

Integrated Management of Dual-Purpose Cattle: Nutritional Requirements, Grazing Systems, and Winter Fodder Production

Introduction to the Dual-Purpose Paradigm

The management of a dual-purpose cattle herd represents a highly sophisticated intersection of dairy and beef production sciences. Unlike specialized breeds that have been genetically selected over decades exclusively for either maximum milk yield (such as the Holstein-Friesian) or rapid muscular accretion and fat deposition (such as the Aberdeen Angus), dual-purpose breeds require a meticulously calibrated management strategy that balances competing physiological demands¹. These cattle are expected to deliver substantial lactation yields—often ranging from 7,000 to 11,000 kg of milk per lactation with high butterfat and protein content—while simultaneously maintaining a robust, muscled frame and producing offspring capable of achieving superior daily weight gains¹.

To sustain this dual functionality, herd management cannot rely on the simplified, high-input feeding and grazing protocols tailored for single-trait breeds. Prominent dual-purpose breeds such as the Fleckvieh (German Simmental), the French Normande, the Shorthorn, and even the smaller Dexter exhibit unique metabolic characteristics that make them highly adaptable, yet nutritionally demanding³. The Fleckvieh, for instance, is renowned for holding its body condition significantly better than conventional dairy breeds, making it highly suitable for grass-based and organic dairy systems¹. However, the physiological realities of producing up to 30,000 kg of lifetime milk while maintaining a heavy frame necessitate exacting nutritional precision¹. Furthermore, because dual-purpose herds are frequently integrated into pasture-based systems to leverage the economic efficiencies of grazed forage, the interplay between the animal's nutritional demands, the agronomic realities of rotational grazing, and the biochemical stability of winter fodder conservation becomes the defining factor of operational success⁷. The integration of these elements must account for the metabolic tug-of-war between lactation and tissue accretion, which dictates everything from ration formulation to pasture layout.

Breed	Primary Geographic Adaptation	Expected Milk Yield (kg/lactation)	Carcass Characteristics	Unique Physiological Traits
Fleckvieh	Temperate /	7,000 – 11,000	Excellent muscling;	Superior body condition

(Simmental)	Alpine		57–60% dressing	retention; high cell count resistance; heat tolerant ¹ .
Normande	Temperate / Highland	6,000 – 8,000	Well-marbled, flavorful beef	Exceptionally high butterfat and protein; optimized for cheese yield ³ .
Brown Swiss	Temperate / Subtropical	7,500 – 9,500	Moderate to heavy muscling	High component milk; robust longevity; moderate heat stress tolerance ³ .
Shorthorn	Temperate	5,500 – 7,500	Early maturity; moderate fat	Highly versatile; varying lines lean heavily toward either beef or dairy ³ .
Dexter	Marginal / Low-Input	2,000 – 3,500	Lean, tender beef; high dressing	Extreme feed efficiency on poor forage; dwarfism genetics suitable for smallholdings ³ .

Advanced Nutritional Requirements and Feed Evaluation

Dry Matter Intake (DMI) Dynamics

The foundation of dual-purpose cattle nutrition is the accurate prediction and optimization of dry matter intake (DMI). Dry matter represents the moisture-free fraction of the feed that contains the critical energy, protein, fiber, and mineral nutrients required for maintenance and production¹¹. The physical capacity of the rumen combined with the metabolic feedback

mechanisms of the cow tightly regulates how much forage and concentrate can be consumed daily¹².

A mature dual-purpose cow typically consumes between 3.0% and 3.5% of its body weight in dry matter per day, though this can peak at up to 4.0% during early- to mid-lactation when energy demands are at their zenith¹¹. For a standard 650 kg Fleckvieh cow, the baseline DMI translates to approximately 19.5 to 22.75 kg per day¹³. However, DMI is not static; it is heavily influenced by the physiological state of the animal, the neutral detergent fiber (NDF) content of the diet, and environmental factors such as heat stress. When ambient temperatures exceed 25°C, heat stress triggers a cascade of metabolic adaptations that can suppress DMI by 10% to 35%, simultaneously depressing milk synthesis and exacerbating negative energy balance¹¹.

Cow Body Weight (kg)	Estimated Maintenance Intake (kg DM/day)	Expected Peak Lactation Intake (kg DM/day)
450	13.50	15.75
500	15.00	17.50
550	16.50	19.25
600	18.00	21.00
650	19.50	22.75
700	21.00	24.50
750	22.50	26.25

The data above illustrates the linear relationship between body mass and volumetric intake capacity, though late gestation severely compresses rumen volume due to fetal expansion, reducing DMI capacity to as low as 2.0% of body weight immediately pre-calving¹².

Energy Partitioning and the GfE 2023 Framework

To fulfill the energy demands associated with the calculated DMI, nutritionists rely on complex energy evaluation models. In 2023, the German Society of Nutrition Physiology (GfE) modernized its feed evaluation standards, officially transitioning away from the legacy Net Energy for Lactation (NEL) system to a unified system based on Metabolizable Energy (ME)¹⁶. This paradigm shift is particularly critical for dual-purpose operations, as ME allows for a seamless, comparable evaluation of feedstuffs across diverse physiological states—from a lactating cow to a growing finishing bull—without the mathematical distortions inherent in

assuming constant NEL conversion efficiencies¹⁶.

