

seven times in flat races and eight times over jumps. If a jockey exceeds these limits by one, two or three hits, then they will be suspended for two, five or seven days, respectively. If a jockey goes on to use the whip excessively a second time within a 12-month period then the suspension periods for a second offence increase and overuse by one, two, or three hits will incur a suspension of four, ten or fourteen days. However, this is at the discretion of the racing stewards and some hits may be disregarded by the steward after review of the race video footage and after hearing evidence from the jockey. Where a jockey receives a suspension of seven days or more then he will also forfeit any prize money.

The BHA consider that further scientific research into the use of the whip in racing is required and recommend that that the Authority should continue to support research in this area, and to incorporate any future changes in whip design or technological innovations that may enhance equine welfare. Additionally, the public opinion research showed a general lack of understanding of how and when the whip is used in racing and the BHA therefore recommend that the Authority should publish the results of the Review widely, and keep track of public perception by commissioning further opinion research in the future.

The training of jockeys is also targeted and the BHA recommends that current knowledge on animal welfare and behaviour is incorporated into jockey training. The BHA also proposes that the course content and structure for apprentice jockeys, conditional jockeys, and amateur riders at each stage of their career is revisited to ensure that teaching is effective in explaining the acceptable and correct use of the whip. Additionally, it is recommended that greater use is also made of remedial training for jockeys who are identified as having deficiencies in their riding and whip use.

Responsible Regulation: A review of the Use of the Whip in Horse Racing (September 2011). A4, 77 pages. British Horseracing Authority. British Horseracing Authority, 75 Holborn, London, WC1V 6LS. Email: info@britishhorseracing.com. The review is available online at: <http://www.britishhorseracing.com/whip-review/WhipReview.pdf>.

*E Carter,
UFAW*

The cost of improving farm animal welfare

Compassion in World Farming has recently published a report written by its Chief Policy Advisor, Peter Stevenson. The report considers the economics of livestock farming systems and, specifically, compares the cost of production between intensive systems and those which are thought to offer a higher standard of farmed animal welfare.

The Report reviewed a number of academic studies and these were used to demonstrate that the differences in production costs between the systems are, in some cases, quite low. For example, the on-farm costs of producing a free-range egg is considered to be only 2.08 pence more than a cage egg. It is therefore suggested that the average

consumer could switch to eating free-range eggs for a moderate 7.48 pence extra each week (the average per capita consumption of eggs in the United Kingdom is 187 eggs per year). Similar figures are provided for cost comparisons of pig production systems, such as: sow stalls versus group housing; outdoor versus indoor; and various methods for keeping growing pigs.

It is suggested in the Report that systems with higher animal welfare often result in healthier animals, which may result in decreased production costs as a result, such as lower mortality, improved growth rates and lower feed-conversion ratios. It is noted that assessment of the profitability of milk production solely by measuring the conversion of feed into milk ignores a number of other important factors, including fertility, longevity, and milk yield losses and culling due to health problems, and the value of both cull cows and calves. The results of a study looking into the differences between a more robust dairy herd (in which cows are stronger, healthier, have lower milk yields per lactation but greater longevity) and a higher yielding herd concluded that the net margin for a robust herd was 20% higher per cow compared to a high yielding herd.

According to the Report, increased production costs associated with implementing higher welfare practices have a relatively small effect on final retail prices. This is because production costs are only part of the end price and other factors, eg slaughter, processing, packaging, distribution, marketing, also play a role. A study from the United States exemplifies this: it concluded that changing US pork production from sow stall to group-housing systems would result in a 9% increase in costs at the farm-level but only a 2% increase at the retail level. The same study concluded that changing from sow stall to free-range systems, would increase farm-level costs by 18% but retail costs by only 5%.

The Report then goes on to outline various economic drivers that could be used to stimulate higher welfare farming practices. It is proposed that all products should be labelled to indicate the method of production, enabling consumers to take these into account in their purchases, should they wish to do so. Subsidies could also be used to provide incentives for farmers to adopt higher welfare practices, eg via the EU Common Agricultural Policy. The Report considers that full account should be taken of indirect costs such as use of water, soil degradation, greenhouse gas emissions, control of food-borne diseases (eg *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter*), and possible effects on prevalence of non-communicable diseases that may be associated with meat consumption.

Reviewing the Costs: The Economics of Moving to Higher Welfare Farming (August 2011). A4, 23 pages. A report written by the Chief Policy Advisor, Peter Stevenson, at Compassion in World Farming. ISBN: 1-900156-55-5. Available online at: http://www.ciwf.org.uk/includes/documents/cm_docs/2011/reviewing_the_costs_august_2011.pdf.

*E Carter,
UFAW*