



**HAL**  
open science

## Impact of organic pig production systems on CO<sub>2</sub> emission, C sequestration and nitrate pollution

Niels Halberg, John E. Hermansen, Ib Sillebak Kristensen, Jørgen Eriksen,  
Niels Tvedegaard, Bjørn Molt Petersen

► **To cite this version:**

Niels Halberg, John E. Hermansen, Ib Sillebak Kristensen, Jørgen Eriksen, Niels Tvedegaard, et al..  
Impact of organic pig production systems on CO<sub>2</sub> emission, C sequestration and nitrate pollution.  
Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 2010, 30 (4), 10.1051/agro/2010006 . hal-00886423


**HAL Id: hal-00886423**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00886423>**

Submitted on 11 May 2020

**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.



## Research article

# Impact of organic pig production systems on CO<sub>2</sub> emission, C sequestration and nitrate pollution

Niels HALBERG<sup>1\*</sup>, John E. HERMANSEN<sup>2</sup>, Ib Sillebak KRISTENSEN<sup>2</sup>, Jørgen ERIKSEN<sup>2</sup>, Niels TVEDEGAARD<sup>3</sup>,  
Bjørn Molt PETERSEN<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> International Centre for Research in Organic Food Systems, PO Box 50, 8830 Tjele, Denmark

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, University of Aarhus, Department of Agroecology & Environment, PO Box 50, 8830 Tjele, Denmark

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Food and Resource Economics, Rolighedsvej 25, 1958 Frederiksberg C, Denmark

(Accepted 8 February 2010)

**Abstract** – Organic rules for grazing and access to outdoor areas in pig production may be met in different ways, which express compromises between considerations for animal welfare, feed self-reliance and negative environmental impact such as greenhouse gas emissions and nitrate pollution. This article compares the environmental impact of the main organic pig systems in Denmark. Normally, sows are kept in huts on grassland and finishing pigs are raised in stables with access to an outdoor run. One alternative practice is also rearing the fattening pigs on grassland all year round. The third method investigated was a one-unit pen system mainly consisting of a deep litter area under a climate tent and with restricted access to a grazing area. Using life cycle assessment (LCA) methodology, the emissions of greenhouse gases of the free range system were estimated to be 3.3 kg CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalents kg<sup>-1</sup> live weight pig, which was significantly higher than the indoor fattening system and the tent system, yielding 2.9 and 2.8 kg CO<sub>2</sub>-eq. kg<sup>-1</sup> pig, respectively. This was 7–22% higher compared with Danish conventional pig production but, due to the integration of grass-clover in the organic crop rotations these had an estimated net soil carbon sequestration. When carbon sequestration was included in the LCA then the organic systems had lower greenhouse gas emissions compared with conventional pig production. Eutrophication in nitrate equivalents per kg pig was 21–65% higher in the organic pig systems and acidification was 35–45% higher per kg organic pig compared with the conventional system. We conclude that, even though the free range system theoretically has agro-ecological advantages over the indoor fattening system and the tent system due to a larger grass-clover area, this potential is difficult to implement in practice due to problems with leaching on sandy soil. Only if forage can contribute to a larger proportion of the pigfeed uptake may the free range system be economically and environmentally competitive. Improvement of nitrogen cycling and efficiency is the most important factor for reducing the overall environmental load from organic pig meat. Presently, a system with pig fattening in stables and concrete-covered outdoor runs seems to be the best solution from an environmental point of view.

agroecology / life cycle assessment / nutrient losses / organic / pig production

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A large part of the European pig production is carried out in very intensive systems with the animals confined indoors in capital-demanding stables, being fed optimised diets with supplementation of – among others — synthetic amino acids (Dourmad et al., 1999). A high proportion of the feed is imported rather than grown on the farm, and many large pig farms do not have sufficient land for the utilisation of manure and depend on export of slurry (De Clercq et al., 2001). Although the biological productivity of these systems is often high, the externalities in terms of reduced animal welfare and environmental impact through losses of nutrients have been questioned by society (Fernández and Fuller, 1999;

Tamminga, 2003). Organic pig production has emerged as an alternative with the multiple aims of improving animal welfare by supporting to a higher extent the pig's natural behaviour (Hermansen et al., 2003), and improving soil fertility by linking crop and livestock production better from an agro-ecological point of view. The latter perspective has become even more interesting as a potential way to contribute to carbon mitigation by increasing soil organic matter. Moreover, some organic systems aim at reducing the need for resources and capital for investment in stables and other infrastructure. The European Commission uses “*The area under organic farming*” in general as an indicator for the development of environmentally-friendly farming practices (EEA, 2005).

The differences between organic and conventional pig production are more fundamental than, for example, differences

\* Corresponding author: Niels.Halberg@icrofs.org

between dairy production systems, which may be why the percentage of organic pig herds is considerably lower than the percentage of organic dairy herds compared with conventional herds in the UK (Defra, 2009), Germany (Willer, et al., 2002) and Denmark (Plant Directorate, 2008). However, a recent development has seen a dramatic increase in demand for organic pig meat in Denmark, Germany and the UK, and present production in Europe cannot meet demand (Alrøe and Halberg, 2008; Padel et al., 2009). Approximately 80 000 organic pigs were produced yearly in Denmark in 2007 and 2008, 60% of which were exported mainly to the UK, Germany and France, making Denmark the largest exporter of organic pig products globally. Besides regulation on use of feedstuffs, organic pig production has a major challenge in the regulation for housing. The sows need access to grazing in summer time, and growing pigs need as a minimum requirement access to an outdoor run. In addition, the area requirements for indoor housing are higher than for conventional production.

These requirements have a major impact on what systems to consider, both from economic and agro-ecological points of view. Therefore, efforts to improve organic pig production should focus on the integration of livestock production and land use, but considering environmental impacts on local and global scales.

The most commonly used system in Denmark is to combine an outdoor sow production all year round with rearing growing pigs in barns with an outdoor run (Hermansen and Jakobsen, 2004). The type of stable most commonly used by full-time producers in Denmark is a system with deep litter in the entire indoor area or a deep litter/straw bed in half the area (Fig. 1a). The outdoor run consists of a concrete area (Fig. 1b) from which the manure can be collected, as a way to comply with the environmental regulations aiming at preventing leaching.

Research shows that very good production results can be obtained in such systems in terms of litter size, daily gain, feed consumption and health (Hermansen et al., 2003). However, two possible drawbacks exist. First, the space requirement per growing pig in housing facilities is considerable and, thus, capital-demanding. For fattening pigs of 85–100 kg live weight, the indoor space required is equivalent to 1.3 m<sup>2</sup>/pig (of which at least 0.65 m<sup>2</sup> must consist of a solid floor) and a 1.0-m<sup>2</sup> outdoor run (Council Regulation, 1999). In addition, each lying zone, i.e. straw bedding area, must be able to accommodate all pigs at a time. This puts a heavy burden on costs of buildings, and at the same time, it can be questioned if such rearing systems comply with the consumer expectations. Second, outdoor sow production has been connected with a high environmental burden in the form of N losses (Larsen et al., 2000; Eriksen, 2001).

