

***METHANE PRODUCTION BY
NEW ZEALAND RUMINANTS***

***A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE
MINISTRY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT***

BY

DSIR GRASSLANDS

JUNE 1991

METHANE PRODUCTION BY NEW ZEALAND RUMINANTS

**THIS IS A REPORT DESCRIBING THE ANNUAL
PRODUCTION OF METHANE BY NEW ZEALAND'S
GRAZING RUMINANTS IN RELATION TO THEIR
SEASONALLY CHANGING DIET**

**IT IS THE RESULT OF A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE
MINISTRY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND
DSIR GRASSLANDS**

The report was prepared by:

***M.J. Ulyatt, K. Betteridge and D. Costall
DSIR Grasslands, Palmerston North in collaboration with
J. Knapp and R.L. Baldwin, University of California,
Davis, USA***

Contents

1.	Summary	4
2.	Introduction	5
3.	Calculation of methane production	6
4.	Methane production by ruminants in New Zealand	12
5.	Conclusion	14
6.	Acknowledgements	16
7.	References	18
8.	Appendices	20

1. *Summary*

Methane production by ruminants in New Zealand (sheep, beef cattle, dairy cattle, goats and deer) was estimated using a mathematical model of rumen digestion (Baldwin *et al.*, 1987) interfaced with estimates of livestock numbers. Input required by the model was diet composition and feed intake.

New Zealand was divided into climatic regions that contained similar pasture species, growth patterns and thus pasture composition. Each region (North, East, Central and South) was classified into **Improved**, **Unimproved** and **Tussock** grasslands and livestock allocated to these in line with acceptable stocking rates. Models of livestock movements within a year were developed for each animal and land class.

Food dry matter intake for each class of livestock was calculated from estimates of feed requirements and diet digestibility.

Total methane production from ruminants was estimated to be 1.50 Tg per year: 58.4% sheep, 20.7% beef cattle, 17.7% dairy cattle, 2.0% deer and 1.2% goats. There was considerable seasonal variation in methane production in the order Spring > Summer > Autumn > Winter. Dairy farming appears to be more efficient in terms of methane production than sheep or beef farming.

2. *Introduction*


Methane has been identified as a gas which has a 20 year global warming potential 63 times greater than CO₂ per kg of gas (IPCC, 1990). The 1980 concentration of methane in the atmosphere was 1.72 ppmv (compared to 353 ppmv for CO₂), however its rate of increase is about 1.0% per year, being approximately twice that of CO₂ (IPCC, 1990). Atmospheric methane arises from many sources such as land fills, swamps, paddy fields, seepage of natural gas and ruminants, however this report will concentrate on estimating the contribution from ruminants in New Zealand.

Methane is a product of anaerobic fermentation in both the rumen (c.90%) and the caecum (c.10%). Hydrogen ions liberated during the digestion of carbohydrates, proteins and other dietary constituents are utilized by methanogenic bacteria to produce methane. While this process is beneficial in maintaining a satisfactory environment in the rumen it is inefficient in terms of nutrient utilization because approximately 8% of gross energy is lost as methane. Thus while ruminant nutritionists have been interested in methane reduction for many years in terms of efficiency, interest in its reduction for environmental reasons is a reasonably new phenomenon.

The present study was undertaken to try and obtain an accurate estimate of methane production from New Zealand's ruminants. Previous estimates, based on methane production per animal as a % of energy intake, have indicated that total methane production may lie between 1.10 and 1.56 Tg/year (Fennessy, 1989; Lassey *et al*, 1990; Hollinger and Hunt, 1990; G.C. Waghorn, pers. comm.). In the present case, methane was estimated using the mathematical model of ruminant digestion of Baldwin *et al* (1977). The model computes methane production by integrating the stoichiometries of the relevant biochemical reactions occurring in the rumen during the process of food degradation and microbial growth. The

Fig. 1

Geographic Regions into which animals were allocated for the estimation of methane production. Effective grazed areas (ha) are shown.



approach attempts to be mechanistic rather than empirical. The model requires as input the dry matter intake and the chemical composition of the diet consumed by the animal under consideration. The numbers of each class of ruminant livestock and their variation during the year were also required.

3. *Calculation of methane production*

3.1 *Vegetation classes*

The rumen model requires as input data on the chemical composition of the diet. For this reason it was necessary to divide New Zealand into climatic regions that contained similar pasture species, growth patterns and thus pasture composition. These areas were defined (Fig. 1) as *North* (characterised by warm summers, mild winters and an even distribution of rainfall through the year), *East* (dry summers with mild to cold winters), *Central* (mild winters and mild summers with even rainfall distribution), and *South* (cold winters, mild summers with even rainfall distribution). Within each of these regions land was classified as *Improved*, *Unimproved* and *Tussock* (Appendix 1) by combining vegetational cover data (Newsome 1987) with the Local Territorial Authority Boundaries extracted from the DSIR Land Resources Geographic Information System database. This output defined areas for each of the three vegetation classes within the 103 county/urban regions defined by the Department of Statistics. Livestock were distributed to land class within each of the 103 statistical districts and these numbers were in turn aggregated into 22 geographic zones which were then converted to the four major geographic regions (Fig. 1). Table 1 gives the 10 final aggregations of land class x region.

