



**HAL**  
open science

## Evaluation of the contribution of 16 European beef production systems to food security

Claire Mosnier, Anne Jarousse, Pauline Madrange, Jimmy Balouzat, Maëva Guillier, Alexandre Mertens, Edward Oriordan, Christoph Pahmeyer, Sylvain Hennart, Louise Legein, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Claire Mosnier, Anne Jarousse, Pauline Madrange, Jimmy Balouzat, Maëva Guillier, et al.. Evaluation of the contribution of 16 European beef production systems to food security. *Agricultural Systems*, 2021, 190, pp.103088. 10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103088 . hal-03143906

**HAL Id: hal-03143906**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03143906>**

Submitted on 6 Jul 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Evaluation of the contribution of 16 European beef production systems to food security

Mosnier Claire (1), Jarousse Anne (1), Madrange Pauline (2), Balouzat Jimmy (1), Guillier Maëva (1), Pirlo Giacomo (7), Mertens Alexandre (3), ORiordan Edward (5), Pahmeyer Christoph (8), Hennart Sylvain (3), Legein Louise (3), Paul Crosson (5), Kearney Mark (6), Dimon Philippe (2), Bertozzi Carlo (4), Reding Edouard (4), Iacurto Miriam (7), Breen James (6), Carè Sara (7), Veysset Patrick (1)

(1) INRAE, UMR Herbivores, 63122 Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France

(2) IDELE, Service productions de viandes, 75595 Paris, France

(3) Walloon Agricultural Research Centre, 5030 Gembloux, Belgium

(5) Teagasc, Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Grange, Dunsany, Co. Meath, Ireland

(4) Walloon Livestock Association, 5590 Ciney, Belgium

(6) University of Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland

(7) Council for Agriculture Research and Economics, 26900 Lodi, Italy

(8) University of Bonn, 53115 Bonn, Germany

**Corresponding author:** [claire.mosnier@inrae.fr](mailto:claire.mosnier@inrae.fr)

## Abstract:

### CONTEXT

Livestock production, and more particularly ruminants, is criticized for its low conversion efficiency of natural resources into edible food.

### OBJECTIVE

The objectives of this paper are to propose an evaluation of the contribution to food security of different European cattle farms through three criteria: 1) food production assessed by the amount of human-edible protein (HEP) and energy (HEE) produced at farm level, 2) feed-food competition at the beef production scale estimated in terms of net human-edible protein and energy and in terms of land used, and 3) food affordability assessed by the production cost of meat, protein and energy.

### METHODS

34 The analysis is based on 16 representative beef production systems in France, Belgium, Ireland, Italy and  
35 Germany and covers cow-calf systems, finishing systems, dairy and mixed dairy- finishing systems, with  
36 or without cash crops.

#### 37 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

38 The results show that, at the farm level, systems producing both beef and milk or cereals have higher HEP  
39 and HEE production per hectare (up to 370 kg of HEP and 60000 10<sup>6</sup>J.ha<sup>-1</sup>) than specialized beef systems  
40 (up to 50 kg of HEP and 1600 10<sup>6</sup>J.ha<sup>-1</sup>) and have lower production costs (approximately €6 kg<sup>-1</sup> of HEP  
41 in mixed beef system and €29 kg<sup>-1</sup> of HEP in a specialized cow-calf-fattener system). Beef systems are  
42 almost all HEE net consumers. Results are more variable concerning net HEP efficiency. The cow-calf  
43 enterprises are mostly net producers of HEP but, in order to produce human edible meat, these systems  
44 need to be combined with finishing systems that are mostly net consumers of HEP. In most cases, cow-  
45 calf-finishing systems are net consumers of HEP (between 0.6 and 0.7) but grass-based systems using  
46 very little concentrates or systems using co-products not edible by humans are net HEP producers. The  
47 grass-based systems use more land area per kilogram of carcass but a major part of this area is non-tilled  
48 land, thus these systems are not in direct competition with human food production. The lowest meat  
49 production costs are the finishing systems producing the most live weight per livestock unit (LU) per year  
50 and dairy systems in lowland which share the costs between milk and meat.

#### 51 SIGNIFICANCE

52 Although most of HEE and HEP efficient farms typically have higher meat production costs, some  
53 grassland based systems stand out positively for all indicators. These results pave the way for  
54 improvements of the contribution of beef production systems to food security.

55

56 **Keywords:** Food security, feed food competition, European livestock, beef production

57

## 58 Introduction

59 A necessary, but not sufficient, condition to ensure global food security as defined by the FAO (FAO,  
60 1996) is to produce food in sufficient quantity and quality to feed all people at all times at an affordable  
61 price. Meat and milk from domestic herbivores provides 16% of global protein consumption, with 20% of  
62 meat and 83% of milk from cattle (FAOSTAT 2016 in Mottet et al., 2018). Due to the increase in the  
63 world population, which could reach 9.6 billion people in 2050 and with the projected rise in living  
64 standards, cattle production will need to increase by 60% between 2002 and 2050 at the global scale to  
65 meet the anticipated increase in demand (Alexandratos and Bruinsma, 2012). However, the development

66 of diets based on high beef consumption seems incompatible with the objectives of reducing the pressure  
67 agriculture exerts on the planets resources and many studies envisage a reduction in meat consumption  
68 will be necessary to achieve sustainable development objectives (Willett et al., 2019). Livestock  
69 production, and more particularly ruminants, is indeed criticized for its low conversion efficiency of  
70 natural resources into edible food (water consumption, land and biomass use, greenhouse gas emissions  
71 per unit of beef consumed by humans), being less efficient than other food production methods (Gerber et  
72 al., 2015). However, ruminants have the capacity to make use of resources (roughage, co-products i.e.  
73 products that are produced as a consequence of the production of biofuels, human food, etc.) that cannot  
74 be consumed by humans but can be utilised as a source of feed for livestock and should therefore be able  
75 to contribute to human food security. To take into account this aspect of ruminant production systems,  
76 Wilkinson (2011) proposed an indicator to assess the net contribution of livestock to biomass, protein and  
77 energy production, taking into account only the portion of food consumed by animals that can be  
78 consumed by humans. Similarly, van Zanten et al. (2016) defined an indicator which weighted the areas  
79 used for animal consumption by the potential of this land to directly produce edible plant products for  
80 human consumption.

81 Several studies estimate the net contribution of cattle farming to food security. Using the GLEAM  
82 (Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model) model Mottet et al. (2017) simulated that on a  
83 global scale nearly 7 kg of protein that is edible for humans is used, on average, to produce 1 kg of  
84 protein from cattle farming, but with significant disparities depending on the production system used. In  
85 the United States, Tichenor et al. (2017) estimated that land would have been used more efficiently if it  
86 had been dedicated to crops directly edible by humans, instead of grass-based beef or dairy production  
87 systems. Laisse et al. (2018) also estimated that, for two typical French beef production systems, the net  
88 protein efficiency of production (ratio of human edible meat protein to human edible feed protein) is less  
89 than one, demonstrating that both systems were net protein consumers. On the basis of this observation,  
90 which is rather unfavourable to ruminant farming, the project *SustainBeef* aimed to assess how European  
91 beef production could make a greater contribution to food security. To this end, a clear picture is required  
92 of the contribution made by different European beef production systems to food security. The objectives  
93 of this paper are to propose an evaluation of the contribution to food security of different European Union  
94 cattle farms, in order to constitute benchmarks for European beef production systems and to identify key  
95 drivers of food security and levers for improvement.


96 Sixteen case studies were selected in order to give a picture of the diversity of beef production systems  
97 that exist across five European countries (Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland and Italy) and which  
98 account for half of the dairy and beef cows in Europe (Eurostat 2016). These systems cover cow-calf  
99 systems (production of calves from a herd of suckler beef cows), finishing systems (finishing of calves),

100 cow-calf-finishing systems (from the herd of suckler beef cows to the finishing of calves) and dairy  
101 systems (these cattle are mainly reared for their milk but also produce meat). The *SustainBeef* Project  
102 proposed an evaluation tree to assess the sustainability of the beef farms for the social, environmental and  
103 economic pillars. Each of the pillars is characterised by different components, which are in turn assessed  
104 by a number of criteria that can be measured by indicators (Bockstaller et al., 2009). The current study  
105 focused on the food security component of the social pillar. Food security was assessed using three  
106 criteria that fall within the concept of physical availability and economic accessibility defined by Jones et  
107 al. (2013) and the food security index (2020). The boundary of the studied cases is the farm gate,  
108 consequently the distribution and consumption of food that are also important in the evaluation of food  
109 security are not considered in this analysis.

