

Signorello, Giovanni; Pappalardo, Gioacchino

**Working Paper**

## Farm animal biodiversity conservation activities in Europe under the framework of Agenda 2000

Nota di Lavoro, No. 39.2002

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Signorello, Giovanni; Pappalardo, Gioacchino (2002) : Farm animal biodiversity conservation activities in Europe under the framework of Agenda 2000, Nota di Lavoro, No. 39.2002, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/119647>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

**Farm Animal Biodiversity  
Conservation Activities in Europe  
under the Framework of  
Agenda 2000**

Giovanni Signorello and  
Giacchino Pappalardo

NOTA DI LAVORO 39.2002

**JUNE 2002**

SUST - Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Evaluation
--

Giovanni Signorello, *University of Catania (DISEAE)*  
Giacchino Pappalardo, *University of Catania (DISEAE)*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:  
[http://www.feem.it/web/activ/\\_activ.html](http://www.feem.it/web/activ/_activ.html)

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:  
[http://ssrn.com/abstract\\_id=XXXXXX](http://ssrn.com/abstract_id=XXXXXX)

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

# Farm Animal Biodiversity Conservation Activities in Europe under the Framework of Agenda 2000

## Summary

In this paper we examine the content of farm animal biodiversity conservation measures currently under implementation in the European Union (EU), as a result of the application of EC Regulations 1257/99 and 1750/99. We surveyed 69 Rural Development Plans (RDPs) set up in EU Member States. Our analysis focuses on six livestock mammalian species: asses, cattle, goats, horses, pigs, and sheep. The starting point for our investigation is the Domestic Animals Diversity-Information System (DAD-IS) FAO database which monitors the status of breeds in the world. We compare breeds included in the DAD-IS FAO database with breeds covered by the various RDPs. The analysis highlights that many breeds at risk of extinction according to FAO are not included in the RDPs. The analysis also indicates that the main efforts of the RDPs are devoted to preserving local cattle and sheep breeds. As concerns the financial aspects of livestock biodiversity measures, we note that the payments offered to farmers do not take into account the different probabilities of extinction associated with each breed in each country. Furthermore, we observe that payments do not meet all of the relevant criteria stated in the EEC Regulations. In many cases, we observe that, in spite of the Union's support to farmers, it still remains unprofitable to rear local breeds. These anomalies suggest the need for a revision of the current EU supporting measures related to the conservation of livestock biodiversity. Finally, by using FAO indicators on the current population size of each breed, we estimate the level of expected public expenditure necessary to ensure the upgrading of breeds from their "at-risk" status to a "not-at-risk" status during the period 2000-2006.

**Keywords:** Farm animal biodiversity, Agenda 2000, Rural Development Plans.

**JEL:** Q18, Q20

*Address for correspondence:*

Giovanni Signorello  
Università di Catania  
Dipartimento di Scienze Economico-Agrarie ed Estimative  
(DISEAE)  
Via Santa Sofia 98  
95123 Catania, Italy  
E-mail: [g.signorello@unict.it](mailto:g.signorello@unict.it), [giacchino.pappalardo@unict.it](mailto:giacchino.pappalardo@unict.it)

## 1. Introduction

Policy-makers and public opinion are expressing serious concern about the continuing reduction in the overall pool of agriculturally important genetic resources, especially domestic breeds of livestock. According to the most recent estimates of FAO (2000), 10% of domesticated breeds have been lost in the last century, and a further 20% are at risk of extinction. The threat to farm animal biodiversity is dramatically displayed in Figure 1, which shows a summary of the status of the world's farm animal breeds. In Europe the condition of farm animal biodiversity is particularly critical: 18% of breeds existing in the early 1900's have already been lost, and 40% of recorded breeds risk becoming extinct over the next 20 years, unless significant changes take place in the driving forces behind biodiversity depletion.

*Insert Figure 1 near here*

The causes of biodiversity depletion are widely known, as well as the ecological and socio-economic consequences of farm animal biodiversity loss (OECD, 1996; Pearce and Moran, 1994)<sup>2</sup>. The challenge facing biodiversity conservation is the need for the development of strategies, actions, and institutions that can slow the rate of genetic erosion by encouraging, especially at the farm level, the effective conservation and sustainable use of farm animal genetic resources. The Rio de Janeiro Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) calls on governments to "adopt economically and socially sound measures that act as incentives" for biodiversity conservation (UNEP, 1995). The Third Conference of the Parties (COP3) reaffirmed that the implementation of incentive measures is of central importance to the realisation of the goals of the Convention. The European Union (EU) seeks to pursue the CBD and COP3

---

<sup>2</sup> The most important force behind the loss of farm breeds is the homogenisation of livestock production. Farmers replace local breeds in favour of a few high-yielding breeds. This specialisation is supported by perverse economic incentives and the fact that economically rational farmers' decisions only account for private profitability. Drucker et al. (2001) report that in European Union, over 60% of cattle are derived from the Holstein Friesian breed.

recommendations under the auspices of “Agenda 2000” and Regulations 1257/99 and 1750/99 on support to Rural Development Plans (RDPs). These EU regulations make provisions and set general guidelines and goals under which member countries can implement voluntary management agreements for the provision of livestock biodiversity services. The specific measure provides for payments to farmers, in the form of cost sharing or incentive payments, in return for maintaining local, traditional and rustic breeds at risk of extinction.

