Advances in Animal Biosciences, (2016), **7:3**, pp 227–228 © The Animal Consortium 2016
doi:10.1017/S2040470016000212

advances in animal biosciences

Modelling responses of forages to climate change with a focus on nutritive value

P. Virkajärvi[1†], P. Korhonen[1], G. Bellocchi[2], Y. Curnel[3], L. Wu[4], G. Jégo[5], T. Persson[6], M. Höglind[6], M. Van Oijen[7], A.-M. Gustavsson[8] and R. P. Kipling[9]

[1]*Green Technology, Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), Halolantie 31A, FI-71750 Maaninka, Finland;* [2]*Grassland Ecosystem Research Unit, French National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA), 5 Chemin de Beaulieu, 63039 Clermont-Ferrand, France;* [3]*Farming Systems, territories and information technologies unit, Walloon Agricultural Research Center (CRA-W), Rue de Liroux, 9, 5030 Gembloux, Belgium;* [4]*Rothamsted Research, North Wyke, Okehampton EX20 2SB, UK;* [5]*Québec Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 2560 Hochelaga Boulevard, Quebec (QC), G1V 2J3, Canada;* [6]*Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO), Po. Box 115, NO-1431 Ås, Norway;* [7]*Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (CEH), Bush Estate, Penicuik, EH26 0QB, UK;* [8]*Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, (SLU), Department of Agricultural Research for Northern Sweden, SE-901 83 Umeå, Sweden;* [9]*Institute of Biological, Environmental and Rural Sciences (IBERS), Aberystwyth University, 1st Floor, Stapledon Building, PlasGogerddan Aberystwyth, Ceredigion, SY23 3EE, UK*

Keywords: climate change, grassland, nutritive value, process-based models, ruminant production

Introduction

Process-based models (PBMs) are important tools for predicting and understanding the impacts of climate change on grassland systems. The models should be able to simulate changes in sward nutritional value (NV) over time in order to better understand the interactions between grasslands and ruminant nutrition. Changes in the NV of forage may not only alter animal performance but also the need for other feeds, the management and productivity of the system, the quality of final products and the environmental impacts of production. Climate change is expected to affect the NV of grasslands by affecting plant physiological processes, and via effects on species composition. An increase in temperature may cause an increase in NDF and lignin content of forages, thus reducing digestibility by domestic herbivores. On the other hand, under high CO_2, analyses on both temporary and permanent grasslands indicate a strong increase in soluble sugar content, which increases the energetic value and the aptitude for ensiling of grass. Conversely, a decrease of the CP content in grass dry matter up to 30% is observed. The reduction in the forage protein and energy content lowers the rumen microbial synthesis and availability of microbial proteins for ruminant growth and production, and may also lead to increased production of methane (a greenhouse gas) by methanogens in the rumen. Ruminants kept in extensive systems that are based on low protein forages may be sensitive to these negative effects. On the contrary, an increase in soluble sugar and decrease in CP content would rather be positive for ruminants in intensive high protein forage systems. Modelling grassland NV is often based on variables describing the energy and protein content of forage. However, a wide range of variables are used to define forage NV in experimental data, presenting challenges for modellers. Further complication arises from the dissimilar feeding regimes used across the different production systems in countries and regions.

The aim of this work was to review the extent to which current grassland PBMs are capable of characterising the NV of forage species in grassland swards in relation to projected climate change. This includes the identification of the modelling approaches used, the key characteristics of the forages represented and the production systems these models have been developed for.

Results and discussion

This publication is the first step towards gathering and clarifying information about the possibilities of modelling NV. Different methods for simulating the NV of forages were reviewed from literature and a questionnaire survey was sent to MACSUR (Modeling European Agriculture with Climate Change for Food Security) knowledge hub partners in order to obtain information about how NV value was characterised in different models. Here, we briefly review eight PBMs for which information was found (Table 1). In general, most grassland PBMs simulate the nitrogen concentration in the plant material which can be used to evaluate forage CP content, development of cell wall, and its digestibility, but energy value is simulated in only a few models.

PBMs tend to be fairly comprehensive in their consideration of weather variables that are expected to change, but there are still some parts that could be improved. For instance, the effect of (CO_2) on photosynthesis (or radiation use efficiency) is usually taken into account, but the effect on

† E-mail: perttu.virkajarvi@luke.fi

https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040470016000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1 *The main variables used to describe the nutritive value of forages in the studied process-based models*

			Energy variables		Digestibility variables		CP variables	
Models	Reference	Sward type	ME	Other	NDF	Other	[N]	Other
BASGRA	Höglind *et al.* (2016)	Mono	–	–	–	–	Yes	CP
CATIMO	Bonesmo and Bélanger (2002)	Mono	–	–	Yes	IVTD, dNDF	Yes	RNC
IFSM	Rotz *et al.* (2015)	Mixt	Yes	NEL/NEM	Yes	TDN	–	CP
MCPy	Stilmant *et al.* (2001)	Mixt	–	VEM	Yes	–	–	–
PaSim	Graux *et al.* (2011)	Mixt	MEI	NELh	Yes	OMD, dNDF	Yes	–
QUAL	Gustavsson *et al.* (1995)	Mono	Yes	–	–	OMD, IVTD	Yes	CP
SPACSYS	Wu *et al.* (2007)	Mixt	–	–	–	–	Yes	–
STICS	Jégo *et al.* (2013)	Mixt	–	–	Yes	IVTD, dNDF	Yes	CP

