

51st Annual Meeting of the European Association for Animal Production
21-24 August 2000, The Hague, The Netherlands

Commissions on Genetics, Cattle and Pigs, Paper GCP 3.9

Future pathways in farm animal breeding and reproduction

Anne-Marie Neeteson¹, Alessandro Bagnato², Jan Merks³

¹ *Farm Animal Industrial Platform (FAIP), Benedendorpsweg 98, NL-6862 WL
OOSTERBEEK, The Netherlands, Neeteson@iaf.nl*

² *Universita degli Studi di Milano, Via Celoria 10, IT-20133MILANO, Italy,
Alessandro.Bagnato@unimi.it*

³ *IPG - Institute for Pig Genetics, Schoenaker 6, NL-6641 SZ BEUNINGEN, The
Netherlands, Jan_Merks@ipg.nl*

Abstract

Both the new (bio)technologies and the traditional breeding of farm animals may raise questions that involve society. Three future models for the breeding and reproduction of farm animals have been described As part of the EC project 'Farm Animal Breeding – Implications for Society': conventional, alternative and low-cost.

Because of the unknown economic aspects, the potential application of biotechnology and social risks, the alternatives for organic, ethical and animal friendly breeding need to be worked out more into detail. A thematic network funded by the EC will among others explore the possibilities for sustainable farm animal breeding and reproduction in ruminants, pigs, poultry and fish.

Introduction

Since mankind started the domestication of farm animals, he has tried to get progeny from the animals that seemed best fit for the purpose he had in mind. Since the beginning of this century, initiated by governmental organisations by the set up of herdbooks, the farm animal reproduction and selection organisations are doing this job, providing the farmers with genetically high value animals to produce milk, meat, eggs or wool. All towards enough food at low cost.

Nowadays, not only the opinion of the farmers about the quality of their product or production system is important for animal breeders. In Europe, the issues surrounding developments in farm animal breeding (cattle, sheep, pigs, poultry and fish) are the ones in which the public has a real stake: new reproduction and selection technologies like transgenesis and cloning, but also undesirable side effects of high production in farm animals. More and more, the opinion of society and the 'licence to produce' determines the goal of farm animal selection and reproduction. Furthermore, food production has moved from being supply side driven to consumer driven. European farm animal reproduction and selection, on the outermost beginning of the food production chain, has to deal with this new situation. There is a growing need for rational debate among producers, consumers and policy makers and for decision-making based on technological, economical and society information.

1. The project “Farm Animal Breeding and Society”

The awareness of the European public concerning diseases in farm animals and new technologies has been the challenge for the European reproduction and selection industry as represented in the Farm Animal Industrial Platform (*FAIP*) to start a dialogue with society about the future of farm animal breeding, and to initiate the project “The Future Developments in Farm Animal Breeding and Reproduction and their Ethical, Legal and Consumer Implications (Fam Animal Breeding and Society)”. The project was a research project, funded in the Fourth EC Framework Programme for Research and Technological Developments in the area of Ethical, Legal and Social Aspects (ELSA). It started at 1 September 1998 and finished in December 1999. The goal of the project “Farm Animal Breeding and Society” was to explain breeding and reproduction, to indicate future possibilities and constraints, and to look at these developments from an ethical, legal and consumer viewpoint. The project has worked out a picture of challenges and future scenarios in farm animal breeding, and the possible societal merits and constraints.

The partners in the project were:

- 1) Farm Animal Industrial Platform (*FAIP*) and Institute for Pig Genetics (IPG). Their task was to make an inventory of the present and future aspects of breeding and reproduction, together with the
- 2) Zootechnical Institute of the University of Milan;
Together with working groups from the breeding industry, they developed among others three future scenarios: a conventional path, an alternative path and a low cost path, and a fourth path on biotechnology in farm animals for medical purposes. The scenarios give an overview of what is possible, and how breeding, technologies, production systems, consumer quality and cost price can be linked. Above all, they are meant to be a basis for discussion on the future of farm animal breeding and production.
- 3) Veterinary and Agricultural University, Frederiksberg Copenhagen. They reviewed the ethical aspects of farm animal breeding and reproduction;
- 4) Centre de Droit des Obligations, Faculty of Law Paris University I addressed the impact of the legal protection of biotechnological inventions by patents for farm animal reproduction and selection, and made an overview of the role animal welfare legislations could play on the future breeding work, and
- 5) Consumer and Biotechnology Foundation from the Netherlands working out the consumer interest in farm animal breeding and reproduction.

The results of the project have been presented and discussed at a workshop in Utrecht, the Netherlands, and distributed by means of a report, and a brochure for extended audiences in 12 languages. In this paper, the emphasis will be on the future pathways for farm animal breeding and reproduction.

1.12. Factors influencing the future of farm animal breeding

An exercise is made to determine which factors most probably will influence and determine the farm animal breeding of tomorrow in Europe. The main scientific, technological, and economical factors are described below.

1.1.1. Sustainability. Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Brundtland, 1987). Sustainable agriculture aims at production systems that can

provide man with food in a balanced way. European animal production is characterised by no use of additional hormones nor growth promoters. Many by-products from human food industry (e.g. soybean and citrus extractions) find their way in animal feed. A lot of farms are family farms, and they play an active part in the maintenance of their local rural environment. Compared with other continents, in Europe there is more concern about animal welfare and sustainable production. Breeding can be directed towards animals having the ability to digest by-products in a better way, to use feed more efficiently, or to produce in extensive environments. The art will be to find the right balance between animal production, animal welfare, environment, product quality and consumer price. However, a clear definition of sustainability in breeding terms has not yet been agreed upon.

