



Better Training for Safer Food *Initiative*

Training course on “Animal Welfare in pig production”

Working Group N.3

IN FIELD EXERCISE

Herning, Denmark, 14-17 October, 2014

Farm description

Split into two sites, site 1 reproduction, site 2 weaners

Site 1, 1500 sows, gilts and boars

Site 2, 9150 weaners, 1400 slaughter pigs. Majority sold at 30Kgs, to Germany. Remainder of low quality retained to slaughter weight at 100Kgs

Site 1. Farrowing unit housed in crates on fully slatted floor. Piglets had lamp with heated pad area. Sows had half their area padded.

Gestation unit from 4 weeks post mating, held in areas with common area and crates, with access in and out. Slatted in some points mostly in the common corridor but also in the metal areas.

From weaning to 4 weeks afterwards, all held in crates. Around 500 crates.

Farm description, continued

Gilts and old sows for slaughter held in pens of 6 – 9. Half solid and half slatted.

Additionally some of the above held in confined, stalls, due to lack of room.

Site 2. Weaners held in one third slatted and two thirds solid pens, with heated area behind plastic curtain. Curtain area ceased at around 7Kgs.

Data recordings

Site 1. Farrowing sows. Good feeding – felt was in balance, all in good bodily condition, none lean.

Water supplies were adequate.

Good housing – space allowance was a concern at rear of sow. No room at the rear. Heads almost in the water trough or under it. Insufficient length.

Thermal comfort? Too hot at 26C as ? Some sows playing with water.

Good health – leg injuries were seen and floor was very slipper. Sows found it hard to rise.

Absence of disease – concerns re one litter of 17 with yellow D and dehydration, 2 moribound. Remainder huddled up and none suckling.

Data recordings continued

Farrowing, one sow unable to rise found in communal corridor and not in sick bay. Other sows post weaning have to go to sick bay as issues with mobility.

Appropriate behaviour – absence of sufficient straw and some stereotypic behaviour observed. Chewing bars and self suckling tongues. Sham chewing.

Piglets, good feeding – weaned at 26 days average. Uses Foster sows 5-10%. Big litter sizes so lots of competition on udder and clambering.

Good housing – as such big litter numbers insufficient creep areas, with some piglets observed shivering despite heat.

Good health – docking 100% with a very short dock and did not have appearance of a good surgical technique

Data recordings continued

Piglets, they do have teeth clipped and castrated before 24 hours of day.

Good health, as described above with dying litter. Another litter seemed injured? Runt sized, but signs of treatment with spray on back.

Felt some piglets looked anaemic as pale in colour, and less active. They do use NSAID under PVS direction at time of castration, Appropriate behaviour – insufficient manipulable material, although some evidence for wood chips and straw,

Data recordings continued

Gilts and dry sows.

Good feeding – lots of stereotypic behaviour observed.

Good housing – held for 4 weeks in crates, then placed in the larger grouped areas. However it was felt that some spent longer than 4 weeks confined as too few places available in group housing (800 spaces only)

In group area, dominant sows occupied free space leaving many to reside in stall areas for prolonged periods.

Lot of dirty animals observed.

Good health – Lot of leg injuries and coughing.

Sick bay full with very thin animals.

Appropriate behaviour – sham chewing in many , tongue sucking .

Absence of sufficient enrichment – eaten within one hour

Data recordings continued

Site 2, weaners and growers.

Good feeding – ok

Good housing – lack of space as pigs grew. Between the floor and the wall there was a gap directly onto slurry bed, where pigs may get stuck. Seen all over, and farmer did agree the odd one did get stuck and was then destroyed.

Ventilation issues, seen in two pens where pigs were seen to be covered in faeces. Fault in the sensor,

Good health – heard and saw a lot of sneezing and coughing. Sick pen was communal and with no additional heat supplied. Observed huddling in the sick bay. Also sick bay in the same air space as healthy pigs.

Appropriate behaviour, none observed in a negative way.

Data recordings continued

Site 2.

Grave concerns re killing procedures on this site. Up to 30kgs they are ? Stabbed in the heart after the use of a captive bolt. When asked to demonstrate this was effected by appraoching the chest through the axilla. Apparently guided by PVS advice?

Conclusions

Site 1:

Crowded. Lack of manipulable material. Sow in crates NO correct space allowance. Too long in restricted spaces due to lack of space and if fails to get pregnant, plus fostering activities. ? Too many too hungry? Stomach ulcers at abattoir?

Site 2:

Euthenasia procedure.

Sick bay was poor otherwise felt farm was managed well,

Improving suggestions

Site 1.

Farrowing crates to be replaced? Measured? Flooring needs attention as leg injuries.

Requires another dry sow / gilt barn.

Possibly look to replace some stalls with yarded areas with low walls?

Increase manipulable material use.

Look to reconfigure the available space with advice.

Site 2.

Reposition sick bay into a different room and different air space.

Improve the condition, with extra heat etc.

Phased replacement of slatted floors to get rid of fatal crack area.

Yet on site mortality low, but still a duty of care.

Improving suggestions continued

Site 2, to look into slaughter process and REVIEW



This presentation has been produced under the contract n. 2012 96 04 with the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers ([EAHC](#)). The content of it is the sole responsibility of Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale dell'Abruzzo e del Molise "G. Caporale", Teramo and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers or any other body of the European Union. The Executive Agency for Health and Consumers or any other body of the European Union will not be responsible under any circumstances for the contents of communication items prepared by the contractor.

Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale dell'Abruzzo e del Molise "G. Caporale"

Campo Boario, 64100, Teramo, Italy

Email: sancotraining@izs.it

Website: www.sancotraining.izs.it, www.izs.it

Phone: +39 0861 332673

Better Training for Safer Food BTSF

• *European Commission
Consumers, Health and Food Executive Agency
DRB A3/042
L-2920 Luxembourg*