The National Academies of Academies of

ENGINEERING THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS

This PDF is available at http://nap.edu/9825





Nutrient Requirements of Dairy Cattle: Seventh Revised Edition, 2001 (2001)

DETAILS

405 pages | 8.5 x 11 | HARDBACK ISBN 978-0-309-38815-3 | DOI 10.17226/9825

CONTRIBUTORS

GET THIS BOOK

Subcommittee on Dairy Cattle Nutrition; Committee on Animal Nutrition; Board on Agriculture and Natural Resources; National Research Council

FIND RELATED TITLES

SUGGESTED CITATION

National Research Council 2001. *Nutrient Requirements of Dairy Cattle: Seventh Revised Edition, 2001*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/9825.

Visit the National Academies Press at NAP.edu and login or register to get:

- Access to free PDF downloads of thousands of scientific reports
- 10% off the price of print titles
- Email or social media notifications of new titles related to your interests
- Special offers and discounts



Distribution, posting, or copying of this PDF is strictly prohibited without written permission of the National Academies Press. (Request Permission) Unless otherwise indicated, all materials in this PDF are copyrighted by the National Academy of Sciences.

Copyright © National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.

The evaluation of specific components of the model can be found in the relevant chapters. This chapter concerns the evaluation of the overall model relative to energy, protein, and intake. The model equations are also presented in this chapter for reference.

METHODOLOGY

Data from experiments published in the *Journal of Dairy Science* from 1992 through February 2000 were used to evaluate the model. Only data from continuous lactation experiments that lasted at least 6 weeks were used (data from cross-over type experiments were not used). Twentyfive papers representing 100 different diets were selected. The papers were selected so that a wide variety of ingredients and production levels of cows could be evaluated. The selection was made prior to diet evaluation; all selected diets are shown in the plots. Diets varied in:

1. Forage source (corn silage and alfalfa were used in most experiments)

2. Forage:concentrate ratio

3. Fat supplementation (without and with a wide variety of fat sources)

4. Nonforage fiber sources (without and with a wide variety of nonforage fiber sources)

5. Source of starch (mostly corn grain but sorghum and barley was also fed in some experiments)

6. Corn grain processing (dry and high moisture, grind size, steam-treatment)

Cows varied with respect to days in milk, milk yield, and milk composition. Twenty-three papers used Holstein cows, two papers used Jersey cows.

Diet composition (ingredients) was entered into the model. Published nutrient composition of the individual

ingredients was used when available. When nutrient composition data were missing, values from the feed composition table (Table 15-1) were used. When nutrient composition of ingredients was not published but nutrient composition of the total diet was included, nutrient composition of individual ingredients (usually only the forages) were changed by no more than one standard deviation so that composition (NDF and CP) of the diet was the same as the published composition. Most studies did not include measured lignin, ash, and neutral and acid detergent insoluble crude protein. The protein fraction and digestion rate data in the composition tables (Tables 15-2a and b) were used in all evaluations. Few papers published data on mineral composition of the ingredients or diets, and because mean composition data on minerals (Table 15-3) has a large variance, provision of minerals was not evaluated. However, the concentration of mineral supplements was included in the diets.

Mean production data (days in milk, lactation number, body weight, and milk yield and composition) were entered into the model. Day of gestation usually was not published so a reasonable estimate was entered based on days in milk. Most papers did not include data on the age of the cows. Therefore, growth requirements were set to zero for all cows except those that were exclusively primiparous (for those cows, model generated growth requirements were used).

EVALUATION

After diet and cow data were entered into the model, predicted dry matter intake, net energy allowable milk, and metabolizable protein allowable milk were compared with actual intake and milk production. Predicted net

315

energy balance was compared with actual net energy balance by including net energy provided by or needed for the measured body weight change. Sources of data used in the evaluation are shown in Table 16-1.

Dry Matter Intake

Mean observed dry matter intake was 22.3 kg/d and mean predicted intake was 22.1 kg/d. No evidence of a linear bias was found (Figure 16-1). Root mean square error (predicted minus observed) was 2.0 kg/d. Predicted intake was within \pm 5 percent of observed intake in 41 percent of the observations and 73 percent of the predicted intakes were within \pm 10 percent of observed intake.

Energy

To evaluate the energy portion of the model, intake of NE_L (based on actual DMI and model predicted NE_L concentration) was compared with NE_L utilization (model predicted NE_L for maintenance, based on actual body

weight, model predicted NE_L for actual milk produced, and NE_L used for measured body weight change). The data set was as described above except two studies (4 treatment means) could not be used because body weight change was not reported. If the model is accurate, NE_L intake and NE_{L} use should be equal with no apparent bias. Overall, the accuracy of the model was acceptable (Figure 16-2). Intake of NE_L and NE_L use were highly correlated $(r^2 = 0.61; P < 0.01)$. Energy use was within ± 5 percent of NE_L intake for 46 percent of the observations and within 10 percent for 76 percent of the observations. Mean NE_L intake was 35.4 Mcal/d compared with mean NE_L use of 34.5, therefore, a small mean bias $(0.9 \text{ Mcal of NE}_{\text{L}})$ intake or 2.5 percent) was present. A linear bias is apparent (NE_L) intake = $7.8 + 0.8 \times \text{NE}_{\text{L}}$ Use); however, within the range of NE_L used for most lactating cows in the United States the bias will be small (at 20 Mcal of NE_L use, estimated mean NE_L intake is 23.8 Mcal/day; at 30 Mcal/d NE_L use, estimated mean NE_L intake is 31.8 Mcal/day; and at 45 Mcal of NE_L use, estimated mean NE_L intake is 43.8 Mcal/day).

TABLE 16-1Sources of Data Used in the Model Evaluation(see also Figures 16-1 to 16-5)

Aydin et al. (1999)	Knowlton et al. (1998)	Soder and Holden (1999)
Bertrand et al. (1998)	Kuehn et al. (1999)	Stegeman et al. (1992)
Coomer et al. (1993)	Messman et al. (1992)	Tackett et al. (1996)
Dann et al. (2000)	Mowrey et al. (1999)	Wattiaux et al. (1994)
Dhiman and Satter (1993)	Overton et al. (1998)	Weiss (1995)
Kalscheur et al. (1999)	Pereira et al. (1999)	Weiss and Shockey (1991)
Khorasani et al. (1993)	Santos et al. (1998)	Weiss and Wyatt (2000)
Khorasani et al. (1996)	Santos et al. (1999)	Wilkerson et al. (1997)
Kim et al. (1993)		



FIGURE 16-1 Model predicted vs. actual dry matter intake. Values from 100 published treatments means from 25 studies.

Protein

Evaluation of the protein portion of the model by comparing MP allowable milk with actual milk is equivocal. When MP allowable milk is greater than actual milk, milk production could be limited by the physiologic state or genetic potential of the cow or by a nutrient other than MP. Higher MP allowable milk than actual milk could also mean that the model underpredicted MP requirements of the cow. When MP allowable milk was compared with actual milk, MP allowable milk was less than actual milk in only 18 (18 percent) observations (Figure 16-3). Of those 18 observations, MP allowable milk for 5, 8, and 5 observations were within 10 to 17 percent, 5 to 10 percent, or less than 5 percent of actual milk. Eighty-two percent of all treatment groups in this data set produced less milk than the model predicted could be produced from the amount of MP available. In 67 percent of the observations, MP allowable milk was more than 10 percent greater than actual milk. Other than energy, the most likely nutrients



FIGURE 16-2 NEL intake (estimated from observed dry matter intake and model estimated NEL concentration) versus NEL use (estimated from model predicted maintenance and lactation requirement plus NEL needed to meet observed body weight change). Values from a data base of 96 published treatment means from 23 studies. The solid line represents y=x, the dashed line represents y=7.8 + 0.8X.



FIGURE 16-3 Actual milk production versus model predicted MP allowable milk production. Values from 100 published treatment means from 25 studies.

limiting milk production and causing MP allowable milk to be greater than actual milk are specific amino acids. The difference between MP allowable milk and actual milk increased as the concentration of lysine decreased from 6.5 percent of MP (Figure 16-4) and as the concentration of methionine decreased from 1.9 percent of MP (Figure 16-5). This suggests that although supply of total MP was adequate in many of these experiments, the balance of absorbable amino acids may have been incorrect and limited milk production. Experiments specifically designed to test the MP requirements predicted by the model are needed.



FIGURE 16-4 Difference between MP allowable milk and actual milk versus model predicted lysine concentration of MP. Values from 100 published treatment means from 25 studies. Regression line: y = 6.54 - 0.026x.



FIGURE 16-5 Difference between MP allowable milk and actual milk versus model predicted methionine concentration of MP. Values from 100 published treatment means from 25 studies. Regression line: y = 1.90 - 0.0067x.