In this paper we examine the content of the farm animal biodiversity conservation actions currently under implementation in Europe, as a result of the application of EEC regulations 1257/99 and 1750/99. The objective of this paper is to identify response indicators pertinent to livestock biodiversity, ascertain whether compensation levels are sufficient to encourage the farming of local breeds and determine the costs of effectively protecting breeds at risk. To pursue this objective, we surveyed 69 Rural Development Plans (RDPs) set up in EU Member States. The analysis focuses on six livestock mammalian species: asses, cattle, goats, horses, pigs, and sheep. The starting point for our investigation was the Domestic Animals Diversity-Information System (DAD-IS) FAO database which monitors the status of breeds in the world. By comparing the breeds included in the DAD-IS FAO database with breeds entered in the various RDPs, we are able to identify the conservation priorities of each country. Furthermore, by examining net production costs and EU compensation payment levels it was possible to determine whether the latter are sufficient to make farming with local breeds profitable. The total costs of ensuring that breeds currently "at risk" reach a population size sufficient to be considered "not at risk" could also be calculated.

## 2. Livestock biodiversity indicators in the European Union

### 2.1 State indicator

State indicators on endangered breeds are available from many sources. At present, the most widely reported state indicator pertinent to livestock biodiversity is the list provided by FAO through the “Domestic Animals Diversity - Information System” (DAD-IS)<sup>3</sup>.

DAD-IS monitors breeds worldwide and classifies them into seven risk categories: extinct, critical, endangered, critical-maintained, endangered-maintained, not at risk, and unknown. “Extinct” indicates that it is no longer possible to recreate the breed population. Extinction is absolute when there are no breeding males (semen), breeding females (oocytes), nor embryos remaining. “Critical” indicates that the total number of breeding females is less than 100, or the total number of breeding males is less than or equal to five, or the overall population size is close to, but slightly above 100 and decreasing, and the percentage of pure-bred females is below 80 percent. “Endangered” indicates that: the total number of breeding females is between 100 and 1000; or the total number of breeding males is less than or equal to 20 and greater than five; or the overall population size is close to, but slightly above, 100 and increasing and the percentage of pure-bred females is above 80 percent; or the overall population size is close to, but slightly above 1000 and decreasing, and the percentage of pure-bred females is below 80 percent. “Critical-maintained” and “endangered-maintained” indicate that breeds are being maintained by an active public conservation programme or within a commercial or research facility. “Not at risk” indicates breeds for which the total number of breeding females and males is greater than 1000 and 20 respectively; or the population size approaches 1000 and the percentage of pure-bred females is close to 100

---

<sup>3</sup> EU rules state that breeds to be protected must be extracted from lists compiled by authoritative international institutions (such as the FAO) or from specific surveys conducted by each country (i.e. “Action plan for the preservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the livestock sector”).

percent, and the overall population size is increasing. Finally, “unknown” covers breeds for which no data are available<sup>4</sup>.

In the following analysis we take into account only breeds included in the critical, endangered, critical-maintained and endangered-maintained categories, and breeds included in the not-at-risk category but with a population showing a decreasing trend.

In the Appendix, Table A shows breeds classified by risk of extinction according the DAD-IS FAO database. Table A also shows those local breeds included in the RDPs<sup>5</sup>.

## ***2.2 Response indicators***

Table 1 covers the breeds listed in both datasets and shows the level of livestock biodiversity protection in the RDPs relative to FAO list. We consider this percentage as a response indicator.

*Insert Table 1 near here*

In the EU, the total number of local breeds at risk is 773; 172 breeds fall into the “Critical” category, 302 breeds are included in the “Endangered” category, 39 breeds are in the “Critical-maintained” category, and 105 breeds are classified as “Endangered-maintained”. It is worth noting that in the EU there are currently also at least 155 local breeds not at risk of extinction but with a decreasing trend in population size. In terms of species, the highest numbers of breeds at risk belong to sheep (223), horses (200), and cattle (190). At an intermediate level, are pigs (79) and goats (69) and the lowest number of local breeds at risk belongs to ass (12). As concerns the geographical distribution of biodiversity livestock, the EU country with the highest number of local breeds at risk is Germany (164), followed by France (123) and Italy (115).

