

Does animal health and welfare of organic pigs differ between husbandry systems?

Gwendolyn Rudolph, Sabine Dippel, Davide Bochicchio, Sandra Edwards, Barbara Früh, Mirjam Holinger, Diane Holmes, Gudrun Illmann, Denise Knop, Armelle Prunier, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Gwendolyn Rudolph, Sabine Dippel, Davide Bochicchio, Sandra Edwards, Barbara Früh, et al.. Does animal health and welfare of organic pigs differ between husbandry systems?. 7. International conference on the assessment of animal welfare at farm and grip level (Walf), Sep 2017, Ede, Netherlands. Wageningen Academic Publishers, 2017, Proceedings of the 7th international conference on the assessment of animal welfare at farm and group level. hal-01595536

HAL Id: hal-01595536

https://hal.science/hal-01595536

Submitted on 2 Jun 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.



Session 05 Theatre 13

Does animal health and welfare of organic pigs differ between husbandry systems?

Gwendolyn Rudolph¹, Sabine Dippel², Davide Bochicchio³, Sandra Edwards⁴, Barbara Früh⁵, Mirjam Holinger⁵, Diane Holmes⁴, Gudrun Illmann⁶, Denise Knop⁷, Armelle Prunier⁸, Tine Rousing⁹, Christoph Winckler¹ and Christine Leeb¹

¹Univ. of Natural Resources & Life Sciences (BOKU), Vienna, Austria, ²Friedrich-Loeffler-Institut, Celle, Germany, ³CRA-SUI, Italy, ⁴Newcastle University, United Kingdom, ⁵FiBL, Switzerland, ⁶Inst. of Animal Science, Czech Republic, ⁷Beratung Artgerechte Tierhaltung e.V., Germany, ⁸INRA, France, ⁹Aarhus University, Denmark; christine.leeb@boku.ac.at

During the CoreOrganicII ProPIG, animal health & welfare (AHW) of organic pigs in 3 husbandry systems (8 countries) was compared: indoor with outside run (IN: n=34 farms), outdoor on pasture (OUT: n=12) and partly outdoor with at least one age group on pasture (POUT: n=28). The hypothesis was that all systems can deliver good welfare when well managed. 7 trained observers assessed pregnant sows (SO), weaners (WE) and fatteners (FA) using animal-based parameters. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis tests were used, if P<0.05 pairwise testing (Wilcoxon rank sum; Bonferroni corrected) was performed with P<0.05. Across systems, the median prevalence of several AHW areas was 0% (shoulder lesions SO; ectoparasites SO, FA; tail lesions, lameness WE; runts FA). No differences between husbandry systems in the prevalence of vulva deformation in SO (10.7%, 3.0%, 8.7%); short tails in WE (0%, 0.5%, 2.2%) or FA (1.8%, 2.3%, 6.5%) were found. OUT had lower prevalence of respiratory problems in WE and FA (both 0% OUT, >60% POUT, IN). Signs of diarrhoea in WE were less frequent in OUT (0%) than in IN (25.0%) and diarrhoea in FA was less frequent in OUT than in POUT and IN (0%, 0%, 8.3%). OUT had fewer lame SO than POUT and IN (0%, 3.4%, 7.1%). Across systems, prevalences of most AHW areas but respiratory problems in IN and POUT and diarrhoea in IN were low. Beyond that, OUT appeared to be beneficial with regard to several areas of AHW, which could be explained by the environmental conditions, e.g. respiratory problems (air quality), diarrhoea (exposure to faeces) and lameness (flooring). POUT farms in most cases kept SO outdoors and WE and FA similar to IN farms, and this was reflected in the results. It can be concluded, that systems do differ regarding AHW and development of organic husbandry systems across Europe should take this into account.

WAFL 2017 113