



Animal &
Plant Health
Agency

Livestock Demographic Data
Group:

Cattle population report

**Livestock population density maps
for GB, using July 2021 data**



© Crown copyright 2022

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v.3. To view this licence visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/ or email PSI@nationalarchives.gov.uk

Document information	
LDDG	Cattle
Report reference	CP21/22
Contributors	Department of Epidemiological Sciences, APHA Epidemiology and Risk Policy Advice team, APHA Cattle Expert Group, Surveillance Intelligence Unit, APHA Science Strategy and Planning Group, APHA Field Epidemiology Team, APHA
<u>Contacts for queries:</u> Freedom of Information (FOI), Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) and Subject Access requests Livestock Demographics Data Groups (LDDG) Rapid Analysis and Detection of Animal related Risk (RADAR) data warehouse Epidemiology and Risk Policy Advice, APHA	enquiries@apha.gov.uk lddg@apha.gov.uk RADAR@apha.gov.uk erpa@apha.gov.uk
Data source	Cattle Tracing System (CTS) / Rapid Analysis and Detection of Animal related Risk (RADAR) data warehouse, SAM
Data year	July 2021

Contents

Who are these reports for?	1
Who did this work?	1
What do the data show about the population?	1
How accurate are the data?.....	2
What do the data not show?	3
How were the maps produced?	3
Annex 1: Data quality statement for cattle (July 2022).....	9
Introduction	9
Overview and purpose of the source data.....	9
Annex 2: Additional maps	14
Annex 3: Number of cattle holdings and number of cattle per county	18

Who are these reports for?

These reports are suitable for use in animal health and welfare policy work or by anyone who requires an estimate of the distribution and size of the cattle population at GB level. This type of population level information is often required to provide official statistical returns to the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH), assess the economic or social impact of particular animal health policies, for contingency, disease monitoring/control and resource planning, or to provide evidence to trading partners.

Who did this work?

The Livestock Demographic Data Groups (LDDGs) were formed in January 2014 and comprise APHA representatives from data, epidemiology, species expert and GIS work groups. The cattle LDDG is grateful to British Cattle Movement Service (BCMS), IBM and APHA Weybridge Data Systems Group (DSG) staff who handled the Cattle Tracing System (CTS) data and the APHA Rapid Analysis and Detection of Animal Related Risks (RADAR) data warehouse for their assistance in producing this report.

What do the data show about the population?

Table 1 shows the number of cattle and holdings in GB and by country within GB on 1st July 2021 and in the previous year for comparison. **Tables 2, 3 and 4** ([Annex 3](#)) show the number of cattle and holdings per county in England, Scotland, and Wales respectively on 1st July 2021 and 2020:

- The number of cattle holdings in GB identified in the dataset has remained relatively constant, with just a 1.4% reduction in total number of holdings from 2020 to 2021 (63,767 vs. 62,846, respectively). Of the three countries, England saw a small (1.8%) reduction in the number of cattle holdings, and in Scotland and Wales the number of cattle holdings reduced by ≤1% in 2021 compared to 2020.
- Similarly, the total number of cattle in GB has remained relatively constant (<1% reduction in the total number of cattle in GB from 2020 to 2021). Of the three countries, in England the number of cattle reduced by 1.5%, whereas in Scotland and Wales the number of cattle saw a small (<1%) increase from 2020 to 2021. The data shown in Tables 1-4 were produced using the same method and same data source and are therefore directly comparable.

Figures 1 and 2 show either the density of animals, with a smaller map to show how this compares with the density of holdings, or vice versa in a single timepoint, 1st July 2021. In contrast to other livestock species, there is little difference for cattle between the two distributions. Both the cattle population density and holding maps reflect distribution of the GB cattle industry:

- The greatest density of cattle population and holdings is generally on the west side of Great Britain; this includes Ayrshire, Dumfries & Galloway, Cumbria, northwest Midlands, southwest Wales, Devon, Somerset, and Cornwall.
- The areas with the sparsest cattle population and holding densities also reflect general understanding of the cattle industry demographic; these include parts of northwest Scotland and parts of East Anglia.

