and Thornton, 1999) and the International Water Management Institute world water and climate atlas\(^\text{61}\). Irrigation data were taken from Doll and Seibert, 2000; elevation from the GTOPO30 DEM\(^\text{62}\); cropping was derived from a number of datasets, including those described in Loveland \textit{et al.}, 2000; Anderson \textit{et al.}, 1976, and Wood \textit{et al.}, 2000, but was heavily dependent both on interpretation and on expert opinion; night-time lights were taken from the NOAA/National Geophysical Data Center Stable Lights and Radiance Calibrated Lights of the World\(^\text{63}\); and human population data were taken from various sources [Hyman \textit{et al.}, 2000; Reid \textit{et al.}, 2000; Deichmann, 1996]\(^\text{64}\). Figure 7.9 provides an example of the resultant livestock production systems classification for Africa.

The above livestock production system classification does not incorporate livestock population data

\(^{61}\)http://www.iwmi.cgiar.org/watlas/atlas.htm
\(^{63}\)http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/dmsp/download_night_time_lights_94-95.html
\(^{64}\)http://grid2.cr.usgs.gov/globalpop/
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IF 5 \( \text{av T} < 20 \, ^\circ\text{C} \) during growing season OR 1 month or more with \( \text{av T} \) (sea level) \( < 5 \, ^\circ\text{C} \)

THEN Temperate or tropical highland \( T \)

IF 5 LGP > 180

THEN Humid-Subhumid \( H \)

IF 5 LGP < 180

THEN Arid-Semiarid \( A \)

Source: Thornton et al., 2002.
7.9 **LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS IN AFRICA**

![Map of livestock production systems in Africa](image)

*Source: Reproduced from Thornton et al., 2002.*
in its definition. It tends to amalgamate similar systems and fails to capture important differences in use and livestock husbandry practices within categories, e.g. grassland-based grazing combines pastoralists and ranchers, which are clearly not equivalent. However, it is undoubtedly the most appropriate classification system available, and does provide a relevant stratification through which to describe, visualize and explore livestock and livestock-related issues. Table 7.1, reproduced

**TABLE 7.1 DESCRIPTIONS AND EXAMPLES OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production system</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **LGT: Temperate and tropical highlands (COLD GRASS)**                            | • Mongolia’s steppe system  
• Dairy systems near Bogota, Colombia; Peru and Bolivia Altiplano camelid and sheep-grazing systems  
• Chinese merino wool sheep on communal grazing |
| **LGH: Humid/subhumid tropics and subtropics (WET GRASS)**                         | • Extensive ranching in South American lowlands  
• Ranching systems in West and Central Africa  
• Amazonian ranching |
| **LGA: Arid/semi-arid tropics and subtropics (DRY GRASS)**                         | • Pastoralists in the Sahel  
• Near East and North Africa pastoralists  
• Beef-milk systems on pastures in Mexico, Venezuela  
• Southern Africa ranches |
| **MRT: Temperate and tropical highlands mixed rainfed (COLD MIXED)**               | • Smallholder peasant farmers in northern China  
• Smallholders in Ethiopian highlands where oxen for traction is important  
• Mixed crop-livestock smallholders in highlands of Central and South America  
• Smallscale peri-urban dairy in East African highlands |
| **MRH: Humid/subhumid tropics and subtropics mixed rainfed (WET MIXED)**            | • Areas of South America where rainforests are being cleared  
• Large areas of sub-Saharan Africa [tsetse ‘belt’] |
| **MRA: Arid/semi-arid tropics and subtropics (DRY MIXED)**                         | • Dryland farming-sheep systems in West Asia-North Africa and India  
• Small ruminant-cassava systems in northeast Brazil  
• Mixed crop-livestock farms in Burkina Faso, Nigeria  
• Dairy in Senegal and Mali |
| **MIT: Temperate and tropical highlands mixed irrigated (COLD IRRIGATED)**         | • Mediterranean region  
• Far East Asian irrigated rice/dairy farms |
| **MIH: Humid/subhumid tropics and subtropics mixed irrigated (WET IRRIGATED)**      | • Irrigated rice-buffalo systems of the Philippines, Viet Nam and India  
• Irrigated rice, pig and poultry enterprises in Asia |
| **MIA: Arid/semi-arid tropics and subtropics mixed irrigated (DRY IRRIGATED)**      | • Small-scale buffalo milk production, Pakistan & India  
• Animal-traction-based cash crop production in Egypt and Afghanistan  
• Intensive dairy systems in California (United States), Israel, Mexico |
| **Other/Urban: Landless mono-gastric systems**: value of production of the pig/poultry enterprises > the ruminant enterprises | • Pig production in Asia  
• Poultry production in Central and South America |
| **Other/Urban: Landless ruminant systems**: value of production of the ruminant enterprises > the pig/poultry enterprises | • Landless sheep production systems in West Asia-North Africa  
• Sheep fattening operations in Syria and Nigeria |

*Source: Reproduced from Thornton et al., 2002.*
from Thornton et al., 2002, gives examples of systems around the world that fall under each of the 11 categories defined.