Table 1. The ten land classes used to indicate pasture growth regions in New Zealand.

	North	East	Central	South
Improved	x	x	x	x
Unimproved	x	x	x	x
Tussock	-	x	-	x

3.2 *Livestock numbers*

Animal data from the New Zealand department of Statistics 30 June 1990 census were used, totalling 57,852,192 sheep, 4,600,703 beef cattle, 3,463,802 dairy cattle, 1,062,900 goats and 976,290 deer. Feral deer and goats were estimated (Dr J Parkes, Forest Research Institute) to be 250,000 and 587,000 (including 50,000 Thar/Chamois) respectively. Feral animals were each treated separately from farmed animals.

Census data were classified into **Breeding stock** and **Other livestock** for sheep, beef and dairy. Only 'total' numbers were available for deer and goats. Fourteen classifications (see Appendix 2) within each of the geographic zones detailed the number of each animal species on different **Farm types**.

Livestock were allocated to land classes to reflect typical farming practices within constraints of acceptable stocking rates for each land class. An example of this procedure, as used in the Northland zone is presented in Appendix 2. As the areas of tussock in the North and Central regions were small, no animals were allocated to this class, but instead to unimproved land.

A model was constructed for each animal type on each of the 10 geographical and vegetation classes. The model described the movement of animals within a year and included

transfers due to birth, slaughter and age. Assumptions made in developing the models are given in Appendix 3. One of the models (sheep for East improved grassland) is given as an example in Appendix 4.

When interfacing livestock numbers with the model it was calculated that 2060 model runs would be required to estimate methane production for all livestock classes, all land classes and for every month of the year. It was decided that little reduction in accuracy would result from calculating on a seasonal rather than a monthly basis and this aggregation reduced the number of model runs to 560. Seasons are therefore defined as Winter (~~January, June~~ July, August), Spring (September, October, November), Summer (December, January, February) and Autumn (March, April, May).

3.3 *Estimation of food dry matter intake (DMI)*

Intakes of the various classes of animals were derived on a monthly basis using the equation:

$$\text{DMI} = \text{R/NV}$$

The feed requirements (R; MJME/d) of every class of animal were obtained by assuming average liveweight change curves for mature females or liveweight gain curves for growing and fattening stock (Scott *et al*, 1980). ME is metabolisable energy. From these curves were obtained requirement allowances for maintenance, growth, pregnancy or lactation calculated for New Zealand conditions for sheep and cattle (Ulyatt *et al*, 1980), deer (Fennessy and Milligan 1987) and goats (McCall and Lambert 1987). Nutritive values (NV; MJME/kg DM) were either taken from published values (e.g. Ulyatt *et al*, 1980) or calculated from the equation:

$$\text{NV} = \text{GE} \times \text{DE} \times (\text{ME/DE})$$

Where GE (gross energy) was assumed to be 17.57 MJ/kg DM, DE (proportion digested) was a variable and ME/DE was 0.80. NV was thus determined by digestibility which was estimated on a monthly basis, for each type of animal, on each land class within each region. An example of a set of calculations for a mature dairy cow in the North improved land class is given in Appendix 5. It was assumed that the food selected and consumed by the animals was of 2% higher digestibility than the pasture available. Allowance was made for standard management practices, e.g., beef cattle were used to clean up summer, autumn and winter pastures by forcing them to eat material that had seeded or was dead. Food intakes were aggregated into seasonal means.

3.4 Food composition

The rumen digestion model of Baldwin *et al*, (1977) requires that food composition be specified in terms of 13 main components: soluble carbohydrates, organic acids, pectin, starch, lipid, cellulose, hemicellulose, soluble protein, insoluble protein, non-protein nitrogen, lignin, soluble ash and insoluble ash. Data was assembled from a number of published and unpublished sources and an average composition was specified for each of the major classes of pasture species for spring, summer, autumn and winter. Improved pastures were assumed to be mixtures of perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*) and white clover (*Trifolium repens*) while unimproved and tussock grazing were assumed to be mixtures of browntop (*Agrostis tenuis*), white clover and dead matter. It was also assumed that during winter dairy cows consumed a mixture of 60% improved pasture, 20% silage and 20% hay (AM Bryant, pers. comm). In the absence of any data, dead matter was assumed to have the same chemical composition as barley straw.

All these components of the diet were individually entered into the rumen model and methane production predicted. When the two grasses, perennial ryegrass and browntop, were tested over the four seasons it was found that the only significant difference occurred in summer composition. For this reason a mean composition was taken for each grass for spring, autumn and winter and designated "other" (Appendix 6). White clover did not differ significantly between seasons in composition or methane production. Compositions of the individual components of the diet are given in Appendix 6.

