

# Foraging in outdoor organic pig production - modelling environmental consequences



Jakobsen\*, M., Preda, T., Kongsted, A.G., Hermansen, J. E. Abstract no. 23246

Department of Agroecology, Faculty of Science and Technology, Blichers Alle 20, Aarhus University, P.O. Box 50, Tjele DK-8830 Denmark

\*E-mail: malene.jakobsen@agro.au.dk

## Introduction

The objective was to assess the technical and environmental performance at farm level of rearing free-range growing-finishing pigs foraging directly in the range area, as compared to the current Danish organic pig production with sows on pasture and growing-finishing pigs housed indoors with access to outdoor runs.

## Materials and methods

Three scenarios were modelled based on a synthesis of key figures from organic pigs farms, empirical data from on-farm studies and experimental data. The three types of organic pig production systems were: The Reference scenario (**Indoor finishing**), Alternative scenario 1 (**Free-range grass-clover**) and Alternative scenario 2 (**Free-range alternative crops: alfalfa, grass-clover, Jerusalem Artichokes**). The starting point for all three scenarios was 84 ha and 100 annual sows with a production of 1925 finishers (110 kg live weight).



## Results

Regarding **nitrogen balance**, overall in the alternative scenarios the imported feed was reduced (145 and 140 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> for **Free-range grass-clover** and **Free-range alternative crops** scenarios, respectively) compared to the **Indoor finishing** scenario (164 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>). However, the **Free-range alternative crops** scenario had the highest N leaching, which could be attributed to the high input of N, through fixation from alfalfa. **Green house gas (GHG) emissions** were highest in the **Free-range grass-clover** scenario. However, when including Soil C changes and Indirect Land Use Change the GHG emissions were considerably lower in the **Free-range alternative crops** scenario.

Table 1. Farm N balance (kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>), green house gas emissions (kg CO<sub>2</sub> eq) and Land Use (m<sup>2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) in three organic pig production systems

Farm N balance*	Indoor finishing	Free-Range grass-clover	Free-Range alternative crops
<b>Total input</b>	214	202	210
<b>Total output</b>	72	72	72
<b>Balance</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>N losses:</b>			
<b>Ammonia</b>	49	24	20
<b>Denitrification</b>	3	6	6
<b>Soil N</b>	-8	4	4
<b>N leaching</b>	99	100	110
<b>Green house gas (GHG) emissions**</b>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.17</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.00</b>
<b>Thereof home-produced feed</b>	1.01	1.09	0.94
<b>Thereof imported feed</b>	0.96	1.07	0.84
<b>Total soil changes</b>	0.36	0.13	0.13
<b>Land use</b>	8.11	8.05	6.90
<b>Indirect Land Use Change</b>	1.16	1.15	0.99
<b>Total GHG emissions</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.12</b>

## Concluding remarks:

- The Free-range grass-clover scenario had a nitrogen leaching comparable to the Indoor finishing scenario, but various management options must be considered in order to reduce leaching further.
- In terms of GHG emissions, the Free-range alternative crops scenario showed the best performance.
- We suggest that the alternative scenarios represent an actual possibility in terms of reducing the impact of organic pig production on climate change.
- The alternative scenarios is suggested to have agro-ecological advantages: improved crop rotation, increased soil fertility, reduction of pest and diseases.
- In the alternative scenarios all animals are able to perform species-specific behaviour.

\***Farm N balance** was estimated as the difference between input (imported feed and straw, N biological fixation, deposition) and output (live pigs). Nitrogen leaching was estimated by deducting N losses and soil N changes from N surplus.

\*\***Green house gas emissions** included N<sub>2</sub>O from production of feed, CH<sub>4</sub> from enteric fermentation, and manure management and CO<sub>2</sub> from production of feed, soil carbon changes and land use change. Each type of crop production (home-grown or imported) was assumed to increase pressure on land use according to the area occupied by the factor 143 g CO<sub>2</sub> m<sup>-2</sup>