

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Improving the use of perennial ryegrass swards for dairying in Ireland**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of:  
Doctor of Philosophy in Agricultural Science  
at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

by

Gonzalo Enrique Tuñon

2013





Supervisors:

Associate Professor Nicolas Lopez-Villalobos

Dr. Michael O'Donovan

Professor Peter Kemp

Dr. Emer Kennedy

Dr. Deirdre Hennessy



*Dedicated to my wife Berenice and my son Felipe*



## Abstract

The main objectives of this thesis were to investigate the effects of grazing severity, treading damage, re-growth interval and pre-grazing herbage mass (HM) on sward and animal performance in four experiments during 2009 and 2010 in Ireland. Experiment 1 investigated three post-grazing sward heights ranging from 3.6 to 4.9 cm during the main grazing season. Herbage accumulated and harvested (11.3 and 11.2 t dry matter (DM)/hectare (ha), respectively) were not significantly affected by grazing severity but there were sward morphological and structural differences. Experiment 2 quantified the effects of treading damage during two seasons, ranging from light to severe damage (3.3 to 13.3-cm hoof-print depths, respectively). Treading damage in a perennial ryegrass (PRG) sward on a well-drained soil did not reduce annual grass DM production. Treading in a creeping bent-dominated sward on a poorly-drained soil resulted in 14 to 51% reductions in cumulative yields depending on frequency and season. Experiment 3 examined the effects of 2-, 3- or 4-week re-growth intervals on herbage production, characteristics and tissue turnover of a PRG sward using marked tillers ( $n = 240$ ) under a cutting regime. Cumulative HMs were 6.7, 9.1 and 10.4 t DM/ha for the 2-, 3- and 4-week re-growth treatments, respectively. The number of leaves appearing per tiller during the re-growth period was only optimum for the 4-week treatment. Experiment 4 also used marked tillers ( $n = 360$ ) in a grazing dairy cow experiment during the main grazing season under three target pre-grazing HMs (945, 1,623 and 2,360 kg DM/ha  $>4$  cm). The number of leaves appearing per tiller during the re-growth period was 1.0, 1.9 and 2.4 for low (L), medium (M) or high (H) pre-grazing HM treatments, respectively. Cows grazing L, M or H pre-grazing HM produced 343, 342 and 330 kg milksolids, respectively. Low pre-grazing-HM cows grazed for 90 min/day more than M and H pre-grazing-HM cows but there was no difference in individual intake (16.0 and 15.8 kg DM/cow/day in June and August, respectively). Post-grazing sward height, treading damage, re-growth interval and pre-grazing HM can have a significant impact on the sward and on animal performance. The imposition of best management practice leads to a more effective conversion of grass into milk.





## Acknowledgements

First I want to thank Teagasc and Pat Dillon for giving me the opportunity of carrying out experiments in the Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation Centre at Moorepark. I was honoured to be a part of the Walsh Fellowship Scheme that funded the research and my time in Ireland. This thesis is the result of three and a half years of work between Ireland and New Zealand. There remains the pleasant task of expressing my thanks to the people who have contributed and made this work possible.

In Ireland, my supervisors Mick O'Donovan, Emer Kennedy and Deirdre Hennessy trusted me in the task of running the experiments. From each of you I was able to learn some of the art and science of grassland management. Thanks very much for helping on the countless occasions that I knocked on your door to ask questions, in particular to Emer who patiently spent many hours with me. Thanks to Brendan Horan who had huge input, also to Scott Laidlaw and Chris Grainger who gave me very important feedback. The grazing trials would not have been possible without Fergal Coughlan and John Paul Murphy in Moorepark farm, and Aidan Brennan in Curtins farm, and the farm staff, from which I learned a lot, especially during the farm walks with Fergal. Mick Finney was essential for the success of the 'grass cut expeditions', lab analyses and for putting a smile on everyone's faces. Thanks to Flor Flynn who helped me in my first few months at the 'grass lab'. Tom O'Brian and his team were always helpful and gave solutions to every problem.

