

Low-input outdoor and organic poultry productions: how to improve animal welfare in these systems?

Bonnefous C.<sup>1</sup>, Collin A.<sup>1</sup>, Niemi J.<sup>2</sup>, Väre M.<sup>3</sup>, Parrott P.<sup>4</sup>, Walley K.<sup>4</sup>, Re M.<sup>5</sup>, Ponzio R.<sup>6</sup>, Zuliani A.<sup>7</sup>, Rodenburg T. B.<sup>8</sup>, Guesdon V.<sup>9</sup>, Delanoue E.<sup>10</sup>, Roinsard A.<sup>11</sup>, Warin L.<sup>12</sup>, Leterrier C.<sup>13</sup>

INRAE, Nouzilly, France claire.bonnefous@inrae.fr

Introduction: While organic and outdoor low input systems enable the expression of natural behaviour better than indoor systems, issues with the potential to improve animal welfare in these systems still exist. The issues are related especially to the outdoor area

**Method:** Extraction and combination of information from different sources, including experts and practitioners

(predation, diseases, heterogenous range exploration...).

Standards, regulations and labelling schemes

Peer-reviewed articles, congress proceedings and research projects

Interviews with key-informants (UK, FR, IT, FI)

Results: Various barriers to welfare & levers for improvement

Close to 50 systems

Variations of space allowance, genetic strains, beak trimming and free range access

Check innovative solutions

Use of alternative genetic strains, phytobiotics and enrichment of the range

Stakeholders'
perception on
animal welfare
Respect of "the
5 freedoms"
pointed out by all
4 countries and
"Regulation" by
Finland and Italy

**Conclusion:** The results provide a shortlist of practices that could be used to improve animal welfare while taking into account farmer wellbeing and sustainability and contributing to "One Welfare".

This shortlist is currently discussed before use by the practitioners in the PPILOW participatory approach.