and P losses to freshwater ecosystems from mineral fertilizers consumed for feed and forage production	156
<u>4.19</u>	Livestock contribution to nitrogen and phosphorus discharges to surface waters from non-point source and point source pollution in the United States	157
<u>4.20</u>	Pesticide use for feed production in the United States	159
<u>4.21</u>	Seasonal effects of vegetation composition change on water yield, by climate type	166
<u>4.22</u>	Estimated contribution of the livestock sector to water use and depletion processes	168
<u>5.1</u>	Estimated numbers of described species and possible global total	183
<u>5.2</u>	Major ecosystems and threats	186
<u>5.3</u>	Expert ranking of livestock-related threats to biodiversity resulting from the different mechanisms and types of production system	216
<u>6.1</u>	Comparison of key technical parameters in the beef industry in the Amazon area of Brazil (1985–2003)	256
<u>7.1</u>	Global facts about livestock	271

---

# Figures

<u>1.1</u>	Past and projected global rural and urban populations from 1950 to 2030	7
<u>1.2</u>	Consumption function of animal products at different levels of urbanization in China	8
<u>1.3</u>	Past and projected GDP per capita growth by region	8
<u>1.4</u>	The relationship between meat consumption and per capita income in 2002	9
<u>1.5</u>	Past and projected food consumption of livestock products	10
<u>1.6</u>	Past and projected meat production in developed and developing countries from 1970 to 2050	15
<u>1.7</u>	Past and projected milk production in developed and developing countries from 1970 to 2050	15
<u>2.1</u>	Estimated changes in land use from 1700 to 1995	24
<u>2.2</u>	Total harvested area and total production for cereals and soybeans	27
<u>2.3</u>	Comparative growth rates for production of selected animal products and feed grain use in developing countries	39
<u>2.4</u>	Regional trends in the use of feed grains	39
<u>2.5</u>	Feed demand for maize and wheat in selected regions and countries from 1961 to 2002	40
<u>2.6</u>	Relative composition of chicken feed ration in selected countries (by weight)	41
<u>2.7</u>	Relative composition of pig feed basket in selected countries (by weight)	42
<u>2.8</u>	Global trends in demand for soybean and soybean cake from 1961 to 2002	44
<u>2.9</u>	Classification of livestock production systems	52
<u>2.10</u>	Comparative distribution of pig and poultry	56

---

<u>2.11</u>	Changes in geographical concentration of hens in Brazil from 1992 to 2001	57
<u>2.12</u>	Changes in geographical concentration of pigs in Brazil from 1992 to 2001	57
<u>2.13</u>	Changes in geographical concentration of pigs in France from 1989 to 2001	58
<u>2.14</u>	Changes in the peri-urban concentration of poultry from 1992 to 2000 in Thailand	59
<u>2.15</u>	Changes in geographical concentration of cattle in Brazil from 1992 to 2001	60
<u>2.16</u>	Ecological footprint per person, by component	65
<u>2.17</u>	Spatial distribution of humans, livestock and feed crops around Bangkok, 2001	70
<u>2.18</u>	Global trends in land-use area for livestock and total production of meat and milk	75
<u>2.19</u>	Trends in land-use area for livestock and local supply of meat and milk – EU-15	76
<u>2.20</u>	Trends in land-use area for livestock and local supply of meat and milk – South America	76
<u>2.21</u>	Trends in land-use area for livestock and local supply of meat and milk – East and Southeast Asia (excluding China)	76
<u>3.1</u>	The present carbon cycle	84
<u>3.2</u>	The nitrogen cycle	102
<u>3.3</u>	Spatial pattern of total inorganic nitrogen deposition in the early 1990s	115
<u>4.1</u>	Flow diagram for meat processing operations	133
<u>4.2</u>	Process of stream degradation caused by grazing	165
<u>4.3</u>	Technical options in manure management	174
<u>6.1</u>	Shift in livestock policy objectives in relation to economic development	226
<u>6.2</u>	General principles for pricing water	243