## 110 **1. Materials and methods**

### 111 **1.1 Presentation of case studies**

112 The food security indicators were calculated from data of 16 European beef production systems. A case  
113 study representative of a region in a European country described the technical choices made by the farmer  
114 in terms of animal husbandry, land use and investments and provides information on the economic results  
115 of this system. These case studies were chosen to explore the diversity of beef production systems in the  
116 five countries studied according to three main criteria: country of origin, system type (cow-calf, fattener,  
117 dairy, etc.), plant resources used (all grass, etc.) and their land type (mountain, plain, proximity to a cereal  
118 basin). Briefly, a cow-calf-fattener system is a farm that breeds and fattens animals on the farm. A  
119 specialised cow-calf system gives birth to the animals on the farm and raises them to the weaning stage  
120 (weaned animal, 7 to 10 months old) and then sell them to the fattener. A specialized finishing system  
121 only fattens animals purchased from cow-calf farms. Almost half of all the case studies also sold grain  
122 crops. The farming systems examined included two mountain grass based cow-calf systems in France,  
123 one lowland grass based in Ireland, and in Belgium two associated with crops. One dairy system, without  
124 calf finishing in a grassland area found in Belgium, another associated with a suckler herd in mountain  
125 areas in France. In addition, one grass-based finishing system is in Ireland, two intensive systems in Italy  
126 and one in Germany (Figure 1).



**Figure 1: Localisation of the 16 European beef production systems**

The general characteristics of each case study for the reference year 2016 is presented in Table 2. More details are available in the supplementary material. Most of the case studies used were created for the needs of the current project as existing European references were not sufficiently detailed: the Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN) does not distinguish between the different beef cattle production systems (cow-calf, cow-calf-finisher), agri benchmark offers very synthetic sheets, without any system described for Belgium. The French case studies were built by the technicians of the INOSYS farm network (Charroin et al., 2005) based on a set of real viable farms. In the other countries, real farms were selected by experts from the DAEA (Department of Agricultural Economic Analysis) and ELEVEO-AWE group (Walloon Breeders' Association) networks in Belgium, by TEAGASC for Ireland, and the CREA network for Italy and for the University of Bonn for Germany. In Ireland, data for the cow-calf and finishing systems were derived from the Irish National Farm Survey (FADN) database and the integrated system was derived from research data from the Teagasc Beef Research Centre, Grange, Co. Meath. The data available in these case studies and their presentation were harmonised between participating institutions. Details include the structure of the farms (number of workers (WU), utilised agricultural area, herd size, distribution of areas, etc.), the areas farmed (yield, fertilisation, crop sold or intra-consumed, etc.), the herd size (average composition of the herd over a year, animals bought and sold, breed, category, sex, live weight, age, etc.), the feeds used (quantities ingested per category of animal for each type of feed, grazing periods) and the economic results (details of charges and products). However, farm IT-F2 was excluded from the farm-level indicators because its cash crop enterprise was

148 not represented in the case study, making these indicators irrelevant. There is a complete cow-calf-  
149 finishing system in every country except Italy: grass based beef cattle in Ireland, and mixed crop-beef  
150 cattle in France and Belgium, mixed crop-dairy cattle in Germany. For Italy, in order to study the system  
151 as a whole, i.e. from birth to the slaughter of the animals, a reconstruction of the meat production chain  
152 was made (FR-CC2+IT-F2) by aggregating a specialised French cow-calf system (FR-CC2) with the  
153 corresponding specialised Italian fattener system (IT-F2). This is considered as a representative system, as  
154 a large number of calves finished in Italy are imported from the Massif Central in France (GEB-Idele,  
155 2016) The reconstituted farm encompasses the entire production of the French farm in addition to the  
156 Italian farm: the Italian farm, which fattens 913 animals, has been reduced to 55 young cattle produced to  
157 adjust to the 55 weanlings sold by the cow-calf system (all charges and consumption have been reduced  
158 proportionally). There is, however, a time gap of forty days between the time of sale of the French  
159 weaned calf and the date the Italian farm purchases its young male for finishing. To overcome this  
160 discrepancy it is assumed the French weanling is fed a basal diet of hay (4 kg DM/weanling per day) and  
161 concentrates (3 kg gross/weanling per day), with the animal operational costs adjusted accordingly to an  
162 assumed 2.5 LU, in accordance with the data per LU of the source (French) case. The differences between  
163 the farm profiles were reflected in their share of "finished meat" (kilogram live-weight of animals ready  
164 for slaughter). This share varied from 0% for a cow-calf system where all the animals, including cows,  
165 are fattened on another farm, to 100% for fattener or cow-calf-fattener systems (Table 2). The type and  
166 quantity of feed consumed by the animals was the basis for the calculation of the consumption of  
167 resources that are edible by human, such as cereals. Cow-calf farms consume little concentrated feed.  
168 Grass resources are generally sufficient to cover the needs of the growing animal. Finishing systems  
169 require considerably more concentrated feed in energy for their animals to deposit fat. However, these  
170 values vary from farm to farm depending on their degree of intensification, such as IT-F2 which uses four  
171 times as much feed as GE-F2 where animals exhibit low average daily gains. Two of the farms with a  
172 dairy herd and cow-calf-fattener system have intermediate feed consumptions. The German dairy farmer  
173 GE-DF uses a large amount of corn silage due to its zero-grazing herd management.

174

**Table 2: Main characteristics of the case studies, quantity of meat produced.**

Name	Cow-Calf (CC) systems of Dairy (D) systems without finishing							Fattening (F)					Cow-Calf or Dairy+ Finishing (CCF or DF)				
	FR-CC1	FR-CC2	IR-CC	BE-CC1	BE-CC2	BE-D	FR-DCC	IR-F	IT-F1	IT-F2	GE-F1	GE-F2	IR-CCF	FR-CCF	BE-CCF	GE-DF	FR-CC2+IT-F2
<b>Labour (Worker Unit)</b>																	
Family Employee	1.5	1.5	0.5	1	2	1.5	2	0.5	1	1	2	2	0.5	2	1	1	1.6
<b>Animal Production</b>																	
Breed (*: crossbred, li: Limousin, sa: Salers, au: Aubrac, ch: charolais ; bb: Blanc Bleue Belge ; ho: Holstein ; si: Simmental)																	
Herd Size (LU)	li	sa, sa*ch	li*ch	bb	bb	ho	au, mo, mo*ch,	ch	*ch	sa, sa*ch	ho	si	li, ch	ch	bb	ho	sa*ch
	113	96	34	138	250	109	128	64	129	387	113	192	61	113	217	165	122
<b>Cow Sold</b>																	
head	14	9	5	34	68	18 D	12 D 7 B	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	42	45	9
Liveweight	734	660	734	750	750	650	620 D 655 B						661	800	740	688	660
<b>Young animals (W: beef weaned calf, H heifer, C: dairy calf, YB: young bull, S: Steer; age in months)</b>																	
Head Sold	39W 17H	55W 6H	19W	35W 2H	92W 5H	32C 2H	34W 32C	89 S	351 YB	71 9 YB	410 W 64 YB	107 YB	15 S 9H	29 YB 15H	43	65 YB 15 C	55 YB 6H
Age at purchase	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	12	7	11	1	2	/	/	/	/	/
Age at sales	W 9 H 28	W 10 H 30	W 8	W12 H 17	W8 H 20	C1 H18	W 11 C 1	30	17	18	W9 YB 18	YB 22	S 30 H 30	YB 16 H 31	YB <sub>&amp;H</sub> 20	YB 22 C 4	18
Liveweight at sales	W312 H615	W283 H814	W 306	W289 H400	W300 H475	C80 H400	C68 W378	680	520	68 7	W215 YB 715	YB : 685	S 681 H 712	Y 736 H 717	YB <sub>&amp;H</sub> 600	YB550 C 82	YB 687
<b>Meat Production (kg live-weight.LU<sup>-1</sup>.year<sup>-1</sup>)</b>																	
	297	320	201	270	325	138	214	383	816	630	845	334	312	350	262	409	397
<b>Percentage of finished meat (total kg alive for slaughterhouse/total kg alive x 100)</b>																	
	64	34	22	0	66	83	45	100	100	100	48	100	100	100	100	99	100
<b>Milk Production (1000 Liter)</b>																	
Per Farm							489	300									396
Per Cow							7	6.1									7.5
<b>Share of milk sales: Milk sold (€)/Total outputs (€)</b>																	
	0	0	0	0	0	88	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	0
<b>Crop Production (ha)</b>																	
<b>Total UAA</b>	95	96	32	134	118	54	113	43	34	8	58	45	40	249	123	225	97
Grassland	89	96	32	122	64	54	108	43	0	0	5	3	40	60	47	27	96
Maize & Sorghum	0	0	0	0	10	0	0		34	8	18	42		10	14	77	
Alfalfa														5			
Cereals	6	0	0	12	44	0	5				35			174	59	103	1
Sugar beet															3	18	
<b>Share of crop sales : Crops sold (€)/(crops + animal product sold) (€) x100</b>																	
	0%	0	0	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	21	53	0	68	25	47	0
<b>Animal Feeding</b>																	
<b>Stocking rate (LU.ha<sup>-1</sup> of Main Forage Area)</b>																	
	1.3	1	1.1	1.1	3.4	2	1.2	1.6	3.9	53	4	4	1.5	1.5	3.4	1.6	1.3
<b>Feed consumed (kg DM.LU<sup>-1</sup>.day<sup>-1</sup>) : Conc.: concentrate feed, co-prod.: co-product, maize silage, Harvested grass</b>																	
Conc.	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.5	1.3	2.4	1.8	3.3	7.6	9.3	1.6	1.5	0.8	0.9	1.1	3.3	2.6
Co-prod.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.2
Maize sil.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.9	6.1	5.1	2.8	0.0	2.3	2.5	14	1.2
H. grass	4.5	5.5	8.4	5.6	2.8	3.3	7	3.9	1.5	0	0.7	3.6	4.0	3.4	2.5	3.4	4.6