This made us consider two alternatives to the presently most often used organic pig system. A system where all pigs were reared outdoors on grassland (and saving buildings, Fig. 2) and a system where sows and growing pigs were kept in a tent system placed upon a deep litter area in order to reduce risk of N leaching (Fig. 3). Both systems have been used under commercial conditions. In order to assess the possible trade-offs between environmental impacts on the one hand, and the




(a)



(b)

**Figure 1.** Stable for organic pig fattening, deep litter with partly concrete floor and access to outdoor run covered with concrete.

assumed advantages of these alternative systems (animal welfare, low investment) on the other hand, an Environmental Impact Assessment was needed. Environmental assessment of livestock farming systems can be done on an area basis (e.g. nutrient losses per ha; Eriksen et al., 2006) or on a product basis (e.g. Greenhouse Gas emission per kg meat or milk; Haas et al., 2001; van der Werf and Petit, 2002; de Boer, 2003; Halberg et al., 2005; Dalgaard, 2008). The area-based assessment is relevant for locally important emissions such as nitrate leaching but a product-based assessment is more relevant for emissions which have a less localised impact (acidification) or even a global character (greenhouse gases (Halberg et al., 2005)). Moreover, since organic production is often considered a more sustainable alternative to conventional intensive pig production, from a consumer point of view it might be interesting to compare the emissions per kg meat produced from different organic systems with emissions produced from conventional systems.



**Figure 2.** Fattening pigs outdoors in fenced grass-clover paddocks as part of crop rotation.

Basset-Mens and van der Werf (2005) compared three models of pig production, conventional, organic and an intermediate “label rouge”, and found that the organic scenario had lower emissions per ha. However, organic production had higher land use and greenhouse gas emission per kg pig compared with conventional production, and similar eutrophication and acidification. Only one type of organic production system was modelled in this comparison. Degré et al. (2007) compared the environmental impact of pig production on seven mixed organic and free range farms with seven specialised conventional pig farms and found that differences within each of the three groups were equally important as differences between the three systems. The objectives of this paper are: 1. to compare the environmental impact of organic pig production systems with different levels of integration of livestock and land use, and 2. to assess the relative importance of land use strategies and carbon sequestration for the environmental profile of the pork.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Three models of organic pig production systems were established based on a synthesis of empirical data from on-farm studies and experimental production systems as explained in detail below. The emissions per ha from each farm type were modelled using state-of-the-art methodology for nutrient balances, ammonia volatilisation and greenhouse gases. Finally, the environmental impact per kg pork produced was assessed using standard Life Cycle Assessment methodology.

### 2.1. Models of organic pig production

Three different systems were considered. The point of departure was the most commonly used system today in Denmark, where the sow herd is kept on grassland with access to



**Figure 3.** One unit pen tent system for outdoor pig production from piglet to slaughter weight on deep litter straw bedding and access to small grazing plots.

small huts for protection, and the fattening pigs are kept in indoor facilities (“indoor fattening” system, Figs. 1a, b). The construction of indoor facilities consisted of a house with natural ventilation, a deep bedded indoor area, a slatted floor area indoors, a slatted floor area outdoors and a concrete area outdoors (Møller, 2000). The system allows collection of a part of the manure in liquid form.

As one alternative, fattening pigs were reared on grassland all year round, i.e. reducing housing facilities to movable steel huts, no collection of manure, but moving pigs in the crop rotation from year to year (“free range” system, Fig. 2). The other alternative considered was a one-unit pen system as described in principle by Andersen et al. (2000) and Jensen and Andersen (2005) (“tent” system, Fig. 3). In this system, climate tents – containing 4 pens – are placed upon a deep litter area on a floor of seashells on the soil surface. From this area pigs have access to grazing when suitable. Walls are made of wood and polyethylene besides straw, and the tent is made of polyethylene as well. Four sows farrow at a time. At weaning, sows are moved to another tent facility and the fattening pigs stay in the facility until slaughter. At that time the deep litter is removed and utilised as fertiliser.

### 2.2. Bio-technical results in different organic pig production systems

Very few baseline data from commercial organic pig production have been published. Whereas litter size is not expected to be different in organic systems from conventional systems, number of farrowings per sow and year are reduced due to the longer lactation period in organic systems, and this affects the number of weaned piglets per sow and year. Lauritsen et al. (2000) observed 1.9 litters per sow a year in organic production compared with 2.26 in conventional pig production. This, in combination with data on the number of piglets weaned per sow in commercial organic pig farms (Larsen and Kongsted, 2000; Strudsholm, 2004; Jensen and

Andersen, 2005) made us conclude that a reasonable estimate would be the weaning of 19 piglets per sow and year with no differences between the organic systems.

Regarding efficiency in finisher production both a higher (Millet et al., 2004), and a lower daily gain (Hansen et al., 2001) have been observed compared with conventional production. In both references feed conversion was slightly poorer in the organic systems. This probably reflects a two-sided effect, where the more space in the organic housing system stimulates growth compared with conventional production, but the poorer possibilities to adjust feed composition in the organic system result in a higher feed consumption per kg gain.

However, growth rates and feed use seem to be comparable in indoor and outdoor housing (Lee et al., 1995; Sather et al., 1997; Strudsholm and Hermansen, 2005) and therefore, results observed under commercial Danish conditions by Strudsholm (2004) – daily gain 740 g/d and feed consumption per kg gain 3.0 SFU (Scandinavian Feed Units = Barley equivalents) – were used in the three models.

Based on these bio-technical results we established three models of different organic pig production systems. All three systems had the same total production of 1800 fattening pigs (100 kg live weight) per year from a total of 100 sows with own replacement and a total land area of 84 ha. In the indoor fattening system and the free range system, sows were kept in simple, movable semi-isolated huts in grassland, while the fattening pigs were either moved to stables with access to an outdoor concrete area (“indoor fattening” system) or also raised in (separate) huts (“free range” system). In the tent system all animals were housed in tents on deep litter straw bedding on a layer of blue shells and with access to a limited grazing area.

The feed use per sow including recruitment was 2200 SFU year<sup>-1</sup>, 30 SFU was used per piglet from 18–30 kg weight and 217 SFU per grown pig from 30–100 kg weight in all three systems. Cereals contributed to 57% of feed rations, protein-rich feed contributed to 33% and silage/grass-clover contributed to the remaining 10%.

The area with grassland for outdoor keeping of livestock was calculated according to Danish public rules for free range organic pig production (European Commission, 2000; Ministry of Environment, 2002), which allow a stocking rate expected to deposit 280 kg N/ha every second year. This determined the crop rotation to a large extent and – as a consequence – grassland accumulated to 48% of the area in system II (Tab. I). Next, crops were chosen in order to best fulfil the feed requirements of the herd under the restrictions of maximum 15% of the total land grown with rapeseed and peas – respectively – in the crop rotation due to risks of soil-borne pathogens. The rest of the feed requirements for the herd were assumed to be imported from outside the farm, which resulted in the free range system importing a higher percentage of feed due to the limited area with cereals.