---

# Boxes

<u>2.1</u>	Recent trends in forestry expansion	25
<u>2.2</u>	The complex and weakening control of access to pastureland	36
<u>2.3</u>	Ecological footprint	65
<u>2.4</u>	Livestock waste management in East Asia	71
<u>2.5</u>	Livestock production systems and erosion in the United States	73
<u>3.1</u>	The Kyoto Protocol	81
<u>3.2</u>	The many climatic faces of the burning of tropical savannah	94
<u>3.3</u>	A new assessment of nitrous oxide emissions from manure by production system, species and region	110
<u>4.1</u>	Livestock water use in Botswana	131
<u>4.2</u>	Impact of livestock intensification on nutrient balance in Asia	150
<u>4.3</u>	Pesticide use for feed production in the United States	158
<u>5.1</u>	The case of the protected areas	190
<u>5.2</u>	Changes in the Cerrado, Brazil's tropical savannah	192
<u>5.3</u>	Woody encroachment in southern Texas	194
<u>5.4</u>	Wild birds and highly pathogenic avian influenza	198
<u>5.5</u>	From pampas to cardoon, to alfalfa, to soy	201
<u>5.6</u>	Gulf of Mexico hypoxia	212
<u>5.7</u>	Livestock production to safeguard wildlife	218
<u>6.1</u>	New Zealand–environmental impact of major agricultural policy reforms	232
<u>6.2</u>	Payment for environmental services in Central America	258
<u>6.3</u>	Wildlife management areas and land-use planning in the United Republic of Tanzania	260
<u>6.4</u>	Examples of successful management of livestock waste production from intensive agriculture	264

---

# Maps

<u>2.1</u>	Location of industrial pig sector in southern Viet Nam (Dong Nai, Binh Duong, Ho Chi Minh city and Long An province)	58
<u>4.1</u>	Estimated contribution of livestock to total P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> supply on agricultural land, in an area presenting a P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> mass balance of more than 10 kg per hectare. Selected Asian countries – 1998 to 2000.	151
<u>4.2</u>	Risk of human-induced water erosion	161
<u>5.1</u>	Major flyways of migratory birds (Shore birds)	198
<u>5.2</u>	Feed production in the Mississippi River drainage basin and general location of the 1999 midsummer hypoxic zone	212

---

# Acknowledgements

This assessment of global livestock–environment interactions was called for by the Steering Committee of the Livestock, Environment and Development (LEAD) Initiative at its meeting in May 2005 in Copenhagen. The assessment was conducted by the members of the LEAD team at FAO and the chair of LEAD.

This assessment would not have been possible without the financial support and guidance from the LEAD Steering Committee, including Hanne Carus, Jorgen Henriksen and Jorgen Madsen (Denmark), Andreas Gerrits and Fritz Schneider (Switzerland), Philippe Chedanne, Jean-Luc François and Laurent Bonneau (France), Annette von Lossau (Germany), Luis Cardoso (Portugal), Peter Bazeley (United Kingdom), Joyce Turk (United States), Ibrahim Muhammad (Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center, CATIE), Emmanuel Camus (*Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement*, CIRAD), Philippe Steinmetz and Philippe Vialatte (European Union), Samuel Jutzi (Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO), Ahmed Sidahmed (then International Fund for Agriculture, IFAD), Carlos Seré and Shirley Tarawali (International Livestock Research Institute, ILRI), Deborah Bossio (International Water Management Institute, IWMI), Carlos Pomerada (Costa Rica), Modibo Traoré (African Union/Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources, AU/IBAR), Bingsheng Ke (Research Center for Rural Economy – Ministry of Agriculture, China) and Paul Ndiaye (Université Cheikh Anta-Diop, Senegal).