For reasons of space I will deliberately omit some of the students that helped with different tasks in the different trials but I cannot avoid mentioning some of them: Jeanne Guegan, Camille Terrasse, Valerie Gauthier, Susana Cabral, Edwige Bouvet, Clothilde Coquantin, thanks for many hours under difficult conditions! My office mates Ian Hutchinson, Thomas Herbin, Phill Creighton, Elodie Ganche, Roberta McDonald, and Paul Phelan, thanks for the encouragement, fun moments and glam. Special mention to my friend and favourite scrum half Ian who helped me in many ways during my stay in Fermoy, corrected my English and introduced me to the Fermoy Rugby boys. Also special thanks to Brian McCarthy for all the help, I was always impressed by your attitude, passion and commitment to your project and to your Hurling. Finally, Craig,

Cathal, Brendan, Yris, Eoin, PJ, Daniel and Julia, thanks for the happiness you brought into the work environment.

In New Zealand I joined my main supervisor, Nicolas Lopez-Villalobos. I was blessed to have the opportunity to work with you. With Nicolas I learned a bit about science and a lot about life. I am going to miss your support, the conversations and I will miss the Friday meetings in which you created a space for students to express, share and grow academically. Peter Kemp was amazingly clear and helped me a great deal to think about the experiments, was always available and gave me very valuable feedback. Thanks to Colin Holmes and John Hodgson who gave me important insights about the experiments. I am very grateful to Kevin Stafford, Debbie Hill, Story Kristen and Wendy Graham who always helped me with anything I needed. Ronaldo Vibart and Javier Baudracco gave me very valuable suggestions on many aspects of the thesis, for which I am very grateful. Ronnie thanks for your rugby, for the wise advice and for your friendship. Javi it is an honour to follow you side by side in this journey. Jose Garcia Muñiz and Penny Back very gently helped me with proof reading and editing.

The friendship of Andres Gomez Rueda, Mariano Battistotti, Celina Bortolotto, Hernan and Veronica Canterna, Natalia Benquet, Francisco and Valentina Sales, Juan and Dani Sanhueza, Jose Solis, and Nicolas and Camila Bitch was fresh air for us and made us feel closer to home. All this would not have been possible without the constant, unconditional and tender love of my wife, with whom I am learning about synergy and is the reason why I arrived to where I am now. Doing a PhD is like running a marathon and I did this one, this is certainly a privilege. I like to think my work contributes to efficient and common sense dairying, for which I committed myself with all my heart. Finally, there is a Maori saying: If you were to ask me “what is the most important thing in the world?” I would reply, “That is people, people, people.” He tangata, he tangata, he tangata. This is for those who work the land, work in science and those who extend the learning with passion, and especially for farmers.

## Foreword

There is a need to design a grass-based system of production for Irish dairy farmers that is sustainable for animals, people and for the environment, and profitable. It also needs to be socially acceptable, easily replicated with clear guidelines, and sufficiently appealing to attract people to work in the industry. This thesis, however, focuses on grazing management practices.

This thesis is presented in a series of papers which have been published, submitted for publication or are being prepared for submission. Therefore, some repetition, especially in the materials and methods sections, was unavoidable. The references from each chapter are at the end of the thesis. It must be pointed out that this work is only focused on grazing management without taking account of irrigation, sward renewal or nitrogen fertilisation. Ultimately, this thesis aims to provide answers for grassland farmers around the world as a result of work carried out in Ireland.



