Broom, D.M. 2017. Sustainability and the role of animal welfare. In *Proceedings of the 33rd World Veterinary Congress, Incheon Korea,* 632-635. World Veterinary Association.

Sustainability and the role of animal welfare

Donald M. BROOM
Centre for Anthrozoology and Animal Welfare
Department of Veterinary Medicine
University of Cambridge
Cambridge CBV3 0ES U.K.
dmb16@cam.ac.uk

Consumers can demand from retail food companies that they use ethical production systems. Most of the public now think of livestock on farms and companion animals as sentient beings and have concerns about their local environment, global warming and other climate change. The term 'sentient' is now used in legislation about animals and means that the individual has the capacity to have feelings. The European Union Treaty of Lisbon, says in the course of a statement about animal protection and welfare (Article 6b), "since animals are sentient beings…". This wording had the intention to protect the animals commonly used by man, for example on farm, in the laboratory, or as companions.

Scientists and legislators now use animal welfare as a term that is a scientific concept describing a potentially measurable quality of a living animal at a particular time. Such usage has rapidly become widespread during the last thirty years (Broom 2011). However, the use of the term animal welfare was not always as a scientific concept, and indeed there are still many people who are not aware of the modern approach to the subject. The author's (Broom 1986) definition of the welfare of an individual as its state as regards its attempts to cope with its environment refers to all coping systems and so includes feelings and health. It is now used by most welfare scientists and is also, in modified form, by the O.I.E. (World Organization for Animal Health).

Welfare can be assessed using a wide variety of behavioural, physiological, clinical, brain function and other measures. Measures of animal disease are often important because health is a key part of welfare. The concepts of "one health" and "one welfare" emphasise that most of the systems involved and measures to be used in evaluation are the same in humans and non-humans (Broom 2017). Other measures, for example of behaviour, physiology, immune system function, body damage, etc. are described by Broom (2014) and Broom and Fraser (2015). Welfare is always poor when animals are diseased but pain and other aspects of poor welfare vary with severity of pathological effects and can be measured (Corke et al 2014). Pain systems are clearly demonstrated to exist in all vertebrate animals and a few invertebrates (Sneddon et al 2014). Facial expression scoring systems for pain assessment have been recently developed for use in rodents, rabbits, sheep, goats and horses (Dalla Costa et al., 2014, Broom 2015, McLennan et al 2016). The welfare of animals kept extensively can be poor because of heat-stress, parasitic and other infectious disease and low nutrient availability with associated competition.The welfare of animals in feed-lots is often worse than that of extensively-kept animals.

It is important to assess how good the welfare is as well as to evaluate poor welfare. The major changes in animal welfare science during the last 30 years have been the refinement in direct measures of animal welfare and the development of welfare outcome indicators that can be used by veterinary and other inspectors, as well as by those who use animals. Welfare outcome indicators have been developed by many scientists, including those involved in the E.U. Welfare Quality and Animal Welfare Indicators (AWIN) projects. Information on the subject is available at the Animal Welfare Science Hub www.animalwelfarehub.com.

A system or procedure is sustainable if it is acceptable now and if its expected future effects are acceptable, in particular in relation to resource availability, consequences of functioning and morality of action (modified after Broom 2001, 2010). What might make an animal usage system unsustainable? The system might involve so much depletion of resource that it will become unavailable. Alternatively, a product of the system might accumulate to a degree that prevents the

functioning of the system. However, any effect which the general public find unacceptable makes a system unsustainable. Members of the public in all parts of the world, particularly in developed countries, are now insisting on transparency in commercial and governmental activities and on changes in methods of producing of various products. A production system might be unsustainable because of: inefficient usage of world food resources; adverse effects on human health; poor welfare of animals; harmful environmental effects such as low biodiversity or insufficient conservation; unacceptable genetic modification; not being “fair trade” in that producers in poor countries are not properly rewarded; or damage to rural communities. Any of these inadequacies could result in the quality of the product being judged as poor. In future, consumers are likely to demand that sustainable systems are used. If they are not, retail companies, production companies and countries that do not produce good quality, sustainable products are likely to be boycotted and hence forced to change (Bennett et al 2002, Broom 2014).

Many of the greatest animal welfare problems in the world at present are a consequence of conventional breeding with insufficient concern about the adaptability of the animals. Chickens, and some other animals reared for meat production, often grow in body size too fast for their legs and have severe leg and other problems. Cows selected for high milk yield often have major leg disorders, mastitis and reproductive disorders as a direct consequence of the high yield (Broom 2014, Broom and Fraser 2015). These problems may be exacerbated by genetic modification, but need not be. Cloning procedures cause such poor welfare in farm animals that the European Union does not allow their use.

In some countries, genetically modified plants are not accepted because of ethical concerns, the issue being whether or not living things should be modified in the laboratory as opposed to genetic changes that occur naturally. There is also concern because protein changes can cause allergies. Genetic modifications in animals can: benefit the animals (e.g. confer disease resistance), or help to treat human disease (e.g. a blood clotting factor in the milk of a sheep), or develop new products for other purposes, or increase efficiency of animal production. Some people accept all of these but others accept some or none as sufficient justification for genetic modification. A major reason for this is that, in some cases, animal welfare may be poorer as a result of the modification. The conclusion of many people is that any production of genetically modified animals should occur only if it has been demonstrated by scientific studies of animal welfare that the welfare of the animals is not poorer than that of unmodified animals as a consequence (Broom 2014).