Notes: FR: France; IR: Ireland; BE: Belgium; IT: Italy; GE: Germany; LU: Livestock Unit, UAA: Utilised Agricultural Area

## 1.2 The evaluation tree of the systems' contribution to food security and the functional units

Three criteria were considered (Figure 2): i) production of human edible proteins and energy at farm level in order to estimate the capacity of farms to feed a large number of people per unit of agricultural land, ii) competition between animals and human food production in order to assess whether the production system is efficient in using resources that could be directly used for human food and that are used for beef production, and iii) production costs of beef, protein and energy that give an indication of the economic accessibility of this food for the population. Some indicators were calculated at farm gate and took into account all inputs and outputs from the farm and included milk and crops sold so that it assessed the contribution of the whole farm to food security. Other indicators were calculated at beef production level to track the factors that could improve the beef production. These indicators only took into account the inputs used to produce meat (including inputs used to produce feed on the farm) based on allocation rules that are detailed in section 1.5.




Figure 2: Food security evaluation tree.

191 *Notes: in grey: farm gate indicators, in white: meat production level indicators that include purchased*  
 192 *inputs and inputs to produce the feed produced on the farm; HEE: Human Edible Energy and HEP*  
 193 *Human Edible Protein; UAA: Utilised Agricultural Area; TL, nTL, LFP are resp. Tillable Land, non-*  
 194 *Tillable Land and Land equivalent for the purchased feed; J joule.*

195

### 196 **1.3 Farm gate protein and energy production**

197 The calculation of the total quantity of food protein and energy produced by each farm that was edible by  
 198 humans took into account all agricultural production on the farm (beef but also milk, cereals, etc., Table  
 199 2). It was evaluated on a per hectare of utilised agricultural area (UAA) basis, which included the UAA of  
 200 the holding as well as the areas corresponding to feed purchases (Table 3). For each animal product, the  
 201 share of human edible protein and the share of human edible energy are defined as a percentage of the  
 202 gross protein or gross energy of the agricultural product according to Laisse et al. (2019). Meat  
 203 production depends on carcass yield, which varies according to breed and category of cattle (Table 4).  
 204 Giblets and human edible by-products which are also produced when slaughtering beef are included in the  
 205 meat production estimate. In the case where animals are not sold directly to be slaughtered, but to other  
 206 farms where they will be finished, they were treated as if they had been slaughtered. Regardless of the  
 207 animal, 1 kg of bovine human edible meat is composed of 158 g of Gross Protein (GP) and contains 10.9  
 208 Mj of Gross Energy (GE) (Laisse et al., 2018). For cow's milk produced, it was assumed that it is 98%  
 209 human edible which gives an identical share of human edible energy and protein of 0.98. The average GP  
 210 content of 32 g.l<sup>-1</sup>, and GE of 2.6 Mj.l<sup>-1</sup> of milk are assumed. For plant products, Table 4 gives the shares  
 211 of human edible protein (SHEPV) and energy (SHEEV) (in % of gross protein and energy). The average  
 212 composition for each type of concentrate (cow concentrates, weanling concentrates, finishing  
 213 concentrates, etc.) was estimated (appendix 2), which made it possible to establish their human edible  
 214 protein and energy contents in the same way as for other feeds.

215 **Table 2: Method for calculating human edible protein and energy contained in meat, milk and**  
 216 **cereals sold.**

Animal or vegetable product	Calculation method
Meat, (including giblets and human edible) by-product milk,	HEP produced = animal product * GP * SHEPA HEE produced = animal product * GE * SHEEA
Crops sold and feed	HEP produced or consumed = feed or crops sold * GP * SHEPV HEE produced or consumed = feed or crops sold * GE * SHEEV

217 *Notes: HEP: Human Edible Protein and HEE: Human Edible Energy, Animal product in kg of live-*  
 218 *weight (kg of meat sold minus the kg of meat purchased) and kg of milk. Feed and crops in kg of Dry*  
 219 *Matter (DM), GP gross protein and GE gross energy in kg of protein or 10<sup>6</sup>J.kg<sup>-1</sup> of crop DM, human*  
 220 *edible animal live-weight or milk); SHEPA (%) and SHEEA(%) : Share of HEP and HEE in animal*  
 221 *products, SHEPV(%) and SHEEV(%): Share of HEP and HEE in vegetable products.*

222  
223  
224  
225  
226

**Table 3: Share of human edible protein (SHEPV) and energy (SHEEV), gross protein (GP) and gross energy (GE) contained in each plant-based raw material used in animal feed and land competition of these crops.**

Crops sold and feed	SHEPV % <sup>a</sup>	SHEEV % <sup>a</sup>	Gross protein (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> DM) <sup>b</sup>	Gross energy (10 <sup>6</sup> J.kg <sup>-1</sup> DM) <sup>b</sup>	Land competition (m <sup>2</sup> .kg <sup>-1</sup> DM) <sup>c</sup>
Wheat	66	67	126	18.3	1.33
Barley	61	63	112	18.4	1.48
Moist grain maize	15	63	92	18.6	1.04
Oats	84	79	108	19.5	2.08
Triticale	66	68	115	18.1	1.84
Rape	0	57	202	29.1	3.12
Soya meal from Brazil	60	38	526	19.8	1.51
Rapeseed meal	0	0	336	21.5	1.21
Dehydrated beet pulp	0	0	89	17.1	0.55
Pressed beet pulp	0	0	120	12.8	0.15
Beet molasses	0	0	142	15.5	0.26
Whole cow's milk powder for calves	30	30	254	23.3	1.38
Corn silage	10	32	78	18.8	0.89
Sorghum silage	57	43	59	18.4	1.17
Weanling concentrate	33	45	165	18.3	1.12
Cow concentrate	21	37	226	19.1	1.03
Finishing concentrate	29	41	193	18.9	1.2
Veal concentrate	30	44	197	18.8	1.06
Purchased grass-based forage	Non edible by human				1.43

227 Sources: <sup>a</sup> Laisse et al 2018, <sup>b</sup> Inra 2018. <sup>c</sup> ECOALIM (Wilfart et al., 2016) and AGRIBALYSE ®  
228 (Colomb et al., 2015) excepted for grass for which an average production of 7 ton of DM.ha<sup>-1</sup> was  
229 assumed; DM: Dry Matter.