MODEL PREDICTION EQUATIONS

Model Structure

The model is divided into two major components: prediction of requirements and supply of nutrients. Within this structure, there are submodels for young calves, maintenance, pregnancy, growth, lactation, dry matter intake, minerals, reserves, energy and protein supply, amino acids, and diet evaluation. A glossary of the terms used in the equations is included at the end of the chapter. Background information explaining the committee's rationale in choosing the approach and coefficients used in the model is presented in the appropriate chapters. A complete listing of all of the equations in the model is included in a file on the compact disk that contains the model itself. Note, MEng is used to denote metabolizable energy (ME) in the computer program and in the equations below because ME can not be used as a variable in the programming language that we used.

Animal Requirements

The requirements section is divided into four main sections based on physiological function: maintenance,

growth, lactation, and pregnancy. Adjustments made for grazing activity are included in the maintenance section. There are four classes of animals in this model, lactating cow, dry cow, replacement heifer, and young calf. If different equations are used for heifers, lactating cows, or dry cows, they will be presented under the appropriate physiologic function. The equations used to predict the requirements and nutrient supply of the young calves are in a separate section.

Maintenance

MAINTENANCE ENERGY REQUIREMENTS

Maintenance requirements are computed by adjusting the NEm requirement for fasting metabolism for the effects of physiologic state, activity, and, in the case of heifers, heat and cold stress.

Lactating and Dry Cows The maintenance requirement for lactating cows is calculated using metabolic body size (BW^{0.75}), and calculated with the following equation which includes an adjustment for activity:

NEmaint (Mcal/d) =
$$((BW - CW)^{0.75} \times a1) + NEmact$$

Where a1 = 0.08 for mature cows based on the requirement for NEm (80 kcal/kg BW^{0.75}) (NRC, 1989), CW is conceptus weight and NEmact is the variable to calculate the requirement for activity.

$$NEmact = ((((Distance/1000) \times Trips) \times (0.00045 \times BW)) + (0.0012 \times (BW))$$

Where Distance is the distance from the pasture to the milking parlor (km), Trips is the number of times that animals go to and from the milking parlor daily, and Pasture is an adjustment for percent of the predicted dry matter intake supplied by grazing.

NEmact is adjusted for differences in topography for grazing animals. Topography may be either flat or hilly. No adjustment is made if the topography is flat.

If Topography = 'Hilly' Then NEmact = NEmact +
$$(0.006 \times BW)$$

The following equations are used to calculate the net energy concentration of the diet and the amount of feed that is required to meet the maintenance requirement.

 $NEFP = (TotalDMFed - FeedMaint) \times (NEl_Total / TotalDMFed) \times 0.65$

Where NEFP = Net energy for production, TotalD-MFed = Total dry matter consumed, NEL_Total = total NE (in Mcals) and 0.65 is the assumed efficiency of conversion of metabolizable protein to net protein *Heifers* The maintenance requirements for heifers without stress (NEmaintNS) are calculated with the following equation:

NEmaintNS (Mcal/d) = (((SBW - CW)^{0.75}) × ((a1 × COMP) + a2)) + NEmact

Where:

SBW = shrunk body weight = $0.96 \times BW$, CW = conceptus weight (kg),

a1 = 0.086 (thermoneutral maintenance requirement (Mcal/day)),

 $a2 = 0.0007 \times (20 - PrevTemp)$ (Adjustment for previous temperature effect),

COMP = $0.8 + ((CS9 - 1) \times 0.05)$ (Adjustment for previous plane of nutrition) NEmact = energy required for activity

In the model, a 1–9 system for body condition scoring is used so the following equation is used to convert from the 1–5 system more commonly used in the dairy industry to the 1–9 system. The conversion to the 9-point condition score from the 5-point system is:

$$CS9 = ((CS - 1) \times 2) + 1$$

The following equation is used to calculate the activity requirement for grazing heifers:

NEmact = ((0.0009 BW) + (0.0016 BW)) if the heifer is grazing, otherwise it is 0. If Topography = 'Hilly' then NEmact = NEmact + (0.006 \times BW)

For heifers, these requirements then are adjusted for the effects of temperature that are based on surface area, heat production, tissue and coat insulation, coat condition, and temperature. First surface area (SA) and heat production (HP) (Mcal/m²/day) are calculated:

 $SA = 0.09 \times (SBW^{0.67})$ HP = (MEI - NEFP)/SA

Where NEFP = Net energy for production which equals NEGrowthDietNS (Net energy for growth available in the diet with no stress, Mcal/day), HP = Heat production (Mcal/m²/day), MEI = Metabolizable energy intake (Mcal), and NEGrowthDietNS = (Total-DMFed – FeedMaint) × (NEg_Total/TotalDMFed)

The next step is to calculate tissue insulation (TI, Mcal/ $m^2/^{\circ}C/day$). For younger animals, these factors are based on age alone but, for older animals, body condition score is also considered. These factors are:

Age (days)	TI Factor
≤ 30	2.5
31 to 183	6.5
184 to 362	$5.1875 \times (0.3125 \times \text{CS9})$
≥ 363	$5.25 \times (0.75 \times \text{CS9})$

The insulation is further affected by coat condition (Coat):

Coat condition	Factor
Clean/dry	1.0
Some mud	0.8
Wet/matted	0.5
Coated with snow/mud	0.2

The external insulation value, EI (°C/Mcal/m²/day) is:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{EI} = ((7.36 - (0.296 \times \mathrm{WindSpeed}) + \\ (2.55 \times \mathrm{HairDepth})) \times \mathrm{Coat}) \times 0.8 \end{array}$$

Where WindSpeed (kph) is the average wind speed and typical HairDepth values for animals in summer are 0.63 cm (0.25 inches) and for winter 1.27 cm (0.5 inches) and Coat is the coat condition factor.

The total insulation (INS, Mcal/m²/°C/day) is INS = TI + EI

The effects of heat and cold stress are based on lower and upper critical temperatures.

The animal's lower critical temperature (LCT, $^{\circ}C$) is:

 $LCT = 39 - (INS \times HP \times 0.85)$

If the LCT > ambient temperature (Temp), then

MEcs = SA \times (LCT - Temp)/INS

Where MEcs is Metabolizable energy required for cold stress (Mcal/day).

Otherwise, there is no cold stress.

ColdStr = (((NEDietConc/MEng_Total/ TotalDMFed)) × MEcs)

Where NEDietConc is the concentration of net energy in the diet (kg DM/day), MEng_Total is Total ME intake (Mcal/day), and TotalDMFed is total dry matter fed (kg).

To calculate the effects of heat, the HeatStress variable is used. An index based on visible changes in breathing in response to heat based on breathing is used:

If HeatStress = 'None' or Temp < 30 then HeatStr = 1 If HeatStress = 'Rapid/Shallow' then HeatStr = 1.07 If HeatStress = 'Open Mouth' then HeatStr = 1.18

The final equation to calculate the maintenance requirement for replacement heifers is:

$$NEMaint = ((NEMaintNS + ColdStr) \times HeatStr) + NEmact$$

Maintenance Protein Requirement

LACTATING AND DRY COWS AND REPLACEMENT HEIFERS

The protein requirements for maintenance for all classes of cattle except for the young calves are calculated with the following equation: $\begin{array}{l} \text{MPMaint} = (0.3 \times (\text{BW} - \text{CW})^{0.6}) + (4.1 \times (\text{BW} - \text{CW})^{0.5}) + (\text{TotalDMFed} \times 1000 \times 0.03) \end{array}$

 $-0.5 \times ((MPBact / 0.8) - MPBact) + MPEndoReq$

Where MPMaint = Metabolizable protein required for maintenance (g/day)

- CW = conceptus weight
- Scurf Requirement = $(0.3 \times (BW CW)^{0.6});$
- Urinary Requirement = $(4.1 \times (BW CW)^{0.5});$
- Metabolic Fecal Protein Requirement = (TotalDMFed \times 1000 \times 0.03 0.5 \times ((MPBact / 0.8) MPBact));
- MP required for Endogenous Protein (MPEndoReq) = MPEndo/0.67;
- MPBact = Metabolizable protein supplied by microbial
 protein (g/day);
- $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{MPEndo} = \mbox{Endogenous metabolizable protein} \ (g/day) \\ = \ 0.4 \ \times \ \mbox{EndCP and} \end{array}$
- EndCP = Endogenous crude protein (g/day) = 11.8× TotalDMFed.

Growth

ENERGY REQUIREMENTS FOR GROWTH

Replacement Heifers, Lactating and Dry Cows $(1^{st} \mbox{ and } 2^{nd} \mbox{ Lactation only})$

In this section of the model, requirements for growth are calculated from shrunk body weight, SBW (0.96 \times BW) and empty body weight (EBW) (see Chapter 11 for rationale). The user may choose to enter a desired rate of gain or may use the model-generated target gains. For both options, a size-scaling approach is used which requires information on mature body weight (MBW) and mature shrunk body weight (MSBW). The user may use data on mature weights from his/her herd or may rely on default values generated in the program. Accurate estimates of mature weight are needed for accurate predictions of requirements. Representative weights of mature culls cows with average body condition scores may be used to estimate mature weights (MW).

The following calculation is used to calculate the ratio of the standard reference weight to mature shrunk body weight (SRW_to_MSBW).