1.1.2. Structure of farms. The size of farms is expected to grow continuously. In the first place the profit per animal decreases year after year. Consumer prices tend to get lower. Production costs increase. The result will be increased production per hectare, per litter, per animal. Also automation, hygiene regulations and a controlled food chain may force small farmers to give up business, because the investments needed are too high. On the other hand, high quota prices (Europe, Canada) keep farm sizes from expanding. European (cattle) farmers, but also Canadian poultry and dairy farmers currently protected by import barriers and subsidies, will have to adapt to world market prices. Farms where the farmer lives near the farm will disappear more and more. In the USA farms with one million pigs or a hundred thousand beef cows already exist. Exceptions will occur for farmers producing for niche markets or in a special production system (e.g. organic) who will be able to get a higher return per animal. However, with the increase of organic production prices tend to go down because of the power of the intermediates that buy and sell the products. More and more primary producers will have less control on the marketing of their products as farm animal production is moving from being producer driven to consumer driven.

1.1.3. Global markets/international developments. In North America and Europe food consumption will stabilize. In developing and emerging countries increased food consumption is expected due to growing world populations and, in emerging economies, increased access to the means to support consumption. In emerging economies animal products in the food package will increase, starting with fish and poultry, followed by other meat products.

A great deal of breeding knowledge and a number of international breeding companies are situated in Northern Europe and North America. Farm animal breeding will globalise more in the future, especially in cattle and pigs, while poultry breeding is already organised globally. The push for borderless organisation will not come from the scientific communities, but from breeding companies that need to stimulate the development of international genetic programmes in order to finance the necessary investments in software development (Lohuis, 1999) and DNA technology.

1.1.4. Structure of animal breeding. The structure of breeding companies differs between species, mainly due to the biology of the species. In ruminants there is mainly an open structure, in which a proportion of the day to day producing female animals can become future breeding animals. Dairy bulls are even compared world-wide by the International Bull Evaluation Board (INTERBULL) and frozen bull semen is traded globally. In poultry all the breeding work can be done in house and a few companies can and do provide the world with breeding stock. Pig breeding is in an intermediate situation. In aquaculture breeding is at the very start of developments, but in a few decennia a few breeding companies may provide the world with breeding fish. In the future cattle breeding companies may merge to form fewer world-wide operating

companies, providing farmers with semen and embryos. Furthermore, in cattle breeding nucleus herds, and maybe hybrid lines, will become part of the picture. Increased results in boar semen freezing and embryotransplantation in sows will improve possibilities for disseminating pig improvement with reduced disease risk. The number of pig and poultry breeding companies may reduce further and their size increase. Alongside that there may be smaller companies serving niche markets in cattle, pig, poultry and aquaculture breeding.

1.1.5. Computing and handling data. Handling information is very important in animal breeding. More sophisticated hardware and software will improve these possibilities. 'On farm data' can be sent electronically to any estimation company. The improved computing capacity makes it possible to analyse all these data together. For example pig breeding companies will increase involvement of the farmers by using on-farm data for the genetic evaluation and reproductive management of breeding animals. Specially designed or adapted breeding programmes can prevent small breeds from having too much inbreeding and at the same time the maximum genetic improvement (Gandini & Oldenbroek, 1999; Meuwissen, 1999).

1.1.6. Biotechnologies. New technologies are DNA technologies from Marker Assisted Selection to transgenesis, and reproduction technologies like gamete sexing, embryotechnologies or cloning. Some DNA tests or embryotechnology in cattle are already applied. Others are under research and could be used in the near or more distant future. Marker Assisted Selection could be used to detect genes for genetic disorders (Hoeschele & Meinert, 1990; Georges *et al.*, 1993), disease resistance, product quality (Andersson *et al.*, 1994; Georges *et al.*, 1995; Ashwell *et al.*, 1997) or other traits of interest. Transgenic animals would have a special feature, e.g. in New Zealand there are plans to set up a flock of genetically alternative cows producing milk that is similar to human breast milk. Cloned animals could be used to determine the genetic component of important traits, or to disseminate valuable production animals from top breeding population to production populations more quickly. Technologies can only be applied if their use is economically viable. Furthermore, the question is whether public opinion and consumer purchases would favour the application of new technologies.

The development of new technologies and the high cost involved in research, may force the market players legally to protect their research efforts by means of patents or to use trademarks in order to get a return for the research efforts. The possibility of their legal protection may introduce exclusive rights for certain applications and thus influence the structure of breeding and the technologies applied by the several market players. Furthermore, the need to fund research that is too expensive for one market player may stimulate companies to become partners in research or to amalgamate their companies.

1.1.7. Biodiversity. Breeding companies rely, for their selection possibilities, on the genetic diversity that is available in the species/the populations they work with. It is only possible to select for a certain trait, if the animals you select from show variation for this trait. Breeding companies carefully take care of the variation within their breeding stock. It is part of their breeding policy to maintain the available genetic variation, to maintain a 'zoo of special animals or species' and to keep an eye on the extremes of the genetic horizon. However, the genetic make-up of the breeding animals is not known, only estimated by means of performance measurements of the animals and their relatives. In general, information is available about traits that are taken into consideration. Although more traits are incorporated in the breeding goal than a few decennia ago, there can be genes or gene combinations for traits that are

presently unimportant or that we are not aware of yet. Loss of genetic material can take place invisibly, as the role and exchange of genetic material between populations, selection and crossing take place gradually. For instance, it is not known what exactly is the definition of European lines and breeds, e.g. German and Dutch Landrace. Knowledge about their real genetic distance (Nei, 1987; Eding & Laval, 1999) and relationships is insufficient. Research on the consequences of 'invisible loss' through genetic drift, selection or crossing could give a better picture of this. Breeding often concentrates on a few breeds per species. Also, 'popular' breeds like the Holstein Friesian cattle get mixed with local breeds world wide. The consequences for biodiversity of farm animals need further consideration (Farm Animal Industrial Platform, 1998). Animal genetic improvement and conservation of genetic diversity need and use the same tools and technologies (data analysis, reproductive technologies). Co-ordination at the European level of efforts undertaken in different countries is necessary.