Under the ME framework, maintenance energy (ME_m) is calculated relative to metabolic body weight, typically expressed mathematically as $0.515 \text{ MJ} \times \text{BW}^{0.75}$ ¹⁸. For a 650 kg cow, this equates to a daily baseline maintenance requirement of approximately 66.5 MJ ME, to which a standard 10 MJ activity allowance is frequently added¹³. Lactation imposes a profound additional burden, demanding roughly 5.15 to 5.3 MJ ME per kilogram of energy-corrected milk (ECM), though this requirement scales upward for high-component breeds like the Normande or Jersey, which may require up to 6.5 MJ ME per liter of high-fat milk¹³. Pregnancy further elevates energy demands, requiring an additional 11 MJ/day in the seventh month, escalating to 34 MJ/day in the final month of gestation to support rapid fetal hypertrophy¹⁸. When managing body condition, the metabolic cost of synthesizing body tissue is high; dual-purpose cattle require approximately 32 to 34 MJ of ME to accrete one kilogram of body weight, but they only yield 28 MJ of ME when mobilizing that same kilogram of adipose tissue during energetic shortfalls¹⁴.

To account for the realities of high-producing animals, the GfE 2023 system applies dynamic correction equations to expected ME intake¹⁶. As DMI increases to meet lactation demands, the rate of passage through the reticulo-rumen accelerates. This rapid transit limits the exposure time of feed particles to microbial enzymatic degradation, marginally depressing overall organic matter digestibility (OMD)¹⁸. The corrected ME intake adjusts theoretical energy availability downward based on the crude protein (CP) concentration of the diet and the sheer volume of DMI, ensuring that rations are not dangerously overvalued in high-intake scenarios¹⁸.

Protein Evaluation: From nXP to sidP and RMD

Protein rationing for dual-purpose cattle has undergone a similar conceptual evolution to minimize environmental nitrogen excretion while preventing subclinical amino acid deficiencies. Historically, models utilizing crude protein percentages or utilizable crude protein at the duodenum (nXP) struggled with accuracy because they often conflated non-protein nitrogen with true absorbable amino acids¹⁶. The modern framework has been superseded by the measurement of small intestinal digestible protein (sidP) and the microbial nitrogen balance in the rumen (RMD)¹⁶.

By defining protein requirements strictly through the sum of small intestinal digestible amino acids (sidAA), the GfE 2023 system eliminates overestimation errors¹⁶. In practical application, a lactating dual-purpose cow requires a precisely balanced supply of rumen-degradable protein (RDP) to sustain optimal microbial fermentation, and undegradable dietary protein (UDP)—often termed bypass protein—to meet high systemic amino acid demands at the tissue level¹⁴. A baseline ration for a milking herd should maintain a crude protein concentration of 16% to 17% on a dry matter basis¹³. Dipping below 16% risks a severe deficiency in essential amino acids like methionine, which compromises milk solid synthesis, immunity, and hepatic lipid export¹³.

Conversely, overfeeding protein (exceeding 18% CP) is metabolically expensive and environmentally detrimental¹³. Maintaining an optimal RMD near zero ensures that ruminal

bacteria possess sufficient nitrogen to ferment structural carbohydrates effectively without generating excessive ammonia¹⁸. Surplus ruminal ammonia is absorbed across the rumen wall, converted to urea in the liver, and excreted, which manifests as elevated milk urea nitrogen (MUN) levels. High circulating urea significantly degrades reproductive fertility by altering the pH of the uterine environment, a catastrophic outcome for dual-purpose herds attempting to maintain a strict 390-day calving interval¹.

Negative Energy Balance (NEB) and Transition Metabolism

Despite sophisticated ration formulation, dual-purpose cows frequently encounter a severe Negative Energy Balance (NEB) during the transition period (three weeks pre-calving to three weeks post-calving) and early lactation²². Because the volumetric capacity of the rumen limits DMI immediately post-calving—compounded by the endocrine shifts of parturition—the sheer caloric energy required for peak milk production vastly outstrips dietary energy absorption¹¹. During NEB, the cow enters a physiological state of homeorhesis, genetically prioritizing milk synthesis by mobilizing substantial adipose and muscle reserves²⁶. Lipidomic profiling of milk from cows in severe NEB reveals profound systemic metabolic shifts²³. Elevated concentrations of non-esterified fatty acids (NEFAs) resulting from adipose lipolysis are taken up by the mammary gland and incorporated directly into milk fat²³. This results in a higher proportion of long-chain preformed fatty acids and a sharp decline in short- and medium-chain de novo fatty acids (C4:0–C16:0) which are normally synthesized within the mammary epithelium²³. Consequently, comprehensive lipidomic profiling identifies specific polar lipids, such as Phosphatidylethanolamine (PE 33:1) and Lactosylceramide (LacCer 32:1), as highly accurate biomarkers of severe energy deficits in the lactating herd²³.

Furthermore, NEB induces intense cellular stress. Advanced metabolomic and transcriptomic analyses indicate increased leakage of cellular contents into the milk, characterized by elevated concentrations of phosphocholine, UDP-N-acetyl-glucosamine, and metabolites related to cellular apoptosis²². This state of elevated circulating NEFAs and beta-hydroxybutyrate (BHBA) can overwhelm the liver's oxidative capacity, inducing endoplasmic reticulum (ER) stress, precipitating fatty liver disease, and causing subclinical ketosis¹⁰. Moreover, high intrafollicular concentrations of saturated NEFAs exert direct toxic effects on the developing oocyte, suppressing developmental competence, blastocyst formation, and long-term embryo viability²⁵.