 $SRW_to_MSBW = 478 / MSBW$

 $EQSBW = (SBW - CW) \times SRW_to_MSBW$

Where EQSBW = Equivalent shrunk body weight (kg) and CW = Conceptus weight (kg).

The equation is used to compute shrunk weight gain (SWG):

SWG = 13.91 × (NEGrowthDiet $^{0.9116}$) × (EQSBW $^{-0.6837}$)

Where SWG = shrunk weight gain (kg), NEGrowth-Diet = NEg in the diet (Mcal)

If the animal is a replacement heifer, then WG (weight gain) = SWG (shrunk weight gain), Otherwise, WG = ADG (Average daily gain)

The following equations are conversions to equivalent (size-scaled) weights:

EQEBW = Size-scaled empty body weight = $0.891 \times EQSBW$

EQEBG = Size-scaled empty body weight gain = $0.956 \times WG$

Retained energy (RE) is calculated with the following equation:

 $RE = 0.0635 \times (EQEBW^{0.75}) \times (EQEBG^{1.097})$

Protein Requirements for Growth

REPLACEMENT HEIFERS, LACTATING AND DRY COWS $(1^{\rm ST}$ AND $2^{\rm ND}$ LACTATION ONLY)

Net protein for growth (NPg) is calculated as follows:

 $NPg = WG \times (268 - (29.4 \times (RE / WG)))$

Where WG = weight gain (kg) (always positive) and RE = retained energy (Mcal).

The efficiency with which net protein is used for gain (EffMP_NPg) is then computed:

If EQSBW ≤ 478 then EffMP_NPg = $(83.4 - (0.114 \times \text{EQSBW})) / 100$ Otherwise EffMP_NPg = 0.28908

The next step is to calculate the metabolizable protein required for growth (MPGrowth) by dividing NPg by the efficiency with which MP is converted to NP:

 $MPGrowth = NPg / EffMP_NPg$

If the animal is a replacement heifer,

DMIAvailGrowth = TotalDMFed - DMIMaint - DMIPreg

Otherwise

DMIAvailGrowth = TotalDMFed – DMIMaint – DMIPreg – DMILact

Where DMIAvailGrowth is the dry matter intake for growth.

If Age < FirstCalf, then ADGwPreg = SWG + (ADGPreg / 1000)

Otherwise, ADGwPreg = (EQEBG / 0.956) + (ADGPreg/ 1000)

For replacement heifers only, If NEfOverMEng > 0, then MEGrowth = NEGrowth / NEgOverMEng

Calculation of Target Weights and Average Daily Gain for Replacement Heifers and Animals in 1^{st} and 2^{nd} Lactations

The following set of calculations is used to compute the gain required to achieve specified target weights at first breeding, calving, and maturity which is assumed to occur at the beginning of the third lactation. It is important to ensure that appropriate mature weights, age at first calving, and calving interval data are entered or the predictions for target gain will be unrealistic.

The following equations are used to calculate age at different calvings:

Age1st = FirstCalf Age2nd = Age1st + CalfInt Age3rd = Age2nd + CalfInt Age1stBred = Age1st - (280 / 30.4)

It is assumed that heifers will achieve 0.55 of their mature shrunk body weight at first breeding, 0.82 at first calving, and 0.92 at 2^{nd} calving. At the onset of their third lactation, they are assumed to have reached their mature weight.

Wt1stBred = MSBW \times 0.55 Wt1st = MSBW \times 0.82 Wt2nd = MSBW \times 0.92 Wt3rd = MSBWADG1stBred = (Wt1st - Wt1stBred) / $((Age1st - Age1stBred) \times 30.4)$ $ADG1st = (Wt2nd - Wt1st) / (CI \times 30.4)$ $ADG2nd = (Wt3rd - Wt2nd) / (CI \times 30.4)$ If AnimalType = "Replacement Heifer" and Age < Age1stBred Then ADGNonBred = (Wt1st-Bred - SBW) / ((Age1stBred - Age) \times 30.4) Otherwise, ADGNonBred = 0If AnimalType \neq "Replacement Heifer", then ADGNonBred = 0If AnimalType = "Replacement Heifer" and is pregnant then ADG = ADG1stBred

Otherwise, ADG = ADGNonBred

Pregnancy

PREGNANT REPLACEMENT HEIFERS AND MATURE COWS

Constants used in pregnancy calculations are:

Km = conversion of ME to NE = 0.64

EffMEPreg = The efficiency with which ME is used for pregnancy = 0.14

EffMPPreg = The efficiency with which MP is used for pregnancy = 0.33

Until day 190 of pregnancy, no requirements for pregnancy are computed in the model. The maximum number of days that a cow can be pregnant is assumed to be 279.

CBW (calf birth weight) = MW \times 0.06275 CW (conceptus weight) = (18 + ((DaysPreg - 190) \times 0.665)) \times (CBW / 45)

ADGPreg (ADG of the conceptus) = $665 \times (CBW / 45)$

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{MEPreg} \left(\text{ME required for pregnancy} \right) = \left(\left(2 \times 0.00159 \right. \\ \left. \times \text{ DaysPreg} - 0.0352 \right) \times \left(\text{CBW} \, / \, 45 \right) \right) / \, \text{EffMEPreg} \end{array}$

MPPreg (MP required for pregnancy) = ((0.69 \times

DaysPreg - 69.2) \times (CBW / 45)) / EffMPPreg

NEPreg = Net energy required for pregnancy = MEPreg × Km

Lactation

If lactose content of milk is not available,

 $\begin{aligned} \text{MilkEn} & (\text{energy content of milk}) = (0.0929 \times \text{MilkFat}) \\ &+ (0.0547 \times \text{MilkTrueProtein} / 0.93) + 0.192 \end{aligned}$

If lactose content is known,

The amounts of energy, protein, and fat in milk then are computed:

- YEn = NElact (energy in milk daily, Mcal/day) = MilkEn \times MilkProd
- YProtn (daily protein yield in milk, kg/day) = MilkProd \times (MilkTrueProtein / 100)
- Yfatn (daily fat yield in milk, kg/day) = MilkProd × (MilkFat / 100)
- MPLact (Metabolizable protein required for lactation) = (Yprotn / 0.67) × 1000

The following equation is used to convert to fat-corrected milk (FCM):

Reserves

The factors used to adjust weight at the current CS to expected weight at CS3.

$CS_F_1 = 0.726$	$CS_F_6 = 1.069$
$CS_F_2 = 0.794$	$CS_F_7 = 1.137$
$CS_F_3 = 0.863$	$CS_F_8 = 1.206$
$CS_F_4 = 0.931$	$CS_F_9 = 1.274$
$CS_F_5 = 1.000$	
CS5EBW = (SBW)	\times 0.851) / (CS_F _x)

Where CS5EBW = Empty body weight at CS5 using the 1 to 9 scale and $CS_F =$ factor to calculate reserves at CS1 to 9.

 EBW_{X} (Empty body weight at CS_{X}) = $CS_{F_{X}} \times$ CS5EBW AF_x (Proportion of fat at CS_x) = 0.037683 \times X TF_X (Weight of fat at CS_X) = $AF_X \times EBW_X$ AP_X (Proportion of protein at CS_X) = 0.200886 - $(0.0066762 \times X)$ TP_X (Weight of protein at CS_X) = $AP_X \times EBW_X$ ER_X (Energy reserves at CS_X) = (9.4 × TF_X) + (5.55) \times TP_x) Where X varies from 1 to 9. If $CS9 \ge 3$, then $Lose1CS = ER_{CS9} - ER_{CS9-2}$, Otherwise, Lose1CS = 1000000If $CS9 \ge 3$, then NElSub = $0.82 \times Lose1CS$ Otherwise, NElSub = $0.82 \times (ER_{CS9} - ER_1)$ If $CS9 \leq 7$, then $Gain1CS = ER_{CS9+2} - ER_{CS9}$ Otherwise, Gain1CS = 1000000If CS9 \leq 7, then NElReq = (0.644 / 0.75) × Gain1CS Otherwise, NElReq = $(0.644 / 0.75) \times (ER_9 -$ ER_{CS9}) If EnergyBal > 0, then deltaER = NElReq Otherwise, deltaER = NElSubDays to change condition score is calculated only for cows: If AnimalType = "Replacement Heifer", then DaysToChange = 0.Otherwise, DaysToChange = deltaER / EnergyBal Energy balance is calculated in the following equations. For Dry Cows and Lactating Cows: NEBalance = NEl_Total - (NEMaint + NEPreg + NELact + NEGrowth) (These groups of animals use an NE-based system.) For Replacement Heifers: $MEBalance = (MEng_Total - (MEMaint +$

MEPreg + MEGrowth))

(Heifers use an ME-based system).