1.2. Future models of farm animal production systems

Global market, technological, biotechnological, animal welfare, management, political, economical, legal and societal developments may force animal production systems to change.

In order to be able to consider new evolutions with care, and to have future pathways for discussion, three models are worked out in this section. Possible changes in breeding and farming system are divided in three livestock production models. For clarification, a fourth non-food model is mentioned, because the use of farm animals for the production of medicines or organs has caused a lot of commotion recently. This model is not worked out further, because the area in question is the pharmaceutical area, not the agricultural area. If it is agriculture, it is agriculture for non-food production.

Partly the models represent an extrapolation of today's reality into the future as, currently, diversification of breeding is already part of the reality in Europe. Different organisations, different countries or different farming systems work with their own breeding goals. Several models can be applied in one country or within one organisation, each serving part of the market. The drive behind the differentiation is historically determined, following market demands and/or motivation comes from pressure for animal welfare and other societal demands.

In the first model (*conventional path*) farm animal breeding and production develop further towards a system similar to the current one. There is no need to change the actual animal production system, mainly taking place at family farms.

In the second model (*alternative path*) the emphasis is on welfare, disease resistance, environment (pollution), niche markets, organic products, regional and special products. Consumers with differentiated demands for food and societal needs are the main drive behind this scenario.

The drive behind the third model (*low cost path*) is the demand of consumers for cheap and safe products in a global competitive market.

In all models the quality of products must be good. The first and third model are targeted on economic characteristics taking into account certain thresholds for e.g. mortality, welfare etc.

In general a breeding goal is determined by economic motives of farmers, mainly

based on market and economy. Next to this, political or societal conditions may determine the breeding goal.

Animal breeding is associated with reproductive technologies, like Artificial Insemination (AI) and Embryo Technology (ET) and with DNA technologies, like Marker Assisted Selection (MAS). Although in principle newly developed techniques (Ovum Pick Up, cloning, transgenesis) could be used to achieve the different goals described in all models, their application may be less likely or would have to be adapted, in order to meet public demand or to reach the breeding goal faster in a specific model. Table 1 and Table 2 represent today's perception that traditional aspects and technologies will be used in the several models.

Table 1. Today's perception that traditional aspects may be used in the conventional, alternative or low cost path

<u>Traditional aspects</u>	Conventional path	Alternative path	Low cost path
Decrease production costs	++	+/-	++++
Decrease variation in breeds/goals	+	---	++++
Balanced breeding	++	++++	+

++++ used routinely, +++ likely to be applied, ++ will probably be applied, + may be applied, +/- may (not) be applied, - not likely to be applied, -- very unlikely to be applied

Table 2. Today's perception whether technologies may be used in the conventional, alternative or low cost path

<u>Technologies</u>	Conventional path	Alternative path	Low cost path
Marker Assisted Selection	+++	+++	++++
Artificial Insemination and Embryo Technologies	+++	++	++++
Transgenesis	-	--	++
Monosexing (fish)	++	-	+++
Triploidy (fish)	+	+++	++
Cloning	+/-	--	+++

++++ used routinely, +++ likely to be applied, ++ will probably be applied, + may be applied, +/- may (not) be applied, - not likely to be applied, -- very unlikely to be applied

1.2.1. Conventional path

In the actual production system, mainly taking place at family farms, the breeding goal aims at improved efficiency of animal production in order to provide consumers with high quality animal products (milk, eggs, meat) at a reasonable cost price. In the conventional path, more genetic information on functional traits would be considered

in the breeding goal because of factors limiting increase of production, e.g. milk quotas, and the awareness that genetic improvement for high production efficiency may produce undesirable side effects (Rauw *et al.*, 1998). There would be more emphasis on quality traits and disease resistance, to increase food quality and food safety. International competition would be likely to favour those companies that provide breeding stock that will improve general animal efficiency and/or deliver improved products.

Technologies available today like Artificial Insemination, and Embryo Technologies would also be used in the management of populations in the conventional path.

Developments in research would enable the use of Artificial Insemination routinely in all species and Embryo Technologies in all farmed mammals. The development and use of new biotechnologies would not be seen as a primary need to achieve more quickly breeding goals.

Description of conventional path in cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, poultry and aquaculture. As high producing cows may exhibit lower fertility, some metabolic disorders, and some health problems, the breeding goals in milk cattle would incorporate, next to milk production and body structure, issues related to health, metabolism, non productive traits, and longevity (Groen *et al.*, 1997). The quota system that does not allow farmers to increase their production, and thus stimulate more efficient and profitable production, would favour selection for traits other than production in order to decrease the costs of production and increase the farmers' income although production will remain the main selection criterium. DNA tests would be available to detect animals carrying genetically transmittable diseases or genes improving better milk quality, e.g. k-casein (Lenstra, 1999). The aim in beef cattle and meat sheep would be to produce more meat in less time, with the minimum amount of feed, and with the best possible reproductive rate. Characteristics considered in the breeding objective would be mainly growth, carcass, and reproductive traits. Traits like meat quality that are now only measurable on slaughtered animals would be measured on live animals due to improved technologies. The double muscle would be present in some beef breeds, although double muscle causes mainly caesarians in e.g. the Belgian Blue. (Hanset, 1996). DNA tests on the myostatine gene (beef) (Ott, 1990; Grobet *et al.*, 1997; Masabanda *et al.*, 1998) or the Callipyge gene (less fat and more muscles in meat sheep) (Cockett *et al.*, 1993) would assist further selection. Milk composition and milkability, udder traits, and prolificity could be included in the breeding goal of milk sheep and goats next to milk production traits.

