Milk urea content as affected by roughage type

S. De Campeneere, D. De Brabander, J. Vanacker

Department Animal Nutrition and Husbandry Agricultural Research Centre Ministry of the Flemish Community, Belgium Milk urea content as affected by roughage type S. De Campeneere, D.L. De Brabander and J.M. Vanacker

that a system to predict N excretion can not merely be based on MUC.

S. De Campeneere, D.L. De Braomaer and J.M. vanacker Agricultural Research Centre, Department Animal Nutrition and Husbandry Scheldeweg 68, 9090 Melle, Belgium (s.decampeneere@clo.fgov.be)

N.4.1.

Milk urea content (MUC) is used to manage protein nutrition and predict nitrogen excretion of dairy cows. However, MUC might depend on the roughage type offered. To evaluate that, three diets were compared using 18 lactating Holstein cows: 100% maize silage (MS), 50%/50% MS/grass silage (GS) and 100% GS. For all treatments, cows were fed to supply 105% of their net energy and digestible protein requirements. For the 100% groups, N balance was determined. MS and MS/GS treatments had higher DM-intake (19.5 and 19.6 vs. 18.7 kg/d; P<0.001) and improved milking performance: 26.7 and 26.5 vs. 24.3 kg milk/1163 and 1138 vs. 1050 g milk fat/d and 854 and 845 vs. 752 g milk protein/d (P<0.001). MS and GS fed cows ingested the same amount of degraded protein balance (73 g/d), while the MS/GS group ingested 106 g/d. MUC of MS (230 mg/l) and MS/GS (214 mg/l) was significantly (P<0.001) different from GS (171 mg/l). N balances indicated that for the MS diet, 33.2, 32.8 and 34.0% of the excreted N (392 g/d), was excreted with the faeces, urine and milk respectively, while for the GS diet this was 40.0, 30.1 and 29.9% (total excretion: 389 g/d). These results suggest that MUC is roughage dependent and

Introduction

MUC has been suggested to monitor protein supply and estimate N excretion. Some nutritional factors are cited to influence MUC:

- feed protein intake
- · ratio energy/protein intake
- · rumen degraded protein balance
- A possible effect of the roughage type has rarely been investigated

Indications for influence of roughage type

• De Brabander et al (1999) for maize silage/grass silage based diets (36 treatments, 585 cow observations):

MUC (mg/l) = 145 - 1.85 x %NEL + 2.32 x % DPI + 0.28 x g RDPB

Indication for correction for roughage type: 100% PGS: - 48 mg/l 100% MS: + 85 mg/l

| Van D Corrected MUC based on nutri | Duinkerken et al. (2003): MUC-values 2 values according to De Brabander et al. (1999) ient intake from Van Duinkerken et al. (2003) | | |
|--|---|---------------|-----------|
| RDPB-level |] | Proportion MS | 5 |
| g/day | 0% | 50% | 100% |
| 0 | 139 (135) | 159 (148) | 219 (236) |
| 500 | 265 (244) | 302 (297) | 379 (384) |
| 1000 | 390 (403) | 445 (461) | 539 (541) |
| | | | |

Feeding trial: material and methods

- Latin square 3 x 3
- 18 cows
- roughage diets:
 - MS: 100% maize silage
 - MS/PGS: 50%/50% maize sil./prew. grass sil.
 - PGS: 100% prewilted grass silage
- all diets formulated : similar energy (NEL) and protein supply (CP, DPI, RDPB)

| Feeding trial: material and methods | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------|--------|------|--|
| Analysed dietary composition (/kg DM) | | | | |
| | MS | MS/PGS | PGS | |
| NEL (MJ) | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.7 | |
| CP (g) | 137 | 135 | 134 | |
| DPI (g) | 82.4 | 76.3 | 74.2 | |
| RDPB (g) | -0.7 | 3.7 | 3.9 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Results: daily DMI (kg) | | | |
|-------------------------|------|--------|------|
| | MS | MS/PGS | PGS |
| total | 19.5 | 19.6 | 18.7 |
| maize silage | 15.8 | 8.3 | - |
| grass silage | - | 7.9 | 11.6 |
| citrus pulp | - | - | 5.1 |
| soybean meal | 2.2 | 0.8 | - |
| concentrates | 1.5 | 2.6 | 1.9 |