The botanical composition of the pastures and therefore the composition of the dry matter consumed are known to vary with season, although the data available are both variable and unreliable. This is partly because the techniques used to measure pasture growth and composition do not necessarily reflect the composition of pasture available to the grazing animal, and partly because measuring diet selection with animals is very difficult. To try and overcome these problems pasture compositions chosen for simulation studies were based on the authors' experience and by consultation with other scientists experienced in this area. Various mixtures of pasture components were chosen to represent pasture selected during the seasons of the year. Some examples of these are given in Appendix 7.

3.5 *Rumen digestion model*

The mathematical model used to predict methane production in the rumen (Baldwin *et al*, 1977; Murphy *et al*, 1986; Baldwin *et al*, 1987) requires the intake of the 13 main chemical components to be specified. The model predictions are based on known stoichiometries of food degradation and microbial growth. The relatively large number of chemical components are necessary because they either produce unique stoichiometries or affect the physico-chemical milieu in the rumen. Fortunately, one of the authors (MJU) was

Fig. 2

Predicted vs. Observed Methane




Fig. 3

Comparison of Blaxter & Clapperton equation




Fig. 4

Comparison of Moe & Tyrrell equation





Fig. 5

Predicted vs. Observed Metabolizable Energy




involved in the model development and so appropriate compositional data were available for New Zealand diets (Appendix 6).

The accuracy of the model in predicting both methane production and digestion in general needs examining. A test set of data was taken from the literature, where animals were fed a wide range of diets of differing composition and food intake and methane production were measured. These data were used to test the model's ability to predict methane. Fig. 2 presents a plot of methane production predicted by the rumen model plotted against values observed in the test data. Figs. 3 and 4 present similar comparisons where methane was predicted by the equations of Blaxter and Clapperton (1965) and Moe and Tyrrell (1979). The latter two equations are commonly used to predict methane production. (Note: the authors apologise for the units used, however, these do not influence the comparisons). There is a bias in the model predictions: predictions are high at low observed methane and low at high observed methane. Statistical analysis of all predictions showed that when residuals were plotted against predicted methane, there was more bias with the Blaxter and Clapperton (1965) and Moe and Tyrrell (1979) predictions than the rumen model predictions. However, the methane production values generated by the model for the New Zealand diets (which are all high quality) fall between 0.09 and 0.11 kcal/kcal DE, the region where the model predictions are most accurate.

Model prediction of metabolisable energy/kg feed is compared with observed values in Fig. 5, showing that the model predicts overall digestion very well ($r^2 = 0.99$).

The rumen model was not originally developed to predict methane production. It is currently being refined at the University of California, Davis to better represent methane production.

Fig. 6



4. Methane production by ruminants in New Zealand

4.1 Total methane production

Total methane production in the current exercise was calculated to be 1.50 Tg/year (Table 2). This is within the range of values calculated by other methods (Fennessy 1989; Lassey *et al*, 1990; Hollinger and Hunt, 1990; Waghorn, pers. comm.). We believe our estimates are ^{at the high end of the range} higher because our data on livestock numbers throughout the year are more accurate than those used in other studies.

Table 2. Seasonal methane production by ruminant animals in New Zealand (tonnes x 10³).

SEASON	DAIRY	SHEEP	BEEF	DEER	GOAT	TOTAL
WINTER	36.9	202.0	57.1	6.7	4.2	306.9
SPRING	76.3	258.3	93.7	7.1	4.1	438.5
SUMMER	84.5	238.0	87.8	9.2	4.8	424.3
AUTUMN	68.4	177.9	72.8	6.9	4.4	330.4
TOTAL	266.0	876.2	310.3	29.9	17.5	1,500.1

20.5
24.2
28.3
22.0

Implied EF (kg/g) →

76.8 15.1 67.4 30.6¹ 16.5¹
24.4² 10.6² 7.5 8.0 (14.2/g)

4.2 Seasonal variation in methane production

Table 2 shows that there were considerable seasonal differences in methane production in the order Spring > Summer > Autumn > Winter. This is predominantly a reflection of animal numbers and the increased food intake associated with lactation. There was some difference between animal species, with peak methane production occurring in summer for dairy cattle, deer and goats and in spring for sheep and beef cattle. Seasonal variation is presented in graphical form in Fig. 6.

- ¹ On the basis that all CH₄ is calculated as produced by farmed deer/goats (believed wrong)
- ² On the basis that all CH₄ is calculated from farmed + feral deer/goats (believed correct)

Fig. 7





Fig. 8



4.3 Variation between animal species in methane production

There was considerable variation between species in methane production (Table 2). Sheep produced 58.4% of total methane followed by beef cattle (20.7%), dairy cattle (17.7%), deer (2.0%) and goats (1.2%). This result can also be seen graphically in Fig. 6.