Weight change in cows due to energy balance is computed in the following equations:

For Lactating Cows:

```
If NEBalance < 0, Then kg weight change =
NEBalance / 4.92
```

If NEBalance > 0, Then kg weight change = NEBalance / 5.12

For Dry Cows:

If NEBalance < 0, Then kg weight change = NEBalance / 4.92 If NEBalance > 0, Then kg weight change =

If the animal is gaining weight, the protein requirement for this gain must be computed.

```
If NEBalance > 0 Then

MPReqReserves = (Reserves_WG ×

ProteinInGain) / 0.492

MPProvReserves = 0

RUPReqReserves = MPReqReserves /

DietRUPDigest
```

```
If NEBalance < 0 Then
MPReqReserves = 0
```

NEBalance / 6.40

If the animal is losing weight, the protein provided by catabolism is computed.

```
\begin{array}{l} \text{MPProvReserves} = (-1 \times \text{Reserves}\_\text{WG}) \times \\ \text{ProteinInGain} \times 0.67 \\ \text{RUPReqReserves} = \text{MPProvReserves} / \text{DietRUPDigest} \end{array}
```

Where MPReqReserves = metabolizable protein required for reserves, MPProvReserves = metabolizable protein provided by mobilization of reserves, RUPReqReserves = RUP required for repletion of reserves and RUP-ProvReserves = RUP provided by mobilization of reserves.

Mineral Requirements

In most cases, the requirements for minerals are determined for each physiologic function, maintenance, growth, lactation, and pregnancy, but for some minerals this approach has not been followed. The maintenance component of the mineral requirement includes fecal, urinary, sweat, and miscellaneous losses. Because the bioavailability of minerals from various sources differs, the amount of the total mineral in the diet that is absorbable is determined. Growth requirements for minerals are calculated for heifers during their first lactation, but not during their first dry period or during the second lactation.

All calculations for milk mineral requirements are done on a 4 percent fat corrected milk basis (FCM). The equation to convert to FCM is: CALCIUM (g/d) Fecal If DaysInMilk > 0, then Fecal = $3.1 \times (BW / 100)$ If DaysInMilk = 0, then Fecal = $1.54 \times (BW / 100)$ Urinary Urine = $0.08 \times (BW / 100)$ Miscellaneous Misc = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg > 190, then Fetal = $0.02456 \times \text{Exp}((0.05581 - (0.00007 \times$ DaysPreg) × DaysPreg - 0.02456 \times Exp((0.05581 - (0.00007 \times (DaysPreg - 1))) \times (DaysPreg - 1)) If DaysPreg \leq 190, then Fetal = 0 Lactation If DaysInMilk > 0, then If breed = Holstein or Milking Shorthorn, then $Milk = 1.22 \times Milk Prod$ If breed = Jersey, then $Milk = 1.45 \times Milk Prod$ Otherwise, Milk = $1.37 \times Milk Prod$ Growth If BW > 0 and WG > 0, Then Growth = $(9.83 \times (MW^{0.22}) \times (BW^{-0.22})) \times$ (WG / 0.96)PHOSPHORUS (g/d) Fecal If AnimalType = Cow, then Fecal = $1 \times \text{TotalDMFed}$

 $FCM = (0.4 \times MilkProd) + (15 \times (MilkFat / 100))$

 \times MilkProd)

Otherwise, Fecal = $0.8 \times \text{TotalDMFed}$

Urine Urine = $0.002 \times BW$ Miscellaneous Misc = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg ≥ 190 Then Fetal = $0.02743 \times Exp(((0.05527 - (0.000075 \times C)))))$

DaysPreg) × DaysPreg) - 0.02743 ×

 $Exp(((0.05527 - (0.000075 \times (DaysPreg - 1))) \times$ (DaysPreg - 1)))Otherwise, Fetal = 0Lactation If DaysInMilk > 0, then Milk phosphorus = 0.9 \times MilkProd Growth If BW > 0 and WG > 0, then Growth = $(1.2 + (4.635 \times (MW^{0.22}) \times (BW^{-0.22}))) \times$ (WG / 0.96) MAGNESIUM (g/day) Fecal Fecal = $0.003 \times BW$ Urine Urine = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg > 190 Then Fetal = 0.33 g/day Otherwise, Fetal = 0Lactation If DaysInMilk > 0, Then Milk $= 0.15 \times$ MilkProd Growth Growth = $0.45 \times (WG / 0.96)$ CHLORINE (g/day) Fecal $Fecal = 2.25 \times (BW / 100)$ Urine Urine = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg > 190 Then Fetal = 1 Otherwise, Fetal = 0Lactation $Milk = 1.15 \times MilkProd$ Growth Growth = $1 \times (WG / 0.96)$

POTASSIUM (g/day) Fecal If AnimalType = Lactating cow $Fecal = 6.1 \times TotalDMFed$ Otherwise Fecal = $2.6 \times \text{TotalDMFed}$ Urine Urine = $0.038 \times BW$ Sweat If Temp < 25, then Sweat = 0If Temp 25 to 30, then Sweat = $0.04 \times (BW / 100)$ If Temp > 30, then Sweat = $0.4 \times (BW / 100)$ Miscellaneous Misc = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg > 190 Then Fetal = 1.027Otherwise, Fetal = 0Lactation $Milk = 1.5 \times MilkProd$ Growth Growth = $1.6 \times (WG / 0.96)$ SODIUM (g/day) Fecal For lactating cows, Fecal = $0.038 \times BW$ Otherwise, Fecal = $0.015 \times BW$ Urine Urine = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0Sweat If Temp < 25, then Sweat = 0If Temp 25 to 30, then Sweat = $0.1 \times (BW / 100)$ If Temp > 30, then Sweat = $0.5 \times (BW / 100)$ Pregnancy If DaysPreg > 190, then Fetal = 1.39 If DaysPreg \leq 190, then Fetal = 0 Lactation $Milk = 0.63 \times MilkProd$ Growth Growth = $1.4 \times (WG / 0.96)$

SULFUR (g/day) A non-factorial approach is used to determine the sulfur requirement. $Total = 2 \times TotalDMFed$ COBALT (mg/day) A non-factorial approach is used to determine the cobalt requirement. $Total = 0.11 \times TotalDMFed$ COPPER (mg/day) Fecal $Fecal = (0.0071 \times BW)$ Urine Urine = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg < 100, then Fetal = 0.5 mg/day If $100 \leq \text{DaysPreg} \leq 225$, then Fetal = 1.5 mg/dayIf DaysPreg > 225, then Fetal = 2 mg/day Lactation $Milk = 0.15 \times MilkProd$ GrowthGrowth = $1.15 \times (WG / 0.96)$ IODINE (mg/day) Fecal Fecal = 0Urine Urine = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0Fetal Fetal = 0Lactation If DaysInMilk > 0, then Milk $= 1.5 \times (BW / 100)$ If DaysInMilk = 0, then Misc = $0.6 \times (BW / 100)$ Growth Growth = 0

IRON (mg/day) Fecal Fecal = 0Urine Urine = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg > 190, then Fetal = 18Otherwise, Fetal = 0Lactation $Milk = 1 \times MilkProd$ Growth Growth = $34 \times (WG / 0.96)$ MANGANESE (mg/day) Fecal $Fecal = 0.002 \times BW$ Urine Urine = 0Sweat Sweat = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0Pregnancy If DaysPreg > 190, then Fetal = 0.3Otherwise, Fetal = 0Lactation If DaysInMilk > 0, then Milk $= 0.03 \times \text{MilkProd}$ Growth Growth = $0.7 \times (WG / 0.96)$ SELENIUM (mg/d) A non-factorial approach is used to determine the selenium requirement. $Total = 0.3 \times TotalDMFed$ ZINC (mg/day) Fecal

Fecal = $0.033 \times BW$ Urine Urine = $0.012 \times BW$

Sweat Sweat = 0Miscellaneous Misc = 0

 $\begin{array}{l} Pregnancy\\ \text{If DaysPreg} > 190, \text{ then Fetal} = 12\\ \text{Otherwise, Fetal} = 0 \end{array}$

 $\begin{aligned} Lactation \\ Milk &= 4 \times MilkProd \end{aligned}$

Growth Growth = $24 \times (WG / 0.96)$

VITAMIN A (1000 IU/kg)

A non-factorial approach is used to determine the Vitamin A requirement.

- If AnimalType = Lactating Cow, Dry Cow, or Replacement Heifer with DaysPreg > 259, then Total = $0.11 \times BW$
- If AnimalType = Replacement Heifer with DaysPreg \leq 259, then Total = 0.08 \times BW

VITAMIN D (1000 IU/kg)

A non-factorial approach is used to determine the Vitamin D requirement.

The requirement is $0.03 \times BW$.

VITAMIN E (IU/kg)

A non-factorial approach is used to determine the Vitamin E requirement.