230 **Table 4: Carcass yield and Share of Human Edible Protein (SHEPA) and Energy (SHEEA) values**  
231 **for each category and breed of cattle in the study.**

Animal category	Breed	Carcass yield (kg of Carcass. kg <sup>-1</sup> of live-weight*100)	SHEPA (Kg of HEP. kg <sup>-1</sup> of protein)	SHEEA (J of HEE. J <sup>-1</sup> of energy)
Cow	Holstein	45.5	0.520	0.300
	Montbéliarde	47.0	0.530	0.305
	Salers or Aubrac	51.0	0.560	0.315
	Charolaise	52.5	0.570	0.320
	Aubrac	53.0	0.570	0.320
	Limousine	54.5	0.585	0.325
	Blanc Bleu Belge	61.5	0.635	0.345
Heifer ≥15 m.o	Holstein	47.0	0.530	0.305
	Charolais x Salers	54.0	0.580	0.325
	Limousine	55.5	0.590	0.330
Young bull	Blanc Bleu Belge	64.5	0.655	0.355
	Holstein	52.5	0.570	0.320

≥15 m.o.	Simmental	57.0	0.600	0.335
	Charolais	58.0	0.610	0.335
	Charolais x Salers	59.0	0.615	0.340
	Blanc Bleu Belge	64.5	0.655	0.355
Bull ≥24 m.o.	Salers or Aubrac	54.0	0.580	0.325
	Charolais	57.0	0.600	0.335
	Limousin	58.0	0.610	0.335

Notes: HEP: Human Edible Protein and HEE: Human Edible Energy; see appendix 1 for the calculation.  
m.o. month old

#### 1.4 Feed-food competition

Feed-food competition was assessed by two indicators estimated at the beef production scale, the efficiency of conversion of edible resources in edible animal products, and the use of agricultural land. The ratio of human edible proteins (or energy) produced and used evaluated the net efficiency of conversion of plant proteins (or energy) into beef protein (or energy). An efficiency greater than 1 means that the system produces more human edible protein (or energy) than it consumes. Conversely, an efficiency between 0 and 1 means that the production of meat is a net consumer of protein (or energy). The use of agricultural land is assessed through the amount of tillable and non-tillable land required to produce one kilogram of meat carcass. Non-tillable land corresponds to permanent grassland. These areas are not currently in competition with human food because they may be of low productivity or not accessible by machinery and (or) European Agricultural policy restricts their cultivation (European Commission, 2020). Nonetheless, higher pressure on arable land or climate change might lead to conversion of a part of these permanent grasslands into tillable lands in the future (Havlík et al., 2012). The arable areas (cereals for feeds, temporary grassland, fodder crops, etc.) are considered to be in direct competition with the production of human food. It was assumed that the land required to produce the purchased feed is arable land (including fodder).

#### 1.5 Production costs

The third criterion used to characterize food security is the production cost of agricultural products that reflects the potential price at farm gate. This was calculated at the beef production level per 1 kg of carcass produced, and also at farm level per 1kg of human edible protein and 1 MJ of human edible energy produced. The production cost of a product was estimated considering all farm costs over an annual production cycle and assigning them to a given product. They encompassed current costs (structural costs and costs related to the herd, crops and forage areas), depreciation (wear and tear and discounting of equipment and buildings) and supplementary costs (remuneration of labour and borrowed capital). The remuneration of farm labour was estimated on the basis of the number of worker units provided in the farm case studies multiplied by the median net wage, for 2016, per country available on the European statistics website Eurostat.

## 1.6 Allocations between crops sold, milk production and meat production

The feed-food competition and meat production cost indicators needed the isolation of consumption and costs necessary for meat production. However, in the profit and loss accounts of farms, costs are often entered by major items without details of their allocation. For mixed livestock farms, it was necessary to define allocation rules (Table 5) in order to associate the forage area costs with the animal enterprise. These intra-consumed areas were estimated by dividing the amount of feed consumed by the animals by the average yield per hectare. Fixed costs (machinery, labour, land, etc.) were also allocated among the enterprises according to the guidelines presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Allocation method of costs to the animal enterprise.**

Item	Hypothesis for costs	Allocation
Fertilisers and soil improvers	Proportional to the units of Nitrogen (N) applied to each crop consumed by animals.	$\frac{N \text{ on } (MFA + IAC)}{N \text{ on } UAA}$
Crop protection products	Equally distributed across all Annual Crops	$\frac{ha \text{ ICA}}{ha \text{ CA}}$
Seeds and seedlings	Equally distributed over all areas of crops sown in the year with a reseeded of TG every four years	$\frac{ha \text{ of } (IAC + TG/4)}{ha \text{ of } (AC + TG/4)}$
Other specific crop costs (analysis, small equipment, etc.)	Proportional to the hectares of annual crops, silage maize/2 and grassland/2	$\frac{ha \text{ of } (IAC + MS/2 + grass/2)}{ha \text{ of } (AC + MS/2 + grass/2)}$
Maintenance of buildings and equipment, fuel, contract work, depreciation, interest and financial costs and other charges	One hectare of non-fodder crop is equivalent in terms of capital use - excluding labour and land - to 1 LU (and the associated main forage area (MFA).	$\frac{LU}{LU + ha \text{ of } nfCA}$
Wages and social insurance	1 LU requires double the hours of work than 1 hectare of cash crops (Veysset, 2014)	$\frac{LU}{LU + ha \text{ nfCA}/2}$
Rental charges	All plots have the same value.	$MFA + IAC/UAA$

Note: AC: Annual Crops, IAC: intraconsumed annual crops, nfCA: non fodder annual crops, MS: Maize Silage, MFA: Main Forage Area, UAA: Utilised Agricultural Area, TG: Temporary grassland, LU: Livestock unit

For farms with both dairy and suckler cattle, feeds were divided between the two herds according to the diets described in each case-study. This made it possible to determine the areas used by each herd, that were needed to calculate the competition indicators for agricultural land use. Regarding the economic data, the feed and crop operational costs were divided between dairy and suckler cattle according to the feed consumed by each herd. For other costs, where no information is provided, the production cost allocation by the French Livestock Institute (Appendix 3) were used.

279 Finally, for farms where beef is a by-product of milk production, the biophysical allocation method of the  
280 International Dairy Federation (2010) was used where the Milk Allocation Factor =  $1 - 6.04 \cdot (\text{total live kg}$   
281  $\text{sold-purchased from the dairy herd}) / \text{kg total milk sold}$ . This gives an allocation factor of about 80% for  
282 milk and 20% for meat which is applied to the feed of the dairy herd, the areas used and the economic  
283 costs.

## 284 **2 Results**

### 285 **2.1 Human edible protein and energy production at farm gate**

286 At farm level, Human Edible Protein per hectare (F\_HEP\_ha) production varies from 20 to 394 kg per  
287 hectare of utilised agricultural area (Figure 3). Systems selling milk and cereals, in addition to meat, have  
288 a higher F\_HEP\_ha than systems producing only meat. This is explained by the high proportion of HEP  
289 contained in cereals (60-70% on average) and the large quantities of milk produced. The GE-F2 farm  
290 produces less HEP than other diversified farms because it sells corn silage, which contains only 10% of  
291 HEP. IT-F1 stands out as a relatively important producer of F\_HEP\_ha, although it does not sell milk or  
292 cereals, its animals are mainly fed a diet based on co-products that require little land for their production  
293 ( $0.3 \text{ m}^2 \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$  for beet molasses compared to  $1.6 \text{ m}^2$  per kg for soybean meal, Table 1).

294 This is even more characteristic for farm Human Edible Energy production per hectare (F\_HEE\_ha),  
295 where farms also selling milk and cereals produce significantly more F\_HEE\_ha (from 2031 to 79977  
296  $10^6 \text{ J} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1}$ ) than farms selling only meat (from 759 to 8022  $10^6 \text{ J} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1}$ ) because of the very significant  
297 difference in HEE content of meat compared to other products.

298





Figure 3: Net production of human edible protein ( $F_{HEP\_ha}$ ) and energy per hectare ( $F_{HEE\_ha}$ ) of utilised agricultural area at farm level.

### 2.2 Efficiency in the use of human edible resources for beef production

Almost all systems are net consumers of Human Edible Energy (HEE) at beef production scale with efficiencies lower than 1, due to the low share of HEE present in the meat compared to that present in the resources used (Figure 4). Only the IR-CC system is a net producer of HEE (1.1 HEE Joule produced per HEE Joule consumed) due to its low consumption of concentrates (Table 5).