4.4 The contributions of farming type to methane production

The two main farming systems used in New Zealand are mixed sheep with beef, and dairying. On this basis the sheep and beef systems produced considerably more methane than did dairying (Table 2, Fig. 6).

4.5 The contribution of land class to methane production

Improved land accounted for the largest portion of methane production, followed by unimproved land with a minor contribution from tussock (Fig. 7). This distribution occurs because improved land is the largest land class and because stocking rate was higher on improved land. In other words, it was largely a reflection of animal numbers.

4.6 Methane production from breeding versus dry stock ←

Fig. 8 demonstrates that breeding stock produced most methane. The only exception on an animal species basis was with beef cattle where fattening stock produced more methane than breeding stock. This is due to animal numbers and is reinforced by the fact that a large proportion of male dairy calves are transferred into beef farming. Breeding stock had a high methane output because of their increased food intakes during late pregnancy and lactation.

5 *Conclusions*

5.1 *Reliability of the model estimates of methane production*

The quality of the data used in the study was variable. The data on livestock numbers and their changes through the year are accurate. New Zealand collects and processes agricultural statistics annually, something that very few countries do. Our colleagues in the US, who are working on similar data to predict global methane from ruminants believe the New Zealand livestock data are the best in the world. This is important because livestock numbers are probably the most significant determinant of total methane production.

The animal requirements for nutrients used in this study, derived from Ulyatt *et al*, (1980), McCall and Lambert (1987) and Fennessy and Milligan (1987), are based on experimental data and are regarded by the authors as being accurate for New Zealand's pastoral agricultural system.

The data on the chemical composition of pasture species and other diets have also been derived experimentally under New Zealand conditions and are regarded as being adequate.

Estimates of the digestibilities of pastures were required to predict food intake. As few NZ measurements of digestibility are available for the wide range of pastures used for the various land classes and regions, many values had to be estimated.

Similarly, the botanical composition of the pasture selected by the animals had to be estimated due to the extremely small amount of experimental data available. The available data suggest that animals select food that is of much higher quality than that on offer. This argument applies to digestibility as well as the chemical composition of the diet selected.

Finally, the rumen model is itself still being evaluated for its accuracy in predicting methane. Its accuracy will almost certainly improve as the model is refined.

Given the caveats stated above, we believe the data presented in this study to be a good approximation of methane production by ruminants in New Zealand although sensitivity analyses are still required to refine the estimates. All previous estimated values are based on the assumption that methane production is 6 to 8.5% of gross energy intake. The model predicts methane from biochemical transactions and is thus a totally different approach. The fact that both methods give similar predictions gives us confidence in our predictions.

5.2 Methods for reducing methane production from ruminants

Generally we agree with the options reported by IPCC (1990). Other than reducing livestock numbers, an option that is politically and economically unsustainable in New Zealand, most promise would appear to be in the area of improving the efficiency of our pastoral systems. Supplementation, use of feed additives to modify rumen microflora and the use of hormones such as bST are theoretical possibilities but these have limitations such as the cost and efficacy of application in a low-cost pastoral environment. bST has the added problem of consumer acceptance. However any methods that increase the intake of digestible nutrients per animal and thus lower the proportion of the diet that is used for maintenance will result in increased food conversion efficiency and lowered methane. In particular, research should be conducted into methods of altering pasture quality to increase intake.

The FOB values for all sheep, beef and dairy products in 1989/90 were \$B3.513, \$B1.370 and \$B3.906 respectively (NZ Meat and Wool Board's Economic Service). In terms of methane production per dollar earned sheep, beef and dairy cattle were 0.249, 0.227 and 0.068 (kg/\$) respectively. In other words dairying was approximately 3.5 times more methane-efficient than sheep or beef farming in 1989/90. There is considerable scope for improvement with sheep and beef farming.

5.3 *Global estimates of methane production*

Many estimates of global methane production from ruminants have been made (e.g. Reuss *et al*, 1988; IPCC, 1990). In our view these tend to be low because estimates of livestock numbers and requirements are very poor for many countries. These estimates contrast with those from New Zealand which indicate relatively high values. It would be unfortunate if New Zealand were penalised because its estimates were high but accurate, compared to other countries whose estimates were low but very bad. We should not be penalised for being accurate.

Similarly, ruminant methane production per head of NZ human population calculated from the present study was 438 kg. However, we export approximately 80% of our ruminant-based products. We would argue that our population base should be expanded at least five times to account for all the consumers of our products. On this basis methane production would be 88 kg per head of population per year. No data are yet available to describe methane production from ruminant faeces. In the NZ environment this is likely to be substantially less than in the northern hemisphere where animal waste is collected and stored for long periods allowing anaerobic fermentation to proceed.

6. *Acknowledgements*

Mr R. Tass, NZ Department of Statistics, Auckland, for supplying animal census data.