### 2.3. Estimation of crop yield in the system

In Denmark 598 organic arable farmers reported their cash crop yields with economic accounts during the period of

**Table I.** Land use and crop yields in three modelled types of organic pig production.

Characteristics of system	Indoor fattening	Free range	Tent system
Area use, ha	84	84	84
- grain cereals, %	52	39	55
- pea and lupine, %	14	6	15
- winter rape, %	14	7	13
- grass/clover/alfalfa, %	20	48	18
Manure on crops, kg N ha <sup>-1</sup>			
- grain cereals	116	0	142
- pea and lupine	0	0	70
- winter rape	230	0	240
- grass/clover/alfalfa	195	260	214
Average over all crops	132	124	157
Crop yields			
- grain cereals, kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	4343	3625	4592
- pea and lupine, kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	2592	2770	2642
- winter rape, kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	2610	1482	2922
- grass/clover/alfalfa, SFU ha <sup>-1</sup>	4088	1707	4491
Average over all crops, SFU ha <sup>-1</sup>	3856	2381	4053

1999–2002 (Anonymous, 2002). The characteristics of the farms are given by Kristensen (2005). The recorded grain yield per ha on farms with sandy soils (less than 10% clay, corresponding to USDA (1990) soil texture classes loamy sand and sandy loam) and mostly no irrigation was on average 3410 kg cereal (*Avena Sativa* L., *Hordeum vulgare* L., *Triticum aestivum* L.), 1890 kg winter rape (*Brassica napus* L.) and 2770 kg peas (*Pisum sativum* L.). These yields were achieved with an average input of 70 kg N per ha of animal manure. The grass/clover fields consisted of a mixture of mainly *Lolium perenne* L., *Poa pratensis* L., *Festuca Pratensis* L. and *Trifolium repens* L. or alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) in pure stand. It was assumed that all the area with grass/clover was ploughed each year, and that the N left over and mineralised from crop and root residuals equalled 70 kg N per ha available for a following cereal crop (Anonymous, 2005). The resulting expected crop yields per ha used in the three farm models are given in Table I.

In the tent system the manure production available for redistribution was 23% higher than in the indoor fattening system, due to high straw import for bedding in the deep litter in the one-unit pen system, and the fact that a higher proportion of manure deposited by sows was collected. This resulted in slightly higher yield of cereals in the tent system. The average net yield in grass/clover was determined in each system as a combination of the grazing area needed to comply with regulations in minimum area per grazing animal and the assumed roughage uptake by the sows and pigs. This resulted in relatively low estimated net yields in the free range system because of a need for a large grass-clover area, which cannot be used effectively as feed by the pigs under the current feeding practices.

## 2.4. Estimating emissions from the pig production model farms

Based on the import of feed and straw and the export of live pigs and cash crops, farm gate Nitrogen (N) and Phosphorus (P) balances were established following methods described in Halberg et al. (1995) and Kristensen et al. (2005). The farm gate balance included deposition (estimated at 16 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in Denmark) and Biological Nitrogen Fixation (BNF), which was assumed to be 75 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> grassland, taking into account high levels of N returned from grazing livestock in all the systems. Subsequently, partial nutrient balances for the herds, the manure stores and fields were established in order to estimate partial losses of N in ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) volatilisation and denitrification.

Sommer et al. (2001) have shown that NH<sub>3</sub> volatilisation from grassland grazed by sows primarily depends on feed inputs. Therefore, NH<sub>3</sub> losses were estimated as 23% of the N surplus of the grazed area (Eriksen et al., 2002; Gustafson and Svennson, 2003; Williams et al., 2000).

Denitrification was estimated using the SimDen model (Vinther and Hansen, 2004) based on added N and soil type, and this model also estimated the proportion of Dinitrogen monoxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) in total denitrification (N<sub>2</sub>O+N<sub>2</sub>). SimDen does not account for the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management and storage, or the indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in recipients of the ammonia and nitrate emissions from the farm. This was estimated according to IPCC principles using the fractions 0.025 and 0.01 of Nitrate-N (NO<sub>3</sub>-N) leached and NH<sub>3</sub>-N volatilised, respectively (IPCC, 2000). In the indoor fattening system and the tent system emission factors of 0.001 and 0.1 of N in slurry and deep litter straw bedding, respectively, were used (IPCC, 2000).

Ammonia loss from indoor growing pigs was estimated using Danish standards: loss of 15% NH<sub>3</sub>-N in slurry and 10% in deep litter (Poulsen et al., 2001). In the tent system the total gaseous N losses were estimated to be 25% of deposited manure N. Partial estimates of nitrate leaching from grasslands and cereal crops following the first year after ploughing grass clover swards were estimated following Eriksen (2001).

The farm-level nitrate emission was estimated from the soil balance after deducting airborne emissions and soil N change and checked against the field level estimates. Changes in soil N were calculated on the basis of the C inputs from manure and crop residues and the current soil C/N, using a dynamic model (C-tool), which is outlined in Gyldenkærne et al. (2007). The change in soil N used here is that which is predicted to occur after 10 years.

## 2.5. Product-based environmental assessment of pork from 3 model farm types

In order to calculate the aggregated resource use and environmental impact through the production chain for organic pigs in the three systems, consequential Life Cycle Assessment methodology was applied (Wenzel et al., 1997;

Anonymous, 2001; Ekvall and Weidema, 2004). The functional unit was defined as one kg of live weight pig delivered from the farm. The system was defined as the production on-farm (herd and crops), the off-farm production and transport of feed off-farm, and the production of the building material for housing and of energy for electricity and traction.

For each farm type a process was established in the Life Cycle Assessment tool Simapro Version 7.01 (Anonymous, 2006) using the databases LCAfood (Nielsen et al., 2003; Dalgaard et al., 2006) and Ecoinvent (Ecoinvent Centre, 2004) with purchased feed and diesel for traction as the main input from the “techno-sphere” to the pig production. The environmental impact categories considered were eutrophication, acidification, Global Warming Potential (emissions of greenhouse gases), ozone depletion and land use following the principles of EDIP 97 (Wenzel et al., 1997, updated version 2.3).

## 2.6. Uncertainty analysis and Monte Carlo simulation

An analysis of the influence of uncertainty on the comparative assessment of the emissions from the three pig systems was carried out using the Monte Carlo simulation tool in SimaPro (Anonymous, 2006). This involved running 300 pairwise comparisons where the LCA tool randomly chooses values for emissions and inputs according to the chosen distributions and counting the frequency of results where one system had a higher environmental impact than the other. Differences are considered significant if 95% of the iterations are in favour of one of the compared systems, following Huijbregts (1998). The uncertainty on the nutrient emissions was determined based on the aggregated coefficient of variation on the farm gate N balance calculated from the coefficients of variation of the individual input and output items (Kristensen et al., 2004; Dalgaard et al., 2006).