In pigs, selection would be aimed at strong, efficient, and high producing animals. To achieve this, selection criteria would be further differentiated between males and females lines, to take advantage of extra productivity and vitality due to the heterosis effect. Special crosses would be developed for specific housing systems. Information of the individual farms would be used to decide which families within the population contain valuable genetic characteristics and which do not. DNA tests would be available to detect deviant alleles.

The selection of poultry for table eggs (layers) would mainly aim at larger numbers of eggs per hen housed, optimum egg weight, efficient feed conversion, and improved egg quality. Demand for eggs from non cage-systems would change the layers farming system, especially in Northern Europe.

In broilers, turkeys and ducks (poultry meat production) there would be continued selection for growth rate, feed conversion, eviscerated yield and breastmeat yield. The

improvements in growth and yield characteristics would be achieved with increasing emphasis on quality and fitness traits through improved population structure, statistical methods and selection technologies. Examples of improved selection technologies include real-time X-ray technology to improve assessment of skeletal quality. Also other than production traits, e.g. skeletal quality, heart and lung function, disease resistance and other traits related to fitness or welfare would be incorporated in the breeding goal. Broiler breeding has used marker-assisted selection for many years in the form of serological determinants of resistance to Mareks Disease virus. Other markers could be used to improve disease resistance.

Currently selection in aquaculture has taken place for less than six generations in salmonids and two generations in marine species. No selection of breeders is recorded in molluscs. Breeding programmes would initiate selection for quality traits to decrease fat content in the muscle, improve yields at harvesting, and decrease the variation of the repartition of the lipids in the filet that causes variation of smoking success and the taste of smoke and salt. Furthermore, the development of lean strains could improve feed efficiency and decrease waste. This improvement could be extended to new lines and other species.

1.2.2. Alternative path

The production system, and consequently the breeding goal, would aim at moderate production levels, specific products (niche markets, organic products, regional products), health and welfare of the animals, environment and improved feed efficiency. The breeding goal would be towards balanced breeding, avoiding possible negative effects of breeding for production on other biological traits, e.g. mobility, reproduction, disease resistance. Not all technologies available today would be used to allow a product to be advertised and marketed with certain characteristics, e.g. organic products. Specific technologies or recently developed biotechnologies would be an exception. They could be used when there would be a strong need to reach a specific breeding objective. Examples could be the use of Embryo Transplantation and Embryo Sexing to ensure the survival and development of small and endangered breeds, the use of Artificial Insemination and Embryo Transfer, allowing the dissemination of genetic material free of diseases, or the use of Marker Assisted Selection to improve longevity, feather pecking, stress resistance, or a desired animal behaviour characteristic.

Three possible production systems are described:

- a) **Animal Welfare** Non productive traits that can improve animal welfare would be emphasized in the breeding objective. Selection for increased production has also increased the danger that the homeostatic balance of animals gets affected. In a literature study Rauw *et al.* (1998) have presented over a 100 references of undesirable side effects of selection for high production efficiency for broilers, pigs and dairy cattle. High productive animals seem to be more at risk for behavioural, physiological and immunological problems. When selection and farming is aimed at higher production, the individual resources would be used mostly for production, and less for other demands, and the buffer capacity of the animals could be affected (Resource Allocation Theory, Beilharz *et al.*, 1993). Reducing emphasis on production would accelerate genetic improvement for non-productive functional traits. If the economic benefit of “welfare traits” does not overcome the decreased revenue due to limited improvement in production, consumers may be ready to pay for the animal welfare through the higher prices of products.
- b) **Link region-breed-product / niche markets** Products of high quality and limited

in quantity represent the typical production in different geographical areas. Usually these products are part of the local culture. Breeding objectives should be addressed to maintain breeds and production systems that guarantee the variety of local food (Gandini & Giacomelli, 1997). Associations between region of production and breed or particular product (cheese, meat) could increase the value of the production, especially in areas where intensive farming cannot take place. The farming system could be addressed to maintain a balance between production and environment, by subscribing a maximum amount of animals of a breed on a specific extension in order to produce a limited amount of product, guaranteeing a good price to the farmers. Moreover, the presence of farmers is important for land conservation in areas otherwise destined to be abandoned.

- c) **Organic products** The demand for organic products is rising. The definition of organic products could lead to the application of particular breeding objectives. It will depend on the final EC regulation on organic production concerning what will be allowed or forbidden, and which technologies can be applied.

Description of alternative path in cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, poultry and

aquaculture. Next to the selection criteria mentioned in the conventional path, other reasons would be brought forward to change breeding goals and to consider alternative traits on top of the production criterion. Traits, like longevity, calving ease, udder health, somatic cell counts, control of mastitis, fertility, would be weighted heavier in the breeding goals in dairy cattle than would be the case in conventional breeding. For example, instead of obtaining a genetic improvement of 100 kg a year for milk production with no benefit for other characteristics, one could decide to improve milk production only 50 kg and reduce in the meantime health problems and metabolic disorders. Another example comes from beef cattle. Here the selection criterion could be to avoid the use of animals carrying the double muscle characteristic as reproducers to increase calving ease. Furthermore, selection could be aimed at animals able to adapt to difficult environments and able to produce a live healthy new-born calf each year. Some examples of regional products, produced by local breeds are the Fontina from the Aosta Red Pie and the Reblochon cheese from the Abbondance breeds. Niche markets could request particular products, as is the case for the “Parmigiano Reggiano delle Vacche Rosse” made from the milk of the Reggiana cattle breed, today counting only 1000 head (51,000 in 1955). Multiple Ovulation and Embryo Transfer (MOET) could improve selection schemes in breeds limited in size but with an economic importance (niche markets) and help their maintenance and their survival.