# Contents

Abstract	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Contents	xiii
List of figures	xv
List of tables	xix
Definitions	xxiii
Glossary of terms	xxv
<b>Chapter 1: General introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Improving grazing management on perennial ryegrass swards for dairying in Ireland: a review</b>	
2.1 Abstract	11
2.2 Introduction	12
2.3 Main features of the Irish grass-based dairy farm	15
2.4 Perennial ryegrass for dairying in Ireland	23
2.5 Management practices for optimal sward and cow performance	44
2.6 Conclusions	55
<b>Chapter 3: Effect of grazing management practices on perennial ryegrass herbage production and sward structural characteristics throughout an entire grazing season</b>	
3.1 Abstract	59
3.2 Introduction	60
3.3 Materials and methods	62
3.4 Results	68
3.5 Discussion	81
3.6 Conclusion	87
<b>Chapter 4: Herbage production and tiller density in Irish temperate grazing swards as affected by treading damage of dairy cows</b>	
4.1 Abstract	91
4.2 Introduction	92
4.3 Materials and methods	93
4.4 Results	103
4.5 Discussion	112
4.6 Practical implications	115
4.7 Conclusions	117
<b>Chapter 5: Re-growth interval affected herbage accumulation and tissue turnover of a perennial ryegrass sward under a cutting regime in Ireland</b>	
5.1 Abstract	121
5.2 Introduction	122
5.3 Materials and methods	124
5.4 Results	128
5.5 Discussion	142
5.6 Implications for grazing management	145
5.7 Conclusions	146

## **Chapter 6: Effects of herbage mass on characteristics and tissue turnover of a perennial ryegrass sward under grazing with dairy cows**

6.1	Abstract	149
6.2	Introduction	150
6.3	Materials and methods	151
6.4	Results	155
6.5	Discussion	170
6.6	Implications for grazing management	172
6.7	Conclusions	173

## **Chapter 7: Effect of pre-grazing herbage mass on grazing behaviour, grass dry matter intake and milk production of dairy cows**

7.1	Abstract	177
7.2	Introduction	178
7.3	Materials and methods	178
7.4	Results	182
7.5	Discussion	184
7.6	Conclusions	187

## **Chapter 8: General discussion**

8.1	Overview and thesis objectives	191
8.2	Main findings and implications	191
8.3	Further work	201
8.4	Main conclusions	201

<b>References</b>	203
-------------------	-----

<b>Appendix 1</b>	225
-------------------	-----

<b>Appendix 2</b>	227
-------------------	-----

# List of figures

Figure 1.1 Relationship between total costs of production and proportion of grazed grass in the dairy cow's diet (from Dillon <i>et al.</i> 2005).	4
Figure 1.2 (a) Lines connecting points of similar potential for herbage production in annual dry matter grass production (tonnes/hectare) and (b) potential lengths of grazing season in days (adapted from Brereton, 1995).	5
Figure 2.1 Conceptual framework of the literature review subsequently developed in the thesis.	14
Figure 2.2 Average daily temperature (°C ▲) and monthly rainfall (mm ●) at Teagasc, Moorepark, Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Fermoy, Co. Cork, Ireland.	15
Figure 2.3 Average grass growth rates for 2009, 2010 and 2011 at the Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Teagasc, Moorepark, Fermoy, Co. Cork, Ireland (▲ 2009 ■ 2010 ◆ 2011; from <a href="http://www.agresearch.teagasc.ie/moorepark/grassgrowth">http://www.agresearch.teagasc.ie/moorepark/grassgrowth</a> ).	16
Figure 2.4 Average grass growth rate of three years of Figure 2.3 (—) and herd dry matter requirements from two hypothetical stocking rates (— 3 and - - 3.3 cows per hectare).	19
Figure 2.5 Illustration of the grass phytomer (from Silsbury, 1970).	27
Figure 2.6 (a) Illustration of an established plant of perennial ryegrass with four tillers (from Hodgson, 1990); (b) the morphology of a temperate-region perennial ryegrass plant at the flowering stage (from Jewiss, 1972); (c) organs of the tiller that are visible externally and (d) arrangement of phytomers on the tiller axis. DT = daughter tiller, EL = elongating leaf, ML = mature leaf, SL = senescent leaf, LL = leaf lamina, PS = pseudo-stem composed of leaf sheaths, TS = true stem, AM = apical meristem, TB = axillary tiller bud, R = root (from Valentine and Matthew, 2000).	30
Figure 2.7 Re-growth of a perennial ryegrass tiller after defoliation.	32
Figure 2.8 The relationship between the main morphogenetic characteristics of grasses and sward structural components (from Lemaire and Chapman, 1996).	36
Figure 2.9 (a) Herbage accumulation following grazing in a rotationally-grazed sward and (b) relationship between herbage mass and leaf growth, leaf senescence, and net herbage production in continuously grazed swards (from Bircham and Hodgson, 1983; redrawn from Brougham, 1957).	40
Figure 2.10 Treading damage and soil compaction caused by the cows' hooves (from Batey, 1988).	49
Figure 2.11 A hypothetical scenario showing two swards at two levels of pre-grazing herbage mass with their leaf stage below.	53
Figure 2.12 Grassland farmer integrating management decisions on some of the key factors of the grass-based dairy system.	54
Figure 3.1 (a) Herbage mass measurement above the 3.5-cm horizon and (b) herbage mass measurement below the 3.5-cm horizon.	64
Figure 3.2 (a) Sampling with hand shears; (b) assessment of grazing rejected areas; (c) extended tiller height measurement and (d) sampling procedure for morphological measurement.	66



