

**Ruminant Welfare<sup>®</sup>: development of a new approach to evaluate Buffalo Welfare, work in progress.**

**Vecchio Domenico 1, DVM, PhD; Bertocchi Luigi 2, DVM; De Rosa Giuseppe 3, DVM, PhD; Napolitano Fabio 4, DVM, PhD; Neglia Gianluca 5, DVM, PhD; Grassi Carlo 6, DVM; Rossi Pasquale 6, DVM, PhD; Iemma Lazzaro 6, DVM; Palladino Massimo 6, DVM, PhD; D'Ausilio Francesco 6, DVM; Natale Antonio 6, DVM; De Carlo Esterina 1, DVM.**

[1 Vecchio Domenico]<sup>1</sup> Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale del Mezzogiorno (IZSM) National Reference Centre on Water Buffalo Farming and Productions Hygiene and Technologies (CRENBuf). Via delle Calabrie, 9, Salerno, Italy, Mail: [domenico.vecchio@izsmportici.it](mailto:domenico.vecchio@izsmportici.it)

[2 Bertocchi Luigi]<sup>2</sup> Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale della Lombardia e dell'Emilia Romagna (IZSLER), Italian National Animal Welfare Reference Centre (CRENBA). Via Bianchi, 9, Brescia, Italy, Mail: [luigi.bertocchi@izsler.it](mailto:luigi.bertocchi@izsler.it)

[3 De Rosa Giuseppe]<sup>3</sup> Dipartimento di Agraria -Università degli studi di Napoli "Federico II" Via Università 100 Portici, Italy, Mail: [giderosa@unina.it](mailto:giderosa@unina.it)

[4 Napolitano Fabio]<sup>4</sup> Scuola di Scienze Agrarie, Forestali, Alimentari ed Ambientali (SAFE) -Università degli studi della Basilicata Viale dell'Ateneo Lucano 10 –Potenza, Italy, Mail: [fabio.napolitano@unibas.it](mailto:fabio.napolitano@unibas.it)

[5 Neglia Gianluca]<sup>5</sup> Department of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Production (DMVPA), Federico II University of Naples, Via Delino, 1, Naples, Italy, [neglia@unina.it](mailto:neglia@unina.it)

[6 Grassi Carlo]<sup>6</sup> Freelance, Via Germano Palma 1, Giungano, Salerno, Italy, Mail: [grassicarlo@libero.it](mailto:grassicarlo@libero.it)

[7 Rossi Pasquale]<sup>6</sup> Freelance, Via Catena, SNC Rende, Cosenza Italy, Mail: [pad\\_rossi@yahoo.it](mailto:pad_rossi@yahoo.it)

[8 Iemma Lazzaro]<sup>6</sup> Freelance, Via delle Industrie 23/B, Battipaglia, Italy, Mail: [lazzaro.iemma@tiscali.it](mailto:lazzaro.iemma@tiscali.it)

[9 Palladino Massimo]<sup>6</sup> Freelance, Via Ceccano 4, Frosinone, Italy, Mail: [max2727@libero.it](mailto:max2727@libero.it)

[10 D'Ausilio Francesco ]<sup>6</sup> Freelance, Presidente Associazione Nazionale Allevatori Specie Bufalina, Via F. Petrarca 42/44, Caserta, Italy, Mail: [presidenza@anasb.it](mailto:presidenza@anasb.it)

[11 Natale Antonio]<sup>6</sup> Freelance, Via Iardino SNC, Pietramelara, Italy, Mail: [nataleantonio67@libero.it](mailto:nataleantonio67@libero.it)

[12 De Carlo Esterina]<sup>1</sup> Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale del Mezzogiorno (IZSM) National Reference Centre on Water Buffalo Farming and Productions Hygiene and Technologies (CRENBuf). Via delle Calabrie 9, Salerno, Italy, Mail: [esterina.decarlo@cert.izsmportici.it](mailto:esterina.decarlo@cert.izsmportici.it)

\*Corresponding Author: [domenico.vecchio@izsmportici.it](mailto:domenico.vecchio@izsmportici.it)

Keywords: Buffalo, animal welfare, risk assessment.

### **Abstract**

Animal welfare is a growing, compelling and urgent topic as a result of the interest that it generates among the citizens and consumers. The goal to be fulfilled is to define systems and protocols for assessing animal welfare that should be impartial, reproducible and science-based on risk analysis. On these premises, the Italian Ministry of Health has signed an agreement with the IZSLER, through the CReNBA and IZSM through the CReNBuf on development and management of a system to evaluation of welfare and biosecurity in buffaloes breeding system.

