

Original Research Article

Study on Existing Livestock Manure Management Practices in Bangladesh

ABSTRACT

Livestock manure, up to 55% of feeds fed to ruminant animals that pass through digestive tract undigested, pollutes the environment through conventional managements. . It is being considered a waste may turn into wealth through improved management. Considering this point of view a research was taken to identify the existing livestock manure management practices followed by the Bangladeshi farmers, figure-out the problems and constraints, and find possible technology and policy intervention to increase farm income and safeguard environment. To attain the objectives a survey was conducted through a constructed questionnaire and the finding reflects that broadly two types of managerial system are available at farmers field-one is conventional and another is improved. Under conventional system solid store and burned fuel and under improved system anaerobic digester and liquid slurry system was observed. Only a few (25%) farmers were using digester where 33.64% farmers were store manure as solid and 34.71% were used manure as burned fuel for cooking. About 58.62% and 24.14 % farmers store manure as solid and burned fuel respectively inspite of having bio-digester. But the ration is much higher in non-digester group and it is 78.02% farmers are storing and 36.16% famers are dry manure. Bio-slurry is a valuable product come from bio-digester and about 48.3% farmer use it as fertilizer in crop land, certain portion in aquaculture about 31% become wasted. To determine the impact of existing managerial system on climate methane emission factor was calculated and it was seen that highest amount of methane is emitted from liquid slurry (5.81kg/head/year) and burned fuel (5.46kg/head/year) and it is much controlled in anaerobic digestion system (1.24kg/head/year). Lack of manure treatment capacity, information and awareness, credit problem, illiteracy, lack of bank loan facilities etc were identified as major constrains of improved manure management.

Key Words: *Livestock manure, Solid store, Burned fuel, anaerobic digester, Liquid slurry, Methane and Environment*

I. INTRODUCTION

Livestock manure, feed biomass fed to animals that pass through digestive tract undigested and urine excreted from subsequent tissue metabolism, is conventionally termed as wastes. It pollutes environment through emitting greenhouse gases (GHGs) estimated to be 9.50% of the total of livestock origins [1]. Improved livestock manure management reinforcing the planet pillar of sustainable livestock production [2] may reduce food-feed-fuel competitions. It may support the vision of climate smart agriculture (CSA, FAO) and green growth dynamics also (7th Five Year Plan, Bangladesh). About 26 million large ruminants, 18 million small ruminants and 137 million poultry [3] of Bangladesh, 70% to 82% of which are being raised by landless and small farmers, produce manure largely piled as solids and liquid slurries at a variable concentration per unit land area. The manure of large ruminants is also dried as sticks & cakes for using as cooking biomass depending on their distribution and rearing systems. However, the database

of conventional uses of livestock manure and the extent of GHGs emissions are not studied thoroughly considering variations in livestock production systems in different regions of Bangladesh.

The livestock rearing systems have both positive and negative effects on natural resource base, public health, social equity and economic growth [4]. Livestock manure, in addition to production of energy for rural areas via biogas/electricity from anaerobic digestion, improving livelihood, saving fuelwood and reducing methane emissions may build up soil organic matter [5][6][7] of arable land depleted through gradual increase of crop intensities, if livestock manure based fertilizer is used as a source of soil nutrients [8]). However, the plethoric open solid storages of manure and spread of slurry in the environment reduce air, water and soil quality posing threats to public health and causing social and economic impacts. It may contain bacterial, viral, protozoal or parasitic pathogens that are significant health hazards to both humans and livestock.

Global concerns of climate pollution changed the perception of livestock manure management very recently. The vision of CS along with the gradual transformation of subsistence animal agriculture to input supported systems has been emphasizing the development of market oriented good practices of manure management. This requires research, development and extension works focusing on strategies, systems and techniques that allow maximization of the benefits of manure uses while minimizing its impacts on natural resource and ecosystems. Organizing community based biogas production systems based on livestock manure available to small farmers may be gateways for trapping the socioeconomic benefits of livestock rearing [9]. All the above factors substantiate development of database of livestock manure under different animal rearing system in different regions of Bangladesh, and its present uses by farmers.

Thus, the present research work was undertaken with the following objectives.

- i. to determine existing livestock manure management systems and their shares according to the type of animals
- ii. to quantify methane emission factors and the extent of pollution through livestock manure management
- iii. to identify major limitations to on farm management of livestock manure

II. Material and Methods

The study was conducted by the Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute (BLRI), Dhaka, in cooperation with the Wageningen University, the Netherlands and the Stockholm Environment Institute, Asia-Centre, Bangkok in the selected district of different livestock production area of Bangladesh characterized as follows.