- Figure 3.3 Effect of grazing severity on (a) perennial ryegrass tiller density (lax ▲, intermediate ● and severe ◆) and (b) non-perennial ryegrass tiller density (lax △, intermediate ○ and severe ◇) during the grazing season. Treatment (T) by season (S) interaction (\*\*\*) corresponding to treatment-by-season interaction,  $P < 0.001$ . 70
- Figure 3.4 Effect of grazing severity on the proportion of rejected area at each grazing rotation (rotation 5, mid/late June; rotation 11, late October/early November; lax ▲, intermediate ● and severe ◆; \*\*\*) corresponding to treatment-by-rotation interaction,  $P < 0.001$ . 75
- Figure 4.1 Time line of the experimental periods: 1) one treading damage event in spring 2009; 2) two treading damage events in autumn 2009 and spring 2012, 3) one treading damage event in spring 2010; and 4) one treading damage event in autumn 2009. 95
- Figure 4.2 Experimental treatments (from left to right): control, light damage, moderate damage and severe damage imposed in (a) Experiment 1 (perennial ryegrass-dominated sward with a well-drained soil) and in (b) Experiment 2 (creeping bent-dominated sward with a poorly-drained soil). 96
- Figure 4.3 (a) Tiller-density measurement; (b) surface-roughness measurement; (c) dung removal with shovel; (d) hoof-print-depth measurement; (e) severe treading damage and (f) moderate treading damage. 102
- Figure 4.4 Cumulative herbage mass (HM) of plots that were allocated to four treading-damage treatments: control (no damage □), light damage (◻), moderate damage (◼) and severe damage (◼) on (a) a creeping bent-dominated sward with a poorly-drained soil in autumn 2009, spring 2010 or on both occasions and on (b) a perennial ryegrass-dominated sward on a well-drained soil in spring 2009. a-c letters indicate differences between treatments at the 0.05 probability level; they refer to the means within a treatment allocation time. 105
- Figure 4.5 Total tiller density (a) and comparative grass growth rates in relation to control plots (b) in spring, mid-season and autumn of plots that were allocated to four treading-damage treatments: control (no damage □), light damage (◻ left; ○ right), moderate damage (◼ left; ◼ right) and severe damage (◼ left; ▲ right) on a creeping bent-dominated sward with a poorly-drained soil. Treading damage of 1/3 of the plots was imposed in autumn 2009 (1), 1/3 of the plots were damaged in spring 2010 (2), and 1/3 of the plots were damaged in autumn and spring (3). Arrows indicate treading dates (17 October 2009 and 9 April 2010). 110
- Figure 5.1 (a) Pre-harvest height and herbage mass measurements; (b) collection and weight measurement of cut herbage; (c) tiller marked with colour-coated wire and (d) tiller with tips marked with Tipp-ex™. 126
- Figure 5.2 Time line of the experiment. The experimental period was divided into six periods of four weeks in order to compare the three treatments, harvested every four weeks (above), every three weeks (middle) or every two weeks (below). 128
- Figure 5.3 Mean pre- (◆) and post-cut heights (■) of plots that were harvested every two, three and four weeks (left, middle and right, respectively) from 4 April to 16 September 2009 in a perennial ryegrass sward. 129