Dr I. Brookes, Animal Science Department, Massey University, for advice in developing the animal numbers model.

Dr M.G. Lambert and Mr D.A. Clark, DSIR Grasslands, Palmerston North, for helpful discussion on the composition of New Zealand pastures and dietary selection of animals.

Mr R. Davidson and Mr B. Spiers, NZ Meat and Wool Board Economic Service, for providing general statistics and advice on age and sex structure of livestock systems.

Mr P. van der Logt, MAF Policy, Wellington, for providing statistics of animal slaughtering at abattoirs and meat export companies in New Zealand.

NZ Deer Farmers Association, Wellington, for advice on deer farming statistics.

Drs M.T. Jasen and P.F.J. Newsome, DSIR Land Resources, Lower Hutt, and G.R. Harmsworth, DSIR Land Resources, Palmerston North for providing Land Class classification data for each county.

7. References

- ✓ Baldwin, R.L., Koong, L.J. and Ulyatt, M.J. (1977). *Agricultural Systems* 2, 255-288.
- ✓ Baldwin, R.L., Thornley, J.H.M. and Beever, D.E. (1987). *Journal of Dairy Research* 54, 107-131.
- Blaxter, K.L. and Clapperton, J.L. (1965). *British Journal of Nutrition* 19, 511-522.
- ✓ Fennessy, P.F. (1989). *Methane Production by Ruminants*. Report prepared for Electricorp Production. MAF Invermay. 9pp.
- ✓ Fennessy, P.F. and Milligan, K.E. (1987). In *Livestock Feeding on Pasture*. N.Z. Society of Animal Production, Occasional Publication No. 10. pp.111-118.
- ✓ Hollinger, D.Y. and Hunt, J.E. (1990). *Journal of The Royal Society of New Zealand* 20, 337-348.
- ✓ IPCC (1990). Workshop on *Methane Emissions and Opportunities for Control*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. pp.64 USEPA.
- ✓ Lassey, K.R., Lowe, D.C. and Manning, M.R. (1990). *Sources and Sinks of Atmospheric Methane in New Zealand: a Perspective*. DSIR Report INS-R-419.
x Lassey 1991
- ✓ McCall, D.G. and Lambert, M.G. (1987). In *Livestock Feeding on Pasture*. N.Z. Society of Animal Production Occasional Publication No. 10. pp.105-109.
- Moe, P.W., and Tyrrell, H.F. (1979). *Journal of Dairy Science* 62, 1583-1586.
- ✓ Murphy, M.R., Baldwin, R.L. and Ulyatt, M.J. (1986). *Journal of Animal Science* 62, 1412-1422.
- ✓ Newsome, P.J.F. (1987). *The Vegetative Cover of New Zealand*. Pub. The National Soil and Water Conservation Authority. MWD, Wellington.
- Reuss, S.K., Swift, D.M., Ward, G. and Ellis, J.E. (1990). In *Global Ruminant Livestock Production Systems*. Estimated 1988 Methane Emissions. Colorado State University.

- ✓ Scott, J.D.J., Lamont, N., Smeaton, D.C. and Hudson, S.J. (1980). *Sheep and Cattle Nutrition*. Agricultural Research Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Hamilton.
- ✓ Ulyatt, M.J., Fennessy, P.F., Rattray, P.V. and Jagusch, K.T. (1980). In *Supplementary Feeding*. N.Z. Society of Animal Production. Occasional Publication No. 7 pp.157-184.

Appendix 1

a) Definition of land classes.

IMPROVED grassland is characterised as "...exhibits a healthy appearance with vigorous green growth for most of the year, resulting from a selected blend of pasture species....Grazing management is intensive with medium to high stock densities, relatively smaller paddocks by comparison with unimproved pasture and a tendency towards rotational grazing". (Newsome, 1987).

UNIMPROVED grassland is an aggregation of several grassland vegetation classes described by Newsome (1987), generally representing hill country pastures and grazed lowlands which have not been developed. As much of the **Unimproved** and contained weed and scrub vegetation, weighting factors (below) were applied to each of the various component land classes to reduce the land area to the apparent area actually grazed.

TUSSOCK grassland comprised Short Tussock, Snow Tussock and Red Tussock grasslands and associated scrublands. Weighing factors (below) were used to derive the apparent grazed area of Tussock grassland.

b) Vegetation cover classification and weightings used to estimate the true area available for grazing.

Vegetation Class	Land Class	Area Weighing
Pasture/Horticulture/Orchards	I	0.5
Improved pasture	I	1.0
Unimproved pasture	U	1.0
Short Tussock	T	1.0
Snow Tussock	T	0.25
Short+Snow Tussock	T	0.25
Red Tussock	T	0.1
Grassland/mixed scrub	U	0.688
Grassland/Leptospernum scrub	U	0.6
Grassland Cassinia scrub	U	0.6
Tussock/subalpine scrub	T	0.1
Grassland/Dracophyllum scrub	U	0.25
Grassland/gorse	U	0.6
Grassland/matagouri	T	0.6
Grassland/sweet briar/matagouri	T	0.6
North Island Pasture/forest	I	0.5
South Island Pasture/forest	T	0.5

Appendix 2

Northland zone animal numbers at 30 June 1990 and the percentage of each animal class allocated to each class of land.
(I=improved, u=unimproved, t=tussock grassland).