Because dual-purpose breeds like the Fleckvieh carry significant body condition, the rate of fat mobilization can be extreme if not managed correctly⁸. Therefore, the dry period—ideally truncated to 40 to 60 days—must be meticulously managed utilizing a two-phase nutritional approach: a "far-off" diet with higher structural fiber, transitioning to a "close-up" diet with carefully escalated energy density (targeting approximately 0.70 to 0.74 Mcal NEL/lb or equivalent ME) during the final three weeks of gestation²⁴. This prepares the ruminal papillae for the highly fermentable lactation ration and mitigates the depth of the postpartum energy nadir²⁴.

Beef Finishing Nutrition and Rumen Health

While the dairy cohort of the herd focuses on lactation persistence and component yield, the beef-producing cohort—comprising growing heifers and finishing bulls—demands a distinct nutritional approach aimed at maximizing tissue accretion. In dual-purpose breeds, finishing bulls can achieve average daily weight gains (ADWG) exceeding 1.3 kg/day when supplied with high-energy rations¹.

Animal Weight (kg)	Estimated DMI (kg/day)	NEm Required (Mcal/day)	NEg Required for 1.36 kg ADG (Mcal/day)	Total Energy (Mcal/day)
181 (400 lb)	4.5 – 5.5	3.69	4.07	7.76
272 (600 lb)	6.5 – 7.5	5.00	5.52	10.52
363 (800 lb)	8.0 – 9.0	6.21	6.85	13.06
454 (1000 lb)	9.5 – 11.0	7.34	8.09	15.43
544 (1200 lb)	11.0 – 12.5	8.42	9.28	17.70
635 (1400 lb)	12.5 – 14.0	9.45	N/A (Approaching mature weight)	9.45+

Note: Data derived from standardized Net Energy for Maintenance (NE_m) and Net Energy for Gain (NE_g) requirements²⁹.

Mitigating Subacute Ruminal Acidosis (SARA)

To achieve these rapid weight gains, finishing diets are formulated with high concentrate-to-forage ratios, often exceeding 85% concentrate on a dry matter basis³⁰. However, aggressive supplementation with rapidly fermentable carbohydrates introduces the severe risk of Subacute Ruminal Acidosis (SARA)³¹. SARA is clinically defined as a state where the ruminal pH remains depressed below 5.8 for more than 5.24 hours per day, without dipping below the acute acidosis threshold of 5.5³².

The pathology of SARA is insidious. Prolonged exposure to high concentrations of volatile fatty acids (VFAs) and lactic acid damages the ruminal epithelium, resulting in hyperkeratosis, parakeratosis, and the shedding of mucosal tissues³⁰. This acidic environment suppresses the growth of cellulolytic bacteria, severely depressing fiber digestion³². Clinically, SARA manifests

through intermittent diarrhea, reduced feed efficiency, and a heightened risk of laminitis and liver abscesses, which result from pathogens crossing the compromised ruminal barrier into the portal blood circulation³⁰.

A critical diagnostic indicator of SARA is the physical composition of the feces. In a healthy rumen, feed particles must be degraded to a size of 1.5 to 2.0 mm before they can pass through the reticulo-omasal orifice³⁴. During SARA episodes, the fractional outflow rate of the rumen increases abnormally, causing a significant proportion of large, undigested feed particles to escape³⁴. Fecal analysis revealing that more than 4% of the fecal dry matter consists of particles larger than 4 mm (and up to 20% larger than 8 mm) is a strong diagnostic indicator of ruminal dysfunction³⁴.

The Role of Physically Effective Fiber (peNDF)

To combat SARA while maintaining high energy intakes, rations must contain mathematically precise quantities of physically effective neutral detergent fiber (peNDF). The peNDF fraction represents the fibrous material that is long and rigid enough to stimulate stretch receptors in the reticulo-rumen, thereby promoting regurgitation, rumination, and the copious production of bicarbonate-rich saliva, which acts as an endogenous buffer against fermentation acids¹². Extensive feedlot trials demonstrate that modifying the peNDF proportion profoundly impacts animal behavior and ruminal pH³¹. Research evaluating high-concentrate diets (85% concentrate, 15% straw) with varying peNDF levels (ranging from 6.4% to 15.4%) indicates that an optimal peNDF inclusion rate resides near 10.4%³¹. At this threshold, cattle allocate adequate time to rumination, effectively buffering the rumen and reducing the duration that pH drops below 5.8, without suffering the severe depressions in dry matter intake associated with excessive gut fill at higher fiber levels³¹. Maintaining proper forage particle

distribution—specifically ensuring adequate intake of particles > 4 mm while avoiding the excessive sorting behavior seen in diets with excessively long fiber—is paramount for maintaining ruminal homeostasis³¹.