309 **Figure 4: Net Human Edible Protein and Energy Efficiencies of meat production ( $M_{HEP\_eff}$  and**  
310  **$M_{HEE\_eff}$ )**

311 *Notes:  $M_{HEP\_eff} = \frac{HEP\ of\ meat}{HEP\ of\ feed}$  and  $M_{HEE\_eff} = \frac{HEE\ of\ meat}{HEE\ of\ feed}$  (see Figure 2). Calculations are based on the*  
312 *farm case studies described in Table 2.*

313  
314 Human Edible Protein efficiency ( $M_{HEP\_eff}$ ) at beef production scale is more favourable for beef  
315 production systems particularly those using low inputs of concentrates, such as cow-calf systems, which  
316 are net producers of HEP (efficiencies  $> 1$  in Figure 4). The Irish cow-calf system using almost  
317 exclusively grass has the highest  $M_{HEP\_eff}$  with 4.5 kg of HEP produced per kilogram of HEP  
318 consumed. The Belgian BE-CC2 cow-calf system with a high use of concentrates (1.3 kg DM.LU<sup>-1</sup> per  
319 day), is a HEP consumer. Most of the finishing systems are net consumers of HEP because of their higher  
320 use of concentrates, despite higher animal productivity. The Italian fattener IT-F1 is a small producer of  
321 protein (efficiency of 1.1) due to its strong animal growth and its use of co-products and wet grain maize.

322 Except for one case study, cow-calf-finishing systems that take into account the entire meat production  
323 cycle are predominantly net consumers of HEP. The reconstituted cow-calf-fattener system "FR-  
324 CC2+IT-F2" has a  $M_{HEP\_eff}$  of 0.6, a combination of the cow-calf phase with an efficiency of 1.8 and  
325 the finishing phase with an efficiency of 0.2. This demonstrates the importance of considering full  
326 systemic approaches. The French and Belgian cow-calf-fattener systems have similar values (0.7). The  
327 Belgian dairy farm BE-D is also a protein consumer (efficiency of 0.8) due to its low meat productivity  
328 (138 kg of live weight. LU<sup>-1</sup>.an<sup>-1</sup> while the average productivity of the cow-calf system studied is 230  
329 kg.LU<sup>-1</sup>.an<sup>-1</sup>). However, two out of five cow-calf fatteners are net producers of protein. The cow-calf-  
330 fattener IR-CCF produces almost twice as much protein (efficiency of 1.9) because the animal's diet is  
331 almost exclusively grass- based (only 0.8 kg of DM of concentrate.LU<sup>-1</sup> per day) and the GE-DF finishing  
332 dairy farm is in balance with a net efficiency of 1, thanks to the allocation of 80% of the herd's feed to  
333 milk production and good meat productivity. This data shows that beef production can be a net protein  
334 producing system if the systems are adapted and oriented towards the greater use of grass and co-products  
335 with a limited use of concentrates.

336 The cow-calf systems, cow-calf-finishing(except GE-DF in zero grazing) and the Irish finishing systems  
337 use more Tillable and non Tillable Land areas directly and indirectly (in the production of purchased  
338 feed) per kilogram of carcass ( $M_{TL} + M_{nTL}$ ), from 19 to 92 m<sup>2</sup> of tillable and non-tillable land per  
339 kilogram of carcass, but a major part of these areas are non-arable land (Table 6), corresponding to the  
340 high proportion of permanent grassland in their crop rotation (78% on average). Two cow-calf farms  
341 stand out with a high use of  $M_{nTL}$  ( $>20\text{m}^2.\text{kg}^{-1}$  of carcass), which is explained by the use of temporary  
342 grassland. The more intensive German finishing systems and the more intensive German dairy-finishing

343 system use less surface area per kilogram carcass (5 to 16 m<sup>2</sup>.kg<sup>-1</sup> of carcass), but 93% of this surface area  
 344 is arable land, which could therefore be used for human consumption.

345 **Table 6: Indicator of competition for agricultural land use and production costs.**

	FR- CC1	FR- CC2	IR- CC	BE- CC1	BE- CC2	BE- D	FR- DCC	IR- F	IT- F1	IT- F2	GE- F1	GE- -F2	IR- CC F	FR- CCF	BE- CCF	GE- DF	FR-CC2+ IT-F2
<b>Land used for meat production</b>																	
M <sub>nTL</sub> (m <sup>2</sup> .kg <sup>-1</sup> carc)	23	58	80	37	11	87	32	27	0	0	1	1	38	27	12	1	34
M <sub>TL</sub> (m <sup>2</sup> .kg <sup>-1</sup> carc)	29	2	1	21	8	5	3	7	7	16	4	15	2	9	9	9	7
<b>Production Costs</b>																	
M <sub>Cost</sub> (€.kg <sup>-1</sup> carc)	6.6	7.3	8.9	5.1	6.1	4.4	6.9	4.3	2.4	4.2	2.8	4.9	6.6	7.3	8.9	5.1	6.1
F <sub>HEP_cost</sub> (€.kg <sup>-1</sup> prot)	39	43	53	27	10	9	19	26	15	na	8	22	29	5	7	6	na
F <sub>HEE_cost</sub> (€.10 <sup>-6</sup> J)	1.0	1.1	1.4	0.4	0.03	0.1	0.3	0.8	0.4	na	0.06	0.1	0.8	0.03	0.04	0.04	na

346 *Notes: TL and nTL: Tillable and non-Tillable Land in and out of farm; M<sub>Cost</sub> meat production cost,*  
 347 *F<sub>HEP\_cost</sub> and F<sub>HEE\_cost</sub> production costs of Human Edible Protein and Energy at farm gate. na:*  
 348 *not available*


### 349 2.3 Feed production costs

350 Farms selling milk and cereals have lower production costs for human edible protein (F<sub>HEP</sub>) and energy  
 351 (F<sub>HEE</sub>) at farm gate than those farms that produce meat-only (Table 6), due to the dilution of the costs  
 352 allowed by the large quantities of F<sub>HEP\_ha</sub> and F<sub>HEE\_ha</sub> produced. These costs range from €7 to  
 353 €53.kg<sup>-1</sup> of HEP and €0.04 to €1.4 per 10<sup>6</sup> J HEE for meat-only farms and €5 to €29.kg<sup>-1</sup> of HEP and  
 354 €0.03 to €0.75 per 10<sup>6</sup> J of HEE for other farms.

355 Beef production costs range from €2.4 to €8.9 per kg of carcass produced (Table 6). The systems with the  
 356 lowest production costs (from €2.4 to €5.4 per kg of carcass) are the finishing systems due to their higher  
 357 meat production per LU and per year (Table 5). Cow-calf systems have the highest meat production costs,  
 358 although there is a high variability between them (from €4.4 to €8.9 /kg carcass). These higher costs for  
 359 cow-calf systems can be explained by their lower animal productivity due to the sale of young non  
 360 finished animals: the daily growth of animals during the rearing phase is lower than the finishing phase of  
 361 most systems (Table 5).

362 In cow-calf systems, operational costs are relatively low compared to structural costs and represent 26%  
 363 of total costs (Figure 5). In particular, the cost of purchased feed represents only 12% of the total costs on  
 364 average, except for BE-CC2 which is the most intensive per animal and per hectare of forage area, and  
 365 therefore it is the most intensive consumer of concentrates. IR-CC is the smallest farm in the cases  
 366 studied, labour productivity (volume of beef output per worker) is among the lowest, and its level of  
 367 machinery costs (including contractor charges) is quite high in respect to its size, resulting in very high

368 mechanisation and labour costs and a very high production cost per kilogram of beef produced. This farm  
 369 thus has the highest production cost despite very low feed purchases. For finishing systems, feeds  
 370 represent the largest production cost item, especially for IT-F2, which is a very intensive animal feed  
 371 system purchasing all its feed, (i.e. 16.5 kg DM.LU<sup>-1</sup> per day of concentrates, cereals, co-products and  
 372 maize silage). However, in order to really measure the cost of meat and thus its accessibility to the  
 373 greatest number of people, it is necessary to study complete cow-calf -fattener systems. These present  
 374 intermediate costs varying from €4.4 to €6.5.kg<sup>-1</sup> of carcass. The GE-DF dairy farm which finishes its  
 375 calves has the lowest meat production costs among cow-calf-fatteners due to the burden sharing between  
 376 milk and meat. Due to its extensive system of production and very low feeding costs, the Irish IR-CCF is  
 377 also one of the most competitive. Feed costs of all systems are higher in Germany and Belgium than in  
 378 France and Ireland, due to their higher stocking rate which reduces their feed sufficiency. The French and  
 379 Irish systems are more self-contained feed-wise, but the lower feed purchases are partially offset by  
 380 higher mechanisation costs partly due to multiple grass harvests.



