### Poultry and Plg Low-input and Organic production systems' Welfare



# Comparing animal welfare assessments by researchers and free-range pig farmers with the PIGLOW app

E.A.M Graat<sup>1,2</sup>, C. Vanden Hole<sup>1</sup>, S. Nauta<sup>3</sup>, M. Giersberg<sup>3</sup>, T.B. Rodenburg<sup>3</sup>, F. Tuyttens<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food <sup>2</sup>Ghent University, <sup>3</sup>Utrecht University

**EAAP Congress** 

30th of August 2023





## **PIGLOW** app

- PIGLOW app for animal welfare assessments by farmers
- Specific for free-range and organic farms
- Meant to sensitize farmers towards possible welfare issues
- Available in the Google Play Store and App Store in 9 languages



# **≡** PIGLOW











# **Longitudinal study**

- Two-year study on the effect of the app on animal welfare
- 12 participating farmers in Belgium and The Netherlands
- Participants conduct periodical animal welfare assessments for finishing pigs (at least 6)
- Farm visits at the beginning and end of the study
- Farmers and researchers conduct the first and last welfare assessments simultaneously
- Goal: to compare welfare assessments by farmers and researchers at the beginning and end of the study





16-10 MANAGER OF THE STANGE OF







#### **Welfare indicators**

#### **Individual level (13)**

Scratches

Skin wounds

Ear lesions

Tail lesions

Lameness

Skin irritation

Too small

Bad general state

Laboured breathing

Covered in dirt

**Panting** 

Shivering

Enrichment use



alette to the test with the test with the test of the test with the test

## **Results – Farm visit 1: farmers vs researchers**

	Indicator (individual level)	Mean absolute difference  % farmer - % researcher	Number of different scores	Higher score
	Enrichment use	21,22	11	7 Farmer - 4 Researcher
(	Scratches	6,48	8	1F 7R
(	Too small	2,44	6	4F 2R
	Covered in dirt	2,25	5	3F 2R
	Skin wounds	1,70	5	3F 2R
	Lameness	1,30	3	1F 2R
	Tail lesions	1,26	4	1F 3R
	Laboured breathing	0,93	3	1F 2R
	Ear lesions	0,53	3	1F 2R
	Bad general state	0,43	2	2R
	Panting	0,39	2	2R
	Skin irritation	0,2	1	1R
	Shivering	0,15	1	1F

More severe score: 20F - 34R





#### Results – Farm visit 1 vs farm visit 2

Differences in 12 individual welfare indicators – Farm visit 1 vs 2	Farm visit 1	Farm visit 2
Average mean absolute difference	1,51	0,89
Average number of different scores	3,58	2,83
Number of indicators with largest difference in this round	7	5

Difference in average scores for 12 welfare indicators – Farm visit 1 vs 2	Farmers	Researchers
Average score farm visit 1	0,92	1,48
Average score farm visit 2	0,96	0,96
Difference between farm visit 1 and 2	-0,04	0,52

Farmers gave a slightly higher (more severe) score during farm visit 2 Researchers gave a lower (less severe) score during farm visit 2



#### **Conclusion**

- Overall, farmers assessed the welfare of their pigs a bit more positively than researchers during farm visit 1
- Differences between researchers and farmers during farm visit 1 show that:
  - Some welfare indicators are less suitable for quick observations
  - Certain welfare indicators require more focus and/or skills to be assessed reliably
  - Farmers might be more strict when observing welfare indicators that also have economic value
- Overall differences in welfare assessments of farmers and researchers were smaller at the end of the two-year study than at the beginning, but it differed per welfare indicator
- The smaller difference was mostly due to researchers scoring welfare more positively at the end
  of the study, while farmers only scored slightly more negatively
- This could indicate that animal welfare has improved and that farmers have learned to measure more strictly, but alternative explanations are also possible

and the state of t



#### PPILOW PARTNERS













































Thank you for your attention

www.ppilow.eu





8