Dietary Modulations of Carcass Quality and Lipid Profiles

The finishing phase also dictates the ultimate technological and sensory quality of the beef carcass. Intramuscular fat (IMF), which determines marbling scores, significantly influences the flavor and juiciness of the meat³⁶. However, carcass quality is defined not just by total lipid deposition, but by the complex ratio of saturated fatty acids (SFA), monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA), and polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA)³⁶.

Increasing the dietary energy density via grain concentrates accelerates total weight gain and reliably increases IMF accumulation³⁶. However, heavy concentrate feeding induces a well-documented "dilution effect." While high-starch diets drive de novo lipogenesis and substantially increase the accumulation of triacylglycerols (the primary component of visible marbling), they simultaneously dilute the relative concentration of the phospholipid fraction within the muscle³⁶. Because the phospholipid fraction contains the highest proportion of desirable, health-promoting PUFAs, aggressive grain finishing can inadvertently degrade the nutritional lipid profile of the meat³⁶. Therefore, optimal finishing strategies for dual-purpose

bulls often utilize a semi-intensive approach, incorporating high-quality conserved forages (such as maize or clover-rich grass silage) balanced with moderate concentrate allocations³⁶. This balances superior carcass conformation scores and adequate marbling while preserving a favorable fatty acid composition³⁶.

Mineral Metabolism, Antagonisms, and Toxicities

Dual-purpose cattle managed in pasture-centric systems are continuously exposed to complex trace mineral antagonisms that can subvert otherwise adequate nutritional planning. Soil geochemistry dictates the elemental composition of the sward, and specific mineral interactions within the anaerobic environment of the rumen can render essential nutrients biologically unavailable⁴¹.

The Copper-Molybdenum-Sulfur Triad

The most economically significant antagonism in ruminant nutrition occurs between copper (Cu), molybdenum (Mo), and sulfur (S)⁴³. In the rumen, microbial populations reduce dietary sulfates and sulfur-containing amino acids into sulfides⁴⁴. These sulfides react rapidly with molybdenum to form complex molecules known as thiomolybdates (ranging from mono- to tetrathiomolybdates)⁴⁴. Thiomolybdates possess an extraordinary affinity for copper, binding it tightly into insoluble complexes within the ruminal digesta⁴⁴. These complexes cannot be dismantled by the acidic environment of the abomasum, effectively rendering the dietary copper completely unabsorbable⁴⁴. Furthermore, certain absorbable thiomolybdate species can enter the bloodstream, stripping bound copper from systemic transport proteins like plasma albumin, thereby inducing a severe systemic deficiency⁴⁴.

Even if forage analysis indicates adequate baseline copper concentrations, the presence of high soil sulfur (frequently derived from high-sulfate water sources or heavy fertilizer application) combined with alkaline soils rich in molybdenum will precipitate a secondary copper deficiency⁴¹. Clinical symptoms include achromotrichia (a fading or rusting of the hair coat, particularly noticeable as a reddish tinge in dark cattle), spontaneous bone fractures, profound suppression of neutrophil activity and antibody production, and severe reproductive failure, including delayed uterine involution and early embryonic death⁴¹. If the molybdenum content of the dry matter exceeds 2.5 ppm, or if dietary sulfur surpasses 0.3%, supplemental bioavailable copper must be carefully administered, taking strict precautions to avoid crossing the narrow threshold into heavy metal toxicity⁴².

Hypomagnesemia (Grass Tetany)

Another critical metabolic risk for pastured cattle is hypomagnesemia, colloquially termed grass tetany. This neurological and muscular condition typically manifests in the spring when cattle are turned out onto lush, rapidly growing swards⁴⁶. Unlike other macrominerals, magnesium is poorly mobilized from skeletal reserves, meaning the animal is entirely dependent on continuous daily dietary absorption⁴⁶.

The etiology of grass tetany is driven by competitive inhibition at the ruminal epithelium. Spring forages frequently exhibit elevated potassium (K) and nitrogen concentrations, combined with depressed sodium (Na) levels⁴⁸. The influx of excessive potassium alters the electrochemical

gradient across the ruminal wall, severely depolarizing the apical membrane and depressing the active transport of magnesium into the bloodstream⁴⁸.

The risk of pasture inducing grass tetany is quantitatively modeled using the "tetany ratio," an index calculated based on the milliequivalents (mEq) of potassium, calcium, and magnesium per kilogram of dry matter:

$$\text{Tetany Ratio} = \frac{\text{K}^+}{(\text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{Mg}^{2+})}$$

When this ratio exceeds 2.2 mEq/kg DM, the incidence of clinical hypomagnesemia escalates exponentially⁴⁶.

Mineral Status Parameter	Mechanism of Action	Risk Threshold for Tetany
High Potassium (K)	Depolarizes ruminal epithelium; inhibits active Mg transport	High concentrations in lush spring grass ⁴⁶ .
Low Sodium (Na)	Alters ruminal Na:K ratio; decreases Mg solubility	Exacerbates K antagonism ⁴⁶ .
Tetany Ratio Index	Combines competitive cation interactions	> ⁴⁶ .

Preventative protocols necessitate the provision of high-magnesium mineral supplements containing at least 15% to 20% magnesium oxide, initiated two to three weeks prior to spring turnout⁴⁶. Furthermore, free-choice sodium chloride (salt) supplementation is highly effective, as the influx of dietary sodium actively counteracts the antagonistic effects of excessive potassium, restoring the electrochemical balance necessary for optimal magnesium absorption⁴⁶.

