

Invited national training capacities discussed the state of inspector training on pig welfare in an online workshop (26-27 Oct 2020). In total, 13 delegates from member states Italy, France, Greece, Finland, Sweden, The Netherlands, Estonia, Spain and Denmark participated. Furthermore, the meeting was attended by one delegate from DG SANTE, seven staff members of EURCAW-Pigs, and one staff member of EURCAW-Small Farmed Animals.

Activities EURCAW-Pigs on training

To facilitate training, EURCAW-Pigs contributes to EU wide training on pig welfare, mainly by standardization of knowledge across and cascading knowledge and relevant course examples into Member States. This is specifically targeted towards the eight prioritized welfare areas along the value chain (on-farm, transport, slaughter).

EURCAW-Pigs provides:

- (1) Examples of training plans and materials used in different Member States,
- (2) Quality standards, advice, templates, and technical support. These are provided in English so that they can be used by all EU member states. Training and education suggestions may include, for example, calibration between inspectors, seminars, lectures on new legislation, lectures on the biological basis of legislation, dilemmas between legislation and practice, and communication workshops,
- (3) Training suggestions for improvement of communication skills and ways to support inspection-driven welfare improvement.

Aim of the workshop

The main aim for the workshop was:

- To discuss and promote reflection on the state of animal welfare inspector training and the need for further training support in European member states.
- To generate feedback on EURCAW's suggestions for standard training of inspectors in relation to EURCAW's dossiers and indicators.
- Participants were invited to discuss and evaluate EURCAW's standards-under-development and to assess their relevance.

Programme

Day 1:

The meeting started on Monday October 26, at 10:00h. Hans Spoolder, director and coordinator of EURCAW-Pigs, welcomed the participants and introduced the activities of the Centre on training. This was followed by two presentations of the organizing Danish team at Aarhus University (AU) of EURCAW-Pigs. Chair Jan Tind Sørensen presented the research conducted at the Department of Animal Science, and Inger Anneberg addressed the goals for the workshop.

Following the introduction, the Danish team at AU also presented examples of EURCAW training materials based on EURCAW reviews and website dossiers, and started a discussion and open dialogue on how indicators can be used. The examples presented:

- Examples of EURCAW training materials based on EURCAW website dossiers:

- Training guide EURCAW-Pigs: suggestions for national training in EU Member States, Subject: Climate control and space allowance - transport of pigs <https://edepot.wur.nl/531451>
- Training guide EURCAW-Pigs: suggestions for national training in EU Member States, Subject: Farrowing housing and management <https://edepot.wur.nl/531450>
- Examples of indicators:
 - EURCAW-Pigs factsheets: Transport: climate-space <https://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/edepot/530319>
 - EURCAW-Pigs factsheets: Tail biting and tail docking <https://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/edepot/513360>

Links to the presentations:

- *Why does EURCAW-Pigs address training? Hans Spoolder, EURCAW-Pigs* <https://edepot.wur.nl/533633>
- *Department of Animal Science at Aarhus University, Jan Tind Sørensen, Aarhus University, EURCAW-Pigs* <https://edepot.wur.nl/533635>
- *Goal for the workshop, Inger Anneberg, Aarhus University, EURCAW-Pigs* <https://edepot.wur.nl/533638>
- *Examples of EURCAW training materials based on EURCAW website dossiers, Inger Anneberg, Katy Overstreet, Aarhus University, EURCAW-Pigs* <https://edepot.wur.nl/535411>
- *Examples of indicators, Lene Juul Pedersen and Mette S. Herskin, Aarhus University, EURCAW-Pigs* <https://edepot.wur.nl/533639>

In the afternoon, representatives from each country were interviewed individually for 45 min by EURCAW-Pigs representatives. This was done in three parallel sessions, with in total 9 interviews. Important focus points were the specific national situation regarding training inspectors in pig welfare, focusing on challenges and plans, and the response to training course examples and indicator (factsheets) presented in the morning session.