Our sincere thanks go to those who kindly agreed to review various drafts including Wally Falcon and Hal Mooney (Stanford University, United States), Samuel Jutzi and Freddie Nachtergaele (FAO), Harald Menzi and Fritz Schneider (Swiss College of Agriculture), Andreas Gerrits (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, SDC), Jorgen Henriksen (Denmark) and Günter Fischer (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, IIASA), José Martinez (*Institut de recherche pour l'ingénierie de l'agriculture et de l'environnement*, CEMAGREF), Jim Galloway (University of Virginia) and Padma Kumar (Capitalisation of Livestock Programme Experiences in India, CALPI). From within FAO, comments were received from Jelle Bruinsma, Neela Gangadharan, Wulf Killmann and Jan Poulisse. Our thanks also go to Wally Falcon, Hal Mooney and Roz Naylor (Stanford University) for providing a stimulating working environment and continuous debate and encouragement.

We also wish to acknowledge the support of Paul Harrison for style editing; Rosemary Allison for copyediting; Sébastien Pesseat and Claudia Ciarlantini for graphic design; Carolyn Opio, Jan Groenewold and Tom Misselbrook for support in data analysis; Alessandra Falcucci for support in spatial analysis and mapping and Christine Ellefson for a variety of support tasks.

No need to say that all remaining errors and omissions remain the sole responsibility of the authors.

---

# Abbreviations and acronyms

<b>A/R</b>	Afforestation or reforestation
<b>AET</b>	Actual evapotranspiration
<b>ASA</b>	American Soybean Association
<b>AU-IBAR</b>	African Union – Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
<b>BMWS</b>	Barley, maize, wheat and soybean
<b>BNF</b>	Biological nitrogen fixation
<b>BOD</b>	Biological oxygen demand
<b>BSE</b>	Bovine spongiform encephalopathy
<b>CALPI</b>	Capitalisation of Livestock Programme Experiences in India
<b>CAP</b>	Common Agricultural Policy
<b>CATIE</b>	Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Centre
<b>CBD</b>	Convention on Biological Diversity
<b>CDM</b>	Clean development mechanism
<b>CEMAGREF</b>	Recherche et expertise sur la multifonctionnalité de l'agriculture
<b>CERs</b>	Certified emissions reductions
<b>CIRAD</b>	Centre de coopération en recherche agronomique pour le développement
<b>CIS</b>	Commonwealth of Independent States
<b>COD</b>	Chemical oxygen demand
<b>CSA</b>	Central and South America
<b>DANIDA</b>	Danish International Development Agency
<b>Embrapa</b>	Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária – Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
<b>FAOSTAT</b>	FAO statistical databases
<b>FRA</b>	Global Forest Resource Assessment
<b>GATT</b>	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
<b>GDP</b>	Gross domestic product
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environmental Facility
<b>GHG</b>	Greenhouse gases
<b>GMO</b>	Genetically modified organisms

---

<b>GWP</b>	Global warming potential
<b>HPAI</b>	Highly pathogenic avian influenza
<b>IFA</b>	International Fertilizer Industry Association
<b>IFAD</b>	International Fund for Agricultural Development
<b>IFPRI</b>	International Food Policy Research Institute
<b>IIASA</b>	Institute for Applied Systems Analysis
<b>IOM</b>	Institute of Medicine
<b>IPCC</b>	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
<b>IUCN</b>	The World Conservation Union (formerly the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources)
<b>IWMI</b>	International Water Management Institute
<b>LEAD</b>	Livestock, Environment and Development (Initiative)
<b>LPS</b>	Livestock production system
<b>LULUCF</b>	Land use, land-use change and forestry
<b>LWMEAP</b>	Livestock Waste Management in East Asia Project
<b>MAFF-UK</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
<b>MAF-NZ</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry – New Zealand
<b>MEA</b>	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
<b>NASA</b>	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
<b>NEC</b>	National Emission Ceiling (directive)
<b>NOAA</b>	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>OIE</b>	World Organization for Animal Health
<b>PES</b>	Payment for environmental services
<b>ppb</b>	Parts per billion
<b>ppm</b>	Parts per million
<b>RCRE</b>	Rutgers Cooperative research and extension
<b>SAfMA</b>	South African Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
<b>SCOPE</b>	Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment
<b>SOC</b>	Soil organic carbon
<b>SSA</b>	Sub-Saharan Africa
<b>TOC</b>	Total organic carbon
<b>UNCCD</b>	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa.
<b>UNCED</b>	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme

---

<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>UNEP-WCMC</b>	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
<b>UNESCO</b>	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>USDA/FAS</b>	United States Department of Agriculture: Foreign Agricultural Service
<b>USDA-NRCS</b>	United States Department of Agriculture–National Resources Conservation Service
<b>USEPA</b>	United States Environmental Protection Agency
<b>WANA</b>	West Asia and North Africa
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organization
<b>WMAs</b>	Wildlife Management Areas
<b>WRI</b>	World Resources Institute
<b>WTO</b>	World Trade Organization
<b>WWF</b>	World Wide Fund for Nature

---

# Executive summary

This report aims to assess the full impact of the livestock sector on environmental problems, along with potential technical and policy approaches to mitigation. The assessment is based on the most recent and complete data available, taking into account direct impacts, along with the impacts of feedcrop agriculture required for livestock production.

The livestock sector emerges as one of the top two or three most significant contributors to the most serious environmental problems, at every scale from local to global. The findings of this report suggest that it should be a major policy focus when dealing with problems of land degradation, climate change and air pollution, water shortage and water pollution and loss of biodiversity.

Livestock's contribution to environmental problems is on a massive scale and its potential contribution to their solution is equally large. The impact is so significant that it needs to be addressed with urgency. Major reductions in impact could be achieved at reasonable cost.

## **Global importance of the sector**

Although economically not a major global player, the livestock sector is socially and politically very significant. It accounts for 40 percent of agricultural gross domestic product (GDP). It employs 1.3 billion people and creates livelihoods for one billion of the world's poor. Livestock products provide one-third of humanity's protein intake, and are a contributing cause of obesity and a potential remedy for undernourishment.

Growing populations and incomes, along with changing food preferences, are rapidly increasing demand for livestock products, while globalization is boosting trade in livestock inputs and products. Global production of meat is projected to more than double from 229 million tonnes in 1999/01 to 465 million tonnes in 2050, and that of milk to grow from 580 to 1 043 million tonnes. The environmental impact per unit of livestock production must be cut by half, just to avoid increasing the level of damage beyond its present level.

## **Structural changes and their impact**

The livestock sector is undergoing a complex process of technical and geographical change, which is shifting the balance of environmental problems caused by the sector.

Extensive grazing still occupies and degrades vast areas of land; though there is an increasing trend towards intensification and industrialization. Livestock production is shifting geographically, first from rural areas to urban and peri-urban, to get closer to consumers, then towards the sources of feedstuff, whether these are feedcrop areas, or transport and trade hubs where feed is imported. There is also a shift of species, with production of monogastric species (pigs and poultry, mostly produced in industrial units) growing rapidly, while the growth of ruminant production (cattle, sheep and goats, often

---

raised extensively) slows. Through these shifts, the livestock sector enters into more and direct competition for scarce land, water and other natural resources.

These changes are pushing towards improved efficiency, thus reducing the land area required for livestock production. At the same time, they are marginalizing smallholders and pastoralists, increasing inputs and wastes and increasing and concentrating the pollution created. Widely dispersed non-point sources of pollution are ceding importance to point sources that create more local damage but are more easily regulated.

## **Land degradation**

The livestock sector is by far the single largest anthropogenic user of land. The total area occupied by grazing is equivalent to 26 percent of the ice-free terrestrial surface of the planet. In addition, the total area dedicated to feedcrop production amounts to 33 percent of total arable land. In all, livestock production accounts for 70 percent of all agricultural land and 30 percent of the land surface of the planet.

