

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.

**EFFECTS OF FEEDING SILAGE AND EXTENDING
LACTATION ON THE PASTORAL DAIRY SYSTEM**

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

C.S. PINARES PATIÑO

1996

ABSTRACT

It is a common practice in the New Zealand seasonal dairying system to dry-off the herd at an earlier date in order to prevent excessive loss of body condition and average pasture cover. Thus, short lactation length is one of the main reasons for the low milk yield per cow in New Zealand. An experiment was carried out in April and May 1995 (54 days) at the Dairy Cattle Research Unit (DCRU), Massey University in order to measure the effects of extending the lactation, and feeding silage on the dairy farm system. On the 4th April, 54 of the lower yielding cows of the herd (118 cows) were dried-off and divided into two equal herds (D or control system). The remaining 64 cows were also divided into two equal herds, and milked for another 54 days (M system). Each of the four herds was grazed on a self-contained farmlet, at 2.9 cows/ha stocking rate. D herds received only grazed pasture (16 kg dry matter (DM)/cow/day allowance), while M herds received pasture (30 kg DM/cow/day allowance) plus silage (5.5 kg DM/cow/day). All of the replicated farmlets were feed budgeted to common targets of 2,000 Kg DM/ha pasture cover and condition score 5.0 at 29th May. At the end of the experiment the M system had produced 57.7 kg milksolids (MS, fat+protein) per cow, but had lower ($P < 0.01$) average pasture cover (by 584 kg DM/ha) and body condition scores (by 0.33 units/cow) than the D system. The target conditions were achieved by the D system, but not by the M system (deficits of 400 kg DM/ha pasture cover and 0.38 units CS/cow). When the feed required to overcome the deficits (when compared with the D system) in pasture cover and condition score of the M system was added to the silage fed, and these were all expressed in terms of their "pasture equivalences", a *total marginal response* to the silage feeding and extra days in milk of 116 g MS/kg equivalent pasture DM was calculated. Findings of this and previous farm system studies show that milk production response to late lactation (autumn) supplementary feeding is higher than was commonly believed, provided that it is associated with extra days in milk. Nevertheless, feed planning and management must be specially vigilant to ensure that the extended lactation does not cause reduced body condition score and pasture cover at the start of the next season.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to Associate Professor Colin Holmes, my supervisor, for his constant encouragement throughout my study. His time and efforts devoted to this experiment and also to my education are highly appreciated.

My special thanks are also given to Professor John Hodgson and Dr. Cory Matthew, of the Pastoral Group (Plant Science Department), for their advices and great contributions to my pastoral science understanding.

This work would not have been possible without the full involvement of Martin Chesterfield and Louise Platt from the Dairy Cattle Research Unit (DCRU). Thanks to both.

I would also like to thank the staff members of the Animal Science Department for their help and assistance. Particular appreciation to Drs. I.M. Brookes and G. Wilson.

Aderina, Mashudi, Hamsun and Wigati (Indonesian colleagues); Chandana, Min and Francis, all are gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks to Aderina Uli, Barbara Purchas, Nicolas Lopez and Jose Garcia.

My eternal gratitude to Joyce and Arthur Worboys, whose encouragement and support are invaluable. They are special persons for my family.

I would also like to gratefully thank to Jacky and Phill Mac'Donell, Claudia and Roger Clark and Ruth Hodgson, for their constant support given to my family.

My special thanks are given to the New Zealand Official Development Assistance (NZODA) Programme, for giving me the opportunity to undertake the study at Massey University, New Zealand.

To Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina, Lima, Peru (my Alma Mater), for giving me the opportunity to continue my studies. Special thanks to Professor Guillermo Aguirre for his proud friendship, and *in memoriam* of Professor Alberto Pumayalla for his guidance and friendship.

Members of my family and relatives in my home country are gratefully acknowledged for their constant support and encouragement.

