

Synchronisation of energy and protein degradation in the rumen to improve nitrogen utilisation by dairy cattle

G. van Duinkerken,
A. Klop, R.M.A. Goselink and J. Dijkstra



Our objective

- Study the effect of degradation rate of FOM on:
 - feed intake
 - performance
 - N utilisation



Experiment with double Latin-square design (I)

- 32 animals (8 primiparous + 24 multiparous)
 - DIM \geq 50 at start of the experiment
- Four experimental periods (replicated twice)
 - Each period: 2 wk adaptation + 1 wk measurements
- Each replicate had a different ratio of grass silage : corn silage (GC) in the basal diet
 - GC3:2 = ratio 3:2 (on a DM basis)
 - GC1:4 = ratio 1:4 ,,
 - Some formaldehyde treated soybean meal included in the basal feed mixtures (1.75 and 2.35 kg/d resp.)



Experiment with double Latin-square design (II)

■ FOM2 at four levels

- FOM2 = OM fermented in the first 2 h after feed ingestion
- FOM2 levels were set by choice of compound concentrate

■ Two compound concentrates with contrasting FOM2

- “Low” 175 g FOM2/kg (level 1)
- “High” 358 g FOM2/kg (level 4)
- Intermediate levels (level 2 and 3) achieved by mixing these two concentrates
- Compound concentrate fed with transponder controlled feeders

Design: FOM2 at four levels: 1, 2, 3 and 4

| GC ratio | Cow | Period | wk 1-3 | wk 4-6 | wk 7-9 | wk 10-12 |
|----------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| | | | | | | |
| GC 3:2 | A1, B2, C8, D4 | | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| | A6, B8, C6, D2 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| | A5, B1, C1, D1 | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | A3, B4, C7, D3 | | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| GC 1:4 | A2, B5, C5, D7 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | A8, B6, C4, D8 | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | A7, B7, C3, D6 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| | A4, B3, C2, D5 | | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 |

Compound feed ingredients

| | FOM2 | GC3:2 | | GC1:4 | |
|------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|
| | | Low | High | Low | High |
| Sugar beet pulp | | 209 | 0 | 127 | 0 |
| Palm kernel expeller | | 200 | 0 | 200 | 0 |
| Corn gluten feed | | 178 | 0 | 131 | 0 |
| Soy hulls | | 167 | 0 | 175 | 0 |
| Copra expeller | | 70 | 21 | 46 | 5 |
| Vinasses | | 53 | 5 | 53 | 0 |
| Lupine | | 25 | 0 | 104 | 5 |
| Cane molasses | | 20 | 111 | 20 | 120 |
| Citrus pulp | | 7 | 384 | 5 | 260 |
| Canola meal solvent extract | | 2 | 160 | 4 | 193 |
| Soybean meal solvent extract | | 0 | 61 | 48 | 116 |
| Wheat | | 0 | 226 | 0 | 263 |
| Miscellaneous | | 69 | 32 | 87 | 38 |

Compound feed characteristics

| | FOM2 | GC3:2 | | GC1:4 | |
|----------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|
| | | Low | High | Low | High |
| NE _{lac} (MJ) | | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| DVE ₁₉₉₄ (g/kg) | | 90 | 90 | 105 | 105 |
| DVE ₂₀₁₀ (g/kg) | | 92 | 98 | 107 | 113 |
| FOM (g/kg) | | 456 | 593 | 450 | 581 |
| FOM2 (g/kg) | | 178 | 358 | 175 | 358 |

Intake (day⁻¹)

| | GC ratio | | | | GC3:2 | | | | GC1:4 | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|---|---|---|
| FOM2 level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| DM (kg) | 22,3 ^{ab} | 22,6 ^b | 22,9 ^b | 21,5 ^a | 23,8 ^b | 24,0 ^b | 24,0 ^b | 22,7 ^a | | | | |
| NElac (MJ) | 150 | 153 | 155 | 146 | 161 | 163 | 163 | 154 | | | | |
| DVE ₁₉₉₄ (g) | 2181 | 2215 | 2241 | 2110 | 2384 | 2412 | 2418 | 2299 | | | | |
| DVE ₂₀₁₀ (g) | 2119 | 2173 | 2210 | 2109 | 2416 | 2459 | 2480 | 2378 | | | | |
| FOM2 (g) | 5121 | 5777 | 6318 | 6603 | 5768 | 6333 | 6867 | 7091 | | | | |

Milk performance and N utilisation

| FOM2 level | GC ratio | | | | GC3:2 | | | | GC1:4 | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Milk (kg) | 35.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 34.5 | 34.4 | 34.9 | 35.4 | | | | |
| Fat (%) | 4.30 ^b | 4.27 ^b | 4.20 ^b | 4.03 ^a | 4.37 ^{ab} | 4.41 ^b | 4.35 ^{ab} | 4.23 ^a | | | | |
| Protein (%) | 3.25 ^a | 3.28 ^{ab} | 3.30 ^{ab} | 3.32 ^b | 3.34 ^b | 3.27 ^a | 3.37 ^b | 3.39 ^b | | | | |
| Fat (g) | 1514 ^b | 1516 ^b | 1485 ^b | 1438 ^a | 1506 | 1518 | 1512 | 1492 | | | | |
| Protein (g) | 1144 | 1161 | 1166 | 1179 | 1154 ^{ab} | 1128 ^a | 1173 ^{ab} | 1198 ^b | | | | |
| FPCM (kg) | 36.3 | 36.5 | 36.1 | 35.7 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.3 | 36.4 | | | | |
| Urea (mg/100 g) | 21.7 ^b | 21.1 ^{ab} | 20.4 ^{ab} | 19.4 ^a | 25.3 ^c | 23.4 ^{ab} | 22.0 ^a | 23.9 ^{bc} | | | | |
| N utilisation (%) | 34.3 ^a | 34.3 ^a | 34.1 ^a | 36.7 ^b | 32.3 ^a | 31.1 ^a | 32.2 ^a | 34.5 ^b | | | | |

- DMI depressed with highest FOM2 level
- Milk fat % lowest at highest FOM2 level
- Milk protein increased with increasing FOM2
- FOM2 levels should not be maximized but optimized





LIVESTOCK RESEARCH
WAGENINGEN UR

gert.vanduinkerken@wur.nl