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1. Farm-level environmental impact

Table II shows the N balances (kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>year<sup>-1</sup>) on herd, land and farm levels in a coherent setup, which accounts for the total internal and external N flows. The N balances of the three organic pig production systems differed mainly with respect to the amount of imported protein in feed due to the different land use. The indoor fattening system imported 140 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> with cereals and concentrates, which accounted for 61% of the 229 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in total feed protein and straw supplied to the herd. The free range system had a higher feed N import – 73% of total N to the herd – due to a larger grassland area. In the tent system the feed import was comparable with system I, but due to the need for straw for the bedding the total N input from outside the farm was higher. The free range system had the highest N surplus per ha (land and farm level) and the highest denitrification due to the dominant grazing area. The total emission of NH<sub>3</sub> per ha was at comparable levels in

**Table II.** Nitrogen balances at herd, land and farm levels in three modelled, organic pig production systems.

System I = Indoor fattening II = Free range III = Tent system	Herd level			Land level <sup>a</sup>			Farm gate		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
	(kg nitrogen ha <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )			(kg nitrogen ha <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )			(kg nitrogen ha <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )		
<b>Inputs</b>									
Imported cereals	99	124	96				99	124	96
Concentrates	41	41	41				41	41	41
Straw bedding	5	5	28						23
Seeds				2	1	1	2	1	1
Biological fixation				40	45	39	40	45	39
Deposition				16	16	16	16	16	16
Home-grown cereals and legumes	53	29	57						
Home-grown forages	21	10	27						
Grazing	9	18	2						
Collected manure				97		122			
Deposited manure <sup>b</sup>				51	167	27			
Total input <sup>c</sup>	229	227	251	205	229	206	197	228	216
<b>Outputs</b>									
Home-grown cereals				53	29	57			
Home-grown forages				30	28	29			
Cash crops				12	3	12	12	3	12
Live pigs	60	60	60				60	60	60
Straw				5	5	5			
Total output	60	60	60	100	65	103 <sup>d</sup>	72	64	72
Balance	169	167	190	105	164	102 <sup>d</sup>	125	164	144
<b>Losses</b>									
Denitrification	2		7	12	17	10	14	17	17
<b>NH<sub>3</sub> losses</b>									
Stable and storage	19		18				19		18
Grazing				12	37	6	12	37	6
Spreading and crops				11	4	11	11	4	11
Soil change				24	25	38	24	25	38
Leaching			16 <sup>e</sup>	46	80	37	46	80	53

<sup>a</sup> Balance covering all farmland used on farm including grass-clover, cereals, pulses and cash crops.

<sup>b</sup> Manure deposited directly by livestock during grazing.

<sup>c</sup> Total herd input of feed protein is equal in all systems because protein norms were identical in the three models.

<sup>d</sup> Rounding off errors gives small inconsistencies of 1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>.

<sup>e</sup> Leaching from deep litter bedding calculated as average of total farm area (equals 1440 kg N total from tent area).

all systems but in system II, there was a relatively high emission of NH<sub>3</sub> from manure and urine excreted on the outdoor area. After deduction of gaseous losses and net soil N changes from the N surplus, the resulting NO<sub>3</sub> leaching was highest in the free range system (III) and lowest in system I.

Table III shows the aggregated emissions of NH<sub>3</sub> and the NO<sub>3</sub> and PO<sub>3</sub> leaching and denitrification in kg substance at farm level used as input to the LCA models. The different models of pig production represent trade-offs between emissions. The tent system (III) had lower ammonia loss compared with the indoor fattening system but higher denitrification loss and nitrate leaching. The free range system had the highest N losses, and the higher nitrate leaching from grazed swards in this system may be considered as the major environmental cost of keeping free range fattening pigs.

This is because the potentially improved nutrient cycling from the increased grass-clover area is difficult to establish in reality on sandy soils which are prone to leaching. The higher proportion of grass-clover in the rotation increases BNF and

**Table III.** Farm-level emissions of ammonia, dinitrogen monoxide, nitrate, methane and phosphate in kg year<sup>-1</sup> from three modelled types of organic pig production.

System emissions	Indoor fattening	Free range	Tent system	Estimated CV, % <sup>a</sup>
Ammonia	4164	4183	3548	22
Dinitrogen monoxide	692	843	793	29
Nitrate	17183	29767	19785	15
Phosphate	74	122	109	50
Methane	2174	506	490	50

<sup>a</sup> See methods for explanation.

could improve the cereal yields. But the average effect on the farm level was lower cereal and rapeseed yields per ha (Tab. I) due to lack of manure for the second year cereal crops. This resulted in a higher feed import, which together with high BNF increased the surplus of the farm gate N balance (Tabs. II and III). However, most of this extra N input was lost

**Table IV.** Comparative life cycle assessment of three modelled systems of organic pig production. Environmental impacts per kg live weight pig delivered from the farm.

Impact category	Unit	Indoor fattening	Free range	Tent system
Global warming (greenhouse gas 100)	g CO <sub>2</sub> -eq	2920 b	3320 a	2830 b
Soil C sequestration	g CO <sub>2</sub> -eq	-398	-413	-623 n.a.
Ozone depletion	g CFC <sub>11</sub> -eq	6.9 E-4 b	7.7 E-4 a	6.8 E-4 b
Acidification	g SO <sub>2</sub> -eq	57.3 a	61.4 a	50.9 b
Eutrophication	g NO <sub>3</sub> -eq	269 b	381 a	270 b
Land use	M <sup>2</sup> year <sup>-1</sup>	6.9	9.2	8.5 n.a.

Differences interpreted as significant based on pairwise Monte Carlo simulations giving one system a higher outcome in more than 95% of 300 runs are indicated with small letters. n.a. = not applicable.


through leaching and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions according to experience, documented in the methods section. Therefore, the relatively high nitrate leaching from free range pig fattening would have to be reduced considerably for this system to be environmentally sustainable. One possible way for this could be to reduce the purchased feed and increase the pigs' forage uptake (which presently accounts for only 10% of feed intake, thus equal to the "indoor fattening system" and "tent system"), and hereby increasing the immediate nutrient recycling during the grazing period. However, it remains to be documented that this in fact can be achieved and it can be foreseen that other crops than grass, i.e. root crops, then need to be included in the crop rotation. Another way of reducing N leaching could be to only keep fattening pigs on grassland in the plant growing season (Eriksen et al., 2006), but this is difficult from an economic point of view.

Methane emissions in the indoor fattening system were four times higher than in the free range system and the tent system due to losses during storage of the slurry (Tab. III).

### 3.2. Environmental impact per kg pig

The results of the LCA combining the farm-level emissions and traction with emissions from production and transport of imported feeds, and construction of sow and pig housing are presented in Table IV. The contribution to Global Warming in kg CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents per kg pig was significantly higher (according to the Monte Carlo simulations) in the free range system compared with the indoor fattening system and the tent system, mainly due to the higher emission of N<sub>2</sub>O in the free range system (Tab. III) and the higher feed import (due to smaller cereal and pulse areas, Tab. I). The production and transport of imported feed accounted for 33% of total greenhouse gas emission in the free range system compared with 27 and 26% in the indoor fattening system and the tent system, respectively (Fig. 4). Traction for crop production and fodder handling on the farm accounted for 12% of greenhouse gas in all systems, while emissions from housing and electricity were relatively small. In all systems N<sub>2</sub>O linked to the N cycling on the farm and in production of imported feed contributed by far the largest part of the total greenhouse gas.