As with **Figures 1 and 2**, **Figures 3 and 4** show population and holding densities across Great Britain. These however are split into beef and dairy cattle distributions and then combined as a single bivariate population density and holdings density map, showing the spatial distribution of the beef and dairy populations across GB. For the purpose of this report, information on cattle breed purpose as defined in RADAR was used to define beef and dairy breed populations and holdings. As such, a beef holding was defined as a cattle holding with at least one beef breed animal present on the 1st July 2021. Similarly, a dairy holding was defined as a cattle holding with at least one dairy breed cattle present on the 1st July 2021. There is significant overlap between holdings which have beef breed cattle and those which have dairy breed cattle, this is reflected in the strong spatial correlation shown in **Figure 4**.

Separate beef and dairy population and holdings density maps can be seen in **Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8** in [Annex 2](#).

As with the total cattle distributions, the highest densities of both beef and dairy population and holdings tend towards the west of Great Britain. Some differences in distribution between beef and dairy are seen, however. Areas with the highest dairy population density, for example in the southwest peninsula of England, Dyfed, northeast Wales, the northwest Midlands, Lancashire, Cumbria, Dumfries & Galloway, and Ayrshire, all coincide with either the highest or moderate densities of beef cattle. No areas of high dairy population density are coincident with low beef population density. In Scotland, for example, Orkney, Caithness, Aberdeenshire, Banffshire, Berwickshire and Roxburgh all show areas of high (>50 cattle per km²) beef population density and low (0-10 cattle per km²) dairy population density. This can also be seen locally in northeast England, in Northumberland, Durham and North Yorkshire, as well as Buckinghamshire.

How accurate are the data?

The data are derived from the CTS by analysis of all the reported movements, birth, and death registrations of cattle on and off holdings in Great Britain on 1st July 2021. The output of this analysis is stored in ‘RADAR’, an APHA information management system; where location data are missing in the record due to subsequent updates, new location records have coordinates generated from the postcode of their address. Therefore, there can be a discrepancy between the ‘RADAR’ location and that provided originally through CTS; 88% of RADAR and CTS locations are within 2km, but notably 3% are > 20km apart.

The supporting quality statement provides further detail on the limitations in the data ([Annex 1](#)).

What do the data not show?

The population dataset represents a single snapshot in time as recorded in CTS (on July 1st, 2021). It does not draw out the pattern of movements between cattle herds, or the effect of seasonal breeding on the number of young calves or seasonal grazing.

The representation of the cattle demographic by data from CTS is near complete, but not perfect. A small number of movements are not recorded, either due to non-compliance or are not required to be recorded. However, these are believed to not significantly impact the data presented.

There is uncertainty inherent in the information displayed. Limitations in the dataset are discussed in the supporting quality statement ([Annex 1](#)) and it is important that the user considers these in the context of their work. Similarly, population and holding density maps are classified to different scales and units; and due care must be taken regarding their interpretation.

How were the maps produced?

Figures 1 & 2 have been created using the kernel density function in ArcGIS software. This tool spatially distributes population information (the populations at holdings and their point locations), over a defined radius (15km radius for the figures presented within this report), creating a smooth density surface. Two key parameters that require adjustment are the “*search radius distance*” and the size of the “*output surface grid*”. Discussion at the LDDG meetings informed these criteria, and their selection is recognised as a subjective process¹. A search radius of 15km was deemed sufficient to enable distinction between categories and a 1km grid square was used for the density surfaces themselves. The classification bins were limited to six, to aid in cross referencing areas of the map to the key. Note that the ArcGIS Kernel Density tool does not take into account edge effects², and as such density estimates in and around coastal areas may be underestimated. Similarly, the kernel density model is clipped to the coastline of Great Britain, and as such, the maps do not represent holdings whose location data positions them offshore. Such holdings are however incorporated into the Country and County figures shown in Table 1 and 2, and [Annex 3](#).

Comparison between the maps was optimised by assigning similar parameters between the species in this series of reports to those used in previous reports.

¹ Pfeiffer, D. Spatial Analysis in Epidemiology, 2008. p47.