If the animal is grazing and the AnimalType = Dry Cow, then Vit E required = $0.5 \times BW$

If the animal is grazing and the AnimalType = Lactating Cow or Replacement Heifer,

Then Vit E required = $0.26 \times BW$

- If the animal is not grazing and the AnimalType = Dry Cow, then Total = $1.6 \times BW$
- If the animal is not grazing and the AnimalType = Lactating Cow or Replacement Heifer, then Vit E required = $0.8 \times BW$

Dry Matter Intake Predictions

LACTATING AND DRY COWS

The equation to predict intake for lactating cows (DMI-Lact) is:

DMILact =
$$(((BW^{0.75}) \times 0.0968) + (0.372 \times FCM) - 0.293) \times Lag$$

Low intake in early lactation is adjusted using the Lag variable for lactating cows:

Lag = 1 -
$$e^{(-1 \times 0.192 \times (WOL + 3.67))}$$

The equation for predicting the dry matter intake of dry cows (DMIDry) in the last 21 days of pregnancy is:

DMIDry =
$$((1.97 - (0.75 \times e^{(0.16 \times (DaysPreg - 280))})) / 100) \times BW$$

REPLACEMENT HEIFERS

Heifer intakes are adjusted for environmental temperature and conditions using the coat condition (CoatCond) variable to calculate CCFact, the adjustment factor. In the following section, we describe how the environmental adjustments are made and then provide the equation for heifer intake (DMI_RH).

If CoatCond = Clean/Dry, then CCFact = 1 If CoatCond = Some Mud, then CCFact = 1 If CoatCond = Wet/Matted, then CCFact = 0.85 If CoatCond = Covered with Snow/Mud, then CCFact = 0.7

Heifer intake also is adjusted for temperature effects (TempFact). At temperatures > 35, night cooling also affects intake:

If Temp < -15, then TempFact = 1.16 If $-15 \le \text{Temp} \le -5$, then TempFact = 1.07 If $-5 \le \text{Temp} \le 5$, then TempFact = 1.05 If $5 \le \text{Temp} \le 15$, then TempFact = 1.03 If $15 \le \text{Temp} \le 25$, then TempFact = 1.00 If $25 \le \text{Temp} \le 35$, then TempFact = 0.9 If Temp > 35 without night cooling, then TempFact = 0.65 If Temp > 35 with night cooling, then TempFact = 0.9

Predicted intake also is adjusted for the effects of age with the SubFact variable:

If Age ≤ 12 , Then SubFact = 0.1128 If Age > 12, Then SubFact = 0.0869

The energy concentration of the diet affects intake using the DivFact variable. For lactating and dry cows, net energy diet concentration is calculated as follows:

NEDietConc = NEl_Total / Total DMFed

For replacement heifers, the equation is: NEDietConc = NEm_Total / Total DMFed

If NEDietConc < 1, then DivFact = 0.95 Otherwise DivFact = NEDietConc

Because intake decreases immediately prior to calving, an adjustment to intake is made in this period as well.

If DaysPreg < 210 and if DivFact > 0, then

If DaysPreg > 210 and < 259, then an intake adjustment factor (DMIRH_Factor) is used to adjust the intake of heifers. This DMIRH_Factor is multipled by DMI_RH to obtain the predicted DMI for heifers. The DMIRH_Factor is calculated as follows:

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{DMIRH_Factor} = (1 + ((210 - \text{DaysPreg}) \times 0.0025)) \\ \text{if DaysPreg} > 210 \text{ and } < 259 \\ \text{Otherwise DMIRH_Factor} = 1 \end{array}$

If DaysPreg > 259, then DMI_RH = ((1.71 - $(0.69e^{(0.35 \times DaysPreg - 280)}))) / 100 \times BW$

SUPPLY CALCULATIONS

Energy

The percent concentrate in the ration is calculated based on the amounts of feeds designated as "Concentrate" that are fed.

 $PercentConc = (ConcSum / TotalDMFed) \times 100$

For feeds that are not classified as Vitamin/Mineral supplements, TDN at 1X maintenance (TDN_{1x}) and at the actual increment above maintenance is calculated.

 $\begin{aligned} \text{TDN}_{X} &= (\text{Feed}_{X}.\text{TDN} \ / \ 100) \ \times \ (\text{DMFed} \ \times \ 1000) \\ \text{TDN}_{Act_{X}} &= \ (\text{Feed}_{X}.\text{TDN}_{Act_{X}} \ / \ 100) \ \times \ (\text{DMFed} \\ &\times \ 1000) \end{aligned}$

The following calculations are used to determine the energy value of all feeds that are not classified as Calf Feeds or as Vitamins/Minerals. A different set of calculations is used to calculate the energy value of the milk-based calf feeds, and vitamin and mineral supplements are assumed not to contain energy.

Non-fiber Carbohydrate (NFC) amounts and digestibility

- It is assumed that non-fiber carbohydrate digestibility, NFCDigest = 0.98
- The total digestible NFC = tdNFC = NFCDigest × (100 - NDF - CP - Fat - Ash + NDFIP) × PAF

Where NFCDigestibility = non-fiber carbohydrate digestibility, NDF = neutral detergent fiber, CP = crude protein, Fat = Fat, NDFIP = neutral detergent insoluble protein, and PAF = processing adjustment factor.

The tdNFC is calculated for each feed and the amounts from the individual ration components are added together.

Crude Protein Contribution to Energy

The contribution of protein to the energy supply is computed in the next set of calculations. Different routines are used to calculate protein digestibility depending on how the feed is classified using the energy equation class (EnergyEqClass) that divides feeds into forages, concentrates, or feeds of animal origin also is used.

Protein digestibility of forages is calculated with the following equation:

 $tdCP = Exp((-1.2 \times (ADFIP / CP))) \times CP$ Where tdCP = total digestible Crude Protein, ADFIP =Acid detergent insoluble protein, and CP = crude protein.

Below is the equation to calculate protein digestibility of feeds (tdCP) containing proteins from animal sources:

 $tdCP = (CPDigest \times CP)$

For all other classes of feeds, tdCP = (1 - (0.4 \times (ADFIP / CP))) \times CP

Contribution of Fat to the Energy Supply

If Fat < 1, then tdFat = 0 Otherwise, tdFat = (Fat - 1) × 2.25 If Category = Fat and EnergyEqClass = Fatty Acid, TDN = Fat × FatDigest × 2.25 DE = 0.094 × FatDigest × Fat If Category = Fat and EnergyEqClass = Fat, TDN = $10 + ((Fat - 10) \times FatDigest × 2.25)$ DE = (FatDigest × (Fat - 10) × 0.094) + 0.43

TDN Calculations

Adjustments are made based on feed type in the calculations of TDN. TDN and DE are computed with the following equations if the feed is an Animal Protein:

 $\begin{array}{l} {\rm TDN} \,=\, ({\rm CPDigest}\,\times\,{\rm CP})\,+\, (({\rm Fat}\,-\,1)\,\times\,2.25)\,\,+\\ (({\rm NFCDigest}\,\times\,(100\,-\,{\rm CP}\,-\,{\rm Ash}\,-\,{\rm Fat}))\,-\,7)\\ {\rm DE}\,\,=\, ({\rm tdNFC}\,\times\,0.042)\,+\, ({\rm tdCP}\,\times\,0.056)\,+\,(0.094\\ \times\,({\rm tdFat}\,/\,2.25))\,-\,0.3 \end{array}$

For feeds that are not Animal Proteins or Fats and that do contain some NDF (forages, many by-products, concentrates), the following equations are used:

 $\begin{aligned} \text{TDN} &= \text{tdNFC} + \text{tdCP} + \text{tdFat} + \text{dNDF} - 7 \\ \text{DE} &= (\text{tdNFC} \times 0.042) + (\text{dNDF} \times 0.042) + \\ (\text{tdCP} \times 0.056) + (0.094 \times (\text{tdFat} / 2.25)) - 0.3 \end{aligned}$

The equation below is used for feeds that do not contain NDF, that are not primarily fat and that are not derived from animals (molasses, for example):

 $\begin{aligned} \text{TDN} &= ((0.98 \times \text{PAF}) \times (100 - \text{CP} - \text{Fat} - \text{Ash})) \\ &+ (\text{CP} \times (1 - (0.4 \times (\text{ADFIP / CP})))) + ((2.25 \times (\text{Fat} - 1) - 7)) \end{aligned}$

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{DE} = (0.98 \times \text{PAF}) \times (0.042 \times (100 - \text{CP} - \text{Fat} \\ - \text{Ash})) + (\text{CP} \times (0.056 \times (1 - (0.4 \times (\text{ADFIP} / \text{CP}))))) + (0.094 \times (\text{Fat} - 1)) - 0.3 \end{array}$

The equations for feeds with fat and ash are:

$$TDN = ((0.98 \times PAF) \times (100 - Fat - Ash)) + ((2.25 \times (Fat - 1) - 7)))$$

DE = (0.98 × PAF) × (0.042 × (100 - Fat - Ash)) + (0.094 × (Fat - 1)) - 0.3

No energy values are calculated for Vitamins or Minerals.

Energy Calculations and Conversions

For animals other than young calves, the ratio of total dry matter intake to intake used to meet the maintenance requirement (DMI_to_DMIMaint) is calculated with the following equations.

For replacement heifers

DMI_to_DMIMaint = TotalTDN / $(0.035 \times (\text{SBW}^{0.75}))$ Where DMI to DMIMaint is the amount of intake needed to meet the maintenance requirement, TotalTDN = Total dietary TDN, and SBW = shrunk body weight.