Figure 5.4 Pre-harvest herbage mass (kg dry matter per hectare) and leaves appeared per tiller during the re-growth period of 12 plots (5 m × 11 m) that were harvested every two (○), three (◆) or four (●) weeks for six months from 4 April to 16 September 2009 in a perennial ryegrass sward.	139
Figure 6.1 (a) Marked tillers fenced using two pigtail posts and a 2-m power line rope attached to them in a high-herbage-mass base plot and (b) a cow grazing under the fence in a medium-herbage-mass plot.	153
Figure 6.2 Pre- (◆) and post-grazing sward heights (■) of perennial ryegrass swards that were grazed at three targets of pre-grazing herbage mass.	158
Figure 6.3 (1) Leaf length at grazing; (2) leaves emerged during re-growth period; (3) leaf extension rate per tiller and (4) number of secondary tillers at grazing from marked tillers that were defoliated at low (○), medium (◆) or high (●) pre-grazing herbage mass during the main grazing season.	162
Figure 6.4 Pre-grazing herbage mass (kg dry matter per hectare) and leaves appeared per tiller during the re-growth period of nine plots (0.36 ha) that were grazed at low (○), medium (◆) or high (●) pre-grazing herbage mass for 24 weeks in a perennial ryegrass sward.	164
Figure 7.1 (a) Dosing alkane for intake measurement and (b) cow fitted with a grazing behaviour recorder.	181
Figure 7.2 Mean weekly milk solids (MS) production of cows during each week of the trial while grazing low (.....), medium (—) or high (—) mean pre-grazing herbage masses (means 978, 1,521 and 2,330 kg dry matter per hectare, respectively, measured at 4 cm above ground level) *** corresponding to treatment-by-week interaction, ( $P < 0.001$ ).	184
Figure 8.1 Predicted values for number of leaves emerged and pre-grazing herbage mass under cutting (—) and under grazing (.....).	198
Figure 8.2 The pasture management envelope (developed after Spain <i>et al.</i> , 1985).	200
Figure 10.1 General soil map of Ireland (adapted from Gardiner and Radford, 1980).	225
Figure 11.1 Examples of grass wedges.	228