² https://www.e-education.psu.edu/geog586/l5_p15.html

Figures 3 & 4 were also created using the kernel density function in ArcGIS software to create separate beef cattle and dairy cattle density surfaces. Contours of these surfaces were then extracted at the intervals shown on the maps, the contours were then merged into a single set of polygons using the union tool in ArcGIS. This allowed the values of both contour sets to be preserved as a series of overlapping polygons. These were then styled according to their dairy and beef values.

Table 1: Number of cattle holdings and number of cattle by country in GB, based on 1st July 2021 and 2020 records. The number of cattle holdings and number of cattle per county is provided in [Annex 3](#).

Country	Number of holdings			Number of cattle		
	2021	2020	% Change	2021	2020	% Change
ENGLAND	41,591	42,350	-1.8	5,089,442	5,168,583	-1.5
SCOTLAND	10,803	10,857	-0.5	1,723,474	1,711,759	0.7
WALES	10,452	10,560	-1.0	1,149,145	1,138,409	0.9
GB TOTAL	62,846	63,767	-1.4	7,962,061	8,018,751	-0.7

GB Cattle Population Density in July 2021



© Crown Copyright and database rights 2022.
Ordnance Survey Licence number 100051110

CREATOR: DSG GIS
REVIEWED BY:DJBr
DATE: 14/03/2022

Cattle Population Kernel Density
1km Output Cell, 15km Search Radius

Animal &
Plant Health
Agency

Figure 1: Cattle population density in GB (as recorded in CTS on 1st July 2021) with holding density inset

GB Cattle Holding Density in July 2021




Figure 2: Cattle holding density in GB (as recorded in CTS on 1st July 2021) with population density inset.

GB Beef/Dairy Population Density in July 2021




Figure 3: Bivariate map showing both Beef and Dairy population density (as recorded in CTS on 1st July 2021) in GB with holding density inset. Beef and dairy cattle defined according to breed purpose as defined in RADAR.

GB Beef/Dairy Holding Density in July 2021




Figure 4: Bivariate map showing both Beef and Dairy holding density in GB (as recorded in CTS on 1st July 2021) with population density inset. Beef and dairy cattle defined according to breed purpose as defined in RADAR.

Annex 1: Data quality statement for cattle (July 2022)

Introduction

This data quality statement provides an overview of the quality of the data used to underpin the kernel density holding and livestock figures. This statement is written in the context of the data being used to provide an overview of the livestock demographics within Great Britain. The statement may not necessarily relate to data quality for other purposes.

Overview and purpose of the source data

Data were supplied by the APHA's Data Systems Group (DSG) and sourced from the Rapid Analysis and Detection of Animal-related Risks (RADAR) data warehouse, the Cattle Tracing System (CTS) database and APHA's Sam database. The CTS dataset describes cattle movement, birth and death registration data, contributing to the overall cattle count and location data, within GB and is captured by the British Cattle Movement Service (BCMS).

Category [definition]	Quality description
Relevance of data <i>[degree to which data meets user needs in terms of currency, geographical coverage, content and detail]</i>	Spatial coverage: The data cover Great Britain. Temporal coverage: The data are representative of July 1 st , 2021, as recorded in CTS and were accessed in December 2021. Key data items available: The dataset includes births, deaths and movements for registered cattle. It can provide the number and location of cattle at any one point in time based on these movement records. It also includes data on breed and sex. Information on breed purpose (i.e., beef or dairy) available in RADAR was used to define cattle population as beef or dairy and to produce the beef and dairy figures behind the bivariate population and holding density maps seen in Figures 3 and 4. A dual purpose breed was also identified in the data. This represented around 3% of overall cattle and was included in the total cattle maps but was excluded from the beef and dairy bivariate maps in Figures 3 and 4. For the production of beef/dairy holding density maps, a beef holding was defined as a cattle holding with at least one beef breed animal present on the 1 st July 2021. Similarly, a dairy holding was defined as a cattle holding with at least one dairy breed cattle present on the 1 st July 2021. It is