381

382 **Figure 5: Beef production costs (€/kg<sup>-1</sup> of meat carcass produced)**

383 **2.4 Correlations between indicators**

384 Farms that produce larger amounts of F\_HEP\_ha and F\_HEE\_ha have also lower F\_HEP and F\_HEE  
 385 production costs (Table 7). Most of these farms sell cereals and milk in addition to beef meat (Table 5).  
 386 They also have lower meat production cost but with more exceptions: IR-CCF which is a grass-based  
 387 system had low meat production cost but high F\_HEP and F\_HEE costs, BE-CCF (cereals and high  
 388 stocking rate) had low F\_HEP and F\_HEE costs but high meat production costs. F\_HEP\_ha and  
 389 F\_HEE\_ha are negatively correlated with the M\_HEP and M\_HEE efficiencies of meat production and  
 390 with Meat production cost (significant for F\_HEP\_ha) , i.e. farms producing a high amount of edible

391 protein and energy due to the volume of crops or milk produced have a beef unit that is less efficient in  
 392 converting edible feed into edible protein or energy. M\_HEP and M\_HEE efficiencies of meat production  
 393 are highly correlated. Farms with high M\_HEE efficiency of meat production have generally higher  
 394 production cost, use more non-tillable land (Table 7). Nonetheless, IR-CCF is efficient in terms of  
 395 M\_HEP and M\_HEE and exhibits low meat production cost.

396 **Table 7: Correlations (Spearman) between the different indicators**

	Production per ha		Feed/food competition				Production Cost		
	F_HEP_ha	F_HEE_ha	M_HEP_eff	M_HEE_eff	M_TL	M_nTL	M_cost	F_HEP_cost	F_HEE_cost
<b>F_HEP_ha</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	0.2	<b>-0.6</b>	<b>-0.5</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>-0.9</b>
<b>F_HEE_ha</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	0.4	<b>-0.6</b>	-0.3	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>-1.0</b>
<b>M_HEP_eff</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.7</b>	-0.4	0.5	0.3	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>
<b>M_HEE_eff</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.0</b>	-0.5	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>
<b>M_TL</b>	0.2	0.4	-0.4	-0.5	<b>1.0</b>	<b>-0.5</b>	-0.2	-0.3	-0.4
<b>M_nTL</b>	<b>-0.6</b>	<b>-0.6</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>-0.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>
<b>M_cost</b>	<b>-0.5</b>	-0.3	0.3	<b>0.6</b>	-0.2	0.5	<b>1.0</b>	0.4	0.3
<b>F_HEP_cost</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>	-0.3	<b>0.5</b>	0.4	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.9</b>
<b>F_HEE_cost</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>-1.0</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>	-0.4	<b>0.5</b>	0.3	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.0</b>

397 *Notes: in grey: farm gate indicators; HEE and HEP: Human Edible Protein and Energy, F\_HEP\_ha and*  
 398 *F\_HEE\_ha : farm gate production of HEP and HEE per ha of usable area, M\_HEP\_eff and M\_HEE\_eff*  
 399 *net efficiency of HEP and HEE at meat production level, M\_TL and M\_nTL Tillable and non-Tillable*  
 400 *Land (in and out the farm) used to produce meat; Values in bold are different from 0 with a significance*  
 401 *level alpha=0.10*

402

### 403 **3 Discussion**

404 The objectives of this study were to propose an evaluation tree of the contribution to food security for  
 405 different cattle farms, to constitute references for European beef production systems and to identify  
 406 opportunities for improvement.

407 The first criterion evaluated was energy and protein production at farm level. The data shows that while  
 408 farms specialized in beef production produce no more than 43 kg of human-edible protein and 1600 MJ of  
 409 energy per hectare, systems selling milk and cereals in addition to meat have higher production levels, up  
 410 to 370 kg of protein and 60000 MJ/ha. In this context, Garnett (2009) and Van Zanten et al. (2018)  
 411 recommend reserving arable land for crops that can be directly consumed by humans and using only  
 412 leftovers and co-products for animals. Although beef production is less efficient on the basis of these  
 413 metrics than cereal or milk production, some complementarities should not be overlooked: manure  
 414 fertilizes crops and temporary grasslands are essential in crop rotations (limiting the development of  
 415 weeds, diseases and pests by disrupting their biological cycles, providing nitrogen to the soil through  
 416 legumes, carbon sequestration in the soil, etc.) as pointed out by Benoit et al. (2020). In order to measure  
 417 this contribution, it would be necessary to compare long-term human edible food production with and

418 without temporary forage crops and grasslands. In order to improve the production of protein and energy  
419 from the cattle herd, favoring dairy cows of dual-purpose breeds producing both milk and meat or with  
420 more beef cross-bred calves when resources are sufficient are interesting options to explore (Zehetmeier  
421 et al., 2012).

422 The second criterion is feed-food competition. Concerning the efficiency of the studied beef production  
423 systems, we find net HEP efficiencies between 0.6 and 0.7 and net HEE efficiencies between 0.1 and 0.2  
424 for the French, Belgian and Italian-French cow-calf systems. These results confirm those of Laisse et al.  
425 (2018) on two French cow-calf calf-fattener systems with net HEP conversion efficiencies of 0.67 and  
426 0.71. Mottet et al., (2017) also reported a HEP efficiency of 0.6 for ruminant farms worldwide. As Benoit  
427 et al., (2020) point out, most ruminant systems consume more HEP than they produce. We highlight a  
428 significant difference between the cow-calf phase of the animals, which is generally a net producer of  
429 HEP (on average 1.7, min 0.5 and max 4.5) and the finishing phase, which is a net consumer (on average  
430 0.6, min 0.2, max 1.1). Extensive systems are often presented as virtuous and opposed to intensive feedlot  
431 systems (Gerber et al., 2015). However, in Europe and elsewhere, these systems are often linked because  
432 animals from extensive 'breeder' systems often pass through intensive 'finishing' type systems before  
433 being consumed by humans. In this paper, such an example was the Franco-Italian system (breeder in  
434 France and fattener in Italy) which is a net consumer of HEP as most of the cow-calf finishing systems  
435 are whereas the cow-calf-phase is a net producer of HEP. The net protein efficiency of this reconstituted  
436 system is not greater than that of the French farm, where the two phases (cow-calf and finishing) are  
437 carried out. It could be concluded that specialization does not improve the net protein efficiency, however  
438 the pedoclimatic contexts of these farms are different and a larger sample of farms would be needed to  
439 confirm this statement.

440 Within each phase it appears that HEP efficiency can be improved by using plant resources that provide  
441 little or no competition with human food demand such as grass and food co-products. The most HEP  
442 efficient cow-calf system is based exclusively on grass, as in the Irish cow-calf system (net edible protein  
443 efficiency of 4.5). For fatteners, two strategies emerge: the production of animals with a high daily gain  
444 and fattened from feed co-products (alternative Italian system: IT-F1), or the finishing of animals on  
445 grass, which implies slower growth. In the Irish systems, grasslands are managed quite intensively based  
446 on rotational grazing and a high level of mineral fertilization. The estimated results for dairy systems are  
447 more difficult to compare in the literature since the allocation between milk and meat production is  
448 generally not made (Ertl et al., 2016; Laisse et al., 2018). Producing some milk on a beef farm does not  
449 necessarily appear to be the best solution for improving the protein efficiency of meat, although milk  
450 production is a plus at the farm level. This can be explained by slightly more intensive systems with a  
451 higher use of feed in competition with humans. The negative correlation between HEP and HEE

452 production per hectare at farm level and HEP and HEE efficiencies at beef production scale can be  
453 explained by a higher consumption of cereals by animals in crop-livestock farms: since cereals are  
454 produced on the farm they may be more widely used as a source of animal feed.

455 Concerning land use, the results of Beauchemin et al. (2011), Mogensen et al. (2015) and Nguyen et al.  
456 (2010) present values between 40 and 150 m<sup>2</sup>.kg<sup>-1</sup> of carcass from beef cattle, and between 9 and 50  
457 m<sup>2</sup>.kg<sup>-1</sup> of carcass for dairy cattle. The estimated values for the systems studied are within this range,  
458 although some cow-calf finishing systems have higher performances (21 m<sup>2</sup>.kg<sup>-1</sup> of carcass for the  
459 Belgian cow-calf finishing farm). The breeder-fattener systems studied use between 2 m<sup>2</sup> for Irish grass  
460 based systems and 9 m<sup>2</sup> of tilled land per kilogram of meat carcass produced. The most effective way to  
461 reduce the area of tillable land is to reduce the consumption of human edible concentrates by the herds.  
462 To improve the efficiency of use of non-tillable land, better management practices should be adopted that  
463 would allow for better use of the grassland by animals, including improving grassland productivity by  
464 over-seeding, or choosing beef breeds that make better use of grassland resources without greatly  
465 reducing meat productivity per hectare.