For lactating and mature cows

 $DMI_to_DMIMaint = TotalTDN / (0.035 \times (BW^{0.75}))$

For young calves

DMI_to_DMIMaint = TotalTDN / (0.035 × (CalfBW^{0.75}))

Fat Adjustment

After the total amount of fat in the diet has been determined (code not shown), it is necessary to make an adjustment to the TDN value if the diet contains more than 3 percent fat. Fat digestibility is calculated differently for feeds classified as fatty acids than for other fats. The equations below show how fat digestibility is calculated for 1) fat supplements classified as fats, 2) fat supplements classified as fatty acids, and 3) for other feeds:

1). DigestibleFat = $10 + ((Fat - 10) \times FatDigest)$

2). DigestibleFat = Fat \times FatDigest

3). DigestibleFat = Fat -1

Discount Variable

This variable is used to discount TDN to account for depressed digestibility of feeds above maintenance levels. It used to calculate energy availability for all classes of animals except young calves.

- If a feed is not a milk-based calf feed and contains energy, then
- DiscountVariable = $((0.18 \times \text{TDNConc}) 10.3) \times (\text{DMI_to_DMIMaint} 1)$ Where DiscountVariable = Factor used to discount TDN, TDNConc = TDN concentration in the ration, and DMI_to_DMIMaint is the amount of the specified ration needed to meet the maintenance requirement.

The discount variable cannot be < 0 and, if the TDN of a feed is < 60, then the DiscountVariable = 1. Otherwise Discount = (TDNConc - DiscountVariable)/TDNConc

For feeds other than milk-based calf feeds and if TDN-Conc > 0, then

 $TDN_ActX = TDN \times Discount$

Different discounts are applied depending on the fat content of the ration. These discounts apply to all classes of animals except young calves.

- If Fat ≥ 3 and if the animal is a dry cow or a lactating cow, then MEng = $(1.01 \times \text{DiscDE}) - 0.45 + (0.0046 \times (\text{Fat} - 3))$
- If Fat \geq 3 and the animal is a heifer, then MEng = 0.82 × DE

Net energy for lactation for feeds having more than 3% fat is computed. NEl = $(0.703 \times \text{MEng}) - 0.19 + ((((0.097 \times \text{MEng}) + 0.19) / 97) \times (\text{Fat} - 3))$

If the feeds have < 3% fat, the equation to compute ME for lactating and dry cows is MEng = $(1.01 \times \text{DiscDE}) - 0.45$

The equation for heifers is $MEng = 0.82 \times DE$

The equation to compute the NEl of low fat feeds is:

 $NEl = (0.703 \times MEng) - 0.19$

For feeds that are not classified as fats

Otherwise, MEng = DiscDE $NEl = 0.8 \times DiscDE$ $NEm = 0.8 \times MEng$ $NEg = 0.55 \times MEng$

Computation of the total energy values for the diet.

MEng_Total = TotalMEConc × TotalRegDMFed NEl_Total = TotalNElConc × TotalRegDMFed NEg_Total = TotalNEgConc × TotalRegDMFed NEm_Total = TotalNEmConc × TotalRegDMFed

If AnimalType is not "Replacement Heifer", then NEDietConc = NE_Total / TotalRegDMFed If AnimalType is "Replacement Heifer", then NEDietConc = NEm_ Total / TotalRegDMFed

Protein Supply and Requirements

Microbial yield (MCP_Total) is calculated as a percentage of discounted TDN (TDN_Act_Total):

 $MCP_Total = 0.13 \times TDN_Act_Total$

The following equation is used to calculate the amount of crude protein from each feed.

 $CP_x = (Feed_xCP / 100) \times (DMFed \times 1000)$

To calculate the site of digestion of protein, both passage (kp) and digestion (kd) rates are needed. Separate passage equations are used for concentrates, dry forages, and wet forages.

Concentrate

 $Kp = 2.904 + (1.375 \times BW_DMI) - (0.02 \times PercentConc)$

Dry Forage

Wet Forage

 $Kp = 3.054 + (0.614 \times BW_DMI)$

The amount of RDP in a specific feed is calculated using the following equation. It is assumed that all of Protein A is ruminally available and that none of Protein C is degraded in the rumen. Thus, only Protein B is affected by digestion and passage rates.

 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{If (Feed_x.Kd + Kp) > 0 Then} \\ \mbox{RDP}_X = ((Feed_x.Kd / (Feed_x.Kd + Kp)) \times \\ ((((Feed_x.PrtB / 100) \times (Feed_xCP / 100)) \times \\ \mbox{Feed}_xDMFed))) + (((Feed_xPrtA / 100) \times \\ (Feed_xCP / 100)) \times Feed_xDMFed) \\ \mbox{Otherwise, } \mbox{RDP}_X = 0 \end{array}$

The amount of ruminally-undegraded protein is obtained by subtraction:

 $RUP_{X} = (CP_{X} - (RDP_{X} \times 1000)) / 1000$

If RUP_Total > 0, then DietRUPDigest = TotalDigestedRUP / RUP_Total Otherwise, DietRUPDigest = 0.

The requirement for RDP is calculated in the following equation.

 $RDPReq = 0.15294 \times TDN_Act_Total$

 $RDPSup = TotalDMFed \times 1000 \times DietCP \times CP_RDP$

RDPBal = RDPSup - RDPReq

 $RUPSup = CP_Total - RDPSup$

RUPReq = TotalCPReq - (MPBact + MPEndo))/ DietRUPDigest

The efficiency of microbial crude protein synthesis cannot exceed 0.85.

If MCP_Total > $(0.85 \times (RDP_Total \times 1000))$, then

 $MCP_Total = (0.85 \times (RDP_Total \times 1000))$

CP required = RUPreq + RDPReq

MPBalance = (((MPFeed × 1000) + MPBact + MPEndo) - (MPMaint + MPPreg + MPLact + MPGrowth))

Amino Acids

The amino acid supply is calculated using the following equation with arginine (Arg) as an example. The structure of this equation is similar for all of the amino acids that are considered in the model.

 $\begin{array}{l} {\rm TArg} \ = \ {\rm TArg} \ + \ ((({\rm DMFed}\ /\ {\rm TotalDMFed})\ \times \\ ({\rm CP}\ /\ 100)\ \times \ (({\rm RUP}_{\rm X}\ \times\ 1000)\ /\ {\rm CP}_{\rm X}) \\ \times \ ({\rm Arg}\ /\ 100)\ \times\ {\rm TotalDMFed})\ \times\ 1000) \end{array}$

Where TArg = Total arginine, DMFed = quantity of feed X fed, TotalDMFed = Total dry matter fed, CP = % Crude Protein, $RUP_X = RUP$ in feed X, $CP_X =$ crude protein in feed X.

The next step is to calculate the total digestible supply of each amino acid. Below is the equation for Dig_TArg. The equations for the other amino acids have the same format.

Where Dig_TArg = Total digestible arginine, RUPDigest = RUP digestibility of feed X

The total essential amino acid supply before the contribution of the microbial protein has been added (EAATotal-BeforeMP) is calculated.

 $\begin{aligned} \text{EAATotalBeforeMP} &= (\text{TArg} + \text{THis} + \text{TIle} + \text{TLeu} \\ &+ \text{TLys} + \text{TMet} + \text{TPhe} + \text{TThr} + \text{TTrp} + \text{TVal}) \end{aligned}$

The variables x1 and x2 are used in the following sets of calculations of the total amount of each amino acid supplied. The equations to calculate the total amounts of each amino acid follow. In all equations, it is assumed that:

```
If EAATotalBeforeMP > 0 then
  x1 = ((TArg (or other amino acid) / EAATotalBefore-
     MPP \times 100)
Otherwise x1 = 0
If ((RUP\_Total \times 1000) + EndCP + MCP\_Total) >
  0 then
  x2 = ((RUP\_Total \times 1000) / ((RUP\_Total \times 1000))
     + EndCP + MCP_Total)) \times 100
Otherwise, x^2 = 0
TotalArg = 7.31 + (0.251 \times x1)
TotalHis = 2.07 + (0.393 \times x1) + (0.0122 \times x2)
TotalIle = 7.59 + (0.391 \times x1) - (0.0123 \times x2)
TotalLeu = 8.53 + (0.41 \times x1) + (0.0746 \times x2)
TotalLys = 13.66 + (0.3276 \times x1) - (0.07497 \times x2)
TotalMet = 2.9 + (0.391 \times x1) - (0.00742 \times x2)
TotalPhe = 7.32 + (0.244 \times x1) + (0.029 \times x2)
TotalThr = 7.55 + (0.45 \times x1) - (0.0212 \times x2)
TotalVal = 8.68 + (0.314 \times x1)
```

The total essential amino acid supply is calculated below:

TotalEAA = $30.9 + (0.863 \times \text{EAATotalBeforeMP})$ + $(0.433 \times \text{MCP}_\text{Total})$

Total flows of RUP of specific amino acids are calculated below:

 $TotalRUPArgFlow = 0.863 \times TArg$ $TotalRUPHisFlow = 0.863 \times THis$ $TotalRUPIleFlow = 0.863 \times TIle$ $TotalRUPLeuFlow = 0.863 \times TLeu$ $TotalRUPLysFlow = 0.863 \times TLys$ $TotalRUPMetFlow = 0.863 \times TMet$ $TotalRUPPheFlow = 0.863 \times TPhe$ $TotalRUPThrFlow = 0.863 \times TThr$ $TotalRUPTpFlow = 0.863 \times TTrp$ $TotalRUPTpFlow = 0.863 \times TTrp$

Duodenal flow (g/day) is calculated using an equation of the form below for each amino acid. Arginine is given as an example.