	important to note that based on this definition, the beef and dairy bivariate maps do not reflect density of holdings with dairy and beef production type, because animals of both production types may be present on individual herds. Instead, they show density of holdings with beef/dairy breed cattle on 1 st July.
Timeliness <i>[the degree to which data represent reality from the required time point]</i>	<p>How often are the data collected? A continuous stream of online reports or completed movement forms are submitted to the British Cattle Movement Service (BCMS) by farmers and entered into CTS. Location co-ordinates of holdings are uploaded to CTS from APHA's operational database called SAM only once per holding. Data are uploaded to RADAR monthly.</p> <p>When do the data become available? Data become available in RADAR up to one month after collection.</p> <p>Data reference period: The database is fed continuously but the population data are a snapshot extracted from July 1st, 2021. This month was chosen because the cattle population drops slightly over winter but is most stable during summer. Also, 1st of July has been used historically and therefore allows comparison of patterns with the previous cattle population reports.</p> <p>How often are the data updated? Movements are recorded online directly to CTS or are reported by phone or by post to BCMS within the 3-day legal reporting period. Holding location coordinates for a CPH are not updated in CTS, and if SAM does not have a record of that holding no coordinates are assigned. Gaps in the initial upload of SAM location coordinates into CTS are filled by the RADAR 'best co-ordinates' algorithm which imputes the location from other data including the address. This though ceased for new locations from around the end of 2017 and so the coordinates are now generated outside of RADAR from the postcode given for the address. If that does not exist it is taken from information given in SAM for the holding. No coordinates are assigned if that still fails to determine a coordinate, but these are few, just one in the 2021 report.</p>
Accuracy and precision <i>[extent of data error and bias and how well data portrays</i>	<p>How were the data collected? Cattle population estimates on each holding are calculated from cattle movement information. Farmers and other cattle keepers, i.e., market operators, agricultural shows and abattoirs, are legally required to submit completed records of cattle movements online or via forms to BCMS. Separate movement forms are submitted as <i>movements off</i> and <i>movements on</i>; these are 'paired' by algorithm prior to</p>

<p><i>reality]</i></p>	<p>being made available, i.e., the <i>from</i> and <i>to</i> herd forms are combined into a single record. ‘New’ keepers should register with APHA before reporting moves to BCMS. However, occasionally they can report moves without having done so, in which case location data will be missing from CTS. Location coordinates are assigned to a holding from SAM when a submitted form has a new location, but location data will be missing if SAM has no record at the time. SAM amendments to the location are not usually fed back to BCMS.</p> <p>Sample & collection size: There are approximately 62,272 CPH records within the CTS database that had at least one bovine animal on the holding, as of 1st July 2021. A holding is defined as any location with cattle on 1st July 2021 (i.e., production holdings, markets, shows, slaughterhouses, etc.). A holding can have one or more cattle herds. There are approximately 825,000 movement records per month (including movements to slaughter but not the additional death movement acknowledging the slaughter itself) which are used to calculate changes in the cattle population on each holding.</p> <p>What steps have been taken to minimise processing errors? DSG monitors the monthly CTS upload by checking that the file is complete and holds expected data. Checks are made monthly by IBM to ensure the data have loaded into RADAR correctly. BCMS investigate and resolve any cattle movements which appear to be either suspicious or inaccurate.</p> <p>What are the non-reporting or non-response rates? It has been assumed that very few cattle keepers fail to report cattle movements, births and death. It is a legal requirement to do so. Unrecorded movements may lead to incomplete data, so inferred movements are calculated when the animal next appears on a movement submission. These movements are unlikely to impact the population counts significantly.</p> <p>More precise and accurate data resulting from changes to CPH and movement reporting rules. Throughout GB, ‘links’ which previously allowed movements not to be reported between paired holdings have been phased out. In England and Wales, new rules mean that larger businesses, with cattle kept at different locations, must register them separately and report moves. Also, all businesses keeping cattle at further locations on a seasonal basis must report moves if the distance is significant (using tCPHs; if within ten miles the land-use can rather be reflected as a Temporary Land Association, TLA, and moves are not reported).</p>
------------------------	--