466 The final criterion is the cost of producing food that can be consumed by humans. Few studies have  
467 estimated the cost of producing meat by taking into account all the factors of production, as this requires  
468 relatively detailed technical-economic data. The meat production cost estimates of the French Livestock  
469 Institute are on average €8 kg<sup>-1</sup> carcass for breeder systems, €4.5 kg<sup>-1</sup> of carcass for finishing systems and  
470 €7 kg<sup>-1</sup> of carcass for breeder-finishing systems in France. The values found in this study are in the same  
471 order of magnitude (resp. €6.5 kg<sup>-1</sup>, €3.8 kg<sup>-1</sup> and €5.4 kg<sup>-1</sup>), although generally lower and characterized  
472 by a great variability. The systems with the lowest meat production costs are the finishing systems  
473 producing the highest amount of live-weight per LU and dairy systems in lowland areas which share the  
474 costs between milk and meat. The cost seems to be highly impacted by the farm size. A small farm will  
475 find it more difficult to amortize its equipment and to remunerate labor.

## 477 **Conclusion**

478 This study provides an indication of the contribution of cattle farms to food security both at farm and beef  
479 production levels, integrating food production, feed-food competition and production costs, as well as  
480 proposing avenues for improvement. This data has been estimated only on a sample of case studies.  
481 Although they have been chosen to be representative of existing farming systems they should not be  
482 considered as average values for each country. The results show that the production of milk, but  
483 especially cash crops, makes more efficient use of arable land in terms of human edible protein (HEP)  
484 and energy (HEE) production at farm level and in terms of production costs compared to beef only

485 production. Nonetheless these farms are less efficient at converting HEP or HEE in beef feed into HEP or  
486 HEE in beef carcass. This raises the question of how greater efficiencies in beef production can be  
487 achieved on crop livestock systems. The grassland-oriented systems and the use of food co-products are  
488 the most effective system in terms of increasing the HEP and HEE efficiency of beef production and  
489 should then be favored on non-tillable land.

490 Many trade-offs exist between indicators which means that no farm is excellent on all of the food security  
491 criteria considered. Although most of HEE and HEP efficient farms typically have higher meat  
492 production costs, some grassland based systems stand out positively for these three indicators. These  
493 results pave the way for improvements of the contribution of beef production systems to food security.  
494 However, further research is required to estimate the impacts of potential innovations to improve the  
495 contribution of beef production to food security on the other dimension of sustainability and to identify  
496 barriers to their development in each territory.

#### 498 **Acknowledgements**

499 This study was carried out in the framework of the *SustainBeef* project  
500 (<https://www6.inrae.fr/sustainbeef/Project>), born from the response of 5 European countries (Belgium,  
501 France, Germany, Ireland and Italy) to the ERA-net Susan (European Union's Horizon 2020 research and  
502 innovation programme ([www.era-SusAn.eu](http://www.era-SusAn.eu)), under Grant Agreement n°696231.

503 The authors would like to thank Michael Mathot (CRAW) and René Baumont (INRAE) for their help and  
504 their constructive comments.

## 505 Références

- 506 Alexandratos, N., Bruinsma, J., 2012. World agriculture towards 2030/2050: the 2012 revision, , in: FAO (Ed.) ESA  
507 Working paper. . Rome, Italy.
- 508
- 509 Beauchemin, K.A., Janzen, H.H., Little, S.M., McAllister, T.A., McGinn, S.M., 2011. Mitigation of greenhouse gas  
510 emissions from beef production in western Canada – Evaluation using farm-based life cycle assessment. *Animal*  
511 *Feed Science and Technology* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.047>.
- 512
- 513 Benoit, M., Dumont, B., Barbieri, P., Nesme, T., 2020. Une agriculture durable pour nourrir la planète : l'élevage  
514 au cœur du débat. *Innovations Agronomiques* 80, 23-32.
- 515
- 516 Bockstaller, C., Guichard, L., Keichinger, O., Girardin, P., Galan, M.-B., Gaillard, G., 2009. Comparison of methods  
517 to assess the sustainability of agricultural systems: a review, *Sustainable Agriculture*. Springer, pp. 769-784.
- 518
- 519 de Vries, M., van Middelaar, C.E., de Boer, I.J.M., 2015. Comparing environmental impacts of beef production  
520 systems: A review of life cycle assessments. *Livestock Science* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.06.020>.
- 521
- 522 Colomb, V., Amar, S. A., Mens, C. B., Gac, A., Gaillard, G., Koch, P., van der Werf, Hayo, M. G. 2015. AGRIBALYSE®,  
523 the French LCI Database for agricultural products: high quality data for producers and environmental labelling.  
524 *Oilseeds and fats, Crops and Lipids*, 22(1). [https://www.ademe.fr/en/expertise/alternative-approaches-to-](https://www.ademe.fr/en/expertise/alternative-approaches-to-production/agribalyse-program)  
525 [production/agribalyse-program](https://www.ademe.fr/en/expertise/alternative-approaches-to-production/agribalyse-program)
- 526
- 527 European Commission, 2020. Sustainable land use (greening). [https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-](https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/income-support/greening_en)  
528 [fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/income-support/greening\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/income-support/greening_en) (last access may 2020)
- 529
- 530 Ertl, P., Steinwider, A., Schönauer, M., Krimberger, K., Knaus, W., Zollitsch, W., 2016. Net food production of  
531 different livestock: A national analysis for Austria including relative occupation of different land categories/Netto-  
532 Lebensmittelproduktion der Nutztierhaltung: Eine nationale Analyse für Österreich inklusive relativer  
533 Flächenbeanspruchung. *Die Bodenkultur: Journal of Land Management, Food and Environment* 67(2), 91-103.
- 534 GEB-IDELE, 2016c. Chiffres clés 2016 - Production bovine lait et viande. [http://idele.fr/filiere/bovin-](http://idele.fr/filiere/bovin-lait/publication/idelesolr/recommends/chiffres-cles-bovins-lait-et-viande-2016.html)  
535 [lait/publication/idelesolr/recommends/chiffres-cles-bovins-lait-et-viande-2016.html](http://idele.fr/filiere/bovin-lait/publication/idelesolr/recommends/chiffres-cles-bovins-lait-et-viande-2016.html) (last access may 2020)
- 536
- 537 FAO, 1996. Rome declaration on world food security and world food summit plan of action. FAO, Rome.,
- 538
- 539 Gerber, P.J., Mottet, A., Opio, C.I., Falcucci, A., Teillard, F., 2015. Environmental impacts of beef production:  
540 Review of challenges and perspectives for durability. *Meat Science* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2015.05.013>
- 541
- 542 Havlík, P., Valin, H., Mosnier, A., Obersteiner, M., Baker, J.S., Herrero, M., Rufino, M.C., Schmid, E., 2012. Crop  
543 productivity and the global livestock sector: Implications for land use change and greenhouse gas emissions.  
544 *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*.
- 545
- 546 Inra, 0218. Alimentation des ruminants, 2ditions Quae, Versailles, France, 728p. <https://feedtables.com/>
- 547
- 548 Food Security Index (2020) <https://foodsecurityindex.eiu.com/> (last access may 2020)
- 549
- 550 International Dairy Federation, 2010. IDF guide to life cycle assessment and life cycle management: A common  
551 carbon footprint methodology for the global dairy sector. International Dairy Federation. Brussels, IDF (available  
552 at [http://www.fil-idf.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Bulletin479-2015\\_A-common-carbon-footprint-approach-](http://www.fil-idf.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Bulletin479-2015_A-common-carbon-footprint-approach-for-the-dairy-sector.CAT.pdf)  
553 [for-the-dairy-sector.CAT.pdf](http://www.fil-idf.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Bulletin479-2015_A-common-carbon-footprint-approach-for-the-dairy-sector.CAT.pdf)).
- 554
- 555 Jones, A.D., Ngure, F.M., Pelto, G., Young, S.L., 2013. What Are We Assessing When We Measure Food Security? A  
556 Compendium and Review of Current Metrics. *Advances in Nutrition* 10.3945/an.113.004119.