 $Arg_Flow = (TotalArg / 100) \times TotalEAA$

The contribution of microbial crude protein and endogenous protein to the amino acid supply is calculated as follows. The form of this equation is similar for all amino acids.

TotalMCPEndArgFlow = Arg_Flow -TotalRUPArgFlow

The next step is to calculate the supply of each amino acid in RUP that is digestible. The form of the equation for each amino acid is similar to that given for arginine below:

If TArg > 0, then dTotalRUPArg = TotalRUPArgFlow × (Dig_TArg / TArg) Otherwise, dTotalRUPArg = 0

The amount of a specific amino acid that is digestible and is of microbial or endogenous origin then is calculated. Arginine is used as the example but similar calculations are made for all amino acids.

dTotalMCPEndArg = $0.8 \times \text{TotalMCPEndArgFlow}$

The flow of digestible arginine, or other amino acids) then is calculated.

Dig_Arg_Flow = dTotalRUPArg + dTotalMCPEndArg

The protein in the duodenum must be converted from crude protein to a metabolizable protein basis. Microbial crude protein is converted to metabolizable protein with an efficiency of 0.64:

 $MPBact = 0.64 \times MCP_Total$ MPFeed = TotalDigestedRUP $MPEndo = 0.4 \times EndCP$

The next computation is to determine the percent of a specific amino acid of metabolizable protein. The arginine equation is similar to those of the other amino acids.

 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{If (MPBact + (MPFeed \times 1000) + MPEndo) > 0, then} \\ \mbox{ArgPctMP = } 100 \times (Dig_Arg_Flow / (MPBact + (MPFeed \times 1000) + MPEndo)) \\ \mbox{Otherwise, } ArgPctMP = 0 \end{array}$

Minerals

Two sets of equations for the calculation of the supply of minerals are presented here for all classes of animals except for young calves. Both the amount of mineral supplied and the amount of the mineral that is absorbable are calculated. The first equations are for the macrominerals using calcium as an example. In the mineral equations, d is used for mineral supplements instead of x to denote the feed.

Supplied = Supplied + ((Feed_dCa / 100) × Feed_dDMFed)

 $\begin{aligned} Absorbable &= Absorbable + (((Feed_dCa / 100) \times Feed_dDMFed) \times (Feed_dCaBio)) \end{aligned}$

The second set of equations represents those used for trace minerals using zinc as an example.

$$\begin{split} & Supplied = Supplied + (Feed_d Zn \times Feed_d DMFed) \\ & Absorbable = Absorbable + ((Feed_d Zn \times Feed_d DMFed) \times (Feed_d ZnBio)) \end{split}$$

Ration density (RD) = Supplied / TotalDMFed

YOUNG CALF SUB-MODEL

Both the requirements and supply portions of the young calf sub-model are in this section.

Requirements

ENERGY REQUIREMENTS

For young calves, the efficiencies with which feeds are used for maintenance and gain, Km and Kg, for milk-based and other feeds are fixed.

Fed Milk and Starter CalfKm = 0.75 if the feed is not milk-based CalfKg = 0.57 if the feed is not milk-based

The equation to calculate the basal maintenance requirement of a calf without stress is:

NEmCalf = $0.086 \times (CalfBW^{0.75})$

The next step is to calculate the CalfKm and CalfKg for the proposed ration using the fixed efficiencies of conversion of ME to NEm and NEg.

If the feed is classified as a calf feed (milk-based) and if cMEng $\neq 0$, Then

 $CalfKm = CalfKm + (0.86 \times (Feed_xDMFed \times Feed_xcMEng))$

 $CalfKg = CalfKg + (0.69 \times (Feed_xDMFed \times Feed_xcMEng))$

An adjustment is made to ensure that no energy values are computed from mineral supplements:

NonMineralFeeds = NonMineralFeeds + $(Feed_x DMFed \times Feed_x CMEng)$

For all other classes of feeds if $MEng \neq 0$ CalfKm = CalfKm + (0.75 × (Feed_xDMFed × Feed_xMEng)) $CalfKg = CalfKg + (0.57 \times (Feed_xDMFed \times Feed_xMEng))$

 $\begin{aligned} NonMineralFeeds = NonMineralFeeds + \\ (Feed_xDMFed \times Feed_xMEng) \end{aligned}$

If NonMineralFeeds > 0 Then CalfKm = CalfKm / NonMineralFeeds CalfKg = CalfKg / NonMineralFeeds

LOWER TEMPERATURE ADJUSTMENTS TO CALF MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENT

The maintenance requirement for young calves is adjusted to account for cold stress as follows:

Temperature	Calves >	Temperature	Calves <
(° C)	2 months	(° <i>C</i>)	2 months
> 5	0	> 15	0
0 to 5	0.13	10 to 15	0.13
-5 to 0	0.27	5 to 10	0.27
-10 to -5	0.40	0 to 5	0.40
-15 to -10	0.54	-5 to 0	0.54
-20 to -15	0.68	-10 to -5	0.68
-25 to -20	0.81	-15 to -10	0.86
-30 to -25	0.94	-20 to -15	0.94
< -30	1.07	-25 to -20	1.08
		-25 to -30	1.21
		<-30	1.34

The resulting equation for the maintenance requirement of young calves with the temperature adjustment is:

 $NEmCalf = (NEmCalf \times (1 + TempFactor))$

The next step is to recalculate ME required for maintenance with the NEm that has been adjusted for temperature effects.

If CalfKm \neq 0 Then MEMaint = NEmCalf / CalfKm Otherwise MEMaint = 0

The following equation is used to calculate the amount of intake devoted to meeting the maintenance requirement:

If DietNEmCalf ≠ 0 Then DMIForNEmCalf = NEmCalf/DietNEmCalf Else DMIForNEmCalf = 0

A similar calculation is used to calculate the dry matter intake available for growth and the net energy available for growth:

DMIForGrowth = (TotalDMFed - DMIForNEmCalf)

 $NEFGCalf = DMIForGrowth \times DietNEmCalf$

If CalfKg \neq 0 Then MEFGCalf = NEFGCalf / CalfKg Else MEFGCalf = 0 If NEFGCalf > 0 Then EnergyADGCalf = Exp($(0.8333 \times (Log((1.19 \times NEFGCalf) / (0.69 \times (CalfBW^{0.355}))))))$

CALF PROTEIN REQUIREMENTS

Calf protein requirements are computed with the following equation:

ProteinReqCalf = CalfADG
$$\times$$
 0.188 (30 g N/kg gain
= 187.5 g Net Protein / kg gain)

Total apparently digested protein (TotalADP) is calculated as follows where 0.93 and 0.75 are the assumed digestibilities of milk-based feeds and starter feeds respectively:

 $\begin{array}{rl} \mbox{TotalADP} + ((\mbox{TotalMilkCP} \times 0.93) + (\mbox{TotalStart-} \\ \mbox{erCP} \times 0.75)) \ \times \ 1000 \end{array}$

The ratio of ADP to CP is calculated as follows:

 $ADP_to_CP = TotalADP / ((TotalMilkCP + TotalStarterCP) \times 1000)$

Calf Protein Maintenance Requirements

- EUN = Endogenous urinary N losses = $0.2 \times (CalfBW^{0.75})$
- $MFN = Metabolic fecal N = (MilkDMI \times 1.9) + (StarterDMI \times 3.3))$
- $BV = Biological value = (0.8 \times (TotalMilkCP / TotalCP)) + (0.7 \times (TotalStarterCP / TotalCP))$
- CPmCalf = ADPMaint / ADP_to_CP if ADP_to_CP>0

 $ADPgrowth = (ProteinReqCalf \times 1000) / BV$

ADPAllowGain = ((TotalADP - ADPmaint) × BV) / 0.188

CALF MINERAL REQUIREMENTS

A factorial approach is not used to estimate mineral requirements for young calves. The requirements for calves are based on the amounts of milk-based feed, starter, and grower that are offered. It is assumed that the values presented in Table 10 = 6 for milk replacers, calf starter, and grower meet the mineral requirements of the young calf. Table 16-2 indicates the desired ration densities for each of the three categories of feeds (milk-based calf feeds, calf starter, and calf grower). The densities for calf grower are used as the standard for all feeds in the Feed Library except milk-based feeds and calf starter.