	<p>As a result, the total cattle population count is unaffected, but there is greater accuracy of cattle location data. In Scotland TLAs and tCPHs are not used; rather movements within businesses are captured via “Scot moves” on its ScotEID system. However, these data do not feed to CTS nor to RADAR and so do not feature in this report.</p>
Comparability <i>[how well these data can be compared with data taken from the same dataset and with similar data from other sources]</i>	<p>Within dataset comparability: Routine checks show that data extracted at different times are highly comparable.</p> <p>Other dataset comparability: The CTS data appear to be the most accurate for placing cattle in a place at a point in time. SAM and RADAR may have more up to date information on location coordinates. This will have minimal impact on county level summaries or kernel density smoothed maps.</p>
Coherence <i>[degree to which data can be or have been merged with other data sources]</i>	<p>How consistent are the data over time? If there are differences, what are they and what is their impact? Have there been changes to the underlying data collection? We are not aware of any change in collection methods during recent years other than already mentioned changes to how “links” between pired holdings have previously been reported but assume minimal bias has been caused. Current location details may be different from when location was first recorded but should still be of similar geographic location.</p> <p>Have any real-world events impacted on the data since the previous release? None have been identified.</p> <p>What other data sources are these data comparable with? Location data are comparable between CTS, SAM and RADAR. There are not thought to be any other datasets that would hold information on cattle movements.</p>
Interpretability <i>[how well the data is understood and utilised appropriately]</i>	<p>Is there a particular context that these data need to be considered within? This dataset can be used to obtain information regarding animal movements and animal population counts. The cattle population peaks during the summer and dips during the winter. These data are from the summer peak (July 1st, 2021). As registration of movements is legally enforced, we expect the data to be a near complete representation of cattle within the agricultural industry.</p> <p>What other information is available to help users better understand this data source? We have documentation of what the tables and data represent. IBM have technical documentation</p>

	<p>for the compilation of the data.</p> <p>Are there any ambiguous or technical terms that may need further explanation? A holding is defined as any location with cattle on 1st July 2021 (i.e., agricultural holdings, markets, shows, slaughterhouses, etc.). A holding can have one or more cattle herds. The data used for this report are at a holding level and care should be taken when comparing these data with other sources that report data at herd level.</p>
<p>Accessibility</p> <p><i>[availability of relevant information and access to the data in a convenient and suitable manner]</i></p>	<p>What data are shared and with whom? Addresses and coordinates of individual locations cannot be released without Confidentiality Agreements. However, summary cattle movement outputs and aggregated data can be shared. The dataset is very large, so provision of individual records would not be easy even with Confidentiality Agreements in place. Aggregated data are a better option. Data are stored within SQL (Structured Query Language) tables on secure servers.</p> <p>Contact details for data source queries</p> <p>British Cattle Movement Service: bcmsequiries@rpa.gov.uk</p> <p>Rapid Analysis and Detection of Animal related Risk (RADAR) data warehouse: RADAR@apha.gov.uk</p> <p>Data Systems Group (DSG) Animal and Plant Health Agency Weybourne Building, Level 2, Area F, Woodham Lane Addlestone, Surrey KT15 3NB</p>

Annex 2: Additional maps





Figure 5: Beef (by breed purpose) population density in GB (CTS) with holding density inset

GB Beef Holding Density in July 2021



© Crown Copyright and database rights 2022.
Ordnance Survey Licence number 100051110

CREATOR: DSG GIS
REVIEWED BY :DJBr
DATE: 14/03/2022

Beef Holding Kernel Density
1km Output Cell, 15km Search Radius



Figure 6: Beef (by breed purpose) holding density in GB (CTS) with population density inset

GB Dairy Population Density in July 2021




Figure 7: Dairy (by breed purpose) population density in GB (CTS) with holding density inset

GB Dairy Holding Density in July 2021




Figure 8: Dairy (by breed purpose) holding density in GB (CTS) with population density inset

Annex 3: Number of cattle holdings and number of cattle per county

Table 2: Total number of cattle holdings and number of cattle per county for England, based on July 2021 records. Data for counties with 6 or fewer holdings have been excluded from this table for data protection reasons.