---

<sup>4</sup> The main domesticated animals included in this program are six mammalian species (asses, cattle, goats, horse, pigs and sheep) and four avian species (chickens, ducks, geese and turkeys).

<sup>5</sup> A detailed database is available upon request from the authors.

The comparison between the two datasets highlights that, in every country, the number of local breeds included in the RDPs is consistently lower than the number of analogue breeds indicated by FAO. In total, only 310 out of the 773 breeds (equivalent to 40.1%) are included in the RDPs. The biggest level of livestock biodiversity protection is pursued in Austria (87.9%) and in Spain (80.4%). Belgium (68.4%), Greece (64.5%), Italy (64.4%), France (43.9%) occupy intermediate positions. The lower levels of protection are found in Finland (35.3%), Sweden (30.0%), Germany (28.1%), Luxembourg (25.0%), Portugal (25.0%) and Ireland (13.0%). Denmark, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom have not included any farm animal protection measures in their RDPs<sup>6</sup>. With regard to levels of protection for each mammalian species, the ranking is as follows: ass (91.7%), cattle (48.9%), sheep (44.8%), goats (42%), horses (30%) and pigs (21.5%).

### **3. EU Compensation Payment Levels**

Table 2 reports the annual payments<sup>7</sup> made to farmers who, on a voluntary and contractual basis, raise local breeds at risk of extinction for a 5 year period<sup>8</sup>. Payments are expressed in Euro (€) per Livestock Unit<sup>9</sup>.

*Insert Table 2 near here*

---

<sup>6</sup> In the United Kingdom, since the recent outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease and the risk presented to a number of Rare and Traditional breeds, public awareness of the problem has increased. There have also been demands for the National Co-ordinator for Farm Animal Genetic Resources (FanGR) to become more active in co-ordinating conservation and developing a National Action Plan following on from the FAO SoW Report process.

<sup>7</sup> A detailed list of the payments for each breed included in the RDPs is available upon request from the authors.

<sup>8</sup> To be eligible for voluntary agreement, breeders must be members of a recognized breeders association. Furthermore, the number of livestock at risk of extinction must not be reduced during the overall period of the contract.

<sup>9</sup> Maximum annual amounts eligible for European aid is 450 EURO/ha. This payment, which is an area-based system, is converted to a Livestock Unit according to the converter rules reported in Annex VII of the EC Regulation 2092/1991. EC Regulation 2328/91, Annex 1, states that cattle over two years and equines over six months of age are equivalent to 1.0 of a



On average, the highest payment is made for farming horses (147,25 €/LU), while the lowest payment is made for farming sheep (98,06 €/LU). Detailed analysis of the full database reveals that the payments in every RDP, generally, disregard the risk status of breeds within the species. The general absence of consideration of the probability of extinction in the calculation of the payments raises doubts about the degree to which the established criteria for establishing the monetary level of the payments is satisfied. This is because although EC Regulations 1257/99 and 1750/99 state that State Member and sub-member level administrative units are free to determine the payments, the payment<sup>10</sup> must be calculated on the basis of: i) income foregone; ii) additional costs resulting from the commitment; iii) the need to provide an incentive<sup>11</sup>; and iv) the cost of any non-remunerative capital works necessary for the fulfilment of the commitment. To test the validity of our doubts regarding the degree to which the criteria are satisfied, we examined each of RDPs in order to determine the economic basis upon which payment levels are calculated. This analysis revealed that only a few RDPs offer a detailed explanation regarding the way in which the level of payment is determined. The only justification we found is the use of a comparison, in terms of economic performance, between a local breed versus a higher yielding breed. This comparison is, however, limited only to representative breeds per species, and figures are then extrapolated, without any adjustment, to breeds of other species. Table 3 displays, as a pertinent example, the economic accounts included in the RDP of Sicily (Italy). Economic figures reveal that: the payment is irrespective of species; farming local breeds involves considerable losses in spite of payments to farmers; there is no reference to any other criteria, such as the need to provide incentives; and finally, that the payment does not allow the maximum stocking rate per hectare to be reached. It is clear that such payments do not offer adequate support

---

Livestock Unit (LU); cattle between six months and two years of age are 0.6 LU; sheep and goat are 0.15 LU; pigs are 0.30 LU.

<sup>10</sup> These criteria are stated in Art. 24 of EEC Reg. 1257/99.

