



HAL
open science

A typology of European organic multi-species livestock farms

Marc Benoit, Guillaume Martin, Gun Bernes, Mathilde Blanc, Christopher Brock, Marie Destruel, Bertrand Dumont, Myriam Grillot, Defne Ulukan, Elise Lang, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Marc Benoit, Guillaume Martin, Gun Bernes, Mathilde Blanc, Christopher Brock, et al.. A typology of European organic multi-species livestock farms. IAHA preconference OWC, Rennes 2021, Sep 2021, Rennes, France. hal-03580526

HAL Id: hal-03580526

<https://hal.science/hal-03580526>

Submitted on 18 Feb 2022

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.

A typology of European organic multi-species livestock farms

Marc Benoit¹, Guillaume Martin², Gun Bernes³, Mathilde Blanc³, Christopher Brock⁴, Marie Destruel², Bertrand Dumont¹, Myriam Grillot², Defne Ulukan², Elise Lang², Marie-Angéline Magne⁵, Tabea Meischner⁴, Marie Moerman⁶, Bernadette Oehen⁷, David Parsons³, Riccardo Primi⁸, Lisa Schanz⁹, Lucille Steinmetz¹, Patrick Veysset¹, Christoph Winckler⁹

¹ Université Clermont Auvergne, INRAE, Vetagro Sup, UMR Herbivores, 63122 Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France

² Université de Toulouse, INRAE, UMR AGIR, F-31326 Castanet-Tolosan, France

³ Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, 90183 Umeå, Sweden

⁴ Forschungsring e.v., Brandschneise 5, D-64295 Darmstadt, Germany

⁵ Université de Toulouse, INRAE, INPT, INP-EI Purpan, ENSFEA, UMR 1248 AGIR, F-31326 Castanet-Tolosan, France

⁶ CRAW, 5030 Gembloux, Belgium

⁷ FiBL, CH-5070 Frick, Switzerland

⁸ Università degli Studi della Tuscia, 01100 Viterbo, Italy

⁹ University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU), A-1180 Vienna, Austria

Introduction

Implementing agrobiodiversity is a core principle of agroecology in livestock farming systems (Dumont et al. 2013), especially in organic production. It is often studied through the lens of crop-livestock integration. Keeping two or more livestock species or categories on the same farm simultaneously is another diversification option that has received less attention to date even though it is expected to increase the sustainability of livestock farms (Martin et al. 2020). The few studies dealing with this topic at the farm level had at best a regional coverage (Dumont et al. 2020) and therefore limited possibilities for outscaling these multi-species livestock systems across Europe. Here, we aimed to propose a pan-European typology of organic multi-species livestock farms according to animal species or productive orientation combinations, farm structure and management (land, livestock, human resources, sales).

Material and methods

We surveyed 95 farms combining cattle and small ruminants (meat or dairy production), cattle and monogastrics (pigs and/or poultry) and small ruminants and monogastrics in six European countries. Each survey was based on a half-day discussion with the farmers and consultation of accounting documents when available (only in France). Survey data covered (i) farm structure in terms of types and areas of cropping areas and grasslands, type and numbers of animals, (ii) management practices, (iii) marketing channels, i.e. type, amounts and prices of products sold and diversification activities (e.g. energy production) and (iv) work organization via the status, role and satisfaction of farmers. This data allowed the calculation of a number of indicators (key ones are presented in Table 1) describing farm production, productivity (per worker, per total livestock unit (LU)), efficiency (e.g. ratio between outputs and inputs) as well as the ability of farmers to manage their farm resources for production (e.g. feeding autonomy), marketing management, farmers satisfaction etc. Note that rangelands are not included in the Usable Agricultural Area (UAA). The detailed data collection and indicator calculation procedures can be found in Ulukan et al. (2021) (under review).

To characterize the diversity of multi-species livestock farming systems, we first performed a principal component analysis (PCA) using four types of variables (with a total of 43 variables) presented in Table 1 (using XLSTAT v2020.3.1 software). An agglomerative hierarchical clustering (AHC) was then conducted in order to identify four groups of relatively homogeneous farms.