County	Number of holdings		% change from 2020	Number of cattle		% change from 2020
	2021	2020		2021	2020	
AVON	647	665	-2.7%	75,975	78,935	-3.7%
BEDFORDSHIRE	151	157	-3.8%	11,074	10,922	1.4%
BERKSHIRE	187	184	1.6%	16,413	18,694	-12.2%
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE	428	444	-3.6%	54,139	57,734	-6.2%
CAMBRIDGESHIRE	298	314	-5.1%	27,747	29,249	-5.1%
CHESHIRE	1,312	1,339	-2.0%	233,060	232,683	0.2%
CLEVELAND	131	136	-3.7%	15,317	15,728	-2.6%
CORNWALL	2,403	2,411	-0.3%	318,836	316,753	0.7%
CUMBRIA	2,922	2,954	-1.1%	438,685	435,795	0.7%
DERBYSHIRE	1,526	1,575	-3.1%	167,850	170,095	-1.3%
DEVONSHIRE	4,074	4,104	-0.7%	579,249	578,614	0.1%
DORSET	1,005	1,035	-2.9%	171,259	177,899	-3.7%
DURHAM	875	897	-2.5%	87,394	88,810	-1.6%
EAST SUSSEX	516	542	-4.8%	42,705	47,592	-10.3%
ESSEX	353	359	-1.7%	27,945	29,248	-4.5%
GLOUCESTERSHIRE	913	923	-1.1%	113,997	119,448	-4.6%
GREATER LONDON	60	61	-1.6%	1,902	1,948	-2.4%

County	Number of holdings		% change from 2020	Number of cattle		% change from 2020
	2021	2020		2021	2020	
GREATER MANCHESTER	405	411	-1.5%	22,214	21,952	1.2%
HAMPSHIRE	724	743	-2.6%	59,681	62,235	-4.1%
HEREFORD AND WORCESTER	1,615	1,660	-2.7%	163,465	165,834	-1.4%
HERTFORDSHIRE	204	212	-3.8%	10,547	12,191	-13.5%
HUMBERSIDE	658	670	-1.8%	55,673	56,830	-2.0%
ISLE OF WIGHT	118	117	0.9%	9,775	11,041	-11.5%
ISLES OF SCILLY	19	21	-9.5%	286	298	-4.0%
KENT	586	605	-3.1%	51,827	55,722	-7.0%
LANCASHIRE	1,764	1,785	-1.2%	227,270	226,904	0.2%
LEICESTERSHIRE	851	902	-5.7%	111,615	117,859	-5.3%
LINCOLNSHIRE	744	780	-4.6%	80,599	82,398	-2.2%
MERSEYSIDE	54	53	1.9%	4,776	5,063	-5.7%
NORFOLK	842	842	0.0%	72,771	75,997	-4.2%
NORTH YORKSHIRE	3,085	3,119	-1.1%	373,981	370,933	0.8%
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE	489	510	-4.1%	53,224	57,190	-6.9%
NORTHUMBERLAND	973	976	-0.3%	139,851	142,992	-2.2%
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE	441	445	-0.9%	43,144	45,072	-4.3%
OXFORDSHIRE	464	457	1.5%	61,370	61,340	0.0%
SHROPSHIRE	1,734	1,747	-0.7%	244,681	244,696	0.0%
SOMERSET	2,028	2,100	-3.4%	291,562	297,390	-2.0%
SOUTH YORKSHIRE	392	403	-2.7%	33,650	35,046	-4.0%
STAFFORDSHIRE	1,817	1,839	-1.2%	210,571	212,856	-1.1%

County	Number of holdings		% change from 2020	Number of cattle		% change from 2020
	2021	2020		2021	2020	
SUFFOLK	463	463	0.0%	32,920	33,928	-3.0%
SURREY	305	314	-2.9%	27,831	27,064	2.8%
TYNE & WEAR	73	67	9.0%	6,023	5,645	6.7%
WARWICKSHIRE	521	533	-2.3%	54,534	56,071	-2.7%
WEST MIDLANDS	83	84	-1.2%	6,200	6,273	-1.2%
WEST SUSSEX	395	401	-1.5%	38,519	44,148	-12.8%
WEST YORKSHIRE	966	987	-2.1%	66,219	67,477	-1.9%
WILTSHIRE	977	1,004	-2.7%	151,116	155,991	-3.1%

Table 3: Total number of cattle holdings and number of cattle per county for Scotland, based on July 2021 records. Data for counties with 6 or fewer holdings have been excluded from this table for data protection reasons.