<sup>11</sup> Art. 18 of the EEC Reg. 1750/99 lays down that "The incentive shall not exceed 20% of the income foregone and additional costs due to commitment given, except in the case of specific commitments where a higher rate is deemed to be indispensable for the effective implementation of the measure".

either to maintain the current population of at risk breeds or to induce farmers to switch from higher yielding breeds to local breeds. The absence of profitability, which we also found in every RDP, raises serious concerns about the eventual success of the livestock biodiversity programs.

*Insert Table 3 near here*

#### **4. Estimation of Conservation Costs**

In order to assess the total cost of the livestock biodiversity conservation program of the RDPs, we estimated:

1. the public expenditure necessary to ensure the maintenance of the current population size of breeds at risk. In the appraisal, we take into account either breeds whose current population size is lower than the threshold level indicated by FAO (1000 head and 20 breeding females and males respectively), or breeds not-at-risk but with a decreasing trend in the population size. Values are obtained by multiplying the current population size of each breed, as listed in the FAO DAD-IS, by the specific annual payment.
2. the public expenditure necessary to ensure the upgrade of breeds from their at-risk status to a not-at-risk status. This expenditure only refers to breeds whose current population size is lower than the threshold level indicated by FAO. Values are estimated by multiplying the specific annual payment by 1022<sup>12</sup>.

In the previous section we established that payment levels generally are insufficient to make local breeds profitable. Thus, the following estimates, which undervalue clearly effective total conservation costs, point out only the financial resources which RDPs require to support current livestock biodiversity measures.

---

<sup>12</sup> This number corresponds to the threshold level required by DAD-IS FAO to consider a breed not at risk.

Table 4 reports these partial and total estimates by species and country. Values are obviously based on the assumption that farmers participate in the present conservation program. An analysis of the estimates reveals that the costs differ by country and species. France, Italy and Finland are the Member States which would need to support the highest maintenance expenditures. Italy, Germany and Spain are the countries which would bear the highest costs in reaching the "not at risk" threshold level for local breeds. Germany, Sweden and Luxembourg exhibit a maintenance expenditure lower than the expenditure to move breeds to a "not at risk" status, which means that in these countries the current population of local breeds is very low. Italy, France and Spain are the countries that should require the highest budgets. In the EU, almost € 40 million are necessary to ensure that all (310) local breeds included in the RDPs will no longer be at risk of extinction. The main part of this expected cost is devoted to cattle and horse species. Ass and pig are the species which exhibit a maintenance expenditure lower than the expenditure required to reach the safety level.

## **5. Concluding Remarks**

At the moment, the Rural Development Plans, set up by Member States under the framework of Agenda 2000, are the main tool to implement measures in favor of livestock biodiversity conservation in the EU.

In this paper we analyzed the content of 69 RDPs to evaluate: which threatened local breeds are included in the conservation measures; the level of payments due to farmers who, on a voluntary and contractual basis, raise local breeds at risk of extinction; and the cost of implementing conservation goals. With regard to these aspects, we identified and quantified a few basic response indicators that could be used by policy makers to assess the impact of the RDPs on livestock biodiversity. Our analysis reveals that: the number of breeds included

in the RDP's are consistently lower than the number of breeds listed by the FAO; payments to farmers generally do not take into account the different breed extinction probabilities; and payments do not offer adequate incentives either to maintain the current population of at risk breeds nor to induce farmers to switch from higher yielding breeds to local breeds .

Overall this would seem to indicate the absence of a general strategy for decision-making. It raises serious concerns about the effective achievements of goals, and calls for a revision of the current EU design and implementation of agri-environmental measures related to the conservation of livestock biodiversity. The revision process should look at several issues. First of all, in the context of limited budgets, it should identify useful operative criteria for setting conservation priorities and differentiating economic support based on those priorities. In this regard, a possible solution may be the “expected overall utility” criterion suggested by Simianer *et al.* (this issue), which combines ecological and economic factors. Furthermore, there should be an attempt to increase the profitability of local breed farming. This adjustment, which would favour participation in the program, could be achieved in several ways. The most obvious and immediate way would be to make higher payments. However, this increment, which would require different maximum eligible amounts per Livestock Unit, should take into account the area stocking limit, so as to be consistent with other environmental conservation goals (e.g. soil conservation). Another route would be to implement common agricultural policies consistent with the above goals. For instance, it would be appropriate to have policies which provide support for agricultural products or foodstuffs which have an identifiable relationship with local breeds.

## References

European Commission, Agriculture DG website:

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/rur/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/rur/index_en.htm)

Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forstenof (Germany),  
Internet website: [www.bml.de](http://www.bml.de)

Direcció General de Desarrollo Rural, Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y  
Alimentación (Spain), Internet website: [www.mapya.es](http://www.mapya.es)

Commission of the European Communities, 2001, *Biodiversity Action Plan for  
Agriculture*, COM(2001) 162 Final, Bruxelles.