| | MS | MS/PGS | PGS |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| RDPB (g d^{-1}) | -16 ^a | 71 ^b | 73 ^b |
| $OPI (g d^{-1})$ | 1608 ^a | 1505 ^b | 1392° |
| $NEL(\mathbf{MJ}\mathbf{d}^{-1})$ | 131 ^a | 129 ^a | 125 ^b |
| OPI (% requir.) | 111 ^a | 104 ^b | 108^{a} |
| VEL (% requir.) | 104 ^a | 104 ^a | 108 ^b |

Results: milking performance

| MUC (mg Γ^1) 230 ^a 214 ^a 171 ^b <0.00 | 001 |
|---|-----|
| corr for nutr. intake 217 193 146 corr for LW-gain 216 187 128 Milk yield (kg d ⁻¹) 26.7 ^a 26.5 ^a 24.3 ^b <0.00 | |
| corr for LW-gain216187128Milk yield (kg d ⁻¹) 26.7^a 26.5^a 24.3^b <0.00 | |
| Milk yield (kg d^{-1}) 26.7 ^a 26.5 ^a 24.3 ^b <0.00 Fat content (%) 4.37 4.32 4.38 0.70 | |
| Fat content (%) 4.37 4.32 4.38 0.70 | 001 |
| | 08 |
| Protein content (%) 3.22 ^a 3.21 ^a 3.12 ^b 0.00 | 06 |
| Weight gain (kg d^{-1}) 0.22 ^a 0.07 ^{ab} -0.12 ^b 0.03 | 36 |

Balance trial: material and methods

- cross-over
- 4 cows
- 2 diets from feeding trial:
 - MS: 100% maize silage
 - PGS: 100% prew. grass silage

| MS | PGS |
|------|--|
| 17.1 | 16.7 |
| 388 | 356 |
| 130 | 155 |
| 129 | 117 |
| 259 | 272 |
| 133 | 116 |
| 392 | 389 |
| -5 | -32 |
| | MS 17.1 388 130 129 259 133 392 -5 |

| | MS | PGS | P-value |
|---------------------------|------|------|---------|
| Excretion (g/d) | | | |
| Environment | 259 | 272 | 0.492 |
| Total | 392 | 389 | 0.902 |
| Excretion (% of intake) | | | |
| Environment | 67.2 | 76.8 | 0.064 |
| MUC (mg/l) | 248 | 180 | 0.095 |
| corr for nutr. intake | 252 | 168 | |
| Milk (kg/d) | 24.7 | 20.4 | 0.199 |
| Urine production (kg/day) | 14.4 | 35.0 | < 0.001 |

Conclusions

- Important influence of roughage type on MUC
- Probably, other feedstuffs may also influence MUC
- This should be studied in detail before Nexcretion estimation from MUC can be applied in practice

References

De Brabander, D.L., Botterman, S., Vanacker, J., Boucqué, Ch.V. 1999. The milk urea concentration as indicator for nutrition and N excretion. Final conclusions and interpretations (in Dutch). Announcement nr1109. Department Animal Nutrition and Husbandry, Centre Agricultural Research, Ghent, Belgium, 8 pp.

Van Duinkerken, G., André, G., Smits, M.C.J., Monteny, G.J., Blanken K., Wagemans M.J.M., Sebek, L.B.J., 2003. Relation between diet and ammonia emission from the dariy barn (in Dutch). Applied Research Report nr. 25, Animal Sciences Group, Applied Research, Lelystad, the Netherlands, 66 pp.