In the alternative model for pigs wishes from society would be integrated in a rural production system with medium sized isolated family farms, evenly spread over the country, with high healthy animals. The breeding goal would aim at animal friendly production, possibility for display of natural behaviour, and residue free pork, incorporating traits like litter size, piglet survival, mothering abilities, ease of growing and lack of fat accretion. Farmers could combine these estimates in a personal index. In this way uniformity within a farm could increase, while at the same moment genetic variation between farms could be maintained. Import of new genetic material would be by means of semen or embryos because of the limitation of disease risk. There would be niche markets with local breeds or regional products (e.g. Iberian ham). Single gene technology could help to assess the presence of deleterious alleles, responsible for among others congenital disorders like atresia ani and tremor piglets.

Poultry breeders for table egg chicken (layers) would respond to customer preferences for eggs from non-cage systems in having a slower genetic progress for conventional

traits and extra emphasis on behaviour traits and liveability in order to decrease the tendency towards feather pecking and/or cannibalism, and to minimise the incidence of floor eggs i.e. eggs not laid in a nest. There is some evidence that selection against undesirable behaviour could be effective. Breeding programmes could be developed for certain niche markets. The further development of the egg products market may require selection for the egg components.

Poultry meat breeding programmes (broilers, turkeys, ducks) would emphasise the quality and welfare of individual birds, skeletal quality, and improved heart and lung function, next to continued selection on meat production and feed efficiency. Although some progress has been made in improving disease resistance, new technologies could accelerate this and make further improvements to bird welfare. Breeding programmes could be developed for certain niche markets, e.g. a particular type of broiler based on specific requirements such as colour, regional breed, organic production system etc. There is a growing niche market for Bronze and Black feathered turkeys. Slow growing turkey breeds with an increased subcutaneous fat content over the breast represent a market for traditional farmed Christmas turkeys.

In fishes and molluscs, the development of resistant strains could be one of the solutions to avoid diseases in open farming conditions, limiting the use of drugs and increasing product safety. Furthermore, specialised breeding lines would be developed for fish species not yet farmed (halibut, char, cod, sole, sparides, perch, catfish), in order to provide consumers with a high diversity of products. Some have potentially very high growth rates (thunnus, seriola). Others originate from other geographic areas in Japan, Chile, South America, Asia or Australia.

1.2.3. Low cost path

In the low cost path the goal would be to provide safe food at the lowest production costs. New methodologies to reach the objective of improved production efficiency would be explored and expensive research funded. Economic interest would be the pushing drive to use the most effective technologies available. Biotechnologies like cloning or transgenesis would most likely find their way here. Their application would mainly be related to ensure higher production at lower cost. This path is expected to be followed by producers at the global market: USA, South East Asia, South America, Canada, and maybe Europe. It can affect a large part of the food supply and may be of great interest to public opinion.

Description of low cost path in cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, poultry and aquaculture.

In cattle, sheep and goats all breeding objectives would be aimed at reducing the cost of production. The cost/benefit ratio would determine which technologies and production systems could be used. Intensive farming would be the main instrument of production. In beef cattle there would be selection for double muscle. In sheep the Boorola gene to produce more offspring per delivery would be used.

In pig farming, family farms would gradually or rapidly be replaced by industrial farms, large well organised farms with very low labour input per animal. The selection for this environment would be on strong animals with a very good and adaptive digestive tract able to grow and farrow with little human intervention. Pig families with easy farrowing and good interaction between sow and piglets would be best adapted to this environment, even if litter size would be a little lower than usual in the conventional path. Uniformity in start of oestrus, in size of animals, in birth weight and quality of piglets etc. would be very important. A reduction in on farm variation would inevitably mean a reduction in genetic variation. Large farms grow large numbers of

animals close together, causing increased disease risks. In large populations it is easier for pathogens to survive, making subdivisions within farms necessary or selection for animals with higher resistance.

The breeding goal for poultry table egg production (layers) would be for low cost safe production systems, although the rates of progress for egg mass and feed conversion are expected to be lower in poultry, due to approaching biological limitations. Genes or genetic markers for desirable behavioural or disease resistance may be found and applied. When more cost-effective screening methods could be found, transgenic animals would also contribute to the genetic progress.

Genetic progress in poultry for meat production would be mainly aimed at growth rate, feed conversion, eviscerated yield and breastmeat yield in a cost-effective production system. Progress would be accelerated if marker genes or the trait genes themselves are identified. A better knowledge of Quantitative Trait Loci (QTL) affecting disease resistance would allow more accurate estimation of breeding values for such traits. Since pathogens evolve faster than the domesticated populations, it is vital that the new technologies do not narrow the genetic resource.

The genetic variability of all the traits in fish is two to three times higher than in the livestock species as fish species are still wild species. This means that an important potential of genetic progress exists. The benefit of the increase of the return rate of investment per kilogram produced and the decrease of the cost of raising would rapidly decrease the cost of the products. For example, Atlantic salmon costs have decreased from 12 US \$ per kilo in the 1980s to 3 to 4 US \$ per kilo in 1998. The part due to the genetic progress is still difficult to estimate as very few estimations have been published, but it could be expected that this cost would continue to decrease in the next decades. Furthermore, monosexing or triploidy could be induced by external factors, e.g. temperature. Monosexing fish would allow fish of commercial size without hormonal treatment. Triploidy, already present in the wild and giving sterile animals, would prevent selected fish from reproducing in the wild.

1.2.4. Farm animals for pharmaceuticals or xenotransplantation

Farm animals may be used for non-food purposes, to produce pharmaceuticals or organs for transplantation for example. In this case the animals are transgenic and reproduction may take place through conventional techniques or cloning. The animals will be kept in a pathogen free environment.

It is conceivable that in the long term transgenics might be used to enable valuable pharmaceutical products to be deposited in the egg for subsequent harvesting. Other examples are ruminants producing 'medicinal' milk, pigs that 'produce' organs for xenotransplantation.

1.3. Discussion

This paper has outlined which technological, economical and global factors will most probably influence the future of breeding and the animals used in livestock production. Although developments in production systems will differ according to species, due to biological differences, many examples carried out previously for a particular case could be extended to different species or productions. For example feed conversion efficiency in all the species and production systems reduces the necessary amount of arable land.