## List of tables

Table 2.1 Composition (% of dry matter) and digestibility of perennial ryegrass at four stages of maturity (adapted from Waghorn and Barry, 1987).	25
Table 2.2 A general ranking of the treading tolerance of pasture species, with some of the reasons for the ranking shown in the right column (from Kemp <i>et al.</i> , 2000 ).	26
Table 2.3 Comparison of the number of days for a new leaf to appear between two studies with marked tillers.	34
Table 2.4 Tiller density (number of tillers/m <sup>2</sup> ) in Ireland and New Zealand.	38
Table 3.1 Effect of lax (L), intermediate (I) or severe (S) grazing treatments on sward chemical composition (CP = crude protein; OMD = organic-matter digestibility; NDF = neutral-detergent fibre).	71
Table 3.2 Effect of lax (L), intermediate (I) or severe (S) grazing treatments on mean pre- and post-grazing herbage mass, sward structure and sward morphology during mid-season (16 April to 31 July 2009).	73
Table 3.3 Effects of lax (L), intermediate (I) or severe (S) grazing treatments on pre- and post-grazing herbage mass, sward structure and sward morphology during autumn (1 August to 18 November 2009).	77
Table 3.4 Effects of lax (L), intermediate (I) or severe (S) grazing treatments on pre- and post-grazing herbage mass, sward structure and sward morphology over the entire season (10 February to 18 November 2009).	80
Table 4.1 Details of two experiments which tested the effects of four levels of treading damage: control (no damage), light damage, moderate damage and severe damage, at two contrasting grassland sites at different times and frequencies.	94
Table 4.2 Hoof-print depths and surface roughness (measured as proportion of chain reduction when placed on the soil surface) of plots allocated to light damage (L), moderate damage (M) and severe damage (S) in experiments 1 and 2.	99
Table 4.3 Mean monthly temperatures and rainfall of the period 1950 to 2008, and for 2009 and 2010. Mean monthly rainfall for the period 1950 to 2008 and monthly rainfall values of 2009 and 2010.	100
Table 4.4 Pre-grazing herbage mass (kg DM/ha >4 cm) of plots allocated to one of four treading-damage treatments: control (C, no damage), light damage (L), moderate damage (M) and severe damage (S) in the spring of 2009, on a perennial ryegrass-dominated grassland site with a well-drained soil.	104
Table 4.5 Pre-grazing herbage mass (kg DM/ha >4 cm) of plots allocated to one of four treading-damage treatments: control (C, no damage), light damage (L), moderate damage (M) and severe damage (S) in the autumn of 2009 on a creeping bent-dominated sward with a poorly-drained soil.	106
Table 4.6 Pre-grazing herbage mass (kg DM/ha >4 cm) of plots allocated to one of four treading-damage treatments: control (C, no damage), light damage (L), moderate damage (M) and	

severe damage (S) in the spring of 2010 on a creeping bent-dominated sward with a poorly-drained soil.	107
Table 4.7 Pre-grazing herbage mass (kg DM/ha >4 cm) of plots allocated to one of four treading-damage treatments: control (C, no damage), light damage (L), moderate damage (M) and severe damage (S) in the autumn of 2009 and spring of 2010, on a creeping bent-dominated sward with a poorly-drained soil.	108
Table 5.1 Mean daily temperature, soil temperature at 50 mm and monthly rainfall for 2009 as compared with previous 25-year average (1983-2008).	127
Table 5.2 Mean pre-harvest herbage mass (above 4 cm), pre-harvest height and tiller density of 12 plots (5 m × 11 m) that were harvested at 2-, 3- or 4-week re-growth intervals (treatments) during six months (from 4 April to 16 September 2009) in a perennial ryegrass (PRG) sward.	130
Table 5.3 Sward morphology above and below 4 cm of 12 plots (5 m × 11 m) that were harvested at 2-, 3- or 4-week re-growth intervals during 24 weeks (from 4 April to 16 September 2009) in a perennial ryegrass sward.	133
Table 5.4 Sward structure of 240 marked primary tillers and secondary tillers in 12 plots (5 m × 11 m) that were harvested at 2-, 3- or 4-week re-growth intervals during six months (from 4 April to 16 September) in a perennial ryegrass sward.	136
Table 5.5 Total leaf length per tiller at harvest, leaf extension rate (LER) from week 1 to week 2 of re-growth and number of leaves emerged during the re-growth period for each of the 240 marked tillers in 12 plots (5 m × 11 m) that were harvested at 2-, 3- and 4-week re-growth intervals during six months (from 4 April to 16 September 2009) in a perennial ryegrass sward.	140
Table 6.1 Mean daily temperature and monthly rainfall for 2010 as compared with previous 10-year average (1999-2009).	154
Table 6.2 Pre-grazing herbage mass (above 4 cm) and grazing interval of swards grazed by dairy cows at low, medium or high pre-grazing herbage mass (targets 900, 1,500 or 2,200 kg DM/ha, respectively) in a perennial ryegrass sward.	157
Table 6.3 Total leaf length per tiller at grazing, leaves emerged during the re-growth period, secondary tillers at grazing and leaf extension rate of 360 marked tillers were grazed by dairy cows at low, medium or high pre-grazing herbage mass (targets 900, 1,500 or 2,200 kg DM/ha, respectively) in a perennial ryegrass sward.	160
Table 6.4 Sward structure of marked tillers grazed by dairy cows at low, medium or high pre-grazing herbage mass (targets 900, 1,500 or 2,200 kg DM/ha, respectively) in a perennial ryegrass sward.	165
Table 6.5 Sward morphology above and below 3.5 cm of plots that were grazed by dairy cows at low, medium or high pre-grazing herbage mass (targets 900, 1,500 or 2,200 kg DM/ha, respectively) in a perennial ryegrass sward.	167
Table 6.6 Tiller density of plots that were grazed by dairy cows at low, medium or high pre-grazing herbage mass (targets 900, 1,500 or 2,200 kg DM/ha, respectively) during 24 weeks in a perennial ryegrass (PRG) sward.	169