Expansion of livestock production is a key factor in deforestation, especially in Latin America where the greatest amount of deforestation is occurring – 70 percent of previous forested land in the Amazon is occupied by pastures, and feedcrops cover a large part of the remainder. About 20 percent of the world's pastures and rangelands, with 73 percent of rangelands in dry areas, have been degraded to some extent, mostly through overgrazing, compaction and erosion created by livestock action. The dry lands in particular are affected by these trends, as livestock are often the only source of livelihoods for the people living in these areas.

Overgrazing can be reduced by grazing fees and by removing obstacles to mobility on common property pastures. Land degradation can be limited and reversed through soil conservation methods, silvopastoralism, better management of grazing systems, limits to uncontrolled burning by pastoralists and controlled exclusion from sensitive areas.

## **Atmosphere and climate**

With rising temperatures, rising sea levels, melting icecaps and glaciers, shifting ocean currents and weather patterns, climate change is the most serious challenge facing the human race.

The livestock sector is a major player, responsible for 18 percent of greenhouse gas emissions measured in CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent. This is a higher share than transport.

The livestock sector accounts for 9 percent of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The largest share of this derives from land-use changes – especially deforestation – caused by expansion of pastures and arable land for feedcrops. Livestock are responsible for much larger shares of some gases with far higher potential to warm the atmosphere. The sector emits 37 percent of anthropogenic methane (with 23 times the global warming potential (GWP) of CO<sub>2</sub>) most of that from enteric fermentation by ruminants. It emits 65 percent of anthropogenic nitrous oxide (with 296 times the GWP of CO<sub>2</sub>), the great majority from manure. Livestock are also responsible for almost two-thirds (64 percent) of anthropogenic ammonia emissions, which contribute significantly to acid rain and acidification of ecosystems.

This high level of emissions opens up large opportunities for climate change mitigation through livestock actions. Intensification – in terms of increased productivity both in

---

livestock production and in feedcrop agriculture – can reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and pasture degradation. In addition, restoring historical losses of soil carbon through conservation tillage, cover crops, agroforestry and other measures could sequester up to 1.3 tonnes of carbon per hectare per year, with additional amounts available through restoration of desertified pastures. Methane emissions can be reduced through improved diets to reduce enteric fermentation, improved manure management and biogas – which also provide renewable energy. Nitrogen emissions can be reduced through improved diets and manure management.

The Kyoto Protocol's clean development mechanism (CDM) can be used to finance the spread of biogas and silvopastoral initiatives involving afforestation and reforestation. Methodologies should be developed so that the CDM can finance other livestock-related options such as soil carbon sequestration through rehabilitation of degraded pastures.

## **Water**

The world is moving towards increasing problems of freshwater shortage, scarcity and depletion, with 64 percent of the world's population expected to live in water-stressed basins by 2025.

The livestock sector is a key player in increasing water use, accounting for over 8 percent of global human water use, mostly for the irrigation of feedcrops. It is probably the largest sectoral source of water pollution, contributing to eutrophication, "dead" zones in coastal areas, degradation of coral reefs, human health problems, emergence of antibiotic resistance and many others. The major sources of pollution are from animal wastes, antibiotics and hormones, chemicals from tanneries, fertilizers and pesticides used for feedcrops, and sediments from eroded pastures. Global figures are not available but in the United States, with the world's fourth largest land area, livestock are responsible for an estimated 55 percent of erosion and sediment, 37 percent of pesticide use, 50 percent of antibiotic use, and a third of the loads of nitrogen and phosphorus into freshwater resources.

Livestock also affect the replenishment of freshwater by compacting soil, reducing infiltration, degrading the banks of watercourses, drying up floodplains and lowering water tables. Livestock's contribution to deforestation also increases runoff and reduces dry season flows.

Water use can be reduced through improving the efficiency of irrigation systems. Livestock's impact on erosion, sedimentation and water regulation can be addressed by measures against land degradation. Pollution can be tackled through better management of animal waste in industrial production units, better diets to improve nutrient absorption, improved manure management (including biogas) and better use of processed manure on croplands. Industrial livestock production should be decentralized to accessible croplands where wastes can be recycled without overloading soils and freshwater.