Agronomy and Rotational Grazing Protocols

Intensive rotational grazing is the cornerstone of sustainable, high-output pasture-based production. By systematically dividing the continuous grazing platform into discrete paddocks and moving the herd at calculated intervals, producers can intercept grasses at their nutritional peak, drastically improve total forage utilization, and extend the grazing season while promoting deep root development and soil carbon sequestration⁵³.

Feed Budgeting and Paddock Sizing

The geometry and size of rotational paddocks must be dynamically adjusted to balance the

herd's daily dry matter demand with the real-time vegetative growth rate⁵³. Overgrazing continuously depletes the plant's root carbohydrate reserves, leading to sward degradation, whereas undergrazing allows grasses to transition from the vegetative to the reproductive phase, causing structural lignification and a severe collapse in digestibility and metabolizable energy⁵³.

The mathematical framework for paddock allocation relies on calculating total herd demand via Animal Units (AU) and matching it against grazable dry matter yield⁵⁶.

1. **Define Animal Units (AU):** A standard AU represents the forage demand of a 1,000 lb (454 kg) dry cow, equating to roughly 25 lbs (11.3 kg) of dry matter per day⁵⁶. A lactating 1,300 lb (590 kg) dual-purpose cow represents approximately 1.5 to 1.6 AU⁵⁶. A herd of 40 lactating cows equals approximately 64 AU, demanding 1,600 lbs (725 kg) of dry matter daily⁵⁶.
2. **Determine Available Forage:** Establish the target pre-grazing cover (e.g., 2,900 kg DM/ha) and deduct the target post-grazing residual (e.g., 1,500 kg DM/ha, equivalent to a 4 cm sward height)⁵⁵. Leaving an adequate residual is non-negotiable; it protects the apical meristem and retains sufficient photosynthetic leaf area to fuel rapid regrowth⁵³. The difference yields the grazable dry matter per hectare⁵⁸.
3. **Incorporate Utilization Efficiency:** Cattle will inevitably trample, foul, or selectively ignore portions of the sward⁵⁷. Continuous grazing achieves poor utilization rates (25% to 40%), whereas high-density rotational grazing can push utilization efficiencies to 50% or 60% without depressing animal performance⁵⁷.
4. **Calculate Area:** The total required DM divided by the grazable DM per hectare dictates the physical acreage required for the specified occupation period (typically 24 to 36 hours for dairy stock to minimize inter-animal competition and prevent grazing of immediate regrowth)⁵⁵.

Grazing System Type	Typical Harvest Efficiency / Utilization Rate	Relative Impact on Sward Persistence
Continuous Grazing	25% – 35%	High risk of selective overgrazing and weed encroachment ⁵⁷ .
Simple Rotational	40% – 50%	Moderate control; improved carbohydrate recovery ⁵³ .
Intensive Strip / Mob	50% – 70%	Maximum harvest efficiency; precise residual management ¹⁵ .

Rest intervals are entirely dictated by the seasonal growth rate of the forage⁵³. During the rapid

growth flush of spring, paddocks may fully recover in 15 to 20 days. Conversely, during the mid-summer slump, the rotation must be decelerated, extending rest periods to 30 to 45 days⁵³.

Multispecies Swards and Climate Resilience

To buffer against increasing climatic volatility, progressive rotational systems are moving away from vulnerable monocultures toward complex multispecies swards (MSS)⁶⁰. On lighter, sandy soils (such as those found in the Brandenburg region) that are highly susceptible to summer desiccation, traditional shallow-rooted species like perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*) rapidly suffer yield penalties⁶¹. The incorporation of orchardgrass/cockfoot (*Dactylis glomerata*) significantly improves drought tolerance and sward density on these challenging substrates⁶¹. More importantly, the integration of deep-rooting non-leguminous herbs, specifically ribwort plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*) and chicory (*Cichorium intybus*), offers profound agronomic and physiological advantages⁶⁰. These tap-rooted species access subsoil moisture and mobilize deep-profile minerals that remain unavailable to shallow grasses, ensuring sustained biomass production during prolonged mid-summer droughts⁶⁰. Furthermore, their seasonal growth curves are often asynchronous with perennial ryegrass, effectively bridging seasonal forage deficits⁶⁵. Beyond physical yield stability, these bioactive forages contain high concentrations of secondary plant metabolites, such as condensed tannins and iridoid glycosides⁶⁶. These compounds complex with plant proteins in the rumen, increasing the flow of bypass protein to the small intestine and concurrently exhibiting mild anthelmintic properties that disrupt parasite life cycles⁶⁶.

Water Infrastructure Hydraulics

A ubiquitous limiting factor in the successful execution of intensive rotational grazing is the provision of adequate, high-quality drinking water to every subdivided paddock⁶⁷. A mature lactating cow consumes 10 to 15 liters of water per 100 kg of body weight daily, a volume that escalates sharply under heat stress or peak milk production⁶⁸. A small herd of 40 dual-purpose cows easily demands upwards of 3,000 to 4,000 liters per day²¹.

