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Factors affecting beef finishing efficiency on pasture

D.G. McCALL AND P.R. MARSHALL

MAF Technology, Whatawhata Research Centre, Hamilton, New Zealand.

ABSTRACT

A model quantifying outputs of carcass from pasture inputs was used to study factors affecting biological efficiency (BE) of finishing beef from 6 months to slaughter.

Two factors which determined biological efficiency (BE, kg carcass gain/ha/yr) on pasture were pasture utilisation and animal conversion efficiency. Effects of stocking rate, length of finishing period (1 v 2 years), mature size and maintenance efficiency of beasts on BE and its components were studied.

Stocking rate was the major factor affecting pasture utilisation rate however more lighter (eg. 12% more 750 kg than 900 kg mature sized) cattle need to be run to achieve equivalent pasture utilisation. Nine percent less cattle can be run in a 2 year system.

Average conversion efficiency was 40% lower from finishing at 2 years than 1 year. An increase in mature size from 750 to 900 kg increased animal conversion by 14%. A 20% decrease in maintenance requirements increased animal conversion by 10%.

Constraints to produce specified carcass weights further favoured BE with high mature weight beasts, particularly at intermediate carcass weights (250 kg).

Breeding cattle for high mature size appears the best way of improving the cattle available for finishing.
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INTRODUCTION

In a simple grazing system the biological efficiency (BE) of beef finishing is determined by the weight of carcass gain from an area of land over a year. This depends on the amount of feed required to produce a kilogram of carcass and the percentage of annual pasture production which is consumed. The biological efficiency of beef finishing under grazing can therefore be expressed as:

\[
\text{Biological efficiency} = \frac{\text{Animal conversion efficiency, Pasture utilisation}}{\text{kg carcass gain/ha/yr}} = \frac{\text{kg feed/kg carcass gain}}{\text{kg feed eaten/ha/yr}}
\]

Computer models which integrate basic information on cattle growth, net pasture production and pasture utilisation can be used to assess the importance of factors which affect BE. Knowledge of the relative importance of these factors is required to focus research and management strategies to improve beef finishing efficiency.

In this paper we used a model to study the effects of stocking rate, age at slaughter, mature size and maintenance requirements on BE and its components for beef finishing on pasture. The paper concentrates on the practical consequences of relationships represented in the model.

MODEL

The model simulates daily liveweight growth of cattle from weaning to slaughter on one hectare of land. It consists of 5 basic components. The relationships used are shown graphically in Figure 1.

1. Potential net pasture production (maximum possible at each site) is expressed as kg DM/ha/day for each month of the year. Actual net pasture production is modified by average pasture mass on the farm (Bircham and Hodgson (1983) data (Fig. 1a)).

2. Daily pasture intake per animal is derived from potential intake and is dependent on average pasture mass (McCall unpub. data) (Fig. 1a). Intake may be
restricted below this level by user controlled seasonal constraints on daily intake.

3. Potential intake (kg DM/hd) is determined as a function of animal age using mature weight scaling (Taylor 1980). An example of potential intake as a function of age is shown in Figure 1b. This approach allows compensatory growth to be determined on this basis of maturity/age relationships rather than liveweight relationships.

4. Maintenance energy requirements were related to degree of maturity (liveweight/mature liveweight; m) and mature weight (A) (Taylor 1982). The equation was: maint = 0.7mA^0.73 (Fig. 1c).

5. The efficiency of ME use for liveweight change was also related to maturity of the animal (Taylor 1982) and Taylor et al. (1986) (Fig. 1d).

Carcass weight was predicted using dressing percent (D0%) data supplied by A.H. Kirton (pers. comm.): D0% = 0.41 + 0.000208 LW.

**RESULTS**

Animal Conversion Efficiency (kg DM/kg carcass gain)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stocking rate (beasts/ha)*</th>
<th>kg Feed eaten/kg carcass gain</th>
<th>Carcass gain (kg/ha)</th>
<th>Carcass weight (kg/beast)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pasture production: 10,000 kg DM/ha/yr.