The free range system caused approximately 30% higher eutrophication per kg pig compared with the indoor fattening



**Figure 4.** Relative contribution to emissions of greenhouse gases from different sources in three organic pig production systems (% of total emission of greenhouse gases per kg live weight pig from farm).

system and the tent system (significant with 100% Monte Carlo runs higher for the free range system), primarily because of higher nitrate leaching from the grazed swards. Approximately 1/3 of the total eutrophication per kg pig was linked with the production of imported feeds (28–31%, not shown), while emissions on the farm accounted for almost all the rest. Acidification was mainly caused by NH<sub>3</sub> volatilisation in all systems. Diesel use for traction and transport contributed 5–10% of total acidification. The free range system had higher acidification than the tent system, but the difference between acidification in the indoor fattening system and the free range system was not significant.

The greenhouse gas emission from construction and maintenance of housing was lowest in the free range system, 78% higher in the indoor fattening system with stables in concrete and steel, and 180% higher in the tent system, (results not shown). Most of the greenhouse gas emissions and acidification from the construction and use of the tents were caused by transport of the blue shells (20 tonnes per tent every year). However, the different pig housing infrastructures contributed only small proportions of the total greenhouse gas (1–3%), acidification (0.2–1.8%) and eutrophication (0–0.7%) per kg pig (Fig. 4). Erzinger et al. (2004) also showed that housing infrastructure itself was of minor importance for the LCA results of fattening pigs. However, they found that energy use



in stables (mostly for ventilation) for intensive pig production accounted for almost 30% of the energy consumption and that differences in housing methods had a large impact on nutrient-related emissions. This conclusion is supported by our study.

The environmental impacts per kg pig from the organic pig systems are higher than results from the comparable LCAs on conventional Danish pig production in the LCAfood database. Dalgaard et al. (2005) reported emissions from Danish conventional pig production corresponding to 2.7 kg CO<sub>2</sub>-eq, 230 kg NO<sub>3</sub>-eq and 43 kg SO<sub>2</sub>-eq per kg live weight pig at the farm gate, which were comparable with the conventional pig scenario assessed by Basset Mens and van der Werf (2005). Thus, the greenhouse gas emission per kg live weight pig in the indoor fattening system was 7% higher compared with conventional pig production, and the free range system was 22% higher.

This comparison, however, does not take into account the Carbon balances arising from differences in the crop rotations. The 24–38 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> net soil accumulation per year (Tab. II) corresponds to approximately 240–390 kg net C sequestration in the three systems given a C/N ratio of 10 in the “active” pools (Hansen et al., 1991). This C sequestration on the farm corresponds to approximately –0.4, –0.4 and –0.6 kg CO<sub>2</sub>-eq per kg live weight pigs in the three organic systems (Tab. IV) or a reduction of approximately 11–18%. Thus, when including soil carbon sequestration the greenhouse gas emissions per ha and per kg pig from the organic indoor fattening system and the tent system were lower than from conventional pig systems, where the net soil N and C changes were close to neutral (Dalgaard et al., 2006). The differences were larger for eutrophication, where the indoor fattening system and the tent system had 35 and 21% higher emissions compared with the conventional system, while the free range system had 65% higher emission, mainly due to leaching from the grasslands. All organic systems had 18–43% higher acidification per kg pig compared with the conventional system due to larger ammonia losses from, respectively, outdoor runs (the indoor fattening system), grasslands (the free range system) and the deep litter bedding (the tent system).

From previous studies (Dalgaard and Halberg, 2005) it was known that the main determinants of the impact categories greenhouse gas, eutrophication and acidification were the nutrient flows and emissions. Therefore, the uncertainty analysis focused on these emissions and used estimated variance parameters for the emissions rather than each input variable, as suggested by Huijbregts (1998). The estimated CVs of P loss and Methane emissions were less precise, which was justified because of their smaller relative importance to the comparative results of the pig systems under Danish conditions.

### 3.3. Overall comparison of systems

The three modelled organic pig systems are all realistic commercial pig production farms. Tvedegaard (2005) compared the three systems' economic performance and found that the indoor fattening system with outdoor sow herd and fattening pigs kept in indoor facilities is the most cost-efficient

system. The costs are slightly higher in the free range system where the fattening pigs are also kept on grassland. Even though investment costs are lower in the free range system, the overall cost efficiency was better in the indoor fattening system due to lower labour costs. In the tent system the pig production is more expensive, primarily due to the large amounts of straw to be imported from other organic farms.

Motives for free ranging the pigs include animal welfare, reduced environmental and economic costs from construction of stables and the – supposed – agro-ecological advantage of improved crop rotation with grass-clover leys (improved nutrient cycling, including BNF, increased soil fertility, higher crop diversity, and reduction of cereal pests and diseases). However, as mentioned, the reduced investment costs in the free range system and the tent system with no stables were offset by higher labour costs.

As explained, the results confirmed and have quantified the trade-off between objectives for free range, outdoor pig production systems and the objectives of reducing emissions with negative environmental impact. But the study also suggests that another compromise between these different objectives might be found. Thus, the emissions per kg live weight pig delivered from the tent system were on the same level – or possibly lower – compared with the indoor fattening system. This demonstrates that it has been possible under practical conditions to reduce the N-related emissions (from the tent system) compared with the free range system by proper management of the deep litter bedding under the tent, ample supply of straw and a layer of blue shells beneath. The pigs in the tent system have only access to a limited grass-clover area, though these are larger than the outdoor runs in the indoor fattening system. But the integration of pig rearing and land use and the resulting crop rotation in the tent system might not seem different from the indoor fattening system from an agro-ecological perspective (Tab. I). The feed import was slightly lower in the tent system compared with the other systems. The most problematic aspects of the tent system are imports of straw and high labour costs. The indoor fattening system, combining stables with outdoor runs for fattening pigs in combination with free ranging sows, seems to be the most competitive system. And the 20% grass-clover in this system's crop rotation still has an agro-ecological advantage over crop rotations with cash crops and cereals only, and contributes to carbon sequestration.

Compared with conventional systems there is a trade-off between lower eutrophication and acidification in the conventional system and better animal welfare and agro-ecological advantages of better crop rotation in the organic systems. It should be noted that important environmental impacts such as pesticide toxicity were not included in this comparison. Organic agriculture differs from conventional in this respect, but due to methodological limitations this impact was not quantified. Degré et al. (2007) suggested solving such dilemmas by multicriteria analysis using expert evaluations and prioritisation. They concluded that on average the Belgium organic and free range pig production ranked higher than conventional farms but also that “the best conventional farms were close to the best organic and free range farms”. In reality, the prioritisation rests with individual farmers based on their criteria and

assessment of economic prospects vis-à-vis their existing farm structure and market opportunities.

