



Assessment of animal welfare and environmental impact

C. Leeb

Scientific Workshop on Organic Pig Production

Hovborg

June 12th-13th 2013

Organic pigs outdoors



CORE organic II



Organic pigs indoors with concrete outside run



CORE organic II





Overview

- Introduction to ProPIG
- How to assess animal welfare and environmental impact?
 - Examples
- How to/how do they relate to each other?
- Conclusions



ERA-net CORE Organic II **ProPIG** (2011-2014)

Farm specific strategies to reduce environmental impact
by improving health, welfare and nutrition of organic
pigs



Aim of this project,

- to investigate the **interaction of animal health and welfare**, with nutrition and environmental impact
- to create and disseminate a **tool to improve both aspects** of organic pig production.

Partners



- 9 Partners in 8 Countries (AT, CH, CZ, DE, DK, FR, IT, UK)
- Coordination: C. Leeb , Austria

Austria: **C. Winckler**, G. Rudolph and **C. Leeb** (BOKU)

Czechia: **J. Urban (Bio-I)**, G. Illman (IAS, Prague)

Denmark: **T. Rousing**, **J.T. Soerensen** (Aarhus Univ.)

France: **A. Prunier**, **J.Y. Dourmand**, **F. Vertes** (INRA)

Germany: **S. Dippel** (FLI) and C. Simatke (BAT)

Italy: **D. Bochicchio** (CRA-SUI)

Switzerland: **B. Früh**, **M. Meier**, **A. Berner** (FIBL)

UK: **S. Edwards**, **G. Butler** (Univ. Newcastle)

(Sweden: **E. Salomon**, **K. Lindgren**, A.K. Lind (JTI))



ProPIG „Three Systems“



CORE organic II



75 farms in 8 countries

To identify

- animal - environment interactions
- in **three systems**:



Indoor with concrete
outside run

=?



Partly outdoor

=?



Outdoor

Hypothesis

All systems are able to ensure good welfare and low environmental impact
when well managed

ProPIG


Farm specific strategies for improvement

To develop and implement

- **Farm specific strategies** to:
 - reduce **environmental impacts**
 - by improving health, welfare, nutrition and management
- To **disseminate knowledge** to national advisory bodies and farmers




CORE organic II



WP1: Definition of systems and development of assessment protocols of animal health, welfare and environmental impacts

WP leader: UK, Sandra Edwards/Gillian Butler)

- Definition of **Systems** (indoor/partly indoor/outdoor)
- **Development of Assessment protocols**
 - **Animal health and Welfare:** e.g. Clinical scoring, medicine records
 - **Environmental impact:** LCA, nutrient balances
 - **Farmer:** qualitative interviews, basic economical data
- **Automatic** recording and feedback: **PigSurfer**
- „**Decision Support Tool**“ for environmental impact



Introduction


WP 2: On-farm assessment and application of improvement strategies of animal health, welfare and environmental impacts

WP leader: Denmark, Tine Rousing

Prospective cohort observational study
75 farms (3 systems of 25 farms each)
Training and Interobserver Repeatability
3 Farm visits



CORE organic II



1. pregnant sows: investigating enrichment:

20% best farms				20% worst farms	Your farm on 02.05.2012 (mean based on 4 value(s))
52.5 - 41.5 %	41.5 - 38.5 %	38.5 - 34.2 %	34.2 - 27.8 %	27.8 - 11.6 %	31.2 %




WP 3: Analysis, evaluation and dissemination

WP leader: Germany, Sabine Dippel

1. **Comparison of three systems** regarding animal health, welfare and environmental impact
2. **Detailed analysis of effect of farming type** on health and welfare and productivity
3. **Evaluation of improvement strategies**
4. **Dissemination:**
 - Website, articles (farmer journals/scientific)
 - Handbooks and training material for advisors
 - National and international stakeholder meetings

Welfare



Assess

Relationship

Housing

Nutrition

Breeding



e.g. training



e.g. space, bedding



e.g. system, ration



e.g. breeding goals

INPUTS



OUTCOME

How to measure?