Three-level plant production, including pasture, shrubs with edible leaves and trees that may also have edible leaves are an example of a silvopastoral system. A cattle production system whose characteristics and aims include: using three-level or other multi-level production of edible plants, managing the soil taking account of worms and water retention, encouraging predators of harmful animals, minimising greenhouse gas emissions improving job-satisfaction for stock-people, reducing injury and stress in animals and maximising good welfare, considering how to encourage biodiversity using native shrubs and trees, and utilising the potential for obtaining wood from trees is explained by Murgueitio et al (2008, 2011), Broom et al (2013).

The production of leaves and other material that can be eaten by the animals is much greater in silvopastoral systems than can be achieved by pasture-only systems. Results presented from tropical and sub-tropical studies show that cattle production can be better, biodiversity much increased, animal disease reduced, and animal welfare also improved by better availability of shade and other conditions selected by the animals. There are also possibilities for feeding tree and shrub leaves to pigs, poultry or farmed fish. Worker satisfaction is generally high in such systems. The biodiversity may be greater than that in natural forest but some wild species can only be conserved by the use of nature reserves.

The welfare of animals in silvopastoral systems has been demonstrated to be better in various ways than that on pasture-only systems. The beneficial effects of shade are substantial in hot weather with cattle skin temperatures up to 4C lower than in pasture-only systems. High temperature reduces foraging times in paddocks fully exposed to the sun. Anxiety and fear, including fear of humans, can be reduced when partial concealment is possible. The increases in predators lowers the populations of ticks and injurious insects, such as horn flies, and hence reduces the incidence of diseases such as anaplasmosis, which has been shown to drop from 25% to <5%. The presence of nitrogen-fixing shrubs such as *Leucaena* improves animal nutrition and this, together with the better water-retention by the soil, reduces the likelihood of thirst and starvation. Feeding behaviour is improved at high temperature and humidity if the animals are in a silvopastoral system. It may be that the improvement

in dietary choice contributes to this beneficial effect. Social behaviour is more normal on silvopastoral systems than on pasture-only monoculture systems (Améndola et al 2013).

Systems, such as these silvopastoral systems, should be considered by all farmers as consumers are likely to insist on sustainable systems more in the future.

References

Améndola, L., Solorio, F.J., González-Rebeles, C., Galindo, F. 2013 Behavioural indicators of cattle welfare in silvopastoral systems in the tropics of México. *Proceedings of 47th Congress of International Society for Applied Ethology, Florianópolis,p.*150. Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen.

Bennett, R.M., Anderson, J. and Blaney, R.J.P. 2002. Moral intensity and willingness to pay concerning farm animal welfare issues and the implications for agricultural policy. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 15, 187–202.

Broom, D.M. 1986. Indicators of poor welfare. *British Veterinary Journal* 142, 524-526.

Broom, D.M. 2001. The use of the concept animal welfare in European conventions, regulations and directives. In *Food Chain* pp.148-151, SLU Services, Uppsala.

Broom, D.M. 2010. Animal welfare: an aspect of care, sustainability, and food quality required by the public. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education* 37, 83-88.doi : 10.3138/jvme.37.1.83

Broom, D.M. 2011. A history of animal welfare science. *Acta Biotheoretica,* 59, 121-137.

Broom, D.M. 2014. *Sentience and Animal Welfare.* pp. 200, CABI, Wallingford.

Broom, D.M. 2015. Sentience and pain in relation to animal welfare. *Proceedings of XVII International Congress on Animal Hygiene,* 3-7. Košice, Slovakia: International Society for Animal Hygiene.

Broom, D. M. 2015. New research relevant to companion animal welfare. *Companion Animal*, *20*, 548-551.

Broom, D.M. 2017. *Animal Welfare in the European Union*. (pp 75). Brussels: European Parliament Policy Department, Citizen's Rights and Constitutional Affairs, Study for the PETI Committee. ISBN 978-92-846-0543-9 doi: 10-2861/891355 available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/583114/IPOL_STU(2017)583114_EN.pdf

Broom, D.M., Fraser A.F. 2015 *Domestic Animal Behaviour and Welfare*, 5th edn. pp 472. CABI, Wallingford.

Broom, D.M., Galindo, F.A. Murgueitio, E. 2013. Sustainable, efficient livestock production with high biodiversity and good welfare for animals. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 280, 20132025. doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.2025

Corke, M.J., McLennan, K.M., Rebelo, C.J.B. and Constantino-Casas, F. 2014. Assessment of pain in farm animals. *Goat Veterinary Society Journal,* 30, 60-68.

Dalla Costa, E., Minero, M., Lebelt, D., Stucke, D., Canali, E., Leach, M.C., 2014. Development of the Horse Grimace Scale (HGS) as a pain assessment tool in horses undergoing routine castration. *PLoS One* 9, e92281.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0092281

McLennan, K.M., Rebelo, C.J.B., Corke, M.J., Holmes, M.A., Leach, M.C. and Constantino Casas, F. 2016. Development of a facial expression scale using footrot and mastitis as models of pain in sheep. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.,* DOI: 10.1016/j.applanim.2016.01.007

Murgueitio, E., Cuartas, C.A. & Naranjo, J.F. 2008. *Ganadería del Futuro*, Fundación CIPAV, Cali Colombia.

Murgueitio, E. Calle, Z. Uribe, F. Calle, A., Solorio, B. 2011. Native trees and shrubs for the productive rehabilitation of cattle ranching lands. Forest Ecology Management 261, 1654-1663. doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2010.09.027.

Sneddon, L.U., Elwood, R.W., Adamo, S.A. and Leach, M.C. 2014. Defining and assessing animal pain. Animal Behaviour, 97, 201-212.