Drucker A.G., Gomez V., Anderson S. 2001, The economic valuation of farm  
animal genetic resources: a survey of available methods, *Ecological  
Economics*, 36 (1) pp. 1-18.

Department of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development (DAFRD) of Ireland,  
Internet website: <http://www.irlgov.ie/daff>

Directorate for Food, Fisheries and Agri-business of Denmark, Internet website:  
<http://www.foedevareministeriet.dk>

Emerton L., 2000. *Using Economic Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation*  
IUCN The World Conservation Union, Eastern Africa Regional Office,  
Nairobi.

FAO, 1998. "*Sustaining Agricultural Biodiversity and Agro-ecosystem  
Functions*", International Technical Workshop by the Food and Agricultural  
Organization of the United Nations and the Secretariat of the Convention  
on Biological Diversity, with the Support of the Government of the  
Netherlands 2-4 Dicembre 1998, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy.

FAO, 1999. "*The Global Strategy for the Management of Farm Animal Genetic  
Resources*", [www.fao.org/dad-is](http://www.fao.org/dad-is) Roma.

FAO, 2000. Domestic Animal Diversity Information System (DAD-IS 2.0):  
<http://dad.fao.org/dad-is/home.htm>

FAO, 2001. "*Second ad hoc Session of International Stakeholders in Animal  
Genetic Resources*", Rome, 5-6 June 2001.

Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Austria, Internet website:  
<http://www.bmlf.gv.at/ge/land>

Hellenic Ministry of Agriculture, Internet website: [www.minagric.gr](http://www.minagric.gr)

Ministry of Agriculture of Belgium, Internet website: <http://www.cmlag.fgov.be>

Minister of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fisheries of Portugal, Internet website: <http://www.dgdrural.pt>

Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche (France), Internet website: <http://www.agriculture.gouv.fr>

Ministre de l'Agriculture, de la Viticulture et du Développement Rural (Luxembourg), Internet website: [www.gouvernement.lu/gouv/fr/gouv/minist](http://www.gouvernement.lu/gouv/fr/gouv/minist)

Ministero delle Politiche Agricole e Forestali (Italy), Internet website: [www.politicheagricole.it](http://www.politicheagricole.it)

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland, Internet website: <http://www.mmm.fi>

Ministries for Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of Netherlands, Internet website: <http://www.minlnv.nl>

National Board of Agriculture and National Board of Forestry (Sweden), Internet website: <http://jordbruk.regeringen.se/index.htm>

Nunes P., Van Den Bergh J., 2001. Economic Valuation of Biodiversity: sense or non sense?, *Ecological Economics* 39 (2) pp. 203-222.

OECD: (1996), *Saving Biological Diversity: Economic Incentives*, OECD, Paris.


Pearce D., Moran D., 1994. The economic value of biodiversity, Earthscan, London.

Regione siciliana: *Piano di Sviluppo Rurale 2000-2006*, S.O. Gazzetta Ufficiale della Regione Siciliana, n.5 del 2.2.2001.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2001. The Handbook of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Earthscan, London.

Simianer H., Marti S.B., Gibson O., Hanotte O., Rege J.E.O: (in this issue), *An approach to the optimal allocation of conservation funds to minimize loss of genetic diversity between livestock breeds.*

Figure 1. Status of farm animal breeds in the World



Source: FAO web site (2000)