Table 7.1 Mean temperature and rainfall for the period of April to October 2010 compared with the 10-year average 1999-2009.	182
Table 7.2 Grazing behaviour for period 1 (27 April to 25 July) and herbage dry matter (DM) intake and daily milksolids (MS) yield for period 2 (26 July to 17 October 2010) for the low (L), medium (M) or high (HM) pre-grazing herbage mass treatments (978, 1,521 and 2,330 kg DM/ha, respectively).	183
Table 8.1 Tissue turnover and yield of plots harvested every 2, 3 or 4 weeks or re-growth.	195
Table 8.2 Tissue turnover and yield of plots harvested at low, medium or high herbage mass.	196



## Definitions

The following terms may be used in a different way in Ireland and the rest of the world (New Zealand), taken from Allen *et al.* (2011) and Drewry *et al.* (2008):

**Herbage:** The above-ground biomass of herbaceous plants, other than separated grain. Grasses, grass-like species, herbaceous legumes and other forbs collectively; the foliage and edible stems of herbs.

**Sward:** A population or a community of herbaceous plants characterised by a relatively short habit of growth and relatively continuous ground cover, including both above- and below-ground parts.

**Canopy:** The above-ground parts of a population or community of forage plants. It may include both herbaceous and woody vegetation.

**Herbage mass:** The total dry weight of herbage per unit of land above a defined reference level.

**Pasture:** A type of grazing management unit enclosed and separated from other areas by fencing or other barriers and devoted to the production of herbage for harvest primarily by grazing.

**Paddock:** A grazing area, part of a grazing management unit, that is enclosed and separated from other areas by a fence or barrier.

**Grazing system:** A defined, integrated combination of soil, plant, animal, social and economic features, stocking (grazing) method(s) and management objectives designed to achieve specific results or goals.

**Defoliation:** Removal of plant tissue by grazing animals or machinery.

**Poaching:** Slurry-induced soil conditions on very wet soil when trampled with stock.

**Pugging:** Deep hoof imprints in wet, soft soil, associated with pasture damage.





## Glossary of terms

ADF	Acid-detergent fibre
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CP	Crude protein
DHA	Daily herbage allowance
DIM	Days in milk
DM	Dry matter
ESH	Extended sheath height
ETH	Extended tiller height
FLL	Free leaf lamina
GLC	Ground level cut
HM	Herbage mass
LAI	Leaf area index
LAR	Leaf appearance rate
LER	Leaf extension rate
LSD	Leaf, stem and dead components in the sward
LWT	Live weight
ME	Metabolisable energy
MS	Milksolids (fat + protein)
N	Nitrogen
NDF	Neutral-detergent fibre
OMD	Organic-matter digestibility
PRG	Perennial ryegrass
SR	Stocking rate
WSC	Water-soluble carbohydrates