WELFARE



Pathology/physiology




e.g. lesions, BCS

Behaviour



e.g. social behaviour

Records



e.g. treatments, mortality

First results- Two Austrian farms



CORE organic II

farrow to finish farms,
approx. 25 sows, F1 (LRxES), mainly home grown feeds

Indoor



Partly outdoor






First results- Animal welfare



Thin sows

20% best farms				20% worst farms	Ihr Betrieb am 18.07.2012 (Mittelwert basiert auf: 19 Werte)
0.0 - 5.3 %	5.3 - 10.5 %	10.5 - 14.3 %	14.3 - 22.2 %	22.2 - 54.5 %	5.3 %

 <p>Condition Score 1: The sow is visually thin, with hips and backbone very prominent and no fat cover over hips and backbone.</p>	 <p>Condition Score 2: The hip bones and backbone are easily felt without any pressure on the palms.</p>	 <p>Condition Score 3: It takes firm pressure with the palm to feel the hip bones and backbone.</p>	 <p>Condition Score 4: It is impossible to feel the bones at all even with pressure on the palm of the hands.</p>	 <p>Condition Score 5: The sow is carrying so much fat that it is impossible to feel the hip bones and backbone even by pushing down with a single finger.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

First results- Animal welfare



Skin lesions

20% best farms				20% worst farms	Ihr Betrieb am 18.07.2012 (Mittelwert basiert auf: 19 Werte)
0.0 - 0.0 %	0.0 - 11.1 %	11.1 - 19.0 %	19.0 - 27.3 %	27.3 - 51.4 %	47.4 %



Environmental impact



Global warming Potential

e.g. Basset-Mens & van der Werf, 2005; Olea et al., 2009; Halberg et al, 2010, Rigolot et al, 2010



Nutrient flow (N and P)

e.g. Schröder et al., 2003

Soil characteristics

e.g. Gee and Bauer, 1986

Assess

Welfare

Housing/Outdoors

Nutrition

Manure management



e.g. training



e.g. space, bedding



e.g. system, ration





e.g. cleaning frequency


INPUTS

How to measure?

Environmental impact



Global warming potential Modell (Rigolot et al., 2010)




First results-

CO₂-eq Emissions of Austrian organic pig farms
in kg CO₂-eq/1000kg finishing pig
(live weight at slaughter)



CORE organic II



Brandhofer 2013

First results-

N and P

balances of Austrian organic pig farms

Betrieb	N-Bilanz (kg N/ha/a)	P-Bilanz (kg P/ha/a)
AT001	17	-6
AT002	-30	-6
AT004+AT006	-10	-3
AT007	7	-4*
AT008	-10	-7*
AT009	3	1*
AT011+AT015	15	-3
AT013	12	4
AT016	5	-2*
AT003	-12	3
AT005+AT012	-11	2*
AT014	42	28*
Durchschnitt indoor	1,0	-2,9
Durchschnitt partly outdoor	6,3	11,0



How to relate?

1. Individual parameters?

– Mange eradication:

- prevalence of ectoparasites vs. Treatment incidence



– Outdoor areas:

- rooting behaviour vs. vegetation cover







How to relate?

2. Combination of few, selected parameters „Cluster“?



- E.g. **Physical welfare**: treatment incidences plus lesions, lameness
- **E.g. Direct animal impact on environment**: Medicinal input, Vegetation cover,





How to relate?

3. Compare e.g. WQ[®] Score of farm with e.g. CO₂-eq Emissions?



How do they relate?