Results

The first four factors of the PCA explained 36.5% of the total variance in farm sample and had the following essential characteristics:

- i) Factor 1 (10.6% of the variance): contrast between large farms including crops, mainly used for feeding the animals on the one hand and mainly dairy sheep farms dependent on purchased feed on the other hand (Fig 1);
- ii) Factor 2 (9.6% of the variance): contrast between farms with a low overall stocking rate, a high degree of feeding autonomy based on fodder use with usually the presence of beef cattle, and on the other hand farms with a high animal density and high amounts of purchased feed related to the presence of monogastrics (Fig 1);
- iii) Factor 3 (8.9% of variance): contrast between farms with monogastrics displaying high labour productivity in terms of livestock unit per worker unit (LU/AWU) and output (€) per AWU, and a high overall stocking rate, and on the other hand smaller farms with low labour productivity and crops used to produce animal feed;
- iv) Factor 4 (7.5% of variance): dairy cattle farms based on permanent grasslands (and opposed to dairy sheep), with on-farm processing, and with farmers converted to organic farming a long time ago and generally very satisfied with their system.

Figure 1 depicts the first two factors of the PCA and the ellipses representing the four groups of farms (Table 1) generated by the AHC with an explained 87.8% intra-class variance and a 12.2% inter-class variance. The classes are quite unequal in size, from 7 to 35 farms (Table 1).

Figure 2a shows that the six countries are well distributed in the groups, with the exception for Group 4, which includes only Italian farms. In addition, Groups 3 and 4 are distant from Group 1 but fairly close to each other (Fig 2b).




Figure 1. Projection of the main variables (representing more than 5% of factors 1 and 2) of the principal component analysis and the four groups of farms from the agglomerative hierarchical clustering (ellipsis plot with 40% confidence). Radiant lines: projection of the variables. Small dots: 95 farms. Bold labels: variables most contributing to factors 1 and 2. Labels on grey background: % LU for animal enterprises

Group 1 (C1; 35 farms) can be characterized by a large mean area with a high percentage of crops (1/3 of the UAA) and 78 livestock vs 87 for the average 95 farms. Farms are mainly dairy cattle, associated with beef cattle or pigs. Up to 63% of farms process their products on-farm and 42% use short-sale channels. Agritourism is practised in 37% of farms (compared to 27% in the whole sampled farms). Labour productivity is low when expressed in LU/AWU (23.4) but relatively high when expressed in € of sales per AWU, due to the added-value induced by on-farm processing and short-sale channels. Despite the presence of cereal production, feed autonomy of these farms is rather low (68%) due to the presence of monogastrics. However, nitrogen efficiency (Ninput/Noutput) is the highest of the four groups. These farms also have the highest number of workers (n=6 AWUs on average) and the most experienced farm managers, with a very early conversion to organic farming (1996 on average), despite the absence of agricultural roots in one of three cases. These farmers were usually satisfied with their farming system.

Group 2 (C2; 17 farms) represents medium-sized farms with a significant proportion of permanent grassland in the UAA (58% on average). Their specificity is the prevalence of poultry (in LUs), usually associated with beef cattle, and leading to a high labour productivity expressed in LU/AWU. It is the highest from all four groups, even when expressed in sales per AWU, exceeding 110 000 €/AWU. There are only 2.6 AWUs on average. The percentage of fodder in ruminant diets is very high (90%), in relation with frequent beef cattle breeding. Nevertheless, feed autonomy at the farm level only reaches 61.5% on average due to poultry, which also explains the high mean N input/output ratio of 2.45. The farmers in this group are the ones who most frequently attend training courses and they have the highest overall satisfaction, including regarding the income generated.

Group 3 (C3; 36 farms) has structural factors comparable to C2 (area used) although temporary grasslands are slightly more prevalent. Beef cattle is the main production, and is generally associated with meat sheep. Farm feed autonomy is the highest among the four groups, at 87.9% on average. Short channel sales are present on 92% of the farms and represent 72.5% of the total value of sales. Stocking rate on the grassland area is the lowest, at 0.81 LU/ha (ruminants only). Compared to C2, this group has a comparable UAA but a three times lower stocking rate on the UAA (on average 0.80 vs 2.58 total LU/ha UAA) linked in particular to the absence of monogastrics. Labour productivity is half that of C2, both as LUtot/AWU, €/AWU and mega-joules (MJ) produced per AWU. This group has the least paid workers (13.9% on average) and the highest proportion of first-generation farmers (33%). Farmers in this group considered the complexity of their farming system to be low, and reported the highest human welfare scores and the lowest workload.

