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AIMS

Reduce production costs
  – improve financial resilience

Improve gut health
  – improve animal welfare

Reduce the reliance on soya as a source of protein
  – reduce the environmental impacts associated with soya production & improve environmental resilience
SILAGE
Feeding pigs silage

Why not?

• Pigs are categorised as monogastrics – like poultry and humans
• Monogastrics are mainly fed concentrates – the main source of protein is usually soyabean meal (SBM)
SOYABEAN MEAL
FEEDING PIGS SILAGE

Why not?

• Silage is a bulky feed – digesting it has an energy cost

• Lower liveweight gain?

• Lower killing out percentage?

• Poorer carcass grade?
FEEDING PIGS SILAGE

Why?

• Pigs are actually *hindgut fermenters*
• Bugs can digest fibrous feeds in their hindgut
• Silage can be produced in Scotland
• Soya is imported
• Silage is cheap, SBM is expensive
GRASS / CLOVER
FEEDING PIGS SILAGE

Why?

• Additional behavioural substrate – allows expression of natural behaviours

• Better for their gut – finely milled feeds are associated with gastric ulcers
METHODOLOGY

Pigs of the same age, sex, and breeds were split into 2 groups

• Group A, ration 1 (control)
  – Ad-lib access to proprietary feed pellets (includes wheat & soyabean meal)

• Group B, ration 2 (experimental)
  – Ad-lib access to 50/50 pellets & barley mix, and ad-lib access to red clover silage
METHODOLOGY

• Ration B diluted the protein content (by having more barley)
• This reduced amino acid supply
• Encourages seeking out of high protein feeds elsewhere, i.e. silage
• Other studies tend to keep the full diet on offer, as well as silage
  – No incentive for pigs to seek lysine (an amino acid)
## Protein

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DM (%)</th>
<th>CP (%)</th>
<th>Lys (%)</th>
<th>Met (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthworms†</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>51.66</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthropods†</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs†</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>62.59</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insect larvae†</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>48.09</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBM*</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans*</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Crawley (2015) Fulfilling 100% organic pig diets: feeding roughage and foraging from the range


ASSESSMENTS

• Liveweight gain (lwg)
• Killing out percentage
• Carcass quality: grade
• Cost of feed (per g of lwg)
• Gut length: hindgut fermentation
• Eating quality – taste
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RESULTS: PIG PERFORMANCE

• 72 Tamworth and Duroc crosses – boars and gilts

• 19 Aug initial weighing (31-68 kg)
  – 53% <50 kg (small)
  – 47% >50 kg (big)

• 13 Oct interim weighing (average 100 kg)

• All pigs grew better than expected
RESULTS: PIG PERFORMANCE

• For the Duroc crosses
  – No significant difference in weight gain between rations

• For the Tamworth crosses
  – No significant difference in weight gain between rations for ‘big’ animals
  – A difference in weight gain between ‘big’ and ‘small’ with the silage diet

• All pigs grew better than expected
TASTE TEST

Soil Association SCOTLAND
RESULTS: TASTE TEST

• Attendees were asked to score each type of pork (A and B) on a scale of 1-5
  1 = least like-able; 5 = most like-able

Criteria scored:

• Appearance raw
• Appearance cooked
• Cooking quality
• Aroma
• Texture in mouth
• Flavour
RESULTS: TASTE TEST

OVERALL SCORE

OVERALL PREFERENCE

Like-ability score

A
B

A
B
No Answer

27%
27%
46%
CONCLUSIONS

• In this trial...

• Silage is an effective source of feed for pigs with mainly Duroc genetics
  – No significant impact on weight gain

• No impact on taste

• Potential to reduce imported protein by using home grown silage for pigs
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