This thesis is dedicated *in memoriam* of Aurelia and Emilio, my parents, who would have loved to see this undertaking to be continued.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Alicia and my children Paulo Cesar and Shaina for making my life so happy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 The New Zealand dairy industry	3
2.1.1 Introduction	3
2.1.2 Principles	4
2.1.3 Weaknesses	6
2.1.4 Opportunities	7
2.2 Factors affecting the seasonal dairying system	7
2.2.1 Introduction	7
2.2.2 Pasture production and utilisation	9
2.2.2.1 Pasture production	9
2.2.2.2 Grazing efficiency	10
2.2.2.3 Gross efficiency of feed conversion	11
2.2.3 Grazing management	12
2.2.3.1 Grazing methods	12
2.2.3.2 Seasonal feeding management	14
2.2.4 Stock policies	21
2.2.4.1 Stocking rate	21
2.2.4.2 Calving date	25
2.2.4.3 Drying-off date	26
2.2.4.4 Breed and genetic merit of cows	28
2.3 Milk production responses to supplementary feeding	30
2.3.1 Principles and measurements of responses to extra feed	30
2.3.2 Factors affecting milk production response to supplementary feeding	31
2.3.2.1 Effect of stage of lactation	32
2.3.2.2 Effect of body condition score	33
2.3.2.3 Effect of substitution	33
2.3.2.4 Effect of type and level of supplement	36
2.3.2.5 Effect of genetic merit of cows (see also Section 2.2.4.3)	37
2.3.2.6 Effect of quality of pasture and supplement ..	37

2.4 Increasing late lactation feed supply on seasonal dairy farms . . .	39
2.4.1 Increasing feed production in late lactation	40
2.4.1.1 Fertiliser application	40
2.4.1.2 Pasture species and forage crops for late lactation	42
2.4.1.3 Irrigation for late lactation	45
2.4.2 Use of supplementary feeds in late lactation (see also Section 2.3)	46
2.4.2.1 Concentrates	46
2.4.2.2 Maize silage	47
2.4.2.3 Pasture silage	47
2.4.2.4 Hay	50
2.4.2.5 Industrial by-products	51
2.5 Summary of this Chapter	52
 MATERIALS AND METHODS	 54
3.1 Location and duration of the experiment	54
3.2 Animals and treatments	54
3.3 Grazing and feeding management	55
3.4 Measurements	56
3.4.1 Pre- and post-grazing herbage mass	56
3.4.2 Herbage allowance	56
3.4.3 Stocking density	57
3.4.4 Apparent daily herbage intake	57
3.4.5 Botanical composition and nutritive value of the grazed herbage and silage	57
3.4.6 Live weight (LW) and condition score (CS)	58
3.4.7 Feeding behaviour	58
3.4.8 Milk yield and composition	59
3.4.9 Average pasture cover	59
3.5 Statistical analyses	59
 RESULTS	 61
4.1 Grazing conditions and level of feeding	61
4.2 Botanical composition and nutritive value of the grazed herbage and silage	65
4.3 Live weight and body condition score	66
4.4 Milk yield	68
4.5 Average pasture cover	70
4.6 Final conditions for animal and pasture conditions versus the targeted values, and total effects of the treatments	71
4.7 Regression analyses of the daily apparent herbage intake on herbage allowance, pre-grazing herbage mass and residual herbage mass	72
4.8 Feeding behaviour	75