**Table 1. Levels of Conservation in the Rural Development Plans**

Member State	ASS			CATTLE			GOAT			HORSE			PIG			SHEEP			TOTAL		
	FAO	RDP	%	FAO	RDP	%	FAO	RDP	%	FAO	RDP	%	FAO	RDP	%	FAO	RDP	%	FAO	RDP	%
AUSTRIA	-	-	-	11	8	72.73	4	4	100.00	7	6	85.71	2	2	100.00	9	9	100.00	<b>33</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>87.88</b>
BELGIUM	-	-	-	3	1	33.33	4	3	75.00	2	0	0.00	-	-	-	10	9	90.00	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>68.42</b>
DENMARK	-	N.E.	N.E.	5	N.E.	N.E.	4	N.E.	N.E.	9	N.E.	N.E.	3	N.E.	N.E.	9	N.E.	N.E.	<b>30</b>	<b>N.E.</b>	<b>N.E.</b>
FINLAND	-	-	-	4	3	75.00	1	1	100.00	10	0	0.00	-	-	-	2	2	100.00	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>35.29</b>
FRANCE	1	0	0.00	31	16	51.61	5	3	60.00	28	14	50.00	24	0	0.00	34	21	61.76	<b>123</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>43.90</b>
GERMANY	-	-	-	36	12	33.33	13	3	23.08	73	13	17.81	11	5	45.45	31	13	41.94	<b>164</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>28.05</b>
GREECE	-	-	-	5	2	40.00	1	1	100.00	6	5	83.33	-	-	-	19	12	63.16	<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>64.52</b>
IRELAND	-	-	-	5	2	40.00	1	0	0.00	6	1	16.67	2	0	0.00	9	0	0.00	<b>23</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13.04</b>
ITALY	6	6	100.00	23	18	78.26	26	11	42.31	17	14	82.35	9	4	44.44	34	24	70.59	<b>115</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>66.96</b>
LUXEMBOURG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	33.33	1	0	0.00	-	-	-	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25.00</b>
NETHERLANDS	-	N.E.	N.E.	6	N.E.	N.E.	-	N.E.	N.E.	2	N.E.	N.E.	2	N.E.	N.E.	6	N.E.	N.E.	<b>16</b>	<b>N.E.</b>	<b>N.E.</b>
PORTUGAL	-	-	-	3	2	66.67	3	0	0.00	2	1	50.00	1	1	100.00	7	0	0.00	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25.00</b>
SPAIN	5	5	100.00	24	23	95.83	1	1	100.00	5	5	100.00	10	4	40.00	11	7	63.64	<b>56</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>80.36</b>
SWEDEN	-	-	-	10	6	60.00	2	2	100.00	14	0	0.00	3	1	33.33	11	3	27.27	<b>40</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30.00</b>
UNITED KINGDOM	-	N.E.	N.E.	24	N.E.	N.E.	4	N.E.	N.E.	16	N.E.	N.E.	11	N.E.	N.E.	31	N.E.	N.E.	<b>86</b>	<b>N.E.</b>	<b>N.E.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>91.67</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>48.95</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>42.03</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21.52</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44.84</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>40.10</b>

Source: FAO (DAD-IS Program), National RDPs  
 Note: N.E. = not existing



**Table 2. Annual Payments to Farmers (€)**

MEMBER STATE	ASS		CATTLE		GOAT		HORSE		PIG		SHEEP	
	Mean	Dev. St.	Mean	Dev. St.	Mean	Dev. St.	Mean	Dev. St.	Mean	Dev. St.	Mean	Dev. St.
AUSTRIA			145,34	-	21,80	-	145,34	-	43,60	-	21,80	-
BELGIUM			100,00	-	12,50	-					12,50	-
FINLAND			168,19	-	168,19	-					168,19	-
FRANCE			122,00	-	122,00	-	130,86	33,14			122,00	-
GERMANY			139,25	124,16	100,00	81,02	150,23	110,25	238,40	249,23	66,15	51,93
GREECE			115,98	-	115,98	-	115,98	-			112,64	12,00
IRELAND <sup>a</sup>			200,00	-			200,00	-				
ITALY	138,93	32,10	201,67	85,05	191,18	78,40	173,63	49,80	152,75	56,01	149,04	96,43
LUXEMBOURG							150,00	-				
PORTUGAL			139,00	-			139,00	-	139,00	-		
SPAIN	120,20	-	120,20	-	120,20	-	120,20	-	120,20	-	120,20	-
SWEDEN			110,00	-	110,00	-			165,00	-	110,00	-

Note: <sup>a</sup> This amount is paid for females only and payment is made only once in the lifetime of the animal. Therefore, a payment of €400 per LU is paid on average every second year.

**Table 3. Costs and benefits of livestock farming: Comparison between "high yielding" breeds and local breeds at risk of extinction (€)**

	CATTLE		SHEEP		GOAT		HORSE		PIG	
	Bruna	<i>Modicana and Cinisara</i>	Comisana	<i>Barbaresca</i>	Maltese	<i>Girgentana</i>	Aveglinese	<i>Ragusana</i>	Landrace	<i>Nera Siciliana</i>
Income per head	1.985,78	1.319,03	186,96	145,90	172,50	130,92	578,43	309,87	1.473,45	791,21
Cost per head	1.679,00	1.371,71	157,52	157,52	157,52	157,52	377,53	367,20	1.249,16	973,98
(Income – Cost) per head	306,26	- 52,68	29,44	- 11,62	14,98	- 26,60	200,90	- 57,58	224,29	- 182,46
Income per head		- 359,00		- 41,06		- 41,57		- 258,48		- 406,75
Income per LU before compensation*		- 359,00		- 273,46		- 276,86		- 258,48		- 1.354,48
Compensation per LU		200,00		200,00		200,00		200,00		200,00
<b>Income per LU after compensation</b>		<b>- 159,00</b>		<b>- 73,46</b>		<b>- 76,86</b>		<b>- 58,48</b>		<b>- 1.154,48</b>

Source: Rural Development Programme of Sicily (Italy).