The scenarios mentioned are model scenarios, meant to facilitate a discussion on the future of breeding. Differences between countries, farmers and breeding companies

have resulted in a variety of breeding goals and practices. The conventional, alternative and low cost model can therefore also be seen as an extrapolation of today's reality into the future. The overall picture of future possibilities - moderate, alternative or just convenient for the consumer - gives an idea of the choices that can be made (Figure 1).




Figure 1. The overall picture of possibilities – moderate, alternative or just convenient for the consumer – gives an idea of the choices that can be made

Directly livestock production and thus animal breeding are influenced by the consumer purchases. This is the most powerful way of influencing the way food is produced.

Any discussion to influence decisions in selection programmes and farming systems should address the consumer needs and the public desire, bearing in mind that

a) changes in breeding goals will not give results now but in five or ten years or more

- from now. In setting breeding goals, the consumer and societal wishes of a future that lays a decade or more ahead need to be predicted,
- b) the actual economical system is moving towards market globalisation, and
 - c) not everything can be reached by breeding. Breeding is a tool that can be used alongside other management tools. Genetic improvement is a part of the production chain, dealing with the choice of the parents of the next generation, and with the production of this generation. The farming system and the technologies involved (the environment) play the other large role in animal production. Even for characters with a very high heritability of 40 %, 60 % of the eventual expression for this character would still be determined by factors in the environment.




Figure 2. The ideas and experience in the alternative path can be used by the farmers in the low cost path and vice versa

The future reality could fit into the pre-described conventional, alternative or low-cost path, but it could also present a variety of the different production systems. There is no

clear answer to what should be the future scenario. They could co-exist and the one could benefit from the other. The ideas and experience in the alternative path could be used by the farmers in the low cost path and vice versa (Figure 2). Also in the future, the wish to express cultural differences in Europe could lead to different farming systems. Part of the differences might be due to different levels of acceptance of technologies involved in the production system or different perceptions of quality and price. Furthermore, consumers may want to have a freedom of choice in their purchases.

In order to be able to adapt to the wishes of society, it will be important to know what society really wants, and to investigate further the technological and economic possibilities of the described scenarios.

2. Sustainable European Farm Animal Breeding And Reproduction: the SEFABAR thematic network

The project ‘Farm Animal Breeding – Implications for Society’ has indicated that the alternatives for organic, ethical and animal friendly breeding need to be worked out more into detail because of the unknown economic aspects, the potential application of biotechnology and social risks of these alternative pathways. In discussions about sustainable production it is often not clear or agreed upon what is exactly meant by ‘sustainability’. In farm animal breeding and reproduction no common definition of sustainability is available. With (bio)technological developments giving more possibilities on the one hand, and animal welfare constraints on the other hand, with other continents exploring the possibilities of ‘natural hormones’, transgenics and cloning and Europe appreciating a more balanced way of animal production, the need for clear, economically sound and society accepted breeding prospects for Europe is apparent.

As a follow up of ‘Farm Animal Breeding – Implications of Society’, a thematic network has been proposed to the European Commission in Socio-Economic Research, Quality of Life of the Fifth Framework Programme: Sustainable European Farm Animal Breeding And Reproduction (SEFABAR). SEFABAR aims at finding sustainable, economically sound and accepted breeding scenarios for ruminants, pigs, poultry and fish, with critical society involvement. The aim is to combine the technological knowledge in industry and science, with socio-economic expertise, and to inform society about the findings.

SEFABAR consists of a breeding and reproduction part of European industry and research managers of farm animal breeding and reproduction institutes and industries. In working parties on ruminants, pigs, poultry and fish, they will define sustainable breeding and reproduction, make an overview of ongoing research and business efforts in sustainable breeding and reproduction, and identify knowledge gaps and sustainable breeding strategies.

Around the breeders’ network, in five case studies the socio-economic aspects influencing sustainable breeding and reproduction of farm animals will be investigated. This will ensure both valuable information, and a continuous interaction ‘with society’, i.e. from bio-ethicists, the German animal welfare organisation, sociologists and economists. The case studies consist of the visualisation of the cultural differences within Europe and between Europe, USA and Asia (Wageningen University - Rural Sociology), the study of ethically and animal welfare regulatory aspects (Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University - Centre for Bioethics and Risk Management and Akademie fuer Tierschutz), a study on the role of public opinion (

INRA - Laboratoire de la Recherche sur la Consommation) and a study on the economic situation and world trade aspects (University of Exeter - Agricultural Economics Unit). Society and policy makers will be informed about the results.

SEFABAR is initiated by FAIP in cooperation with the European Association for Animal Production, the World Poultry Science Association and the European Aquaculture Society. The project is expected to start in the Autumn of 2000 and to take three years. During the project a web site will be available with actual activities and results. The project is open for those who want to contribute.