DISCUSSION	79
5.1 Feed intake	79
5.2 Effects of the treatments on final animal and pasture conditions, and total effects on the system	80
5.2.1 Milk production	80
5.2.2 Final cow condition score and average pasture cover versus the targeted values	81
5.2.3 Total effects of the treatments	84
5.3 Effects of sward conditions upon herbage intake	85
5.4 Effects of grazing conditions and silage feeding upon feeding behaviour	87
5.4.1 Dried-off (D) versus Milked (M) cows	87
5.4.2 Effects of supplement on feeding behaviour of milked (M) cows	89
 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	 91
REFERENCES	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Comparisons between target values for high quality pasture silage and quality indicators for current practice New Zealand silages (from Howse <i>et al.</i> 1996).	48
Table 3.1: Mean (for two dried-off and two milked farmlets) animal and pasture conditions at the start of the experiment (4 th April) (mean±s.e. ¹)	55
Table 3.2: Dry matter (DM), metabolisable energy (M/D) and crude protein (CP) contents of the pasture silage supplement (average±s.d.)	56
Table 4.1: Mean values for daily feeding management and apparent intakes during the 54 days of the experiment (mean±s.e.)	61
Table 4.2: Mean values for botanical composition and nutritive value of the herbage grazed by dried-off (D) and milked (M) herds (mean±s.e.)	65
Table 4.3: Mean values for live weight (LW, kg/cow) and condition score (CS, scale 1 to 10 units/cow) for dried-off (D) and milked (M) cows (mean±s.e.)	67
Table 4.4: Mean values for live weight gain (LW Δ, kg/cow) and condition score gain (CS Δ, 1 to 10 units/cow) for dried-off (D) and milked (M) cows throughout the experimental period (mean±s.e.)	67
Table 4.5: Mean values for daily milk fat (MF), milk protein (MP) and milk solids (MS, MF+MP) yields (kg/cow/day) and total yields (kg/cow) for the milked (M) treatment (mean±s.d.)	69
Table 4.6: Mean values for average pasture cover (APC, kg DM/ha) and their changes (kg DM/ha) during the experimental period (mean±s.e.)	70
Table 4.7: Mean values for final animal and pasture conditions and total silage fed and milk yields, changes in condition score (CS Δ) and average pasture cover (APC Δ) during the 54 days of the experiment (mean±s.e. ¹)	72

Table 4.8: Results of simple and multiple regression analyses of apparent herbage intake (AHDMI, kg DM/cow/day) on herbage allowance (HDMA, kg DM/cow/day), pre-grazing herbage mass (PGHM, t DM/ha) and residual herbage mass (RHM, t DM/ha) for dried-off (D) and milked (M) cows	73
Table 4.9: Mean values for feeding behaviour of Dried-off (D) and Milked (M) cows, measured on 17 th May (when M cows were silage supplemented, M-S) and 24 th May (when M cows were not silage supplemented, M-U) (comparisons between treatments for each day of measurement)(mean±s.e.) ¹	76
Table 4.10: Mean values for feeding behaviour of Dried-off (D) and Milked (M) cows, measured on 17 th May and 24 th May (comparisons between days of measurement for each treatment)(mean±s.e.) ¹	77
Table 5.1: Comparison between the theoretical calculated daily energy requirements (MJ ME/cow/day) and the measured values of daily intake (MJ ME/cow/day) for dried-off (D) and milked (M) cows . . .	79

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Matching feed supply and feed requirements for a seasonal dairy farm (3.7 cows/ha SR, cows calve on 1 st August and dried off on 1 st May) (Holmes and MacMillan 1982)	5
Figure 2.2: A simple model of the key elements of milk production per hectare, and of the factors which affect the key elements (Holmes 1990)	8
Figure 2.3: Daily milk flow (millions l/day) to factories in the Waikato region compared to the average pasture growth recorded at the DRC No. 2 Dairy (Ruakura) (Thomson and Holmes 1995)	10
Figure 2.4: Per animal and per unit area livestock production resulting from the combined effects of solar energy capture efficiency, forage harvest efficiency, and conversion efficiency in response to grazing intensity (Briske and Heitschmidt 1991)	22
Figure 2.5: Model of principles of milk responses to extra feed (Holmes 1995c)	30
Figure 2.6: Factors affecting the milk production response to supplementary feeding (Rogers 1985)	31
Figure 2.7: Effect of herbage allowance on herbage intake at different levels of concentrate feeding (Meijs and Hoekstra 1984)	34
Figure 2.8: Effects of pasture and supplement quality on milk yield and composition (1, good quality pasture + pellets; 2, good quality pasture + wheat; 3, poor quality pasture + pellets; 4, poor quality pasture + wheat) (Stockdale <i>et al.</i> 1990)	38
Figure 2.9: Seasonal energy (MJ ME/ha/day) relationship between the demand of a herd of "calculated cows" stocked at 3 cows/ha) and the pasture supply from No. 2 dairy (Ruakura) (Penno <i>et al.</i> 1995)	39
Figure 4.1: Total apparent dry matter intake (TADMI, kg DM/cow/day) (pasture and silage) for dried-off (D) and milked (M) cows throughout the experimental period	62
Figure 4.2: Weekly mean values for herbage allowance (HDMA, kg DM/cow/day) and apparent herbage intake (AHDMI, kg DM/cow/day) for dried-off (D) (a) and milked (M) (b) cows throughout the experimental period	63