Water infrastructure design must critically account for peak demand behaviors. In intensive rotational systems, cattle display pronounced herd instinct, frequently migrating to the water source simultaneously immediately following a pasture move or milking event⁶⁹. If the flow rate is insufficient, dominant animals will monopolize and drain the trough, leaving subordinate animals dehydrated, which cascades into depressed dry matter intake and immediately reduced milk synthesis⁶⁸.

To engineer out this bottleneck, mobile troughs must possess high volumetric capacities—a minimum of 300 gallons (approx. 1,135 liters) for a standard herd—serving as a physical buffer against sluggish well recharge rates⁶⁷. The pipeline reticulation network connecting the paddocks must utilize appropriately sized high-density polyethylene (HDPE) piping to minimize friction losses over long distances⁷⁰. For example, upgrading from a 20 mm pipe to a 25 mm pipe effectively doubles the flow capacity at the trough⁷¹. Installing robust, quick-coupler valves at 150-meter intervals allows producers to rapidly relocate portable troughs alongside

temporary electric fencing, adhering to the behavioral axiom that cattle should never be forced to walk more than 250 meters for water⁶⁷.

Soil Physics: Treading Damage, Pugging, and Carbon Flux

While intensive grazing optimizes above-ground forage harvest, it exposes the soil profile to severe mechanical stress, particularly during wet shoulder seasons. The concentrated, high-pressure treading of heavy cattle causes "pugging"—the plastic deformation, remolding, and compaction of saturated topsoil⁷².

Pugging inflicts immediate agronomic and severe environmental degradation. The mechanical destruction of soil macropores severely curtails oxygen diffusion into the soil matrix⁷². This induced anaerobic state triggers rapid microbial denitrification, exponentially increasing the emission of nitrous oxide (N₂O)—a potent greenhouse gas—by factors ranging from 1.3 to 42 times compared to uncompacted control soils⁷². Furthermore, the loss of infiltration capacity drastically increases surface runoff, leading to the mobilization and irreversible loss of particulate phosphorus (PP) and suspended sediments into adjacent aquatic ecosystems⁷⁴. From an ecosystem perspective, pugging inflicts acute physiological stress on the recovering pasture, severely suppressing Net Ecosystem Production (NEP)⁷⁴. Eddy covariance studies tracking carbon fluxes over grazed paddocks demonstrate that severe pugging events result in massive cumulative carbon losses ranging from 11 to 35 g C/m² over the recovery period, effectively transforming the paddock from a beneficial carbon sink into a net carbon source⁷⁴. Management must proactively adapt by pulling cattle off vulnerable clay or loam soils during high rainfall events, utilizing designated sacrifice paddocks, or shifting entirely to indoor winter feeding protocols⁵⁹.

Parasite Epidemiology and Targeted Selective Treatment (TST)

Pastured cattle exist in a state of continuous exposure to gastrointestinal nematodes (GINs). The most economically devastating of these parasites in temperate climates is the brown stomach worm, *Ostertagia ostertagi*, followed closely by the intestinal worm *Cooperia oncophora*⁴⁷.

The Pathogenesis of *Ostertagia ostertagi*

Ostertagia ostertagi specifically targets the abomasum, physically destroying the acid-secreting gastric glands. This destruction halts hydrochloric acid production, raising the abomasal pH and preventing the activation of pepsinogen into pepsin, thereby collapsing protein digestion⁴⁷. The resulting protein-losing enteropathy leads to severe, profuse diarrhea, rapid dehydration, and massive weight loss⁴⁷.

The parasite's life cycle is direct: adult females in the abomasum shed eggs in the feces, which hatch and develop through successive larval stages into infective third-stage larvae (L3) that migrate out of the fecal pat and onto the grass canopy, where they are ingested by grazing cattle⁴⁷. First-season grazing calves are highly susceptible to acute Type I ostertagiosis in mid-summer⁴⁷. However, the parasite has evolved a remarkable survival mechanism known as hypobiosis. Larvae ingested during the cooling conditions of late autumn arrest their

development at the L4 stage, remaining dormant within the abomasal glands throughout the winter⁴⁷. Their synchronous mass emergence the following spring causes Type II ostertagiosis, characterized by acute, explosive clinical signs and a high mortality rate even in mature animals⁴⁷.

Targeted Selective Treatment (TST) and Refugia

Historically, parasite control relied on blanket, prophylactic administration of broad-spectrum anthelmintics (such as macrocyclic lactones like ivermectin or moxidectin, and benzimidazoles). However, the ubiquitous, repeated dosing of entire herds has precipitated a global crisis of widespread anthelmintic resistance⁷⁷.

To combat resistance, modern rotational systems must transition to Targeted Selective Treatment (TST) protocols. The foundational premise of TST is the preservation of "refugia"—maintaining a sub-population of susceptible, unexposed parasites on the pasture or inside untreated animals to dilute the genetic pool of resistant worms⁷⁶. Under TST, blanket herd treatments are abandoned; instead, only individual animals exhibiting clinical or defined subclinical parasite burdens are dosed⁷⁷.

The success of TST hinges on accurate, practical decision-making thresholds. For growing cattle, frequent monitoring of average daily weight gains (ADWG) is a highly sensitive metric; mathematical models and field trials indicate that selectively drenching animals that fall below an ADWG threshold of 683 g/day provides the optimal balance of maintaining high herd performance while dramatically reducing anthelmintic usage by up to 95%⁸⁰.