References

- Andersson L., Haley C.S., Ellegren H., Knott S.A., Johansson M., Andersson K., Andersson-Eklund L., Edfors-Lilja I., Fredholm M., Hansson I., Håkansson J., Lundström K. (1994) – Genetic mapping of quantitative trait loci for growth and fatness in pigs – *Science*, 263: 1771-1774.
- Ashwell M.S., Rexroad C.E. Jr; Miller R.H., Van Raden P.M., Da Y. (1997) - Detection of loci affecting milk production and health traits in an elite US Holstein population using microsatellite markers- *Animal Genetics*, 28: 216-222.
- Barillet F. (1997) - Genetic of milk production-In: “The genetics of sheep” ed. Piper L. & Ruvinsky A. 611 pp.
- Beilharz R.G., Luxford B.G., Wilkinson J.L. (1993) – Quantitative genetics and evolution: Is our understanding of genetics sufficient to explain evolution? *J. Anim. Breed. Gen.* 110, 161-170.
- Brundtland G.H. (1987) - *Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press.
- Cockett N.E., Jackson S.P. Shay T.L., Nielsen D., Moore S.S. Steele M.R., Berendise W., Greene R.D., Georges M. (1993) – Chromosomal localisation of the *Callipyge* gene in sheep (*Ovis aries*) using bovine DNA markers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 91, 3019-3023.
- Eding J.H., Laval G. (1999) – Measuring genetic uniqueness in livestock - In :”Genebanks and the conservation of farm animal genetic resources” ed. Oldenbroek 119 pp.
- Farm Animal Industrial Platform (1998) – *Biodiversity of Farm Animals* 4 pp.
- Gandini G.C., Giacomelli P. (1997) – What economic value for local livestock breeds? – 48th Annual Meeting of EAAP.
- Gandini G.C., Oldenbroek J.K (1999) –Choosing the conservation strategy- In :”Genebanks and the conservation of farm animal genetic resources” ed. Oldenbroek. 119 pp.
- Georges M., Dietz A.B., Mishra A., Nielsen D., Sargeant L. S., Sorensen A., Steele M.R., Zhao X., Leipold H., Womak J.E. (1993) – Microsatellite mapping of the gene causing weaver disease in cattle will allow the study of an associate quantitative trait

loci – Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 90 (3): 1058-1062.

Georges M., Nielsen D., Mackinnon M., Mishra A., Okimoto R., Pasquino A.T., Sargeant L. S., Sorensen A., Steele M.R., Zhao X., Womak J.E., Hoeshele I. (1995)- Mapping quantitative trait loci controlling milk production in dairy cattle by exploiting progeny testing- Genetics, 139: 907-920.

Grobet L, Martin L.J., Poncelet D., Pirottin D., Brouwers B., Riquet J., Schoeberlein A., Dunner S., Menissier F., Massabanda J., Fries R., Hanset R., Georges M. (1997) - A deletion in the bovine myostatin gene causes the double-muscling phenotype in cattle- Nature Genetics 17(1):71-74.

Groen A., Steine T., Colleau J.J., Pedersen J., Pribyl J., Renisch N. (1997) – Economic values in dairy cattle breeding, with special reference to functional traits- Report of EAAP- working group. Livestock Production Science, 49: 1-21.

Hanset R. (1996) – Animal Selection and Welfare. The Case of the Belgian Blue. 14pp.

Hoeshele I. , Meinert T.R. (1990) – Association of genetic defects with yield and type traits: The Weaver Locus Effect on Yield- Journal of Dairy Science, 73: 946-952.

Lenstra J.A. (1999) – DNA technology and animal husbandry: state of the art and perspectives – In: “Production diseases in farm animals” ed. Wensing Th. Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Production Diseases in Farm Animals. Wageningen Press. 390 pp.

Lohuis M. M. (1999) - Dairy Breeding Research & Development Discussion Paper. Canadian Cattle Breeding Research Council. 33 pp.

Masabanda J., Pirottin D., Poncelet D., Grobet L., Georges M., Fries R. (1998): A cytogenetic map of the muscular hypertrophy (MH) region on bovine chromosome 2. Animal Genetics (1): 33 suppl. 1.

Meredith M.J. (1995) -Pig breeding and infertility- In: “Animal breeding and infertility” Ed. M.J. Meredith. 508 pp.

Meuwissen T.H.E. (1999) – Operation of conservation schemes- In :”Genebanks and the conservation of farm animal genetic resources” ed. Oldenbroek 119 pp.

Nei M. (1987) -Molecular Evolutionary Genetics- Columbia University Press, New York, 511 pp.

Ollivier L., Sellier P., Monin G. (1975) – Déterminisme génétique du syndrome d'hyperthermie maligne chez le porc de Pietrain- Annales de Génétique et de Sélection Animale 7: 159-166.

Ott RS (1990) - Muscular hypertrophy in beef cattle: déjà vu.- J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc. 196(3): 413-415.

Rauw W.M., Kanis E., Noordhuizen-Stassen E.N., Grommers F.J. (1998)-

Undesirable side effects of selection for high production efficiency in farm animals: a review- *Livestock Production Science*, 56: 15-33.

Surai P.F & Wishart G.J. (1996) - Poultry artificial insemination technology in the countries of former USSR- *World's Poultry Science* 52, 27-43.

Van Vleck L.D. (1993) – Selection index and introduction to mixed model methods *The green book* 481 pp.

Zeuner F.E. (1963) – A history of domestic animals- ed. Harper and Row, New York. 560 pp.

Farm Animal Breeding And Society

*The RTD-project **The future developments in farm animal breeding and reproduction and their ethical, legal and consumer implications - Farm Animal Breeding and Society** is funded by the EC DGXII Ethical, Legal and Social Aspects Unit and organised by Farm Animal Industrial Platform (FAIP)/Institute for Pig Genetics (IPG) as part of the project BIO4-CT98-0055 (DG 12- SSMI).*

September 1998 – December 1999

Contactpersons European Commission:

Laurence Cordier, Maurizio Salvi. Laurence.cordier@cec.eu.int and Maurizio.Salvi@cec.eu.int

Co-ordinator project:

Anne-Marie Neeteson, FAIP/IPG, Oosterbeek. Neeteson@iaf.nl

Partners project:

Jan Merks, IPG, Beuningen. Jan_Merks@ipg.nl

Alessandro Bagnato and Raffaella Finocchiaro, Università degli Studi di Milano. abagnato@imiucca.csi.unimi.it, zootve1@imiucca.csi.unimi.it

Bio-ethics:

Peter Sandøe and Stine Christiansen, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University Frederiksberg, Copenhagen. psand@coco.ihh.ku.dk, sbc@kvl.dk

Law:

Christine Noiville, Centre de Droit des Obligations, University Paris I. noiville@univ-paris1.fr

Consumers:

Arie van Genderen, Consumer and Biotechnology Foundation, The Hague. avgenderen@consumentenbond.nl

The future pathways have been developed by Jan Merks, Alessandro Bagnato, Raffaella Finocchiaro, Anne-Marie Neeteson, Egbert Knol, and the members of the Farm Animal Industrial Platform (FAIP), represented by Ole Andersen, The Danish AI Societies; Roland Aumüller, Zentralverband der Deutschen Schweineproduktion; Paul Bampton, UKMASCP; Ejner Boersting, Scanbrid; Peter Bradnock, Association of British Primary Breeders & Exporters; Caroline Brown, PIC; Luca Buttazzoni, ANAS; Philippe Chapaux, CIA Linalux; Pierre Chereh, France Hybrides; Nanke den Daas, Holland Genetics; Jean-Louis Donal, Hubbard-ISA; Bernard Eivers, The AI Co-operatives of Ireland; Dieter Flock, Lohmann Tierzucht; Ulla Gam Hansen, Federation of Danish Pig Breeders and Slaughterhouses; Magnus Haard, Svensk Avel; Rudolf Hahn, Claus Leiding, AI Neustadt a/d Aisch; Pierrick Haffray, Michel Reffay, SYSAAF; Barbara Harlizius, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Rinderzüchter; Jarmo Juga, Finnish Animal Breeding Association; Ton van Erp, IPG; Sven Korsvoll, Norsk Laksaevl; Siem Korver, Euribrid; Joachim Krieter, Schaumann Besitz-Hülsenberg; Giovanna Lazzari, LTR/CIZ; Alain Malafosse, UNCEIA; Brian McGuirk, Genus; Jim McKay, Ross Breeders; Cliff Nixey, BUT; Marina Pelipenko, Selonda Aquaculture; Arne Ola Refsdal, Norsk Rodt Fe; Emilio Torlini, ELPZOO; Ronald van Giessen, Altapon; Frans van Sambeek, Hendrix Poultry Breeders; Chris Warkup, Meat and Livestock Commission.

SEFABAR

The Thematic Network 'Sustainable European Farm Animal Breeding And Reproduction' is evaluated positively by the EC DG RTD Fifth Framework Programme Quality of Life – Socio-Economic Research, (QLRT-1999-31368). SEFABAR is organised by Farm Animal Industrial Platform (FAIP) in cooperation with European Association for Animal Production (EAAP), World Poultry Science Association (WPSA) and European Aquaculture Society (EAS).

Expected Start Date and Duration: Autumn 2000, 36 months
Future Web Site: www.sefabar.org

Contactperson European Commission:
Maria Theofilatou Maria.Theofilatou@cec.eu.int

Co-ordinator project:

Anne-Marie Neeteson, FAIP, Oosterbeek. Neeteson@iaf.nl

Network Manager:

Anna-Elisa Liinamo, FAIP, Wageningen, Anna-Elisa.Liinamo@alg.vf.wag-ur.nl

Partners project:

Animal Welfare:

Ina Mueller-Arnke, Brigitte Rusche, Akademie für Tierschutz, akademie@tierschutzbund.de

Cultural Differences:

Jan-Douwe van der Ploeg, Rudolf van Broekhuizen, Wageningen Agricultural University – Rural Sociology, jan.douwevanderploeg@alg.swg.wag-ur.nl

Bio-ethics:

Peter Sandøe, Lars Gjøøl Christensen, Christian Gamborg, Stine B. Christiansen, The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University - Centre for Bio-ethics and Risk Assessment, pes@kvl.dk

Public Opinion:

Arouna P. Ouedraogo, Institut National de Recherche Agronomique - Laboratoire de Recherche sur la Consommation, ouedraog@ivry.inra.fr

Economy, World Trade Aspects:

John McNerney, Richard Bennett., University of Exeter - Agricultural Economics Unit, j.p.mcinerney@exeter.ac.uk

Members:

Gerard Albers, Nutreco; Lawrence Aldersen, Rare Breeds Survival Trust; Ole Andersen, The Danish AI Societies; Alessandro Bagnato, Semenitaly; Sofia Belibasaki, NAGREF; W. Bessei, Universität Hohenheim; Jean Boyazoglu, European Association for Animal Production; Caroline Brown, PIC; Graham Bulfield, Alan Archibald, Roslin Institute; Manuel Carrillo, Consejo Superior de investigaciones científicas; Pierre Cherel, France Hybrides; Jean-Louis Donal, Hubbard-ISA; F. Ellendorff, Henner Niemann, Steffen Weigend, Institut für Tierzucht und Tierverhalten Mariensee; Dietmar Flock, Lohmann Tierzucht; Merete Fredholm, Torben Greve, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University; Pierrick Haffray, SYSAAF; Sadasivam Kaushik, INRA St.Pee sur Nivelle; Sven Arild Korsvoll; Aquagen; Joachim Krieter, Institut für Tierzucht und Tierhaltung Kiel; Hans Komen, Wageningen University; Alistair Lawrence, Scottish Agricultural College; Asko Maki-Tanila, Agricultural Research Centre Jokioinen; Alain Malafosse, UNCEIA; Jim McKay, Ross Breeders; Jan Merks, IPG – Institute for Pig Genetics; Gert Nieuwhof, Meat and Livestock Commission; Cliff Nixey, British United Turkeys; Frans Ollevier, KU Leuven; Jean-Paul Renard, Michèle Tixier-Boichard, INRA Jouy-en-Josas; Karl Schellander, Institut für Tierwissenschaft Bonn; Piet Simons, World Poultry Science Association; Diogo Thomaz, Aquanet; Johan Van Arendonk, Wageningen University; Janneke Van Wagendonk, Holland Genetics; Eberhard Von Borell, Martin Luther University