The mixed farming of Bangladesh consists of irrigated area embraces a broad range of food and cash crops and more than 10 percent of the total value of production comes from non-livestock farming activities; and rainfed area, steep and highlands and sources of more than 90 percent of the value of non-livestock farm production [10].

Depending on the length of growing period (LGP) [11] the irrigated farming area was again divided into humid area, LGP is greater than 270 days, and sub-humid area, LGP is 271-280 days. The LGP does not vary in the rainfed area, as crop growing period is not shortened by flood water. Considering the extent of pollution by the number of animals in a farm two categories of farms were randomly selected viz, i) Commercial (having average per household 15 animals) and ii) subsistence (having average per household 2.0 animals, [12]. A summary illustration of different geographical and livestock farming characteristics is presented in Fig1. The data were generated through visiting individual farmer's house and sharing questions of a pre-set questionnaire developed by the University of Wageningen,

Netherlands and SEI (Stockholm Environment Institute) -Asia Centre and pre-tested locally before the use at farm levels.

Considering agroecological area (humid, sub-humid & rainfed) total 47, 63 and 10 farmers, respectively, were randomly selected for visiting and sharing their responses on the preset questions. In each area there were subsistence and commercial farmers, and their number, respectively, was 40 & 7 in humid, 45 & 18 in sub-humid and 5 & 5 in rain fed area. The researchers developed an itinerary and visited each farm in different times with the local support of the district livestock office of each district, an administrative area. Out of 23, 32 and 6 total district in three areas 4, 5 and 2 districts, respectively, were randomly selected under the field study. The total farm animals was classified into i) dairy cattle, ii) other cattle, iii) buffalo, iv) goat and sheep and chicken & ducks. The number of farmers of different categories, their land area and number of different types of animals are presented in Table 1.

The data of manure management system of different livestock, the fate of dung and urine, farmer's opinion on major technical, socio-economic and institutional constraints and any source of information regarding LMM available to them were recorded. All the data were inserted in Microsoft excel sheet for calculation of secondary data and any significant differences in methane emission between the two livestock production system was analyzed using SPSS 17.0. The extent of pollution by methane production from different LMM system was calculated using **Equation 10.23:** $EF_T = (VS_T \cdot 365) \cdot [B_{o(T)} \cdot \frac{0.67Kg}{m^3} \cdot \sum_{S,k} \frac{MCF_{S,k}}{100} \cdot MS_{(T,S,k)}]$ of the IPCC, where methane emission factor (EF) of LMM was calculated using default values of volatile solid (VS), and maximum methane producing capacity of manure (Bo) specified for different farm animal categories of the Indian sub-continent & methane conversion factor (MCF) for different manure management system at an ambient temperature >26°C. The emission factor (EF) was determined using the data of manure management system (MS) of different animals.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 General Information of the Respondent farmers

Table1 shows land holding area and the number of different types of farm animals of the selected farmers in different region. Commercial farm area was higher (2.17 ha) in sub-humid region than other two but the subsistence farmers possessed almost similar land area irrespective of region and the area is was so low. Number of dairy and other cattle was higher in case of commercial farmer and low in case of subsistence farmer (Table-1). No difference was observed in cattle population in humid, sub-humid and rain-fed region. Buffalo rearing was dominant in sub-humid region than other two region. Commercial buffalo farming was not observed among the selected farmers and the average buffalo number of subsistence farmer was only 8. Small ruminant (Goat and sheep) farming was existing in three region but commercial rearing was observed only in humid region (table-1) and farmers of remaining two region rears sheep and gat sporadically. No commercial poultry farm was surveyed in rain-fed region but bird number of humid commercial farm was higher than sub-humid one.

Table1: Farmers of different areas and the number of different animals

Attributes	Humid		Sub-humid		Rain fed	
	Subsistence	Commercial	Subsistence	Commercial	Subsistence	Commercial
Av. area of land, ha	0.13	1.30	0.004	2.17	0.004	1.57
Dairy cattle	2	22	3	20	4	28
Other cattle	1	9	1	15	2	15
Buffalo	0	0	8	0	0	0
Goat & sheep	4	20	3	3	1	0
Chicken & ducks	271	7000	200	2236	9	0