For the mature milking herd, epidemiological surveillance is conducted via the *Ostertagia ostertagi* antibody ELISA (frequently referred to as the MOO test)⁸⁰. By quantifying the optical density ratio (ODR) of parasite-specific antibodies in bulk tank milk or pooled serum, veterinarians can map exposure levels and dictate targeted herd-level interventions only when critical pathogenic thresholds are breached⁸¹. Rotational grazing inherently aids in control if paddocks are spelled long enough for larvae to desiccate and die, though producers must be aware that in temperate climates, L3 larvae can survive for months within the microclimate of the fecal pat⁶⁶. Co-grazing cattle with non-susceptible species, such as sheep or horses, acts as a biological vacuum, further reducing the density of infective cattle larvae on the sward⁶⁶.

Winter Fodder Production, Conservation, and Toxicology

In temperate agricultural zones, the pasture grazing season is invariably interrupted by winter dormancy, necessitating the strategic production, conservation, and feeding of stored forages. The economic viability and metabolic health of a dual-purpose herd through the winter relies heavily on the biochemical quality of ensiled forages.

Catch Crops and Feed Budgeting

To determine total winter feed requirements, producers must calculate an aggregate feed budget. A dry dual-purpose cow requires 9 to 10 kg DM/day, while a lactating cow may require upwards of 20 to 22 kg DM/day depending on yield⁴⁶. The total budget multiplies the daily herd demand by the projected number of housing days, incorporating a mandatory 15% to 20%

buffer to account for unavoidable feed waste, trampling, and aerobic spoilage at the bunker face⁵⁵.

To maximize forage inventories and protect soils during winter, producers often utilize specialized catch crops. A prominent, highly effective example is the *Landsberger Gemenge*, an overwintering polyculture comprising Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*), crimson clover (*Trifolium incarnatum*), and winter vetch (*Vicia villosa*)⁸⁷. Sown in late summer following a cereal harvest, this mixture rapidly establishes a dense canopy, fixes atmospheric nitrogen, suppresses weeds, and yields highly digestible, protein-dense biomass for an early spring cut before the primary permanent pasture rotation commences⁸⁷.

The Biochemistry of Ensiling and Clostridial Spoilage

Silage preservation is governed by the rapid, anaerobic fermentation of water-soluble plant carbohydrates into lactic acid by epiphytic lactic acid bacteria (LAB)⁹⁰. The overarching objective of the ensiling process is a precipitous, uninterrupted drop in pH, which immediately inhibits the proliferation of destructive spoilage organisms and enterobacteria⁹⁰.

The German Agricultural Society (DLG) provides strict, point-based orientation values for evaluating silage quality. For grass silage harvested at an optimal dry matter content of 35% to 40%, the pH must rapidly fall to between 4.0 and 4.2⁹¹. A flawless fermentation profile is dominated by high lactic acid production (ideal targets > 50 g/kg DM) with moderate, controlled levels of acetic and propionic acids (20–30 g/kg DM), which contribute beneficially to the aerobic stability of the face⁹¹.

Fermentation Parameter	Optimal Target Concentration	Indicator of Spoilage / Poor Quality
pH (at 35-40% DM)	4.0 – 4.5	> (indicates incomplete fermentation) ⁹¹ .
Lactic Acid	>	Low levels indicate insufficient sugar or too dry ⁹¹ .
Acetic Acid	20–30 g/kg DM.	High levels indicate excessive heterofermentative activity ⁹¹ .
Butyric Acid	<	Strong indicator of clostridial activity and putrefaction ⁹¹ .

Ammonia-N (% of Total N)	<	Elevated levels indicate severe protein degradation ⁹² .
--------------------------	---	---

Failure to achieve a rapid pH drop—often caused by ensiling overly wet forage, failing to compact the bunker adequately, or introducing soil contamination (high ash content)—creates an environment where opportunistic clostridia dominate the microbial ecology⁹³. The most deleterious of these pathogens is *Clostridium tyrobutyricum*⁹⁵. These obligate anaerobes ferment both residual plant sugars and the protective lactic acid into butyric acid, generating massive quantities of carbon dioxide and hydrogen gas in the process⁹⁰.

A butyric acid concentration exceeding 3.0 g/kg DM is highly toxic, characterized by a rancid, putrid odor resembling rotting matter⁹². Feeding clostridial silage drastically depresses DMI, strips the diet of energy, and induces severe metabolic disturbances. However, it poses an even graver, systemic threat to the dairy enterprise: *C. tyrobutyricum* spores are highly resilient, surviving passage through the bovine digestive tract and contaminating the milk via microscopic fecal transfer during milking⁹⁵. In hard and semi-hard cheese production, these spores germinate during the prolonged ripening phase, producing butyric acid and gas that cause "late blowing" defects, physically rupturing the cheese wheels and rendering the entire batch unmarketable⁹⁵.

Aerobic Stability and Inoculation Protocols

Even if a silage bunker undergoes a perfect initial fermentation driven by homofermentative LAB, the resulting silage is frequently highly susceptible to rapid aerobic spoilage during the feed-out phase. When the silo face is opened and exposed to atmospheric oxygen, dormant, acid-tolerant yeast populations awaken, aggressively metabolizing the lactic acid into carbon dioxide and water⁹⁰. This consumes the preservative acid, causes the local pH to spike, and initiates rapid heating (*nacherwärmung*), paving the way for mold growth and mycotoxin production⁹⁰. The resulting energy and dry matter losses are staggering, often reaching up to 4.5% DM loss per day in the affected zones⁹⁰.