When these production systems are combined with the gridded livestock data presented here, estimated numbers of livestock can be extracted by production system. Compared with simple national totals, this gives a more meaningful breakdown of how livestock are distributed across the globe. As an example that shall be returned to later, Table 7.2 gives a breakdown of cattle numbers (in this case adjusted to FAOSTAT 2005 national totals) by livestock production system in the Horn of Africa. Tables of global livestock numbers by country and, where available, by production system, are given in the annex hereto.

In their original application of these livestock production systems, Thornton et al., 2002, used them to delineate and extract a number of socio-economic variables. They produced tables, for each production system in developing countries, of estimates of the numbers of people, poor people and poor livestock keepers. This type of application is useful for regional targeting and for impact assessment. Since the systems are defined in terms of population density and LGP, the classification can be re-evaluated using different scenarios of population and LGP. A tentative assessment of how these systems might be transformed by human population growth and climate change was thus made, giving some clues as to how the distribution of farming systems may change in the future.

The original livestock production system maps produced by Thornton et al., 2002, did not provide global coverage. However, collaborative work is ongoing at FAO and ILRI to further develop and standardize global livestock production system maps for a number of applications.

**LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION ESTIMATES**

Livestock production and off-take rates vary across different livestock production systems, and in a broadly predictable way. This introduces a further application that involves livestock production system maps to provide a stratification scheme within which to parameterize livestock growth and off-take models.

The GLW maps of livestock densities have been used to map production and off-take levels in sub-Saharan Africa [Otte et al., 2001]. For example, beef and milk production and use of draught power per square kilometre have been estimated by deriving annual output per head of cattle within each of seven major agro-ecological zones. These zones were defined and mapped by combining a number of spatial variables [temperature, elevation, LGP and crop type] in a decision tree [FAO, 2002b]; livestock production was modelled for each zone using the herd growth model within the Livestock Development Planning System Version 2 [LDPS-2] [FAO, 1997]. The herd models were parameterized separately for each zone, based on available published data [for some parameters, data were sparse]. These production maps can then be further combined with human population density maps to produce estimates of off-take per capita.

To illustrate the above, in Figures 7.10 and 7.11, meat and milk off-take has been re-evaluated using both the new GLW grids for Africa [Figure 5.4] and the Thornton et al., 2002, livestock production systems [Figure 7.9] to stratify production modelling.

These production maps of Africa are part of an ongoing FAO effort to map livestock production globally, based on the GLW datasets.

**LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION BALANCE**

Detailed Information on levels of international trade in livestock products is sparse, most especially that which provides consistent and complete global coverage. The situation is improving, however, and the Commodities and Trade Division of FAO has compiled estimates of imports and exports of livestock products at the country level, largely derived from FAOSTAT data. In some cases, details are even provided on the countries to which a specific

45 http://faostat.fao.org/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production System</th>
<th>Djibouti</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Eritrea</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Somalia</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>System Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>137 070</td>
<td>3 743 525</td>
<td>861 950</td>
<td>2 932 925</td>
<td>4 264 535</td>
<td>16 443 100</td>
<td>262 500</td>
<td>28 645 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGH</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>43 625</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>967 500</td>
<td>208 570</td>
<td>1 219 695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGT</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>220 300</td>
<td>21 960</td>
<td>512 775</td>
<td>1 380</td>
<td>6 320</td>
<td>10 560</td>
<td>773 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>7 150</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>79 315</td>
<td>400 150</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>487 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA</td>
<td>8 760</td>
<td>8 735 260</td>
<td>693 880</td>
<td>2 044 045</td>
<td>372 780</td>
<td>17 751 500</td>
<td>1 536 415</td>
<td>31 142 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRH</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1 280 250</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1 006 430</td>
<td>8 330</td>
<td>2 791 160</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5 086 070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRT</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>23 198 000</td>
<td>175 580</td>
<td>4 030 505</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>856 155</td>
<td>28 280 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>13 470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>151 170</td>
<td>1 271 890</td>
<td>196 020</td>
<td>1 459 850</td>
<td>631 990</td>
<td>2 719 200</td>
<td>434 640</td>
<td>6 864 760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Total</td>
<td>297 000</td>
<td>38 500 000</td>
<td>1 950 000</td>
<td>12 000 000</td>
<td>5 350 000</td>
<td>38 325 000</td>
<td>6 100 000</td>
<td>102 522 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Livestock production system data were taken from Thornton et al., 2002. n.a. indicates that system does not occur in a country.