3.2 Existing Livestock Manure Management systems


The manure management system of Bangladesh, as defined by the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change [13], may be categorized into i) Solid storage, ii) Liquid slurry, iii) Burned fuel, iv) Anaerobic digester, and v) Without litter, a system practiced only for commercial poultry. The manure produced by dairy or other cattle is mostly kept as solid storage (56.2%) and burned as fuel (37.3%). The rest of the manure of cattle is used for anaerobic digestion (4.80%). A few number of farmer stated that they store bioslurry (1.65%), and, as stated by farmers, in most cases all form of liquid slurry including bioslurry, instead of keeping in confined systems, are practically lost out of ignorance, and in some cases it was kept as open spreads (Table 2). Similarly, about 57.0% buffalo manure was stored as solid storage and the rest 43% was burned as fuel, while the total amount of manure of goat and sheep (100%) was kept as solid storage (Table2). A major fraction (74.5%) of poultry manure, on the other hand, was without litter and 25.5% was used for anaerobic digestion. The latter fraction of poultry manure was quiet high. Representation of a lesser number of poultry farms without anaerobic digestion system, under the present study, may be one of the causes of showing a higher percentage of anaerobic digestion.

Table 2: Manure management system (MS %) of different farm animals and annual methane emission (KgCH₄/head/Yr)

Farm animals	Solid storage		Liquid slurry		Burned fuel		Anaerobic digester		Without litter		Total	
	MS	CH ₄	MS	CH ₄	MS	CH ₄	MS	CH ₄	MS	CH ₄	MS	CH ₄
Dairy cattle	56.2	2.322	1.65	0.968	37.3	3.08	4.80	0.40	-	-	100	6.77
Other cattle	56.2	0.96	1.65	4.01	37.3	1.28	4.82	0.16	-	-	100	6.41
Buffalo	57.0	2.16	-	-	43.0	3.26	-	-	-	-	100	5.42
Small ruminant	100	0.203	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	0.203
Poultry	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.5	0.006	74.5	0.018	100	0.024

Among three greenhouse gases methane is major one whose warming potentiality is 25 fold higher than NO_2 and CO_2 [14]. Estimation of [15] shows that livestock are one of the leading causes of world wide green house effect. The annual methane emission ($\text{KgCH}_4/\text{head}/\text{Yr}$) of the manure produced by different farm animals under different management systems was estimated to be 6.77, 6.41, 5.42, 0.203 and 0.024, respectively, of a dairy or other cattle, buffalo, small ruminant or poultry, respectively (Table-2) Considering average distribution of livestock manure, the average emission factor of manure of different animals, respectively, was shown to be 6.0, 2.0, 5.0, 0.20 and 0.02 $\text{KgCH}_4/\text{head}/\text{Yr}$ in the warm condition (26°C to 28°C) of Indian sub-continent region [16].

Table 3: Annual livestock manure CH_4 emission (Gg) from different management system

Farm Animals	Number of farm animals (Millions, BER 2016)	Gg methane emission. Yr^{-1}	Fig 1: Percent of Gg methane emission. Yr^{-1} of farm animals 
Dairy cattle	9.3	62.96	
Other cattle	14.4	92.30	
Buffalo	1.47	7.97	
Small Ruminant	29.02	5.89	
Poultry	317.7	7.62	
Total		176.75	

The cattle, buffalo, small ruminants (goat and sheep) and poultry population of Bangladesh was reported to be 23.7, 1.47, 29.02 and 317.7 million in 2015 (Table 3, BER, 2016). The dairy cattle and other cattle number may be calculated to be 9.30 and 14.4 million, respectively, following the ratio reported by [17]. Considering the methane emission of different types of animals (Table2) the annual methane emission calculated to be 62.96, 92.3, 7.97, 5.89 and 7.62 Gg, respectively, of different farm animals described above, and a total annual methane emission of livestock and poultry manure managed in different systems is amounted to be 176.75 Gg of Bangladesh. The findings was supported by [18] who reported that in 1980-83 the total calculated emitted methane from livestock manure management was 80.7 Gg, in 1996 it was 86.64 Gg and 2008-09 it was 99.15 Gg and the trend of methane emission was increasing gradually. The manure of cattle share the highest emission (87.85%) and the rest (12.15%) is shared by other farm animals. [19] also stated that methane emission from dairy cattle was much higher than non-dairy animals and it may due to emission factor variation. The manure of buffalo, small ruminants and poultry emits 4.51%, 3.33% and 4.31%, respectively (Fig 1).