County	Number of holdings		% change from 2020	Number of cattle		% change from 2020
	2021	2020		2021	2020	
ABERDEENSHIRE	1,322	1,338	-1.2%	215,155	207,563	3.7%
ANGUS	269	273	-1.5%	41,973	42,359	-0.9%
ARGYLL	623	607	2.6%	51,146	51,921	-1.5%
AYRSHIRE	822	826	-0.5%	176,319	175,083	0.7%
BANFFSHIRE	391	391	0.0%	51,864	51,548	0.6%
BERWICKSHIRE	193	195	-1.0%	59,292	58,140	2.0%
BUTE	78	78	0.0%	12,186	12,768	-4.6%

County	Number of holdings		% change from 2020	Number of cattle		% change from 2020
	2021	2020		2021	2020	
CAITHNESS	379	378	0.3%	44,586	44,587	0.0%
CLACKMANNANSHIRE	25	24	4.2%	2,587	2,581	0.2%
DUNBARTONSHIRE	82	79	3.8%	11,259	11,211	0.4%
DUMFRIESSHIRE	679	687	-1.2%	159,246	156,237	1.9%
EAST LOTHIAN	85	86	-1.2%	17,509	17,835	-1.8%
FIFE	268	267	0.4%	52,756	52,192	1.1%
INVERNESS-SHIRE	864	864	0.0%	34,871	34,992	-0.3%
KINCARDINESHIRE	174	170	2.4%	40,095	40,758	-1.6%
KINROSS	48	44	9.1%	7,583	7,474	1.5%
KIRKCUDBRIGHT	428	433	-1.2%	133,601	131,659	1.5%
LANARKSHIRE	570	578	-1.4%	93,567	93,845	-0.3%
MIDLOTHIAN & EDINBURGH	122	122	0.0%	21,096	21,643	-2.5%
MORAY	135	134	0.7%	22,613	23,176	-2.4%
NAIRN	46	43	7.0%	8,489	8,441	0.6%
ORKNEY	492	493	-0.2%	78,117	78,194	-0.1%
PEEBLES	99	100	-1.0%	15,572	15,512	0.4%
PERTH	495	510	-2.9%	61,910	64,146	-3.5%
RENFREW	165	166	-0.6%	25,388	25,881	-1.9%
ROSS & CROMARTY	501	507	-1.2%	25,382	25,648	-1.0%
ROXBURGH	254	255	-0.4%	49,534	49,259	0.6%
SELKIRK	59	62	-4.8%	10,427	10,273	1.5%

County	Number of holdings		% change from 2020	Number of cattle		% change from 2020
	2021	2020		2021	2020	
			2020			2020
SHETLAND	157	156	0.6%	4,928	4,825	2.1%
STIRLING	255	262	-2.7%	37,456	37,532	-0.2%
SUTHERLAND	218	224	-2.7%	7,499	7,323	2.4%
WEST LOTHIAN	77	78	-1.3%	13,207	13,986	-5.6%
WIGTOWNSHIRE	428	427	0.2%	136,261	133,167	2.3%

Table 4: Total number of cattle holdings and number of cattle per county for Wales, based on July 2021 records. Data for counties with 6 or fewer holdings have been excluded from this table for data protection reasons.

County	Number of holdings		% change from 2020	Number of cattle		% change from 2020
	2021	2020		2021	2020	
			2020			2020
CLWYD	1,452	1,454	-0.1%	184,749	181,646	1.7%
DYFED	3,723	3,773	-1.3%	491,905	484,593	1.5%
GWENT	649	661	-1.8%	59,761	61,481	-2.8%
GWYNEDD	1,885	1,899	-0.7%	177,113	172,352	2.8%
MID GLAMORGAN	333	342	-2.6%	20,748	20,696	0.3%
POWYS	1,982	2,004	-1.1%	180,324	181,918	-0.9%
SOUTH GLAMORGAN	137	136	0.7%	17,044	17,776	-4.1%
WEST GLAMORGAN	291	291	0.0%	17,501	17,947	-2.5%