The checklist development was based on the Risk Assessment Methodology as suggested by EFSA. Building on the CReNBA's work developed on the welfare dairy cow<sup>2</sup>, this method is based on the analysis of two data groups: the assessment of the hazards (non-ABMs) occurring as a result of environmental conditions; the assessment of the risks, with the concerned adverse effects (ABMs), run by animals living in those environments.

The system developed consists in 83 observations, listed in a multiple-choice checklist divided in five macro-areas:

Farm management and personnel, Facilities and equipment, Animal based measures, Biosecurity, Alarm systems. The result of each area also provides an indication of the burden and importance of each of these on the final calculation of the animal welfare value.

These check represent a functional and smart instrument to allow assign a numerical animal welfare index to each farm, and also, by the data collected in each Area, to supply at the veterinarians and breeders the tools to improve farm management and structures, respecting the farm's sustainability, and is preparatory to given to the development of a Ministerial trademark for animal welfare, giving answers to consumers and add value to the correct activities of the farmers.

### **Introduction**

Animal welfare is a growing, compelling and urgent topic as a result of the considerable interest that it generates among the citizens and consumers and by the great attention the media has given to it. Specifically, in the wake of the major health emergencies of recent years, consumers focus on the quality and healthiness of animal products, and on the sustainability and ethics of the products, especially those sourced from intensive farming. Livestock production and together with the way of life of farmers has evolved: it is therefore no longer objectively acceptable to breed animals in unsuitable conditions.

The dual role of Veterinarians should be taken into consideration in this context: on the one hand, they must ensure the welfare of animals and put a stop to farming them in conditions of suffering; on the other, but in no way in contrast, they have to safeguard food safety and public health.

The consumer has firmly demanded farm animal welfare but it cannot actually come about if that clashes with the economic sustainability of the farm. To achieve this goal it is important to inform chain operators about the positive consequences of improving animal welfare, as it is able to increase the income from the farm.

With a bid to protect the environment and animals, the greatest error would be to achieve the set goal by fearfully abiding by regulatory duties only.

The goal to be fulfilled must be to define systems and protocols for assessing animal welfare that should be impartial, reproducible and science-based on risk analysis. Based on these premises, the Italian Ministry of Health has signed an agreement with the Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale della Lombardia e dell'Emilia Romagna (IZSLER), through the Italian National Animal Welfare Reference Centre (CReNBA) on development and management of a system to evaluation of welfare and biosecurity in different cattle, buffaloes, sheep and goats breeding system cup:E52114001190001. In the project named "Ruminant welfare<sup>®</sup>", the CReNBA, as leader unit, involved different operating units and in particular the Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale del Mezzogiorno (IZSM) through National Reference Centre on Water Buffalo Farming and Productions Hygiene and Technologies (CReNBuf) for the development of a scheme for assessing welfare and biosecurity in buffaloes's breedings.

The final result of the fulfilment of the evaluation system is to assign a numerical animal welfare index to each farm. The index will be obtained from adding up the assessments deriving from the responses for each single item and weighed in relation to the importance that each of these has in defining the state of welfare.

#### Material and Methods

The method chosen for the development of the project was the Risk Assessment Methodology in Animal Welfare as suggested by European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)<sup>1</sup>. Building on the CReNBA's work developed on the welfare dairy cow<sup>2</sup>, Guidance on Risk Assessment for Animal Welfare of European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)<sup>3</sup>, European Welfare Quality<sup>®</sup> in buffalo<sup>4</sup> minimum regulatory provisions, bibliography, and the support of the expert group, the activity of the CReNBuf started in march 2015. Differently from previous other systems of animal welfare evaluation, that were based only on non-animal based measures(non-ABMs<sup>67</sup> or in others cases just on Animal Based Measures (ABMs), this method is based on the analysis of two data groups: the first group consists in the assessment of the hazards (non-ABMs) occurring as a result of environmental conditions; and the second group consists in the assessment of the risks, with the concerned adverse effects (ABMs), run by animals living in those environments.

More in detail, the route utilized to evaluate risk assessment on animal welfare are: 1) Identification of the target population; 2) hazard identification (non-ABMs); 3) identification of the hazard threshold level; 4) identification of the adverse effects (ABMs); 5) Measurement of adverse effects; 6) evaluation of the hazard magnitude; 7) evaluation of adverse effect magnitude;8) Apply the checklist complete in a significant number of pilot farms; 9) formulate an explicative disciplinary for the checklist; 10) assess the data repeatability by statistical analysis; 11) implementation of the checklist on digital media; 12) organization of training courses for evaluators.

#### Results

Based on the experience developed in the dairy cow from CReNBA, on the specific scientific literature on breeding buffalo, on individual experiences made by the expert board members, and on 87 farm's visits undertaken in the period May-September 2015 by the staff of the CRENBUFF,

the target population has been pinpoint with Buffaloes farmed in loose housing systems with the sub groups lactation, dry period, heifers and calves as expositive scenario, furthermore, the consequences of hazards on animals and threshold levels are able to report positive and negative changes in health conditions, such consequences are expressed as Animal Based Measures (ABM) have been identified.