Policy measures that would help in reducing water use and pollution include full cost pricing of water (to cover supply costs, as well as economic and environmental externalities), regulatory frameworks for limiting inputs and scale, specifying required equipment and discharge levels, zoning regulations and taxes to discourage large-scale concentrations close to cities, as well as the development of secure water rights and water markets, and participatory management of watersheds.

---

## **Biodiversity**

We are in an era of unprecedented threats to biodiversity. The loss of species is estimated to be running 50 to 500 times higher than background rates found in the fossil record. Fifteen out of 24 important ecosystem services are assessed to be in decline.

Livestock now account for about 20 percent of the total terrestrial animal biomass, and the 30 percent of the earth's land surface that they now pre-empt was once habitat for wildlife. Indeed, the livestock sector may well be the leading player in the reduction of biodiversity, since it is the major driver of deforestation, as well as one of the leading drivers of land degradation, pollution, climate change, overfishing, sedimentation of coastal areas and facilitation of invasions by alien species. In addition, resource conflicts with pastoralists threaten species of wild predators and also protected areas close to pastures. Meanwhile in developed regions, especially Europe, pastures had become a location of diverse long-established types of ecosystem, many of which are now threatened by pasture abandonment.

Some 306 of the 825 terrestrial ecoregions identified by the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) – ranged across all biomes and all biogeographical realms, reported livestock as one of the current threats. Conservation International has identified 35 global hotspots for biodiversity, characterized by exceptional levels of plant endemism and serious levels of habitat loss. Of these, 23 are reported to be affected by livestock production. An analysis of the authoritative World Conservation Union (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species shows that most of the world's threatened species are suffering habitat loss where livestock are a factor.

Since many of livestock's threats to biodiversity arise from their impact on the main resource sectors (climate, air and water pollution, land degradation and deforestation), major options for mitigation are detailed in those sections. There is also scope for improving pastoralists' interactions with wildlife and parks and raising wildlife species in livestock enterprises.

Reduction of the wildlife area pre-empted by livestock can be achieved by intensification. Protection of wild areas, buffer zones, conservation easements, tax credits and penalties can increase the amount of land where biodiversity conservation is prioritized. Efforts should extend more widely to integrate livestock production and producers into landscape management.

## **Cross-cutting policy frameworks**

Certain general policy approaches cut across all the above fields. A general conclusion is that improving the resource use efficiency of livestock production can reduce environmental impacts.

While regulating about scale, inputs, wastes and so on can help, a crucial element in achieving greater efficiency is the correct pricing of natural resources such as land, water and use of waste sinks. Most frequently natural resources are free or underpriced, which leads to overexploitation and pollution. Often perverse subsidies directly encourage livestock producers to engage in environmentally damaging activities.

A top priority is to achieve prices and fees that reflect the full economic and environmental costs, including all externalities. One requirement for prices to influence behaviour is

---

that there should be secure and if possible tradable rights to water, land, use of common land and waste sinks.

Damaging subsidies should be removed, and economic and environmental externalities should be built into prices by selective taxing of and/or fees for resource use, inputs and wastes. In some cases direct incentives may be needed.

Payment for environmental services is an important framework, especially in relation to extensive grazing systems: herders, producers and landowners can be paid for specific environmental services such as regulation of water flows, soil conservation, conservation of natural landscape and wildlife habitats, or carbon sequestration. Provision of environmental services may emerge as a major purpose of extensive grassland-based production systems.

An important general lesson is that the livestock sector has such deep and wide-ranging environmental impacts that it should rank as one of the leading focuses for environmental policy: efforts here can produce large and multiple payoffs. Indeed, as societies develop, it is likely that environmental considerations, along with human health issues, will become the dominant policy considerations for the sector.

Finally, there is an urgent need to develop suitable institutional and policy frameworks, at local, national and international levels, for the suggested changes to occur. This will require strong political commitment, and increased knowledge and awareness of the environmental risks of continuing “business as usual” and the environmental benefits of actions in the livestock sector.