Currently there is an under-supply of organic pork in Denmark and better economic return compared with conventional production, but still a limited growth in organic pig production (Halberg and Alrøe, 2008). The number of organic pigs in the UK increased by 41% in 2008, but still comprises only 1.5% of total pig production (Defra, 2009). This might be explained by the large changes in management options and production facilities when converting from a conventional system.

Even though the systems were modelled specifically under Danish conditions they may also represent typical organic pig production forms in other European countries. Basset-Mens and van der Werf (2005) compared two non-organic pig systems with a modelled organic pig production scenario consisting of outdoor piglet production in farrowing huts and fattening pigs on deep litter straw bedding in a building. Our indoor fattening system resembles the French organic pig production modelled by Basset-Mens and van der Werf (2005) in terms of land use and pig housing. The French model assumed 20.3 weaned piglets sow<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup> compared with 18 in our model and a comparable feed to gain ratio in fattening pigs (3.2 kg feed per kg live weight gain compared with our 3.1, Tab. I). The French organic model showed higher greenhouse gas emission per kg pig and lower acidification and eutrophication compared with the Danish organic indoor fattening system. However, methodological differences make a direct comparison between the two studies problematic. The French study also found that organic pig production had a better environmental performance compared with conventional when calculated per ha, but worse when calculated per kg pig product. But they did not include differences in the soil carbon sequestration as in our study.

Stern et al. (2005) compared three non-organic pig production systems using LCA and showed that a so-called "environmentally-friendly" system with closed stables and slatted floors had approximately 10% lower greenhouse gas emission and nutrient surplus compared with an "animal welfare" system with housing similar to our indoor fattening system. The greenhouse gas emissions per kg meat were comparable with the results of our study (though methodological differences do not allow precise comparisons) but the N and P surpluses were much lower.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Of the systems considered, the indoor fattening system with only grazing sows and fattening pigs in stables had a better economic and environmental performance compared with systems with all pigs on grassland and housed in huts (free range system) or a tent with deep litter straw (tent system). The free range system can be considered an attempt to minimise investment costs and the environmental burden of building concrete stables, to enhance animal welfare and to benefit from agro-ecological advantages of increased grass-clover area in the rotation. However, the present relations between feed uptake, pig production and crop rotation did not ensure efficient

recycling on the sandy soils in the all-grazing system and the nitrate leaching was therefore 50-60% higher compared with the other systems. If the grass-clover could contribute a larger proportion of feed uptake this would reduce the need for purchased feed and improve farm gate nutrient efficiency. The tent system might be a compromise between all-grazing systems and the use of stables because it allows the pigs a more natural behaviour and access to grazing. But the present version is disadvantaged by higher labour costs, and the yearly import of large amounts of straw and shells, which increases transport-related emissions.

Greenhouse gas emissions per kg pig were lower in organic systems compared with conventional when carbon sequestration in soils was included in the life cycle assessment. Eutrophication and acidification per pig was 21–65% higher in the organic systems compared with conventional. The reduction of environmental burdens from organic pig production should focus on improved nutrient cycling at the farm level. Presently, a system with pig fattening in stables and concrete-covered outdoor runs seems to be the best organic pig system from a combined economic and environmental point of view.

#### REFERENCES

- Alrøe H.F., Halberg, N. (2008) Development, growth, and integrity in the Danish organic sector. A knowledge synthesis on the opportunities and barriers for a continued development and market-based growth in production, processing, and scale of organic products, ICROFS in-house report No. 2/2008, 55 p.
- Andersen B.H., Jensen H.F., Møller H.B., Andersen L., Mikkelsen G.H. (2000) Concept for ecological pig production in one-unit pens in twelve-sided climate tents. Design and layout, in: Hermansen J.E., Lund V., Thuen E. (Eds.), Ecological animal husbandry in the Nordic countries. Proceedings from NJF-seminar No. 303, Horsens, Denmark, 16–17 September 1999, Danish Research Centre for Organic Farming, pp. 65–75.
- Anonymous (2001) Livscyklusvurderinger. A commented translation of International Standard, ISO 14040. Environmental management Life cycle assessment – Principles and framework, DS-håndbog 126.
- Anonymous (2002) Regnskabsstatistik for økologisk jordbrug 2000. [Accounts statistics for organic farming], Danish Food Research Institute, Serie G No. 5.
- Anonymous (2003) Fosfor i dansk landbrug. Omsætning, tab og virkemidler mod tab. [PO<sub>3</sub> in Danish Agriculture. Flows, losses and measurements against losses], Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences, 202 p., [http://www.vmp3.dk/Files/Filer/Rap\\_fra\\_t\\_grupper/fosfor-i-dansk-landbrug-oktober-2003.pdf](http://www.vmp3.dk/Files/Filer/Rap_fra_t_grupper/fosfor-i-dansk-landbrug-oktober-2003.pdf).
- Anonymous (2005) Vejledning og skemaer 2005/06. [Instructions and forms for documentation of compliance with Danish agri-environmental regulation] Ministeriet for Fødevarer, Landbrug og Fiskeri, Plantedirektoratet, [http://www.pdir.dk/Files/Filer/Topmenu/Publikationer/Vejledninger/Goedningsregnskab0506/Vejl\\_blanketer\\_godskning\\_harmoni\\_2005-06.pdf](http://www.pdir.dk/Files/Filer/Topmenu/Publikationer/Vejledninger/Goedningsregnskab0506/Vejl_blanketer_godskning_harmoni_2005-06.pdf).
- Anonymous (2006) Introduction to LCA with SimoPro 7, Pré Consultants, 99 p., <http://www.pre.nl/simapro/default.htm>.
- Basset-Mens C., van der Werf H.M.G. (2005) Scenario-based environmental assessment of farming systems: the case of pig production in France, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 105, 127–144.
- Basset-Mens C., van der Werf H.M.G., Durand P., Leterme P. (2006) Implications of Uncertainty and Variability in the Life Cycle Assessment of Pig Production Systems, *Int. J. LCA*, 1–7.