FARM TYPE	No. DAIRY COWS			No. OTHER DAIRY		
	%I	%U	%T	%I	%U	%T
Town milk ¹	100	0	0	100	0	0
Factory supply ¹	95	5	0	95	5	0
Predominantly sheep ¹	100	0	0	100	0	0
Predominantly beef ¹	50	50	0	50	50	0
Predominantly dairy ^{1, 2}	95	5	0	70	30	0
Sheep ³ /beef ⁴	100	0	0	100	0	0
Sheep ³ /other ⁴	100	0	0	100	0	0
Beef ³ /sheep ⁴	100	0	0	100	0	0
Beef ³ /other ⁴	90	10	0	100	0	0
Deer ⁵	100	0	0	90	10	0
Goat ⁵	100	0	0	100	0	0
Mixed livestock ⁶	2	0	0	53	0	0
Plantations ⁷	1880	50	0	100	0	0
OTHER ⁸	774	50	0	30	70	0
	1112	50	0	10	90	0
				100	0	0

FARM TYPE	No. BEEF COWS			No. OTHER BEEF		
	%I	%U	%T	%I	%U	%T
Town milk ¹	100	0	0	100	0	0
Factory supply ¹	95	5	0	95	5	0
Predominantly sheep ¹	50	50	0	50	50	0
Predominantly beef ¹	50	50	0	50	50	0
Predominantly dairy ^{1, 2}	60	40	0	60	40	0
Sheep ³ /Beef ⁴	40	60	0	40	60	0
Sheep ³ /Other ⁴	90	10	0	90	10	0
Beef ³ /Sheep ⁴	70	30	0	80	20	0
Beef ³ /Other ⁴	50	50	0	80	20	0
Deer ⁵	100	0	0	747	0	0
Goat ⁵	50	50	0	129	0	0
Mixed livestock ⁶	30	70	0	28334	0	0
Plantations ⁷	20	80	0	2446	0	0
OTHER ⁸	90	10	0	9861	10	0

(Appendix 2 continued)

FARM TYPE	No. BREEDING EWES			No. OTHER SHEEP		
	%I	%U	%T	%I	%U	%T
Town milk ¹	100	0	0	100	0	0
Factory supply ¹	70	30	0	70	30	0
Predominantly sheep ¹	30	70	0	30	70	0
Predominantly beef ¹	50	50	0	50	50	0
Predominantly dairy ^{1, 2}	50	50	0	50	50	0
Sheep ³ /Beef ⁴	20	80	0	20	80	0
Sheep ³ /Other ⁴	80	20	0	80	20	0
Beef ³ /Sheep ⁴	70	30	0	70	30	0
Beef ³ /Other ⁴	70	30	0	70	30	0
Deer ⁵	80	20	0	90	10	0
Goat ⁵	30	70	0	20	80	0
Mixed livestock ⁶	40	60	0	30	70	0
Plantations ⁷	10	90	0	10	90	0
OTHER ⁸	90	10	0	90	10	0

FARM TYPE	No. DEER			No. GOATS		
	%I	%U	%T	%I	%U	%T
Town milk ¹	100	0	0	100	0	0
Factory supply ¹	100	0	0	30	70	0
Predominantly sheep ¹	0	0	0	50	50	0
Predominantly beef ¹	100	0	0	30	70	0
Predominantly dairy ^{1, 2}	80	20	0	30	70	0
Sheep ³ /Beef ⁴	100	0	0	10	90	0
Sheep ³ /Other ⁴	100	0	0	80	20	0
Beef ³ /Sheep ⁴	0	0	0	80	20	0
Beef ³ /Other ⁴	100	0	0	80	20	0
Deer ⁵	80	20	0	30	70	0
Goat ⁵	0	0	0	100	0	0
Mixed livestock ⁶	0	0	0	50	50	0
Plantations ⁷	80	20	0	30	70	0
OTHER ⁸	0	0	0	10	90	0

¹ >75% gross farm income derived from this principal component of the farming enterprise.
² This Farm-type excludes those accounted for in Town milk and Factory supply categories.
³ 51-74% of gross farm income derived from this component of the farming enterprise.
⁴ 20-49% of gross farm income derived from this component of the farming enterprise.

⁵ 100% of gross farm income derived from this component of the farming enterprise.
⁶ Two or more components sum to >50% of gross farm income, providing no one activity contributes >51%.
⁷ Livestock grazing in plantations.
⁸ Livestock grazing in horticultural blocks and on predominantly cropping farms.