- Figure 4.3: Weekly mean values for the pre-grazing and residual herbage masses (PGHM and RHM, t DM/ha) and the apparent herbage intake (AHDMI, kg DM/cow/day) for dried-off (D) (a) and milked (M) (b) cows throughout the experimental period 64
- Figure 4.4: Mean values for cow live weight (LW, kg) (a) and cow body condition score (CS, units) (b) for dried-off (D) and milked (M) treatments throughout the experimental period 68
- Figure 4.5: Mean daily milk fat (kg MF/cow/day), milk protein (kg MP/cow/day) and milksolids (MF+MP, kg MS/cow/day) yields of the milked (M) cows throughout the experimental period 69
- Figure 4.6: Mean values for the average pasture cover (APC, kg DM/ha) on the Dried-off (D) and Milked (M) farmlets throughout the experimental period 71
- Figure 4.7: Regression lines of apparent herbage intake (AHDMI, kg DM/cow/day) on herbage allowance (HDMA, kg DM/cow/day) (a), pre-grazing herbage mass (PGHM, t DM/ha) (b), and residual herbage mass (RHM, t DM/cow/day) (c) for dried-off (D) and milked (M) cows 74

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A	Ayrshire
AHDMI	apparent herbage dry matter intake (kg DM/cow/day)
APC	average pasture cover (kg or t DM/ha)
BI	Breeding index
B_i	regression coefficient
BR	rate of biting (bites/min)
cm	centimetres
CP	Crude protein (%)
CS	cow body condition score (scale 1 to 10 units/cow)
CS Δ	condition score change
°C	Celsius degrees
D	Dried-off treatment
DG	Deferred grazing
DM	dry matter
DMD	digestibility of DM (%)
DOM	digestible organic matter (%)
DOMD	dry organic matter digestibility (%)
Eq.	Equation
FCE	feed conversion efficiency
g	grams
G	grazing activity
h	hours
ha	hectares
HDMA	herbage dry matter allowance (kg DM/cow/day)
HDMD	herbage dry matter disappearance (kg DM/ha)
HF	Holstein-Friesian
HM	herbage mass (kg DM/ha)
IVDDM	<i>in vitro</i> digestibility of dry matter (%)
J	Jersey
kg	kilograms

k_g	efficiency of utilization of ME for LW gain (%)
k_l	efficiency of utilization of ME for milk production (%)
k_m	efficiency of utilization of ME for maintenance (%)
l	litres
LC	Late control
LW	live weight (kg/cow)
LW Δ	live weight change
LW ^{0.75}	Metabolic size (kg/cow)
m	metres
M	Milked (plus silage feeding) treatment
M/D	Metabolisable energy content of the dry matter (MJ ME/kg DM)
ME	Metabolisable energy (MJ)
MF	milk fat
min	minutes
MJ	Megajoules
mm	millimetres
m ²	square metres
MP	milk protein
MS	milk solids (milk fat plus milk protein)
M-S	M treatment when silage was given
M-U	M treatment when silage was not given
n	number of observations
N	Nitrogen
NE	Net energy (MJ)
NH ₃	ammonia
ns	statistically non-significant
O	other (no feeding related) activities
OM	organic matter
P	Phosphorus
pH	Potential of Hydrogen
PGHM	pre-grazing herbage mass (kg DM/ha)
PMR	Plate meter readings

R	ruminating activity
R ²	coefficient of determination
RHM	residual or post-grazing herbage mass (kg or t DM/ha)
S	silage eating activity
s.d.	standard deviation
SD	stocking density (cows/ha)
s.e.	standard error of mean
sig	statistical significance
SR	stocking rate (cows/ha)
SSFR	Spring-summer fast rotation
t	test of Tukey
t	tonne
TADMI	total apparent dry matter intake (kg DM/cow/day)
TAMEI	total apparent metabolisable energy intake (MJ ME/cow/day)
vs	versus