- 551 Laisse, S., Baumont, R., Dusart, L., Gaudré, D., Rouillé, B., Benoit, M., Veysset, P., Rémond, D., Peyraud, J.-L., 2018.  
 552 L'efficience nette de conversion des aliments par les animaux d'élevage : une nouvelle approche pour évaluer la  
 553 contribution de l'élevage à l'alimentation humaine. *INRA Productions Animales* 10.20870/productions-  
 554 animales.2018.31.3.2355.
- 555 Mogensen, L., Kristensen, T., Nielsen, N.I., Spleth, P., Henriksson, M., Swensson, C., Hesse, A., Vestergaard, M.,  
 556 2015. Greenhouse gas emissions from beef production systems in Denmark and Sweden. *Livestock Science*  
 557 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.01.021>.
- 558
- 559 Mottet, A., de Haan, C., Falcucci, A., Tempio, G., Opio, C., Gerber, P., 2017. Livestock: On our plates or eating at  
 560 our table? A new analysis of the feed/food debate. *Global Food Security*  
 561 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2017.01.001>.
- 562
- 563 Mottet, A., Teillard, F., Boettcher, P., De' Besi, G., Besbes, B., 2018. Review: Domestic herbivores and food  
 564 security: current contribution, trends and challenges for a sustainable development. *animal*  
 565 10.1017/S1751731118002215.
- 566 Nguyen, T.L.T., Hermansen, J.E., Mogensen, L., 2010. Environmental consequences of different beef production  
 567 systems in the EU. *Journal of Cleaner Production* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.12.023>.
- 568
- 569 Tichenor, N.E., van Zanten, H.H.E., de Boer, I.J.M., Peters, C.J., McCarthy, A.C., Griffin, T.S., 2017. Land use  
 570 efficiency of beef systems in the Northeastern USA from a food supply perspective. *Agricultural Systems*  
 571 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.05.011>.
- 572
- 573 van Zanten, H.H.E., Mollenhorst, H., Klootwijk, C.W., van Middelaar, C.E., de Boer, I.J.M., 2016. Global food  
 574 supply: land use efficiency of livestock systems. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 21(5), 747-758.
- 575 Wilkinson, J.M., 2011. Re-defining efficiency of feed use by livestock. *Animal* 5(07), 1014-1022.
- 576
- 577 Wilfart A., Espagnol S., Dauguet S., Tailleur A., Willman S., Laustriat M., Magnin M., Gac A., Garcia-  
 578 Launay F., 2016. ECOALIM: a Database of the Environmental Impacts of Feed Ingredients Utilized for Animal  
 579 Production. *Plos One*. [https://www6.inrae.fr/ecoalim\\_eng/Project](https://www6.inrae.fr/ecoalim_eng/Project)
- 580
- 581 Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., Garnett, T., Tilman, D., DeClerck, F.,  
 582 Wood, A., Jonell, M., Clark, M., Gordon, L.J., Fanzo, J., Hawkes, C., Zurayk, R., Rivera, J.A., De Vries, W., Majele  
 583 Sibanda, L., Afshin, A., Chaudhary, A., Herrero, M., Agustina, R., Branca, F., Lartey, A., Fan, S., Crona, B., Fox, E.,  
 584 Bignet, V., Troell, M., Lindahl, T., Singh, S., Cornell, S.E., Srinath Reddy, K., Narain, S., Nishtar, S., Murray, C.J.L.,  
 585 2019. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems.  
 586 *The Lancet* 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4.
- 587 Zehetmeier, M., Baudracco, J., Hoffmann, H., Heißenhuber, A., 2012. Does increasing milk yield per cow reduce  
 588 greenhouse gas emissions? A system approach. *animal* 6(01), 154-166.

589

590

591

## 592 **Appendix 1: Share of energy and protein in animal products**

593 The data available in terms of SHEPA and SHEEA from the literature do not cover all breeds and categories of animals present  
 594 in the study. We constructed a linear regression line ( $r^2=0.98$  for SHEPA and  $r^2=0.97$  for SHEEA) from the data available in the  
 595 literature (Laisse et al. 2018) in order to obtain, for each carcass yield value, the corresponding SHEPA and SHEEA value. In  
 596 order to construct our Table 1, we chose to use the carcass yields by type of animal and breed from experimental stations

597 (Idele, conference grand Angle 2019), which corresponds to more recent and complete data than those of Laisse et al (2018).  
 598 We were then able to match each carcass yield in Table 1 with the corresponding SHEPA and SHEEA value.

599 For the carcass yields of animals not mentioned in GAV 2019 (bulls, Salers, Blanc Bleu Belge, and Montbéliard animals), the  
 600 data were obtained from experts or breeding organizations. Due to the lack of data for cross-bred animals, the carcass yields of  
 601 the two breeds were averaged. The same method was used for animals sold alive (weanlings), although these animals are not  
 602 at this stage intended for human consumption but are exported to other holdings for finishing. The SHEPA and SHEEA used for  
 603 weanlings are derived from Laisse et al (2018) and are presented in Table A. For newborn calves sold alive at a few weeks of  
 604 age, the protein and available energy contents are given per whole calf depending on the breed (Table B). Since no carcass  
 605 yield reference exists for newborn calves, we took a 20% yield from their SHEPA on the linear regression line.

606 **Table A: Share of proteins (SHEPA) and energy (SHEEA) edible by humans for weanlings according to their breed, live**  
 607 **weight and carcass yield. GP = Gross proteins, GE = Gross energy.**

Weanling breed	Charolais or Charolais x Salers		Limousin		Blanc Belge	Bleu
	300kg	450kg	300kg	450kg	x	
Live-weight (Kg)	300kg	450kg	300kg	450kg	x	
<b>Carcass yield</b> (% of live weight)	53%	55%	55%	57%	59%	
<b>SHEPA</b> (% GP)	57%	58%	58%	60%	61%	
<b>SHEEA</b> (% GE)	35%	36%	36%	36%	37%	

608

609 **Table B: Kilogram of protein and kilocalorie of edible energy produced per calf according to its breed.**

Calves breed	Kg of proteins produced/calf sold		Kcal of energy produced/calf sold	
	Holstein	Other breed or crossed breed	Holstein	Other breed or crossed breed
<b>Total</b>	9.2	10.9	93 900	110 900
<b>Edible by human</b>	3	3.5	31 500	37 200

Source :  
Laisse et al.

617 (2018) Fiche méthodologique bovins lait

618

619 **Appendix 2: Average composition of each type of concentrate used**

Composition in %		Weanling concentrate 16	Cow concentrate L18	Finishing concentrate JB16	Calf concentrate 18
Cereals	Wheat	9.6	11.9		11.9
	Barley	4.7	8.1	9.3	9.9
	Moist grain maize	26.3	24.0	25.9	23.5
	Oats	5.5	0.8	6.0	0.7
	Triticale		1.7		0.3
Protein crops	Soya			0.2	0.6
Other concentrates	Dehydrated alfalfa (GP < 16% DM)		0.4	5.9	
	Concentré protéique de luzerne		1.0	1.4	0.6
	Urée	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.4
Meal	Soybean meal 46		2.0	2.5	2.5
	Rapeseed meal		5.4		5.7
	Hipro sunflower meal (Black Sea)	0.7	0.0	3.3	
	Sunflower meal partly shelled (France)	1.7		4.6	
	Unshelled sunflower cake (France)	7.2		0.5	
Cereal coproducts	Soft wheat bran	15.0		15.0	7.7
	Soft wheat white remoulding		7.8		7.3
	Wheatgrain (starch distillery > 7 % DM)		7.2		0.9
	Brewery grain (barley)		0.2		
	Cornbread	10.2		19.0	16.3
	Corn Gluten Feed		14.0		
	Wheat Gluten Feed	10.6		1.0	6.0
	Gluten 60 (Corn Gluten meal)	0.2	7.6	0.0	0.9
Other coproducts	Barley Radicelles		2.8		
	Dehydrated beet pulp	6.0		5.3	5.0
	Dehydrated citrus pulp		5.0		

620 GP: gross protein, DM: Dry Matter

621

622 **Appendix 3: Allocation factor of the production cost used in the study from the French Livestock Institute (sept.2019):**

	Lowland dairy herd	Suckler herd, production of young bulls from dairy calves
<b>Structural costs</b>		
Mechanisation	1	1.06
Buildings	1	0.52
Financial costs	1	1.28
General costs	1	0.78
Labour	1	0.32
<b>Livestock operational costs</b>		
Livestock costs	1	0.07
Veterinary costs	1	1.3

623

624