CORE organic II

	Environment +	Environment 0	Environment -
Animal health, welfare & nutrition +	Mange eradication Optimised ration Regular removal of manure in outside run Health management	Adequate amount of bedding	Access to forest Access to natural water sources
Animal health, welfare & nutrition 0	Origin of food stuff Manure storage Food conversion rate		Protein surplus in Ration Feed losses High spacial variability in N and P load
Animal health, welfare & nutrition -	Nose rings of sows	Respiratory problems	High density of pigs outdoors Rotation interval inadequate

First results- Ectoparasites




CORE organic II

Treatment incidence Parasites sows

20% best farms				20% worst farms	Ihr Betrieb am 18.07.2012 (Mittelwert basiert auf: 20 Werte)
0.0 - 0.0 %	0.0 - 100.0 %	100.0 - 100.0 %	100.0 - 187.5 %	187.5 - 200.0 %	190.0 %

Treatment incidence Parasites weaners

33% best farms		33% worst farms	Ihr Betrieb am 18.07.2012 (Mittelwert basiert auf: 262 Werte)
0.0 - 0.0 %	0.0 - 0.0 %	0.0 - 100.0 %	87.4 %



First results-

Ectoparasites- Mange eradication



Treatment incidence Parasites sows

20% best farms				20% worst farms	Ihr Betrieb am 18.07.2012 (Mittelwert basiert auf: 20 Werte)
0.0 - 0.0 %	0.0 - 100.0 %	100.0 - 100.0 %	100.0 - 187.5 %	187.5 - 200.0 %	190.0 %

Treatment incidence Parasites weaners

33% best farms		33% worst farms	Ihr Betrieb am 18.07.2012 (Mittelwert basiert auf: 262 Werte)
0.0 - 0.0 %	0.0 - 0.0 %	0.0 - 100.0 %	87.4 %

When well managed!

Conclusions



- **Selected aspects** of animal welfare and environmental impact can be assessed on farm
- Still to be discussed **how to relate** them to each other
 - Concrete hypothesis
 - Specific – measureable - outcomes
- High influence of **management** - variation within systems larger than across systems
- Allowing to identify solutions





CORE organic II

Thank you!
Questions?



Further information: <http://www.coreorganic2.org/propig>

References



- Basset-Mens, C., van der Werf HMG. (2005): Scenario-based environmental assessment of farming systems: the case of pig production in France Agriculture., Ecosystem and Environment, 105, 127-144.
- Brandhofer, R. (2013): Umweltwirkungen biologischer Schweinehaltung: Vergleich zweier Haltungssysteme auf Basis des THG-Potentials sowie einer N- und P- Bilanz. Master thesis, University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences Vienna, unpublished.
- Duncan, IJD (1993): Welfare is to do with what animals feel. J Agric Environ Ethics (Special Suppl 2): 8-14.
- Fraser, AF Broom, DM. (1990): *Farm Animal Behaviour and Welfare*, 3rd edition. Bailliere Tindall, London, England
- Gee, G.W., Bauder, J.W. (1986): Particle size analysis. p. 383-412. In A. Klute (ed.) Methods of soil analysis; Part 1. 2nd ed. Agron. Monogr. 9. ASA and SSSA, Madison, WI.
- Halberg, N., Hermansen, JE., Kristensen, IS., Eriksen, J., Tvedegaard, N. and Petersen, BM. (2010): Impact of organic pig production systems on CO₂ emission, C sequestration and nitrate pollution. Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 30: 721-731.
- Olea, R., Guy, J., Edge, H., Stockdale, EA. and Edwards, SA. (2009): Pigmeat supply chain: Life Cycle Analysis of contrasting pig farming scenarios, Aspects of Applied Biology, 95, 91-96.
- Rollin, B.E. (1993): Animal welfare, science and value. J. agric. environ. Ethics, 6 (Suppl. 2), 44-50.
- Schröder, JJ., Aarts, HFM., ten Berge, HFM., van Keulen, H. and Neeteson, JJ. (2003): An evaluation of whole-farm nitrogen balances and related indices for efficient nitrogen use. European Journal of Agronomy, 20, 33-44.