- Basset-Mens C., van der Werf H.M.G., Robin P., Morvan Th., Hassouma M., Paillat J.-M., Vertès F. (2007) Methods and data for the environmental inventory of contrasting pig production systems, *J. Clean. Prod.* 15, 1395–1405.
- Council Regulation (EC) No 1804/1999 (1999) Supplementing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 on organic production of agricultural products and indications referring thereto on agricultural products and foodstuffs to include livestock production, *Off. J. Eur. Communities L* 222, 1–28.
- Dalgaard R.L. (2008) The environmental impact of pork production from a life cycle perspective, PhD Thesis, University of Aarhus and Aalborg University.
- Dalgaard R., Halberg N. (2005) Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of Danish pork, *Proceedings from the International Workshop on Green Pork Production*, May 25–27, Paris, France, p. 165.
- Dalgaard R., Halberg N., Kristensen I.S., Larsen I. (2006) Modelling representative and coherent Danish farm types based on farm accountancy data for use in environmental assessments, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 117, 223–237.
- de Boer I.J.M. (2003) Environmental impact assessment of conventional and organic milk production – a review, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 80, 69–77.
- De Clercq P., Gertsis A.C., Hofman G., Jarvis S.C., Neeteson J.J., Sinabell F. (2001) Environmental pressures and national environmental legislation with respect to nutrient management, in: *Nutrient Management Legislation in European Countries*, Wageningen Press, Wageningen, pp. 33–306.
- Defra (2009) Organic statistics 2008, United Kingdom, National Statistics, 10 p.
- Degré A., Debouche C., Verhè D. (2007) Conventional versus alternative pig production assessed by multicriteria decision analyses, *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 27, 185–195.
- Dourmad J.Y., Sève B., Latimier P., Boisen S., Fernández J., van der Peet-Schwering C., Jongbloed A.W. (1999) Nitrogen consumption, utilisation and losses in pig production in France, The Netherlands and Denmark, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 58, 261–264.
- EEA (2005) The European Environment – State and Outlook 2005, 570 p.
- Ecoinvent Centre (2004) Ecoinvent data v1.1. Final reports ecoinvent 2000 (1-15), Swiss Centre for Life Cycle Inventories, Dübendorf 2004, CD-ROM.
- Ekvall T., Weidema B.P. (2004) System Boundaries and Input Data in Consequential Life Inventory Analysis, *Int. J. LCA* 9, 161–171.
- Ellermann T., Andersen H.V., Monies C., Kemp K., Bossi R., Mogensen B.B., Løfstrøm P., Christensen J., Frohn L.M. (2005) Atmosfærisk deposition 2004, Danmarks Miljøundersøgelser, Faglig rapport fra DMU, NOVANA 555, 1–76.
- Eriksen J. (2001) Implications of grazing by sows for nitrate leaching from grassland and the succeeding cereal crop, *Grass Forage Sci.* 56, 317–322.
- Eriksen J., Hermansen J.E., Strudsholm K., Kristensen K. (2006) Potential loss of nutrients from different rearing strategies for fattening pigs on pasture, *Soil Use Manage.* 22, 256–266.
- Eriksen J., Petersen S.O., Sommer S.G. (2002) The fate of nitrogen in outdoor pig production, *Agronomie* 22, 863–867.
- Erzinger S., Dux D., Zimmermann A., Badertscher Fawaz, R. (2004) LCA of Animal products from Different Housing Systems in Switzerland: Relevance of feedstuffs, Infrastructure and Energy use, in: Halberg N. (Ed.), *Life Cycle Assessment in the Agri-food sector*, Proceedings from the 4th International Conference, October 6–8, 2003, Bygholm, Denmark, DIAS report No. 61, pp. 55–63.
- European Commission (2000) Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC). Status and trends of aquatic environment and agricultural practice – development guide for member states' reports, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, pp. 1–42.
- Fernandez J.A., Fuller M.F. (1999) Nitrogen and Phosphorous Nutrition of the Pig, Special issue, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 58, 197–272.
- Gustafson G.M., Svensson L. (2003) NH<sub>3</sub> emissions from pigs on deep litter beds and in a strip grazing system, *J. Sust. Agric.* 23, 41–51.
- Gyldenkærne S., Petersen B.M., Olesen J.E. (2007) Konsekvenser og muligheder ved Danmarks deltagelse i Kyoto-protokollens artikel 3.4 på landbrugsområdet. Arbejdsrapport fra Miljøstyrelsen Nr. 5.
- Haas G., Wetterich F., Köpke U. (2001) Comparing intensive, extensified and organic grassland farming in southern Germany by process life cycle assessment, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 83, 43–53.
- Halberg N., Kristensen I.S. (1997) Expected yield loss when converting to organic dairy farming in Denmark, *Biol. Agric. Hort.* 14, 25–41.
- Halberg N., Kristensen E.S., Kristensen I.S. (1995) Nitrogen turnover on organic and conventional mixed farms, *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics* 8, 30–51.
- Halberg N., van der Werf H.M.G., Basset-Mens C., Dalgaard R., de Boer I.J.M. (2005) Environmental assessment tools for the evaluation and improvement of European livestock production systems, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 96, 33–50.
- Hansen S., Jensen H.E., Nielsen N.E., Svendsen H. (1991) Simulation of nitrogen dynamics and biomass production in winter wheat using the Danish simulation model DAISY, *Fert. Res.* 27, 245–259.
- Hansen L.L., Magnussen C.C., Andersen H.J. (2001) [Meat and eating quality of organically produced pigs] (in Danish), in: *Økologisk og udedørs svineproduktion*, Internal report 145, Danish Instit. Agric. Sci. 145, 39–40.
- Heidmann T., Christensen B.T., Olesen S.E. (2002) Changes in soil C and N content in different cropping systems and soil types, in: Petersen S.O., Olesen J.E. (Eds.), *Greenhouse Gas Inventories for Agriculture in the Nordic Countries*, Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Report Plant Production, 81, pp. 77–86.
- Hermansen J.E., Jakobsen K. (2004) Meat production in organic farming, in: Jensen W.K., Devine C., Dikeman D. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Meat Science*, Elsevier, pp. 1046–1051.
- Hermansen J.E., Larsen V.A., Andersen B.H. (2003) Development of organic pig production systems, in: Wiseman J., Varley M.A., Kemp B. (Eds.), *Perspectives in pig science*, Nottingham University Press, pp. 97–110.
- Huijbregts M.A.J. (1998) Part II: Dealing with Parameter Uncertainty and Uncertainty due to Choices in Life Cycle Assessment, *Int. J. LCA* 3, 343–351.
- IPCC (2000) Agriculture, in: *Good practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, IPCC, [http://www.grida.no/climate/gpg/english/4\\_Agriculture.pdf](http://www.grida.no/climate/gpg/english/4_Agriculture.pdf).
- Jensen H.F., Andersen B.H. (2005) Seasonal production of small entire male pigs raised in one unit system, in: *Book of Abstracts of the 56th Annual Meeting of the European Association for Animal Production*, Uppsala, Sweden, 5–8 June 2005, Wageningen Academic Publishers, ISBN 9076998663, p. 326.
- Jensen H.F., Andersen B.H., Hermansen J.E. (2002) Concept for one-unit pen on controlled outdoor areas integrated in the land use, in: *Proceedings of the 14th IFOAM Organic World Congress, Cultivating Communities*, 21–24 Aug. 2002, Victoria Conference Centre, Canada, ISBN 0-9695851-5-2, p. 86.
- Kristensen I.S., Kelm M., Kristensen T. (2004) Effects of grassland renovation on farm-gate nitrogen balances and losses, in: Lüscher A., Jeangros B., Kessler W., Huguenin O., Lobsiger M., Millar N., Suter D. (Eds.), *Land Use Systems in Grassland Dominated Regions*, Proceedings of the 20th General Meeting of the European Grassland Federation, Luzern, Switzerland, 21–24, June, pp. 756–758.