3.3 Regional and farming system variation in cattle manure management


Table 4: Different management system of cattle manure in different areas of Bangladesh

Manure management system	Humid		Significance		Sub-Humid		Significance		Rain fed		Significance	
	Comm.	Subsist	SE	Level	Comm	Subsist	SE	Level	Comm.	Subsist	SE	Level
Solid storage	82.8	53.3	19.4	$p < 0.01$	33.5	26.9	12.1	$p < 0.01$	66.1	41.9	64.6	$p < 0.01$
Liquid slurry	0	9.48	0.85	NS	1.99	6.17	1.3	$p < 0.05$	0	0	-	-

Burned fuel	13.2	29.8	6.77	p<0.05	62.2	48.5	22.4	p<0.01	33.9	35.7	50.8	NS
Anaerobic digestion	4.04	7.38	1.18	p<0.01	2.36	18.4	1.59	p<0.01	0	22.4	-	-

177

178 Crop production system affects manure
179 management systems in both commercial or
180 subsistence production system of livestock
181 (Table 4). The commercial farmers of all the
182 region (humid, sub-humid or rain fed) store a
183 significantly (p<0.01) higher proportion of
184 manure (82.8%, 33.5% & 66.1%, respectively)
185 in solid storage than subsistence farmers
186 (53.3%, 26.9% & 41.9%, respectively) and both
187 categories of farmers of humid (82.8% &
188 53.3%, respectively) or rain fed areas (66.1% &
189 41.9%, respectively) kept more manure in solid
190 storage compared to those of sub-humid areas.
191 The farmers of both commercial and
192 subsistence system of the sub-humid region
193 use a higher fraction of manure as burned fuel
194 (62.2% & 48.5%, respectively) than that of other areas. A limited access of farmers to cooking biomass
195 due to inundation of major cultivated area by the monsoon flood water of sub-humid region compels them
196 to use cattle manure as burned fuel. The use of anaerobic digestion of cattle manure differed significantly
197 (p<0.01) between the commercial and subsistence farmers of humid and sub-humid areas, and it ranged
198 from 4.04% to 7.38% in the former and 2.36% to 18.4% in the latter area. A higher proportion of
199 subsistence farmers (22.4%) of rain fed area (Table 4) was found to use anaerobic digestion system.
200 Selection bias to farmers having biogas system during the survey may have resulted in an inordinate
201 percentage of manure use for anaerobic digestion.



202 Dietary feed composition, in addition to its effect on enteric methane emission, also affects manure
203 composition that in turn, in addition to its farm management systems, affect the CH₄ emission of manure
204 of farm animals. Fig 2 shows that commercial dairying had less annual CH₄ emission (6.87 Kg/head)
205 compared to subsistence dairy cattle (8.75 Kg/head). A higher input support, especially, in terms of
206 feeding and nutrition [20] and improved management helped reduction of CH₄ emission from manure of
207 commercial dairying.

208 3.4 Constrains of manure management

209 **Table5: Identified major constrains of manure management**

Technical and socio-economical (% farmers)	
Lack of farm labor	22.3
Lack of manure storage capacity	15.90
Lack of manure treatment capacity	52.89
Lack of manure transport capacity	14.88
Lack of suitable equipment	21.49
Credit problem	49.46

Institutional (% farmers)	
Lack of information	87.88
Lack of access to information due to illiteracy	38.02
Lack of access to loan	38.84
Lack of access to required equipment and machines	20.65
Lack of trading infrastructure	41.31
Lack of regulation	30.58

210

211 Data on the farmers opinion about technical and socio-economical along with institutional constrains of
212 manure management was recorded and they are summarized and presented in Table 5. According to the
213 farmer's opinion the major technical and socio-economical constrains are the lack of manure treatment
214 capacity (52.89%) and unavailability of credits (49.46%). About 87.88% of the respondent farmers stated
215 that they were unaware of improved manure management of and 41.31% raised the problem of lacking
216 trading infrastructure. Others supported the problem of absence of easy access to information due to
217 illiteracy (38.02%), regulation (30.58%), and to required equipment and machineries (20.65%).

218 **IV. CONCLUSION**

219 Solid storage, liquid slurry, burned fuel, anaerobic digestion and without litter, especially for chicken
220 manure, are the major livestock and poultry manure management system found in Bangladesh, and
221 56.2% to even 100%, especially in case of small ruminant animals, of the total manure is kept in solid
222 storage, followed burned fuel use of 37.3% to 47.0%. The total annual CH₄ emission from manure is
223 estimated to be 176.75 Gg and emission from cattle manure was estimated to 87.85%. The manure
224 management and the extent of emission varied according to farming system and region of the country.
225 Lack of technical knowledge, credit support, and absence of policy are the major constraint to improved
226 manure management in Bangladesh.

