

# ANIMAL WELFARE IN INDONESIAN TRADITIONAL DAIRY GOATFARM, FIELD STUDY IN CILENGKRANG, CIMALAKA DISTRICT, SUMEDANG REGENCY

Tyagita Hartady, Nabila Ayu Faza, dan Arvia Nisrina praditha

Padjadjaran University, Jl. Raya Bandung Sumedang KM 21, Jatinangor 45363

E-mail: tyagita.hartady@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

For people in Cilengkrang Village, Cimalaka District, Sumedang Regency, dairy goats are a living investment that can be used as future assets. Although not as the main livelihood, raising livestock is done directly by the residents with the provision of knowledge about raising goat from the local breeders group, Simpay Tampomas. Milk produced is then sold and some were consumed by humans.

With traditional maintenance methods, it is not surprising that family involvement in management is high (Yunita et al., 2017). The majority of farmers rely on personal and senior experience in overcoming their livestock problems (Hartady and Widyastuti, 2018).

Welfare is not absolutely necessary for humans alone. As creatures of God Almighty, farm animals also have the same rights to be treated wisely by humans. Animal welfare is closely related to the health of animals and the welfare animal automatically will be productive as well, which in the end animal-source food can be guaranteed safe for human consumption. For information, animal welfare is a new priority trend for the 2001 International Strategic Plan for the World Animal Health Office (OIE) (Daldiri, 2017).

However, not all farmers understand the background and application of animal welfare. Various factors such as educational background, financial condition, limited space for cages and access to update information about farming, etc are a barrier for dairy goat farmers to apply animal welfare principles to their farm.

## METHODS

The concept of farm animal welfare was carried out by direct observation to the field and the data obtained was filled into a questionnaire that had been prepared in advance. The results obtained were analyzed statistically.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained were analyzed statistically and stated that 6 of the 10 observed parameters did not meet the welfare standards of livestock, including inadequate space in the cage (66.7%), goats could not express natural behavior (57.7), shelters cleanliness (57.7%), poor lighting in the cage (57.7%), limited of grazed animal (66.7%), non-routine disinfectants and antiseptic application (66.7%).

The economic limitations impact on the lack comfortable environment for the animal. Ideally the cage is 125 x 150 cm for male goat, 100 x 125 cm for females and 125 x 150 x 175 cm for the fluffy or old pregnant females (Sarwono, 2002). This resulting inability of expressing natural behavior such as running, jumping or even climbing. This is very risky for livestock to become easily stressed. The cleanliness of the cage is a concern because not a few of farmers are less concerned about the cleanliness of the cage. The remains forages were still often found piled on the floor of the cage. This causes the cage to become moist and livestock threatened with disease. Grazing is necessary for the male goat in order to muscle and nerve relaxation. In the field, most of the farmer do not graze the goats. Some of the farmers even design the cage with no doors, so no graze at all for the animal for the rest of their life.

In addition, 3 other parameters have been successfully applied to farmers such as the willingness of farmers to protect animals from heat and rain (100%), enough food and water supply (100%), eliminate animals from objects that can injure animals (100%) and routine of animal grooming (66.7%).

Table 1. Farm animal factor observed in the field study

No.	Animal Welfare Factor	%	
		Yes	No
1.	Protect animals from heat and rain	100	0
2.	Food and water supply	100	0
3.	Ideal space in the cage	33,3	66,7
4.	Space availability for express natural behavior (jump, climb, etc.)	42,3	57,7
5.	Cleanliness of the shelter	42,3	57,7
6.	Prevention from stuffs, treatment or construction tools that endanger the animal	100	0
7.	Light accessibility	42,3	57,7
8.	Animal grooming	33,3	66,7
9.	Grazing frequency	33,3	66,7
10.	Routine of disinfectant and antiseptic application	33,3	66,7

## CONCLUSION

Economic limitations and lack of knowledge of farmers are the main reasons that hamper the implementation of farm animal welfare affecting uncomfortable environment for the animal. This causes livestock potentially stressed and sick, so more attention and effort

is needed to encourage farmers to apply the concept of animal welfare in order to fulfil satisfactory production and safe human consumption.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The study was supported by Padjadjaran University through Hibah Internal UnpadCompetitive Grant

#### REFERENCES

1. Daldiri. 2017. Kesejahteraan Hewan pada Ternak Potong. <https://disnakkeswan.ntbprov.go.id/kesejahteraan-hewan-pada-ternak-potong/> Accessed on 28 Agustus 2018.
2. Hartady T. dan Widyastuti, R. 2018. The influence of experience and confidence on the health management of dairy goat (Case study: “Simpay Tampomas Farmer Group” Village Cilengkrang, Cimalaka District of Sumedang, West Java-Indonesia). ARSHI Veterinary Letter, 2018, 2 (3): 49-50
3. Sarwono, B. 2011. Beternak kambing Unggul. Jakarta: Penebar Swadaya Grup. Pp:21-27. □□□
4. Yondaime, Y. Lantai Kandang Kambing yang Baik. <http://www.ternakkambing.com/2017/12/lantai-kandang-kambing-yang-baik.html> Accessed on 29 August 2018.
5. Yunita D, Widyastuti R, Syamsunarno, MRAA, Rasad SD, and Indika DR. 2017. Pembagian peran dan pengambilan keputusan dalam rumah tangga peternak kambing perah di Desa Cilengkrang Kecamatan Cimalaka Kabupaten Sumedang, Jurnal Ilmu Ternak. 17(1): 21-26.