Either before or after the interviews, there was time available for the participants to watch two pre-recorded Power Point presentations on how training is organised in Sweden and France, which may provide some inspiration.

Links to the pre-recorded presentations:

- *Training of inspectors in relation to pig welfare on farm, Birgitta Staaf Larsson, Swedish Centre for Animal Welfare (SCAW)* <https://edepot.wur.nl/533666>
- *Training of inspectors in relation to welfare during transport and slaughter, Estelle Mollaret and Geneviève Aubin-Houzelstein, French Reference Centre for Animal Welfare* <https://edepot.wur.nl/533668>

The first day of the workshop was closed at 16:30h

Day 2:

The workshop continued on Tuesday October 27, at 11:00h. The results of the interviews were presented in plenum, and there was time for discussion. A sum up of the suggestions and conclusions:

- There were no specific questions to the two pre-recorded presentations and the voice-over style was generally appreciated.
 - Current methods:
 - 1-2 days of seminars a year in most countries, sometimes national and sometimes regional (might not be species specific).
 - Focus on information to inspectors – not necessarily interaction/animal welfare might be only a small part of it.
 - Some countries do intro-courses for new employees (but only partly about welfare).
 - Inspectors working two and two on farms/calibrating (mainly newcomers working with experience?)
 - Other methods:
 - Cascade training (Italy and Spain, train trainers that train others).
 - Inspectors from different regions make small groups and share experience and calibrate (Denmark).
 - Ask inspectors what they need (Finland).
 - Online training goes on in different ways.
 - Workshop with case-studies. Using pictures and discussions.
 - Cases with pictures-vote acceptable/unacceptable in plenum (using mobile phone, TurningPoint clickers to show results after the voting). Discuss- calibrate – can be used to give priority to further guidelines (Denmark and Sweden).
 - Use of animal based indicators as a tool for training (Sweden and others).
 - Farm visits two by two.
 - Involvement of stakeholders.
 - Using researchers/scientist for teaching.
 - Obstacles to develop training in Member States. Would like to do more but...
 - Resources are limited/ some countries have ideas and plans but do not have resources.
 - With the BTSF model of cascading practical problems exist with the time pressure and language incompatibility.
 - Training disappeared because of reorganization (The Netherlands).
 - Training is not prioritized – inspectors are too busy, often having more urgent things.
 - Experienced inspectors feel that they know what they need to know (e.g. old schooled vets not interested in animal welfare, Estonia) OR: CA's consider experienced employees not to need training.
 - Sharing materials across countries:
 - Would like to, but feeling insecure if it is usable for others. Questions about permission and risk of sharing photos (can be misused).
-

- To be usable, in many countries English is not the solution. Therefore, there is no point in sharing if the language issue is not taken care of.
- How much adaptation is needed to share materials?
- Responding to the EURCAW-Pigs training (guides, indicators, etc.):
 - Some parts of the suggestions for standards are useful.
 - Especially the part related to transport was mentioned.
 - Maybe not a whole day-courses – however, the structures may be useful.
 - Indicators/factsheets and the eight topics seen as very relevant.
 - Indicators/fact sheets should ideally be relevant as decisions making – is this “acceptable or not acceptable.
 - Having training in English is not very useful. Countries look for training in their own language.
 - Include some kind of evaluation /test /diplomas.
 - Is there too much focus on animal based indicators in the materials from EURCAW? (open norms indicators towards resource based).
- Sharing materials between countries:
 - Some materials could be shared – but only in the countries own languages.
 - The countries do not have resources to do translations.
 - Difficulties sharing photos/videos and get permission for that.
 - Sweden has some materials in both English and Swedish that can be shared (welfare at the time of slaughter).
 - Lists of indicators e.g. climate control (The Netherlands) can be shared – if translated.
 - International exchange of inspectors to promote alignment.
- Suggestions to EURCAW-Pigs for future training:
 - Make more web-based courses. However, most suggestions are related to provide ‘components’ or ‘building blocks’ for training.
 - More indicators and factsheets paired with training.
 - Make more “dilemmas” to be used in different countries.
 - Make videos with examples to be used in training.
 - Overview /resource area needed where to find it – (with relevance for training).
 - Create slides for training that can be used in presentation during training.
 - A sum up of slide from BTSF courses as a way of cascading.
 - More focus on alignment between and harmonization across countries.
 - Preparing MS for expected changes.
 - A forum or Community or Practice for international exchange of experience/questions and materials among inspectors.
 - Links to existing resources for training on the EURCAW website.