Group 4 (C4; 7 farms) is a little specific because it includes farms with predominantly dairy ewes, associated with dairy or meat cattle, and sometimes goats. They are all located in Italy and have an important percentage of rangelands (three farms fully rely on rangelands), the other areas (included in UAA) being limited on average to 26.4 ha. With a number of LUs reaching 125.2 (no monogastrics in this group), the stocking rate on the fodder area (including rangelands) is high (1.4 LU/ha on average). On-farm processing (dairy products) is present in five of the seven farms, and 82% of the sales are made in short channels. Note that 46.2% of farm activities are carried out by paid workers and the overall workforce is high (5.4 AWUs). The overall satisfaction of the farmers in this group is the lowest compared to the three other groups.

This first work identified four main types of European organic multi-species livestock farms. The following key points are highlighted:

The presence of monogastrics strongly limits feed autonomy, but it provides an important input of nutrients and most likely contributes to the maintenance of soil fertility on the area used by ruminants. The most autonomous systems raise ruminants for meat production. The Italian farms are unique, linked to the high frequency in this sub-sample of small ruminants (especially dairy sheep) associated with processing, large work force and limited arable land. The percentage of sales *via* short channels ranges from 26% to 82% between groups. We can hypothesize that farmers' practices are influenced by this management of sales, e.g. through specific calendars of practices aiming at regular sales across the year. This may result in a part of the off-season production generating high production costs, because of higher use of concentrate feeds. Nevertheless, the added-value generated could compensate for the extra costs. Moreover, this type of sale can increase social satisfaction.

The pool of workers appears to vary greatly between the four groups. Two out of the four groups have between 5 and 6 AWUs, which is very high and could be related to the high degree of farm diversification. This may also have positive effects on the technical management of farm enterprises in terms of resilience, if the versatility of the workers between enterprises is important.

Fig 2a




Fig 2b




Figure 2. Distribution of the 95 farms in the four clusters according to their country of origin (a) and distances between their centroids (b)

Discussion

It is important to be aware that the study of very diversified farms across agronomic, environmental and social dimensions taking into account farm structures and management makes the surveying extremely complex. Thus, on the basis of an initial sample of 146 farms, only 95 were kept for which all the indicators could be calculated. The surveys were carried out by different interviewers with different skills in the diversity of dimensions and situations surveyed. This may have had a small divergent effect on data acquisition, particularly on social evaluations.

Our objective is therefore to refine the analysis of the potential relationships that exist between sales management (including the diversity of the products sold) and management practices on the one hand, and farm productivity and efficiency on the other hand. We also aim to focus on the link between enterprise integration and farm performances, particularly in terms of efficiency of resource use. This will require questioning and renewing some traditional indicators that are not adapted to such diversified farming situations and diversity of contexts, to innovate in terms of appropriate indicators and methods.

Suggestions for research and support policies to develop further organic animal husbandry

We highlighted the impact of the type of animal species combination on feed autonomy. In particular, the presence of monogastrics leads to a high amount of feed purchased. This raises the question of the origin of this feed and the possible collaboration between specialized livestock and crop farms from the same area that should be promoted.

Half of the farms had a large workforce, which seems to facilitate the implementation and success of this type of highly diversified system that usually builds on short-sale channels. In order to support this type of farming system, which generates employment and social dynamics in rural areas, the CAP should account for the workforce present on the farms, and for the cross compliance of subsidies payment (subsidiy threshold) per person rather than per hectare.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the financial support for the MIX-ENABLE project provided by transnational funding bodies, being partners of the H2020 ERA-Net project, CORE Organic Cofund, and the cofund from the European Commission.

References

- Dumont B, Cournot S, Mosnier C, Mugnier S, Fleurance G, Bigot G et al (2020) Comprendre les atouts de la diversification des systèmes d'élevage herbivores du nord du Massif central. *INRAE Productions Animales* 33(3), 173-188. doi: 10.20870/productions-animales.2020.33.3.4557
- Dumont B, Fortun-Lamothe L, Jouven M, Thomas M, Tichit M (2013): Prospects from agroecology and industrial ecology for animal production in the 21st century. *Animal* 7(6), 1028-1043. doi: 10.1017/S1751731112002418
- Martin G., Barth K., Benoit M., Brock C., Destruel M., Dumont B. et al (2020) : Potential of multi-species livestock farming to improve the sustainability of livestock farms: A review. *Agricultural Systems* 181, 102821. doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2020.102821
- Ulukan D., Steinmetz L., Moerman M., Bernes G., Blanc M., Brock C. et al (2021): Survey data on European organic multi-species livestock farms. *Scientific Data*. Under review