227 **REFERENCES**

- 228 1. Gerber PJ, Steinfeld H, Henderson B, Mottet A, Opio C, Dijkman J, Falcucci A, Tempio G. Tackling
229 Climate Change Through Livestock: A Global Assessment of Emission and Mitigation Opportunities. FAO,
230 Rome. 2013.
- 231 2. Bhandari YR, Makkar HPS. Towards Implementation of Sustainable Animal Diets: Evidence
232 Generation, Perspective Building and Way Forward. 2016; CAB Reviews: 11 (029).
- 233 3. Cencus of Agriculture. Structure of agricultural holdings and livestock population, Bangladesh Bureau
234 of statistics, Statistics Division, Ministry of Planning, The Govt. of Bangladesh; 2008.
- 235 4. World Bank. Development Research Group, Policy Research Working Paper 3428. 2009.
- 236 5. Islam MS. Soil Fertility History, Present Status and Future Scenario in Bangladesh. Special Issue on
237 Balanced Fertilization for Increasing and Sustaining Crop Productivity. Bangladesh J. Agric, and
238 Env.2008; 4(SI):129-51.
- 239 6. Rahman MM, Yakupitiyage A. Use of fishpond sediment for sustainable aquaculture-agriculture
240 farming. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*. 2006;1: 192-202.
- 241 7. Chongrak P. Organic waste recycling: technology and management. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Baffins
242 Lane, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1UD, England. 1996; 412 p.

- 249
250 8. Draft National Integrated Livestock Manure Management (ILMM) Policy. Ministry of Fisheries and
251 Livestock, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. 2015.
252 9. Sarkar SK, Uddin MK. Window of Opportunity: An Asset Based Approach to Community Development
253 in Bangladesh. Journal of Developments in Sustainable Agriculture. 2013; 6:1-11 (2011): ISSN 1880-
254 3016. AFRC, University of Tsukuba, Japan.
255
256
257 10. Steinfeld, H., De Haan, C., Blackburn, H. 1996 . Livestock-Environment Interactions. European
258 Commission, Brussels.
259
260 11. Steinfeld, H., De Haan, C., Blackburn, H. 1996 . Livestock-Environment Interactions. European
261 Commission, Brussels.
262
263 12. Census of Agriculture. Structure of agricultural holdings and livestock population, Bangladesh Bureau
264 of statistics, Statistics Division, Ministry of Planning, The Govt. of Bangladesh; 2008.
265
266 13. IPCC. IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National
267 Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston HS, Buendia L, Miwa K, Ngara T, Tanabe K. (eds).
268 Published: IGES, Japan. IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme Technical Support Unit,
269 % Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Kamiyamaguchi, Hayama, Kanagawa, JAPAN, 240-
270 0115. 2006; Volume-5.
271
272 14. Stackhouse KR, Pan Y, Zhao Y , Mitloehner FM. Greenhouse Gas and Alcohol Emissions from
273 Feedlot Steers and Calves. Journal of Environmental Quality. 2011; 40: 899-906.
274 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2134/jeq2010.0354>
275
276 15. Haan CD, Schillhorn VV, Brandenburg B, Gauthier J, Gall FL, Mearns R, Siméon M. Livestock
277 Development: Implications for Rural Poverty, the Environment, and Global Food Security the WorldBank.
278 2001; 96 p
279
280 16. IPCC. IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National
281 Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston HS, Buendia L, Miwa K, Ngara T, Tanabe K. (eds).
282 Published: IGES, Japan. IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme Technical Support Unit,
283 % Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Kamiyamaguchi, Hayama, Kanagawa, JAPAN, 240-
284 0115. 2006; Volume-5.
285
286 17. Huque KS. A performance profile of dairying in Bangladesh- programs, policies and way forwards.
287 Bangladesh Journal of Animal Science. 2011; 43(2): 81-105.
288
289 18. Jahan S, Azad AK. Estimation of Greenhouse Gas Emission from the Livestock Sector of
290 Bangladesh. International Journal of Science and Research.2015; 4(1): 1148-1155
291
292 19. Jahan S, Azad AK. Estimation of Greenhouse Gas Emission from the Livestock Sector of
293 Bangladesh. International Journal of Science and Research.2015; 4(1): 1148-1155
294
295 20. Huque KS, Chowdhury MM, Das PK, Mandal NA, Ahuja V, Baset MA. Milk Vita –realities and
296 reaching out to dreams of millions; The paper was presented at a regional meeting on **Dairy Asia:
297 Towards Sustainability** held in Hotel Plaza Athene, Bangkok, Thailand, during 21 to 24 May, 2014.