Appendix 3

Assumptions that were made in the estimation of stock numbers within various classes during the year.

1. Lactation was assumed to commence simultaneously for all animals within a species within each of the 22 geographic **ZONES**. Peak parturition dates were obtained from animal production specialists. Calving and lambing percentages (NZ Department of Statistics; NZ Dairy Board) were used. Fawning was assumed to be 90% (NZ Deer Farmers Association) and occurred in December. Kidding was assumed to be 120% and occurred in October. As the number of animals lambing and calving in autumn was considered to be insignificant in relation to the general farming pattern all animals commenced lactation in spring. **ZONE** average lambing, calving, kidding and fawning percentage data were applied to each land class within the **ZONE**.

2. 25% of heifer beef calves, ewe hoggets and doe hoggets were kept for selection of replacements for breeding animals. Each year 20% of breeding stock were replaced. NZ Dairy Board statistics provided actual percentages of animals kept, and later used for replacements. 10% breeding hinds were replaced annually.

3. 10% of wether lambs were carried into a second year. All beef calves were carried into a second year with replacement cows being transferred to the "breeding herd" as rising 3 year olds. Dairy cow and hind replacements entered the breeding herds as rising 2 year olds.

4. No allowance was made for calf losses as calving percentage relates to the number live calves at marking, the time after which few losses are likely to occur. Lamb losses after docking were assumed to be 2% on **IMPROVED** and 4% on **UNIMPROVED** grasslands. Natural losses of adult animals were accounted for in the "kill" data.

5. Total slaughter data (export and local trade) were provided by MAF Policy. From these, the percentage of each class of animal killed each month within **ZONES** was determined. These provided the pattern of kill data used in the animal numbers model, with the exception that no lambs were killed until the fourth month after lambing.

The bobby calf "kill" on dairy farms included those males transferred to beef farms for fattening. These were transferred in the month of birth. The same killing patterns for each class of animal within a **ZONE** was used on **IMPROVED**, **UNIMPROVED** and **TUSSOCK** grasslands.

6. Some non-lactating dairy stock were transferred from **IMPROVED** to **UNIMPROVED** grasslands on dairy farms. Similarly some beef cattle were transferred from **UNIMPROVED** to **TUSSOCK** grasslands. These minor exceptions along with the transfer of dairy beef animals, were the only instances of animal transfers from one land class to another.

7. The number of ruminants in New Zealand at 30 June 1991 was the same as at 30 June 1990.

Table 1

Appendix 4

Calculation of sheep numbers at the end of each month within each livestock class in the IMPROVED vegetation class of the EAST New Zealand REGION. Census data on 30 June 1990 provided Breeding ewe and 'Other sheep' numbers. These were allocated to the three Vegetation Classes as shown in Appendix 1.

REGION: NZ EAST
VEGETATION CLASS: IMPROVED

	Breeding Ewe No.	Number New Lambs	Rising ¹ Hoggets (a)	Rising ¹ 4TH (b)	No. to kill ²			% to kill ³	
					Ewes (c)	Other Sheep (d)	Lambs (e)	Ewes	Other Sheep
TOTAL	11,616,214 ⁴		4,065,675	519,079	2,323,243	1,742,432	6,683,166		
JUL	11,559,934	0	4,013,400 ⁵	519,079	56,280	52,273	0	2	3
AUG	11,511,097	3,822,124	3,822,124	4,480,207	48,837	52,273 ⁶	0	2	3
SEP	11,437,916	6,926,716	10,748,840	4,410,510	73,181	69,697	0	3	4
OCT	11,383,825	0	10,748,840	4,358,237	54,091	52,273	0	2	3
NOV	11,229,116	0	10,748,840	4,236,267	154,708	121,970	0	7	7
DEC	10,912,421	0	10,281,018	3,992,327	316,695	243,940	467,822	14	14
JAN	10,324,854	0	9,612,701	3,574,143	587,567	418,184	668,317	25	22
FEB	9,930,504	0	8,543,395	3,295,354	394,350	278,789	1,069,306	17	17
MAR	9,642,437	0	7,340,425	3,103,686	288,067	191,668	1,202,970	12	11
APR	9,530,418	0	6,137,455	3,016,564	112,019	87,122	1,202,970	5	6
MAY	11,703,464	0	4,733,990	588,775	150,197	104,546	1,403,465	6	6
JUN	11,616,214	(7)	4,065,673	519,079	87,250	69,697	668,317	4	4

¹ a + b = 'Total Other Sheep' in census data.

² c = ewe replacements required: viz. 20% of Total breeding ewe No. culled each year (including natural deaths).

d = No. hoggets at 30 June - 2,323,243 Ewe replacements transferred in May (7)

e = No. new lambs - Rising hoggets at 30 June (a).

Note: c + d + e = Number new lambs.

³ Average slaughter pattern of the seven geographic ZONES in NEW ZEALAND EAST.

⁴ Census data at 30 June 1990.