The amount of feed required per kg carcass gain (15.5)
was remarkably similar across a wide range of stocking rates (Table 1) despite cattle having quite different patterns of growth and average feeding levels (as shown by differences in carcass weight).

Only at the very high stocking rate did conversion efficiency decline slightly (16.3) (Table 1). Since the amount of feed required per kg carcass gain was relatively constant across stocking rates, effects of other variables on animal conversion efficiency are presented at a stocking rate of 3.5 beasts/ha.

A decrease in mature weight of beasts from 900 to 750 kg increased the amount of feed required per kg carcass gain by about 14% in both 1 and 2 year finishing systems (Table 2). Finishing over 2 years increased feed requirements by about 40% compared to 1 year finishing.

Finally, a reduction of 20% in the maintenance requirements of a beast reduced feed required by about 10% for a 1 year finishing system (Table 2).

**TABLE 2** Effect of factors other than stocking rate on animal conversion efficiency (kg DM/kg carcass gain).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mature Weight (kg)</th>
<th>900</th>
<th>750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finishing period (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pasture Utilisation**

Stocking rate was the major factor affecting pasture utilisation rate. The effect of annual pasture allowance on pasture utilisation is shown in Table 3. These results are for 900 kg mature liveweight cattle on a 1 year finishing system. While results in Table 3 relate to one pattern of potential pasture production, simulations with other patterns showed little variability from Table 3 provided management was optimised to give maximum cattle liveweights at slaughter. Close to 100% of potential production was used at an allowance of 1820 kg DM/beast/year. This was based on net pasture production with no pasture losses due to trampling during grazing.

**TABLE 3** Effect of stocking rate (annual pasture allowance) on pasture utilisation for 900 kg mature size cattle on 1 year of finishing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stocking rate (beasts/ha)*</th>
<th>Pasture allowance (kg DM/beast/year)</th>
<th>Pasture utilisation (% of potential production)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6665</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Potential pasture production: 10,000 kg DM/ha.

Increased maintenance requirement of the beast had no effect on pasture utilisation since potential intake was related to beast age in the model. Small mature size (750 kg) beasts had a lower level of pasture utilisation at any stocking rate than the large mature size beasts and common levels of pasture utilisation could be achieved by running a 12% higher stocking rate of the “750 kg” beasts. Equivalent pasture utilisation between 1 and 2 year systems require 9% fewer beasts/ha to be run in 2 year compared to 1 year systems.

**Annual Carcass Gain per Ha**

Greatest carcass gains per ha were achieved at high levels of pasture utilisation since animal conversion was relatively constant across a range of stocking rates (Table 1). Where stocking rate was adjusted for each cattle type to give a common level of pasture utilisation then carcass gain per ha depended only on animal conversion efficiency. Under these conditions “900 kg” cattle had 14% higher carcass gain per ha than “750 kg” mature size beasts. One year systems yield 40% more carcass than 2 year and a 20% decrease in maintenance requirements increased carcass gain per ha by 10%.

**Effect of Carcass Weight Constraints on Carcass Gain Efficiency**

The results in Table 1 show that maximum carcass gain...
per hectare will be achieved at high levels of pasture utilisation but low carcass weights. To achieve acceptable carcass weights within time constraints some reduction from the biological optimum will be required.

As desired carcass weight increases a loss in biological efficiency will occur in 1 year finishing owing to the reduced pasture utilisation levels. At some point the carcass gain/ha will equate to that achieved from 2 year finishing with higher pasture utilisation.