Note: According to EU Regulation 2328/91, Annex 1, cattle over two years and equines over six months of age are equivalent to 1.0 Livestock Units (LU); cattle from six months to two years of age, 0.6 LU; sheep and goat: 0.15 LU; Pigs, 0.30 LU.

Local breeds are indicated in italics.

**Table 4. Public expenditure for biodiversity conservation (values in Euro)**

Member State	Species	Expenditure to ensure the maintenance of current population size (A)	Expenditure to ensure the moving of breed to a not at risk status (B)	Total expenditure (A + B)
AUSTRIA	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	943.837,96	514.212,92	1.458.050,88
	Goat	5.192,76	8.175,00	13.367,76
	Horse	934.826,88	367.274,18	1.302.101,06
	Pig	13.080,00	13.655,52	26.735,52
	Sheep	28.426,11	13.030,95	41.457,06
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1.925.363,71</b>	<b>916.348,57</b>	<b>2.841.712,28</b>
BELGIUM	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	100.000,00	2.200,00	102.200,00
	Goat	5.338,13	410,62	5.748,75
	Horse	-	-	-
	Pig	-	-	-
	Sheep	5.163,75	12.082,50	17.246,25
	<b>Total</b>	<b>110.501,88</b>	<b>14.693,13</b>	<b>125.195,00</b>
FINLAND	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	1.208.445,15	312.665,21	1.521.110,36
	Goat	102.276,34	-	102.276,34
	Horse	-	-	-
	Pig	-	-	-
	Sheep	1.683.901,46	6.963,07	1.690.864,53
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2.994.622,95</b>	<b>319.628,28</b>	<b>3.314.251,23</b>
FRANCE	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	2.172.332,00	1.133.258,00	3.305.590,00
	Goat	44.103,00	13.944,60	58.047,60
	Horse	3.483.592,00	751.364,00	4.234.956,00
	Pig	-	-	-
	Sheep	982.636,80	81.270,30	1.063.907,10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6.682.663,80</b>	<b>1.979.836,90</b>	<b>8.662.500,70</b>
GERMANY	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	600.988,00	1.249.814,00	1.850.802,00
	Goat	7.600,50	38.389,50	45.990,00
	Horse	566.390,00	1.560.496,00	2.126.886,00
	Pig	90.742,50	274.724,70	365.467,20
	Sheep	234.960,00	17.447,25	252.407,25
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1.500.681,00</b>	<b>3.140.871,45</b>	<b>4.641.552,45</b>
GREECE	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	176.521,56	60.541,56	237.063,12
	Goat	17.779,73	-	17.779,73
	Horse	471.574,68	121.083,12	592.657,80
	Pig	-	-	-
	Sheep	179.965,78	27.243,70	207.209,48
	<b>Total</b>	<b>845.841,75</b>	<b>208.868,38</b>	<b>1.054.710,13</b>
IRELAND	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	622.400,00	196.800,00	819.200,00
	Goat	-	-	-
	Horse	318.000,00	90.800,00	408.800,00
	Pig	-	-	-
	Sheep	-	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>940.400,00</b>	<b>287.600,00</b>	<b>1.228.000,00</b>
ITALY	Ass	122.646,80	729.292,40	851.939,20
	Cattle	3.561.995,00	2.051.885,00	5.613.880,00
	Goat	568.269,45	109.440,45	677.709,90
	Horse	1.687.189,20	1.407.408,40	3.094.597,60
	Pig	72.059,40	115.273,20	187.332,60
	Sheep	659.256,90	254.433,90	913.690,80
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6.671.416,75</b>	<b>4.667.733,35</b>	<b>11.339.150,10</b>
LUXEMBOURG	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	-	-	-
	Goat	-	-	-
	Horse	54.750,00	98.550,00	153.300,00
	Pig	-	-	-
	Sheep	-	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54.750,00</b>	<b>98.550,00</b>	<b>153.300,00</b>
PORTUGAL	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	278.000,00	6.116,00	284.116,00
	Goat	-	-	-
	Horse	9.730,00	132.328,00	142.058,00
	Pig	8.340,00	34.277,40	42.617,40
	Sheep	-	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>296.070,00</b>	<b>172.721,40</b>	<b>468.791,40</b>