To calculate the desired concentrations of each mineral, the following equation is used:

TABLE 16-2Ration Densities of Required Mineralsfor Three Categories of Feeds for Calves

Mineral	Milk-Replacer	Starter	Grower
Calcium	1.0	0.7	0.6
Phosphorus	0.7	0.45	0.4
Magnesium	0.07	0.1	0.1
Sodium	0.4	0.15	0.14
Potassium	0.65	0.65	0.65
Chlorine	0.25	0.2	0.2
Sulfur	0.29	0.2	0.2
Iron	100	50	50
Manganese	40	40	40
Zinc	40	40	40
Copper	10	10	10
Iodine	0.5	0.25	0.25
Cobalt	0.11	0.1	0.1
Selenium	0.3	0.3	0.3
Vitamin A	9	4	4
Vitamin D	0.6	0.6	0.6
Vitamin E	50	25	25

If TotalDMFed>0 Then

- $\begin{aligned} RDReq &= ((MilkFeeds \times m) + (CalfStarter \times n) \\ &+ (RegFeeds \times o)) / TotalDMFed \end{aligned}$
- Where m = concentration of mineral X in MilkFeeds,
 - n = concentration of mineral X in calf starter, and
 - o = concentration of mineral X in regular feeds.

Calf Supply and Diet Evaluation

In the calf submodel, milk-based feeds are in a separate category in the feed library because the energy values for these feeds are calculated differently from feeds that may be used as starter feeds. Any feed in the library except for the milk-based calf feeds may be used as a starter feed. The information for the starter feeds is taken from the appropriate category of the main feed library.

Calf Energy and Protein

The energy calculations to obtain TDN, DE, and ME are included in the main energy computation section. To get the appropriate energy and protein values, the totals from the calf feeds are calculated and then the totals from the other feeds are obtained. Finally, the contributions from the two groups of feeds are added together.

In the following sets of calculations, it is assumed that the initial value of the variable is 0.

If Category = "Calf Feed - Milk" Then MilkDMI = MilkDMI + DMFed MilkME = MilkME + (DMFed × cMEng)

TotalMilkADP = TotalMilkADP + (DMFed × (cDCP / 100)) TotalMilkCP = TotalMilkCP + (DMFed × (cCP / 100)) Otherwise StarterDMI = StarterDMI + DMFed StarterME = StarterME + (DMFed × cMEng) TotalStarterADP = TotalStarterADP + (DMFed × (cDCP / 100)) TotalStarterCP = TotalStarterCP + (DMFed ×

TotalStarterCP = TotalStarterCP + (DMFed \times (cCP / 100))

To convert starter/regular feeds from CP to cDCP:

 $cDCP = 0.75 \times CP$

Here are the equations to obtain the total values:

TotalNEm = TotalNEm + NEm_Total TotalNEg = TotalNEg + NEg_Total TotalME = TotalME + MEng_Total

DietNEmCalf = TotalNEm / TotalDMFed DietNEgCalf = TotalNEg / TotalDMFed DietMECalf = TotalME / TotalDMFed

Mature Weights

Mature weight is used both to estimate the target growth rates of replacement heifers and to predict calf birth weights. The user has the option of entering the mature weight based on herd observations or of using default values.

The default weights for various breeds are:

Aryshire	545 kg
Brown Swiss	682 kg
Guernsey	500 kg
Holstein	682 kg
Jersey	454 kg
Milking Shorthorn	568 kg

Calf birth weight is calculated from mature weight using the following equation:

 $CBW_From_MW = 0.06275 \times MW$

REFERENCES

- Aydin, G., R. J. Grant, and O. R. J. 1999. Brown midrib sorghum in diets for lactating dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 82:2127–2135.
- Bertrand, J. A., F. E. Pardue, and T. C. Jenkins. 1998. Effect of ruminally protected amino acids on milk yield and composition of Jersey cows fed whole cottonseed. J. Dairy Sci. 81:2215–2220.
- Coomer, J. C., H. E. Amos, C. C. Williams, and J. G. Wheeler. 1993. Response of early lactation cows to fat supplementation in diets with different nonstructural carbohydrate concentrations. J. Dairy Sci. 76:3747–3754.

- Dann, H. M., J. K. Drackley, G. C. McCoy, M. F. Hutjens, and J. E. Garrett. 2000. Effects of yeast culture (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) on prepartum intake and postpartum intake and milk production of Jersey cows. J. Dairy Sci. 83:123–127.
- Dhiman, T. R., and L. D. Satter. 1993. Protein as the first-limiting nutrient for lactating dairy cows fed high proportions of good quality alfalfa silage. J. Dairy Sci. 76:1960–1971.
- Kalscheur, K. F., J. H. Vandersall, R. A. Erdman, R. A. Kohn, and E. Russek Cohen. 1999. Effects of dietary crude protein concentration and degradability on milk production responses of early, mid, and late lactation dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 82:545–554.
- Khorasani, G. R., G. D. Boer, and J. J. Kennelly. 1996. Response of early lactation cows to ruminally undegradable protein in the diet. J. Dairy Sci. 79:446–453.
- Khorasani, G. R., E. K. Okine, J. J. Kennelly, and J. H. Helm. 1993. Effect of whole crop cereal grain silage substituted for alfalfa silage on performance of lactating dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 76: 3536–3546.
- Kim, Y. K., D. J. Schingoethe, D. P. Casper, and F. C. Ludens. 1993. Supplemental dietary fat from extruded soybeans and calcium soaps of fatty acids for lactating dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 76:197–204.
- Knowlton, K. F., B. P. Glenn, and R. A. Erdman. 1998. Performance, ruminal fermentation, and site of starch digestion in early lactation Holstein cows fed corn grain harvested and processed differently. J. Dairy Sci. 81:1972–1985.
- Kuehn, C. S., J. G. Linn, D. G. Johnson, H. G. Jung, and M. I. Endres. 1999. Effect of feeding silages from corn hybrids selected for leafiness or grain to lactating dairy cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 82:2746–2755.
- Messman, M. A., W. P. Weiss, P. R. Henderlong, and W. L. Shockey. 1992. Evaluation of pearl millet and field peas plus triticale silages for midlactation dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 75:2769–2775.
- Mowrey, A., M. R. Ellersieck, and J. N. Spain. 1999. Effect of fibrous by-products on production and ruminal fermentation in lactating dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 82:2709–2715.
- National Research Council. 1989. Nutrient Requirements of Dairy Cattle, 6th rev. ed., Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Overton, T. R., L. S. Emmert, and J. H. Clark. 1998. Effects of source of carbohydrate and protein and rumen-protected methionine on performance of cows. J. Dairy Sci. 81:221–228.
- Pereira, M. N., E. F. Garrett, G. R. Oetzel, and L. E. Armentano. 1999. Partial replacement of forage with nonforage fiber sources in lactating cow diets. I. Performance and health. J. Dairy Sci. 82:2716–2730.
- Santos, F. A. P., J. T. Huber, C. B. Theurer, R. S. Swingle, J. M. Simas, K. H. Chen, and P. Yu. 1998. Milk yield and composition of lactating cows fed steam-flaked sorghum and graded concentrations of ruminally degradable protein. J. Dairy Sci. 81:215–220.
- Santos, J. E. P., J. T. Huber, C. B. Theurer, L. G. Nussio, M. Tarazon, and F. A. P. Santos. 1999. Response of lactating dairy cows to steamflaked sorghum, steam-flaked corn, or steam-rolled corn and protein sources of differing degradability. J. Dairy Sci. 82:728–737.
- Soder, K. J., and L. A. Holden. 1999. Dry matter intake and milk yield and composition of cows fed yeast prepartum and postpartum. J. Dairy Sci. 82:605–610.
- Stegeman, G. A., D. P. Casper, D. J. Schingoethe, and R. J. Baer. 1992. Lactational responses of dairy cows fed unsaturated dietary fat and receiving bovine somatotropin. J. Dairy Sci. 75:1936–1945.
- Tackett, V. L., J. A. Bertrand, T. C. Jenkins, F. E. Pardue, and L. W. Grimes. 1996. Interaction of dietary fat and acid detergent fiber diets of lactating dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 79:270–275.

- Wattiaux, M. A., D. K. Combs, and R. D. Shaver. 1994. Lactational responses to ruminally undegradable protein by dairy cows fed diets based on alfalfa silage. J. Dairy Sci. 77:1604–1617.
- Weiss, W. P. 1995. Full lactation response of cows fed diets with different sources and amounts of fiber and ruminal degradable protein. J. Dairy Sci. 78:1802–1814.
- Weiss, W. P., and W. L. Shockey. 1991. Value of orchardgrass and alfalfa silages fed with varying amounts of concentrates to dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 74:1933–1943.
- Weiss, W. P., and D. J. Wyatt. 2000. Effect of oil content and kernel processing of corn silage on digestibility and milk production by dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 83:351–358.
- Wilkerson, V. A., B. P. Glenn, and K. R. McLeod. 1997. Energy and nitrogen balance in lactating cows fed diets containing dry or high moisture corn in either rolled or ground form. J. Dairy Sci. 80:2487–2496.