The final analysis was done to look at advantages in carcass gain per ha from large compared to small mature size beasts over a range of target carcass weights. Results presented in Table 4 are for the system (1 or 2 year finishing) which gives the greatest carcass gain per ha for each carcass weight. The major point from the analysis is that in a grazing system the greatest differences between large and small mature size beasts occur at intermediate carcass weights of around 250 kg. This is because this carcass weight can be achieved in 1 year of finishing by “900 kg” beasts but requires 2 years for “750 kg” beasts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carcass weight (kg)</th>
<th>Beast mature weight to produce each specified carcass weight.</th>
<th>Beast mature weight</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900 kg</td>
<td>750 kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>380*</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>369*</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>429*</td>
<td>324*</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>417*</td>
<td>274*</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2 year finishing

TABLE 4 Carcass gain (kg/ha) for the most efficient production system to produce each specified carcass weight.

DISCUSSION

A notable feature of the results is the consistent advantage in feed conversion efficiency to the largest mature size cattle. This occurred across a range of pasture utilisation rates and so was translated directly into greater carcass gain per ha. The mechanism used in the model to describe differences in potential intake, maintenance and growth relied on the mature weight scaling rules of Taylor (1980). The effect of these assumptions is that at a common level of maturity, cattle of different mature sizes have the same level of feed conversion efficiency when fed at the same fraction of potential intake.

Alternatively, at any given liveweight, cattle of greatest mature size have the greatest food conversion efficiency because they are least mature.

The reason for differences in average feed conversion efficiency between cattle types was that smaller mature sized cattle matured more quickly than large. They were also more mature as calves on 1 April.

Length of the finishing system has the greatest effect on animal conversion efficiency of any of the variables studied. Lower average conversion efficiencies in 2 year than 1 year finishing is the result of high overhead costs of maintenance feeding 2 year old cattle for the relatively small return in additional liveweight gain in the second year (average 55% of year 1).

Where 2 year finishing does become more biologically efficient than 1 year is when a constraint is imposed to produce high carcass weights which can only be achieved by very low levels of pasture utilisation in a 1 year system. This may not be as critical in integrated beef finishing systems where surplus feed can be used by other stock classes.

The advantage to animal conversion and biological efficiency of a 20% decrease in maintenance requirements was lower than could be achieved by increasing mature size by 20%. This suggests that in beef finishing, maintenance requirements are not as important an issue in determining carcass gain per ha as the mature size of the beast to be finished.

The results in this study apply to the situation where seasonal feed allocation is optimised with respect to final carcass weight. The model achieved maximum carcass weights by manipulating the cattle growth to ensure potential net pasture production was achieved over the farm in the deficit periods of winter and early spring. This meant maintaining average pasture mass on the farm above about 1350 kg DM/ha (see Fig. 1a) particularly at high stocking rates. The degree of autumn and winter restriction required on cattle growth therefore increased as stocking rate increased. This is shown in Figure 2 where optimal growth paths of 900 kg mature weight cattle are graphed for a high and low stocking rate. The sensitivity of pasture utilisation, animal conversion and carcass gain per ha to minimum pasture mass in early spring increased as stocking rate
increased. This was because at low stocking rates optimal pasture masses were soon regained in early spring even if mass dropped as low as 1150 kg DM/ha.

Irrespective of pasture utilisation rate the amount of feed required per kilogram carcass gain was always least in the highest mature size cattle. An additional advantage to high mature weight cattle is that they achieve greater carcass weights in one year of finishing than low mature weight cattle.

Where desired carcass weights are in the range capable of being achieved in 1 year of finishing by high mature sized cattle but requires 2 years in lesser mature sized cattle, the difference in efficiency becomes even greater in favour of large mature sized cattle.

The results suggest that breeding cattle for high growth rates (mature size) appears to be the cheapest means of improving the cattle available for beef finishing, rather than being concerned with maintenance requirement as suggested by some breeders.

Contrary to the common practise of trying to achieve high cattle liveweight gains in winter to maximise carcass weights, the results suggest management strategies should aim to restrict winter liveweight gain as necessary to allow potential pasture production to be achieved through early spring.

This model analysis had identified strategies to optimise beef finishing on pasture, which will require field validation.
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