The system developed consists in 83 observations (Items), listed in a multiple-choice checklist. Each Item assessment is divided into three overall choice option, distinguished

as “unacceptable”, “acceptable” and “excellent”. In borderline situations, the veterinarian performing the assessment must always bear in mind that the worst condition (unacceptable) and the best condition (excellent) should be assigned, respectively, in cases where there is clear negative evidence and clear positive evidence only.

Each item of information is obtained by performing the following actions:

- a) questions on the main management activities to be asked to the farm manager;
- b) assessing the facilities and equipment used in the barn (Non-ABMs);
- c) observing the animals and detecting body condition and behaviour-related welfare indicators (ABMs).

As for the hazard, evaluation is performed using parameters divided into two macro-areas: Area A (23 items) “Farm management and personnel”; Area B (29 items) “Facilities and equipment” and identifying their respective thresholds. Animal based measures are assessment in Area C in 14 point. The partial result of each area also provides an indication of the burden and importance of each of these on the final calculation of the animal welfare value. The hazard analysis areas assess the farming and management conditions of the farms, but these may have different effects as they are regulated by the animals’ ability to adapt and are therefore less important when establishing the final welfare value. Finally, the buffaloes farming welfare assessment system will be integrated with parameters for analysing conditions of biosecurity (Area E) and inspection of alarm systems (Area D).

Although the final value of the welfare and biosecurity index of the farm can be managed at will, it is advisable to identify 3 different levels reflecting the requirements of the single observations, to make it easier to understand:

1) farm with inadequate welfare or biosecurity conditions, in cases where the final score is in

the lowest 33% with respect to the available score;

2) farm with good welfare or biosecurity conditions, in cases where the final score is between

33% and 66% with respect to the available score;

3) farm with an excellent level of welfare or biosecurity: in cases where the final score is between 66% and the maximum available score.

Besides simply breaking down the farms into categories, the system also identifies farms which do not comply with legal requirements: non-conforming farms (failure to comply with legal requirements)

As the final result, a welfare certificate will be presented, containing the following:

1) the list of shortfalls identified (only in the case of farms having legislative non-compliance);

2) the numerical index and the relative welfare assessment level for each of the areas;

3) the overall welfare level value at the farm;

4) the standard of biosecurity at the farm (area E).

Starting to 10/05/16, after the first revision operated in accord with CRENBA, the Checklist rev.3., was applied in 11 buffalo farms distributed in 6 Italian regions, to verify the functionality of the instrument. The compilation of the check list has been carried out on average in 140 minutes.

The evaluated herds have presented an average total number of 582 heads, with a minimum of 130 and a maximum of 1152 animals present.

The average overall welfare value (0-100% average recorded score) was 70.35%, while that for Area A 69.13%, 66.50% Area B, Area C 79.94%, the Biosafety 56,61% on 57,58% and large risks. For undetected legislative compliance it has been highlighted the 9.09% of companies with absence of visual and tactile contact between the calves.

## **Conclusion**

This checklist developed by the collaboration between CReNBA and CReNBuf on the request of Italian Ministry of Health, represent an impartial, reproducible, functional and smart instrument based on risk analysis to allow assign a numerical animal welfare index to each farm, and also, by the data collected in each Area, to supply at the veterinarians and breeders the tools to improve farm management and structures, respecting the farm's sustainability. The usage of this tool will allow to have a uniform assessment of the level of welfare of buffalo farms, and is preparatory to given to the development of a Ministerial trademark for animal welfare, giving answers to consumers and add value to the correct activities of the farmers who respect the parameters of well-being.

## **Acknowledgements:**

This research was supported by Italian Ministry of Health, number project cup:E52114001190001

## **References**

- 1) <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/topics/topic/animalwelfare.htm>
- 2) Bertocchi L., Fusi F. (2014). "Guidelines for the assessment of welfare and biosecurity in dairy cattle in loose housing systems". Brescia, Italy: Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale della Lombardia e dell'Emilia Romagna "Bruno Ubertini".
- 3) EFSA Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW); Guidance on risk assessment for animal welfare. EFSA Journal 2012; 10(1):2513.
- 4) De Rosa G, Grasso F, Winckler C, Bilancione A, Pacelli C, Masucci F, Napolitano F. 2015. Application of the Welfare Quality protocol to dairy buffalo farms: Prevalence and reliability of selected measures. J Dairy Sci. 2015 Oct;98(10):6886-96. doi: 10.3168/jds.2015-9350. Epub 2015 Jul 29.