**Table 4. - continued**

Member State	Species	Expenditure to assure the maintenance of current population size (A)	Expenditure to assure the moving of breed to at not risk status (B)	Total expenditure (A + B)
SPAIN	Ass	349.181,00	265.041,00	614.222,00
	Cattle	2.059.026,00	1.586.159,20	3.645.185,20
	Goat	9.015,00	9.411,66	18.426,66
	Horse	250.617,00	363.605,00	614.222,00
	Pig	45.904,38	101.508,90	147.413,28
	Sheep	73.886,94	55.099,68	128.986,62
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2.787.630,32</b>	<b>2.380.825,44</b>	<b>5.168.455,76</b>
SWEDEN	Ass	-	-	-
	Cattle	246.400,00	428.120,00	674.520,00
	Goat	9.240,00	24.486,00	33.726,00
	Horse	-	-	-
	Pig	24.750,00	25.839,00	50.589,00
	Sheep	35.475,00	19.701,00	55.176,00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>315.865,00</b>	<b>498.146,00</b>	<b>814.011,00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Ass</b>	<b>471.827,80</b>	<b>994.333,40</b>	<b>1.466.161,20</b>
	<b>Cattle</b>	<b>11.969.945,67</b>	<b>7.541.771,89</b>	<b>19.511.717,56</b>
	<b>Goat</b>	<b>759.799,91</b>	<b>194.846,18</b>	<b>954.646,08</b>
	<b>Horse</b>	<b>7.776.669,76</b>	<b>4.892.908,70</b>	<b>12.669.578,46</b>
	<b>Pig</b>	<b>254.876,28</b>	<b>565.279,72</b>	<b>820.155,00</b>
	<b>Sheep</b>	<b>3.883.672,74</b>	<b>487.272,35</b>	<b>4.370.945,09</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>25.116.792,16</b>	<b>14.676.411,23</b>	<b>39.793.203,39</b>

**Appendix. Table A. Local breeds at risk of extinction in the European Union. Comparison between DAD-IS FAO and RDPs**

MEMBER STATE		ASS						CATTLE						GOAT						HORSE						PIG						SHEEP						TOTAL					
		STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK					
		C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD
AUSTRIA	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	2	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	0	1	6	8	11	5	2
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	0	1	6	6	11	5	0
BELGIUM	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	2
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0
DENMARK	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	20	5	5	0	0
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FINLAND	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	3	2	0	3	2
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	0
FRANCE	Breeds at risk	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	10	4	4	0	2	0	1	1	1	2	17	0	2	4	3	4	14	2	4	0	0	1	4	0	5	15	9	13	42	5	22	24	17
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	8	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	15	0	1	1	3	13	24	0
GERMANY	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	18	0	0	1	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	54	18	0	0	1	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	7	0	96	59	0	0	0	0
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	7	0	13	24	0	0	9	0
GREECE	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	9	3	0	14	0	0	14	3
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	9	0	0	6	0	0	14	0
IRELAND	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	15	0	2	0	3
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
ITALY	Breeds at risk	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	6	3	6	16	0	0	3	1	4	9	0	0	4	0	3	4	0	1	0	1	7	15	0	5	7	0	25	48	3	14	20	5
	Breeds included in RDP	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	6	0	2	6	0	0	3	0	3	7	0	0	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	4	7	0	15	28	3	11	20	0

**Appendix. Table A - continued**

MEMBER STATE		ASS						CATTLE						GOAT						HORSE						PIG						SHEEP						TOTAL						
		STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK						STATUS RISK												
		C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	C	E	CM	EM	NR	NRD	
LUXEMBOURG	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
NETHERLANDS	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	1	2	2	7	4	0	
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PORTUGAL	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	2	1	1	0	10	
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	
SPAIN	Breeds at risk	1	3	0	1	0	0	4	7	3	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	4	7	23	8	12	2	4	
	Breeds included in RDP	1	3	0	1	0	0	4	6	3	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	6	20	7	10	2	0	
SWEDEN	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	2	1	1	4	22	1	6	2	5	
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3	1	5	2	0	
UNITED KINGDOM	Breeds at risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	6	0	6	0	2	0	2	0	0	5	7	1	3	0	0	1	4	0	6	0	0	2	10	0	7	0	12	10	30	4	24	0	18	
	Breeds included in RDP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	Breeds at risk	5	6	0	1	0	0	33	56	20	45	18	18	15	32	2	7	7	6	76	82	7	13	13	9	18	37	7	13	2	2	25	89	3	26	43	37	172	302	39	105	83	72	
	Breeds included in RDP	4	6	0	1	0	0	9	24	13	30	17	0	5	12	0	5	7	0	9	27	5	6	13	0	6	9	2	0	0	0	8	36	3	11	42	0	41	114	23	53	79	0	

Source: FAO (DAD-IS Program), National RDPs

Note: C = Critical; E = Endangered; CM = Critical-Maintained; EM = Endangered-Maintained; NR = Not at Risk with decreasing trend of population included in RDP; NRD = Not at Risk with decreasing trend of population not included in RDP