Table 1: Variables used for principal component and agglomerative hierarchical clustering analysis and their values for each of the the four groups (C1-C4) of farms and average

	Variables	Groups of farms				Average
		C1	C2	C3	C4	
Land & animals	Number of farms	35	17	36	7	95
	Usable Agricultural Area (UAA) (ha)	105.3	78.1	71.2	26.4	81.7
	Crop area/UAA (%)	33.1%	10.5%	12.3%	3.9%	19.0%
	Permanent Grassland/UAA (%)	29.9%	58.1%	45.4%	0.0%	38.6%
	Rangeland/[UAA+rangelands] (%)	9.6%	3.3%	11.7%	70.0%	13.7%
	Grassland/UAA (%)	64.9%	89.1%	87.4%	95.4%	80%
	Temporary Pastures / crop (%)	82.6%	137.0%	201.0%	24.8%	132.9%
	Fodder Stocking rate(Herb.LU/ha Fodder area)	0.93	1.16	0.81	1.40	0.96
	Overall Stocking rate (Tot_LU/ha UAA)	0.87	2.56	0.80	1.37	1.18
	Total LU	78.2	146.3	61.3	125.2	87.5
	Beef cattle LU / total LU (%)	25.3%	32.6%	61.3%	18.9%	39.8%
	Dairy cattle LU / total LU (%)	48.4%	14.8%	4.7%	10.4%	23.0%
	Dairy sheep LU / total LU (%)	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	62.1%	4.8%
	Goat LU / total LU (%)	0.3%	0.0%	4.6%	8.6%	2.5%
	Meat Sheep LU / total LU (%)	3.4%	4.5%	21.1%	0.0%	10.1%
	Pigs LU / total LU (%)	15.1%	5.5%	6.9%	0.0%	9.1%
	Poultry LU / total LU (%)	6.9%	42.6%	1.2%	0.0%	10.6%
Sales & other activities	Direct selling (score 0-1)	0.86	0.65	0.92	0.71	0.83
	Processing at farm (score 0-1)	0.63	0.29	0.44	0.71	0.51
	Short channel selling (%€ sales)	41.7%	26.5%	72.5%	81.7%	53.6%
	Service farming (for other farms...)(score 0-1)	0.34	0.12	0.06	0.29	0.19
	Agritourism (score 0-1)	0.37	0.06	0.31	0.14	0.27
Productivity & efficiency	LU/AWU	23.4	64.0	32.9	21.7	34.1
	Sales/AWU (€)	74515	111787	42076	36998	66127
	Sales/AWU (MJ)	543835	337471	156934	131444	329904
	Fodder autonomy (%)	72.8%	89.6%	85.7%	49.3%	79.0
	On-farm grain for ruminants (% on-farm grain)	67.0%	46.4%	40.8%	19.7%	49.9%
	Feed autonomy (% animal energy needs)	67.9%	61.5%	87.9%	37.8%	72.1%
	N input/N output	1.00	2.45	1.28	3.09	1.52
Social	Average Farmers Units (AWU)	2.01	1.37	1.49	1.14	1.63
	Paid workers (% AWU)	29.0%	31.2%	13.9%	46.2%	24.9%
	Unpaid workers (% AWU)	16.5%	5.1%	5.1%	31.2%	11.2%
	Farmer 1 starting (year)	1998	2001	2000	2003	2000
	Farmer 1 off-roots (0-1)	0.31	0.12	0.33	0.00	0.26
	Conversion to organic (year)	1996	2001	2002	2011	2000
	Experience in farming (score 1-4)	2.23	2.41	2.33	1.71	2.26
	Training Frequency (score 1-4)	3.38	3.88	1.96	0.57	2.72
	Availability external knowledge (score 1-4)	3.23	3.12	3.00	1.71	3.0
	Difficulty satisfaction (score 1-4)	2.26	2.44	2.04	2.00	2.19
	Complexity satisfaction (score 1-4)	2.07	2.06	2.35	1.71	2.15
	Overall welfare perception (score 1-4)	3.24	3.35	3.57	3.14	3.38
	Workload satisfaction (score 1-4)	3.06	3.00	3.11	3.00	3.06
Satisfact. /income (score 1-4)	3.14	3.24	2.75	2.71	2.98	
Overall Satisfaction (score 1-4)	3.37	3.47	3.31	2.43	3.30	