⁵ All hoggets at 31 July less those 'Other sheep' killed during August (6), transfer to Rising 4TH at 31 August to join '4TH and Older' sheep remaining on 31 July.

Note: Sheep at 30 June 1991 = sheep at 30 June 1990 (viz. (4)).

Appendix 5

Calculation of dry matter intake of Friesian x Jersey Dairy Cows - NEW ZEALAND NORTH.

	Conceptus-free liveweight ¹ (kg)	Requirement (MJME/d) ²	M/D (MJME/kg DM)	Dry matter intake (kg/d)	Seasonal average DM intake (kg/d)
JUN	391	45	10.4	4.3	
JUL	392	52	10.4	5.0	5.3
AUG	404	68	10.4	6.5	
SEP	380	139	10.8	12.9	
OCT	378	158	11.1	14.2	13.8
NOV	381	158	11.0	14.4	
DEC	389	153	10.8	14.2	
JAN	397	138	10.5	13.3	13.5
FEB	405	131	10.0	13.1	
MAR	406	119	10.0	11.9	
APR	395	109	10.2	10.7	10.8
MAY	392	103	10.4	9.9	

¹ Scott *et al.* (1980)² From Ulyatt *et al.* (1980)

Appendix 6

Chemical composition of the pasture species and other diets used to construct the chemical compositions of pasture mixtures (Appendix 7).

Model Input	White Clover	Browntop Summer	Browntop Other ¹	Perennial Ryegrass Summer	Perennial Ryegrass Other ¹	Grass Silage	Barley Straw ²	Perennial Ryegrass Hay
Soluble sugars	0.113	0.09	0.133	0.102	0.146	0.001	0.015	0.052
Organic acids	0.101	0.04	0.07	0.083	0.083	0.001	0.014	0.043
Pectin	0.112	0.01	0.02	0.015	0.015	0.001	0.011	0.035
Lactic acid	0	0	0	0	0	0.03	0	0
Lipid	0.036	0.03	0.055	0.056	0.066	0.02	0.019	0.036
Starch	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.001	0.01	0.01
Hemicellulose	0.053	0.21	0.133	0.173	0.106	0.25	0.323	0.222
Cellulose	0.142	0.272	0.202	0.259	0.183	0.331	0.353	0.289
Soluble protein	0.146	0.044	0.128	0.071	0.15	0.064	0.01	0.03
Insoluble protein	0.086	0.089	0.061	0.037	0.078	0.064	0.036	0.078
Non-protein N	0.024	0.015	0.023	0.012	0.025	0.032	0.005	0.012
Lignin	0.044	0.07	0.045	0.068	0.024	0.039	0.112	0.078
Soluble ash	0.056	0.06	0.06	0.057	0.057	0.065	0.046	0.057
Insoluble ash	0.057	0.06	0.06	0.057	0.057	0.065	0.046	0.058
Acetic acid	0	0	0	0	0	0.036	0	0
Total	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

1. "Other" indicates spring, autumn and winter.
2. It was assumed that dead material had a similar composition to barley straw.

Appendix 7

Chemical composition of some examples of pasture mixtures used as input for the model. These were constructed by mixing the pasture species given in Appendix 6 in the below ratios.

	Dairy winter	Improved winter	Improved summer	Unimproved winter	Unimproved summer	Tussock winter	Tussock summer
	Improved winter 60 Silage 20 Hay 20	Perennial ryegrass- Other 85 White clover 15	Perennial ryegrass- Summer 75 White clover 25	Brown- top- Other 90 White clover 10	Brown- top- Summer 85 White clover 10 Dead 5	Brown- top- Other 80 Dead 20	Brown- top- Summer 80 White clover 10 Dead 10
Soluble sugars	0.098	0.141	0.105	0.131	0.089	0.109	0.085
Organic acids	0.059	0.086	0.088	0.073	0.045	0.059	0.044
Pectin	0.016	0.030	0.039	0.029	0.020	0.018	0.0203
Lactic acid	0.006	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lipid	0.051	0.061	0.051	0.051	0.030	0.048	0.030
Starch	0.008	0.013	0.015	0.015	0.012	0.01	0.012
Hemicellulose	0.158	0.098	0.143	0.143	0.200	0.171	0.206
Cellulose	0.234	0.177	0.230	0.230	0.263	0.232	0.267
Soluble protein	0.109	0.149	0.090	0.090	0.053	0.104	0.051
Insoluble protein	0.075	0.079	0.049	0.049	0.086	0.056	0.083
Non-protein N	0.024	0.025	0.015	0.015	0.0154	0.019	0.015
Lignin	0.038	0.027	0.062	0.062	0.070	0.058	0.072
Soluble ash	0.059	0.057	0.057	0.057	0.059	0.057	0.058
Insoluble ash	0.059	0.057	0.057	0.057	0.059	0.057	0.058
Acetic acid	0.007	0	0	0	0	0	0