- Kristensen I.S., Halberg N., Nielsen A.H., Dalgaard R. (2005) N-turnover on Danish mixed dairy farms. Part II, in: Bos J., Pflimlin A., Aarts F., Vertés F. (Eds.), Nutrient management on farm scale. How to attain policy objectives in regions with intensive dairy farming, Report of the first workshop of the EGF Workshop, <http://www.agrsci.dk/var/agrsci/storage/original/application/21bf0ab8f732a82cffe8951921067d6.pdf>.
- Kristensen I.S., Nielsen A.H., Kristensen, T., Hvid S.K., Kristensen, K. (2004) Usikkerhed ved beregning af nøgletal for miljøpåvirkninger [Uncertainties in calculation of environmental impact], in: Miljøvurdering af landbrugsprodukter [Environmental assessment of agricultural products], Miljørapport 954, pp. 39–46.
- Larsen V.A., Kongsted A.G. (2000) Sows on pasture, in: Hermansen J.E., Lund V., Thuen E. (Eds.), Ecological animal husbandry in the Nordic Countries, DARCOF Report 2, Tjele, Denmark, pp. 99–105.
- Larsen V.A., Kongsted A.G., Kristensen I.S. (2000) Udendørs sohold – Balancer på mark- og bedriftsniveau, in: Sommer S.G., Eriksen J. (Eds.), Husdyrgødning og kompost. Næringsstofudnyttelse fra stald til mark i økologisk jordbrug, FØJO-rapport 7, 67–76.
- Lauritsen H.B., Sørensen G.S., Larsen V.A. (2000) Organic pig production in Denmark, in: Hermansen J.E., Lund V., Thuen E. (Eds.), Ecological Animal Husbandry in the Nordic Countries, DARCOF Report No. 2, Tjele, Denmark, pp. 113–118.
- Millet S., Hesta M., Seynaeve M., Ongenaë E., De Smet S., Debraekeleer J., Janssens G.P.J. (2004) Performance, meat and carcass traits of fattening pigs with organic versus conventional housing and nutrition, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 87, 109–119.
- Ministry of Environment (2002) Executive order on commercial livestock farming, manure, silage etc. (in Danish), BEK. No. 604, Chap. 1–14.
- Møller F. (2000) Housing of finishing pigs within organic farming, in: Hermansen J.E., Lund V., Thuen E. (Eds.), Ecological Animal Husbandry in the Nordic Countries, Proceedings from NJF-seminar No 303, 16–17 September 1999, DARCOF report 2, pp. 93–98.
- Nielsen P.H., Nielsen A.M., Weidema B.P., Dalgaard R., Halberg N. (2003) LCA food database. Representative inventory for resource use and environmental impact of Danish farms and food products, <http://www.lcafood.dk/>.
- Padel S., Schaack D., Willer H. (2009) Development of the Organic Market in Europe. in: Willer H., Kilcher L. (Eds.), The world of organic agriculture. Statistics & emerging trends 2009, IFOAM, FiBL, ITC, pp. 155–161.
- Petersen S.O., Kristensen K., Eriksen J. (2001) Denitrification losses from outdoor piglet production: spatial and temporal variability, *J. Environ. Qual.* 30, 1051–1058.
- Plant Directorate (2008): Statistics on organic farms 2007. Authorizations & Production. (In Danish with English Table headings), 20 p. Available on-line (Feb. 2009): [http://pdir.fvm.dk/Arkiv\\_-\\_%C3%98kologi\\_i\\_tal.aspx?ID=11778](http://pdir.fvm.dk/Arkiv_-_%C3%98kologi_i_tal.aspx?ID=11778).
- Poulsen H.D., Børsting C.F., Rom H.B., Sommer S.G. (2001) Kvælstof, fosfor og kalium i husdyrgødning – normalt 2000. [N, P & K in livestock manure, norms 2000], DJF-rapport, Husdyrbrug 36, pp. 1–152.
- Sommer S.G., Søgaard H.T., Møller H.B., Morsing S. (2001) NH<sub>3</sub> volatilization from pigs on grassland, *Atmos. Environ.* 35, 2023–2032.
- Stern S., Andresen N. (2003) Performance, site preferences, foraging and excretory behaviour in relation to feed allowance of growing pigs on pasture, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 79, 257–265.
- Strid Eriksson I., Elmquist H., Stern S., Nybrant T. (2004) Environmental Systems Analysis of pig production: the impact of feed choice, *Int. J. LCA* 10, 143–154.
- Stern S., Sonesson U., Gunnarsson S., Öborn I., Kumm K.-I., Nybrant T. (2005) Sustainable Development of Food Production: A case Study on Scenarios for Pig Production, *Ambio* 34, 402–407.
- Strudsholm K. (2004) Slagteekvalitet og sygdomsfund hos økologiske slagtesvin, *Grøn Viden, Husdyrbrug* 38, Danmarks Jordbrugs Forskning, 8 p.
- Strudsholm K., Hermansen J.E. (2005) Performance and carcass quality of fully or partly outdoor reared pigs in organic production, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 96, 291–268.
- Tamminga S. (2003) Pollution due to nutrient losses and its control in European animal production, *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 84, 101–111.
- Tersbøl M., Kristensen I.S. (1997) Afgrødeproduktion og økonomi i relation til sædskifte og gødningsforsyning, SP Rapport Statens Planteavlslforsøg 15, 11–36.
- Tvedegaard N. (2005) Økologisk svineproduktion. Økonomien i tre produktionssystemer. Rapport No. 174, Fødevareøkonomisk Institut, Den Kgl. Veterinær- og Landbohøjskole.
- USDA (1990) Keys to Soil Taxonomy, 4th ed., SMSS Technical Monographs No. 19.
- van der Werf H.M.G., Petit M. (2002) Evaluation of the environmental impact of agriculture at the farm level: a comparison and analysis of 12 indicator-based methods, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 93, 131–145.
- van der Werf H.M.G., Petit J., Sanders J. (2005) The environmental impacts of the production of concentrated feed: the case of pig feed in Bretagne, *Agric. Syst.* 83, 153–177.
- Vinther F.P., Hansen S. (2004) SimDen – en simpel model til kvantificering af N<sub>2</sub>O-emission og denitrifikation, DJF rapport, Markbrug Nr. 104.
- Watson C., Edwards S.A. (1997) Outdoor pig production: What are the environmental costs? in: Environmental & Food Sciences, Research Report, Scottish Agricultural College, pp. 12–14.
- Wenzel H., Hauschild M., Alting L. (1997) Environmental Assessments of products – Vol. 1: Methodology, tools and case studies in product development, Chapman & Hall, London.
- Willer H., Lünzen I., Haccius M. (2002) Organic Agriculture in Germany 2002, [http://www.organic\\_europe.net/country\\_reports/germany](http://www.organic_europe.net/country_reports/germany).
- Williams J.R., Chambers B.J., Hartley A.R., Chalmers A.G. (2005) Nitrate leaching and residual soil nitrogen supply following outdoor pig farming, *Soil Use Manage.* 16, 237–243.
- Williams J.R., Chambers B.J., Hartley A.R., Ellis S., Guise H.J. (2000) Nitrogen losses from outdoor pig farming systems, *Soil Use Manage.* 16, 237–243.