ME = metabolisable energy; [N] = nitrogen concentration of forage; Mono = monoculture; IVTD = *in vitro* true digestibility of dry matter; dNDF = *in vitro* digestibility of NDF; RNC = relative nitrogen concentration; Mixt = mixture; TDN = total digestible nutrients, NEL = net energy of lactation; NEM = net energy of maintenance; VEM = available energy for milk production; MEI = metabolisable energy intake; NELh = net energy content of the ingested herbage; OMD = organic matter digestibility.

water use efficiency is not always simulated. In addition, the effect of extreme weather conditions such as frost and heat waves, or air pollutants, are often lacking. At first, the PBMs may seem to have only few variables in describing forage NV, but these particular variables are the most essential ones to consider (OM digestibility, NDF content and digestibility, and CP content), and which are very useful for planning feeding strategy by producers and agricultural consultants. The current uncertainties in relation to PBMs modelling forage NV are related to (1) the simulation of the physiological adaptation of plants to changes in environmental conditions (e.g. plant acclimatory effects, Zaka *et al.*, 2016); (2) the simulation of the formation and senescence of tillers, (3) the simulation of the dynamics of leaf chemical composition including water soluble carbohydrates, (4) the simulation of the response of carbon and nitrogen-allocation to environmental change, (5) the quantification of the relative importance of grazing regime and harvest dates. For parameterisation, these uncertainties relate to (6) the use of information from field and laboratory trials with different genotypes to parameterise for alternative cultivars (e.g. to represent developmental stages of plants) and (7) the need to improve the link between plant and soil models with respect to the effects of soil water and soil nitrogen. A more comprehensive review is still required in order to understand whether current PBMs are capable enough to assess the effects of climate change on NV. There is a strong need for data including frequent time series of forage NV from experiments in which climate change is mimicked.

Acknowledgements

This paper was produced through the international research project FACCE MACSUR – Modelling European Agriculture with Climate Change for Food Security – a FACCE JPI knowledge hub; the work was supported at national level by MMM (Finland), INRA (France), CRA-W (Belgium), BBSRC (UK), AAFC (Canada), The Research Council of Norway (Norway), Swedish Research Council for Environment and SLU (Sweden).

References

Bonesmo H and Bélanger G 2002. Timothy yield and nutritive value by the CATIMO Model: II. Digestibility and fiber. Agronomy Journal 94, 345–350.

Graux AI, Gaurut M, Agabriel J, Baumont R, Delagarde R, Delaby L and Soussana JF 2011. Development of the pasture simulation model for assessing livestock production under climate change. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 144, 69–91.

Gustavsson AM, Angus JF and Torssell BWR 1995. An integrated model for growth and nutritional value of timothy. Agricultural Systems 47, 73–92.

Höglind M, Van Oijen M, Cameron D and Persson T 2016. Process-based simulation of growth and overwintering of grassland using the BASGRA model. Ecological Modelling 335, 1–15.

Jégo G, Bélanger G, Tremblay GF, Jing Q and Baron VS 2013. Calibration and performance evaluation of the STICS crop model for simulating timothy growth and nutritive value. Field Crops Research 151, 65–77.

Rotz CA, Corson MS, Chianese DS, Hafner SD, Jarvis R and Coiner CU 2015. The integrated farm system model – reference manual – version 4.2, September 2015. Retrieved on 2 June 2016 from http://www.ars.usda.gov/sp2UserFiles/Place/19020500/Reference%20Manual.pdf.

Stilmant D, Rabier F, Dufrasne S, Oger R and Buffet D 2001. Prévision des quantités et des qualités des fourrages disponibles: aide à l'établissement d'une stratégie alimentaire à l'échelle de l'exploitation et de la région agricole. Rapport final. Telsat 4. Ministère des Classes moyennes et de l'Agriculture, CRA, Section Biométrie, Gestion des données et Agrométéorologie, Programme de recherche 'Observation de la terre par satellite'. Gembloux, 85pp. (in French).

Wu L, McGechan MB, McRoberts N, Baddeley JA and Watson CA 2007. SPACSYS: integration of a 3D root architecture component to carbon, nitrogen and water cycling-model description. Ecological Modelling 200, 343–359.

Zaka S, Frak E., Julier B, Gastal F and Louarn G 2016. Intraspecific variation in thermal acclimation of photosynthesis across a range of temperatures in a perennial crop. AoB PLANTS 48p. Available at http://aobpla.oxfordjournals.org.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040470016000212 Published online by Cambridge University Press