Closing and evaluation

EURCAW-Pigs will discuss the suggestions within the team as possible options for future training activities. Important points to be taken up are the language issues, alignment between Members States, expansion of sharing materials via the EURCAW website, and exchange of experience/questions by a forum/community.



The delegates reviewed the meeting in a positive way, but were also asked to give feedback on the workshop after the workshop (Annex I: questions for evaluation).

Jan Tind Sørensen closed the workshop at 13:00h.

Next training workshop

The next training workshop is foreseen for December 2021.

EURCAW-Pigs,
November 8, 2020

Annex I. Evaluation

After the workshop we contacted all participants by e-mail and asked them for an evaluation by answering four questions. Below we have listed the replies received:

Q1. We included two pre-recorded presentations for you to watch during the interview session and subsequently discussed these in plenum on the second day. Is this type of parallel activity useful in future meetings, or would you prefer other approaches?

Answers:

- Yes, it's useful.
- We were a little disappointed that there were no questions from the participants. It's still a lot of preparation work, we would have liked to have been able to exchange more. Perhaps the format was not the most likely to generate discussion.
- I think the pre-recorded presentations worked very well. Easy to fit in between the other parts of the program as a parallel activity. Unfortunately I was not able to attend the discussion on the second day, so not able to provide feedback on that part.
- Parallel activity is fine.

Q2. We presented two examples of EURCAW training materials. Was this informative and relevant to you?

Answers:

- Yes, it's very relevant
- We both found it very interesting to have concrete examples, especially as we were not aware of all the material you have developed for further training. It's always more meaningful to approach things with examples.
- Definitely informative and I think this could be relevant for us. I will share it with my colleagues.
- Yes, they both were very relevant and useful.

Q3. We spent almost three hours on person-to-person interviews followed by a summary presentation and plenum discussion the second day. Is this a method for reflection and discussion, or do you prefer something else?

Answers:

- Yes, this method it's confidential and useful to reflection and discussion.
- We very much appreciated this format which allowed an in-depth exchange with the interviewer, and thanks to the feedback, we were able to see the differences and similarities of the questions between countries. We are well aware that this represents a lot of compilation work for you, but on the one hand, it enabled you to have precise answers to your questions, to realize our level of knowledge of your training materials, and on the other hand, it enabled us to have a really interesting report that opened up the discussion. We very much appreciated this format which allowed an in-depth exchange with the interviewer, and thanks to the feedback, we were able to see the differences and similarities of the questions between countries. We are well aware that this represents a lot of compilation work for you, but on the one hand, it enabled you to have precise answers to your questions, to realize our level of knowledge of your training

materials, and on the other hand, it enabled us to have a really interesting report that opened up the discussion.

This format was quite unusual for us, but it made a real break in the rhythm, to have a closer relationship with the interviewer, and to concentrate well on the discussion.

- I think the interviews probably gave you a lot of insight per Member State. Probably more than with a plenum discussion alone.

- Personal interviews and plenum discussion worked out good, I think this method can be used in future as well.

Q4. Do you have any other comments or recommendations?

Answers:

- No.

- We very much appreciated being able to meet, even virtually, representatives from other countries. It hasn't been long since we took up our positions, and it was a real opportunity for us. Congratulations for the organization, an online seminar is always more complicated to design than a face-to-face one.

- Share presentations as soon as possible, because these would be useful for me to share with colleagues who (also) play a role in training inspectors.

- No recommendations at the moment.