To combat this vulnerability, producers increasingly treat forage at harvest with specialized heterofermentative biological inoculants, most notably *Lactobacillus buchneri*⁹⁰. Unlike homofermentative strains that efficiently produce solely lactic acid, *L. buchneri* possesses a unique metabolic pathway capable of anaerobically degrading lactic acid into acetic acid and 1,2-propanediol⁹⁹. The resulting elevated acetic acid concentration acts as a potent, volatile antimycotic agent, aggressively suppressing yeast and mold proliferation and dramatically extending the aerobic stability of the silage at the bunker face⁹⁹.

Toxicological Risks in Winter Grazing

If late-season grazing is utilized to stretch the forage budget and defer winter housing costs (e.g., grazing standing brassicas, cereal crop residues, or heavily fertilized autumn swards), herd managers must vigilantly monitor for nitrate toxicity⁸⁴.

When plant growth slows precipitously due to cold temperatures, frost, or drought, the metabolic reduction of nitrates into plant proteins ceases, yet the roots continue to uptake

nitrogen from the soil. This causes nitrates to accumulate to dangerous levels within the plant tissues, particularly in the lower stems¹⁰¹. When ruminants ingest this forage, the nitrates are rapidly reduced to nitrites in the rumen. If the influx is massive, the nitrites are absorbed into the bloodstream where they aggressively oxidize hemoglobin into methemoglobin¹⁰¹. Methemoglobin is incapable of binding oxygen, leading to rapid tissue hypoxia, chocolate-brown blood, tremors, and fatal asphyxiation¹⁰¹.

Nitrate-Nitrogen (NO ₃ -N) Concentration (ppm DM)	Toxicity Risk Level	Feeding Recommendation
0 – 1,500 ppm	Safe	Generally safe to feed without restriction ¹⁰⁰ .
1,500 – 5,000 ppm	Caution	Limit to half (50%) of the total dry matter intake; dilute with safe hay ¹⁰⁰ .
5,000 – 9,000 ppm	Danger	Limit to one-third (33%) of the total ration; extreme caution required ¹⁰² .
> 9,000 ppm	Toxic / Lethal	Do not feed; extreme risk of acute mortality ¹⁰² .

Enteric Methane Mitigation

Finally, modern intensive dual-purpose systems must account for their environmental footprint, specifically the production of enteric methane (CH_4). Enteric emissions result from the natural anaerobic fermentation of structural carbohydrates (fiber) in the rumen, where

methanogenic archaea utilize hydrogen gas (H_2) to reduce carbon dioxide, forming methane which is predominantly eructated¹⁰³.

This process represents a significant loss of dietary energy and accounts for roughly 70% of total agricultural greenhouse gas emissions¹⁰³. Current metabolic modeling indicates that

dual-purpose cattle emit approximately 18.53 grams of CH_4 per kilogram of dry matter intake, equating to methane yields of roughly 1.03 to 1.12 MJ per kg of DM¹⁰⁴. Improving the overall digestibility of the diet, incorporating high-sugar grasses, utilizing targeted feed additives, and optimizing the calving interval to increase the lifetime milk and meat yield per unit of methane generated are all necessary strategies to meet tightening global greenhouse gas reduction targets¹⁰³.

Conclusion

The successful, profitable management of a dual-purpose cattle herd transcends the basic principles of animal husbandry, requiring a highly integrated, systems-level approach that harmonizes competing biological imperatives. Nutritionally, the adoption of modern evaluation systems like the GfE 2023 allows for precise ME and sidP calculations, safeguarding high-producing cows against the severe metabolic and reproductive consequences of Negative Energy Balance in early lactation, while providing exactly enough peNDF to prevent acidotic collapse in high-growth finishing stock. Agronomically, the execution of dynamic rotational grazing—bolstered by drought-resistant multispecies swards, robust hydraulic infrastructure, and algorithmic Targeted Selective Treatment (TST) for parasite control—protects fragile soil ecosystems from pugging degradation and maximizes forage harvest efficiency. Finally, the meticulous conservation of winter fodder, driven by a deep understanding of anaerobic fermentation biochemistry, prevents clostridial contamination of the dairy supply chain and ensures the herd maintains peak health and productivity year-round.

Works cited

1. BRS - Fleckvieh - Bundesverband Rind und Schwein, <https://www.rind-schwein.de/brs-cattle/fleckvieh-en.html>
2. Performance, carcass traits and meat quality of Aberdeen Angus, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325958797_Performance_carcass_traits_and_meat_quality_of_Aberdeen_Angus_Gascon_Holstein_and_Fleckvieh_finishing_bulls
3. Dual purpose or breeds with no purpose? | Dellait, <https://dellait.com/dual-purpose-or-breeds-with-no-purpose/>
4. Performance of Red Holstein-Friesian X Fleckvieh crosses in Bavaria., <https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.5555/19750113762>
5. Fleckvieh, shorthorn Or Normande | CattleToday.com, <https://www.cattletoday.com/threads/fleckvieh-shorthorn-or-normande.117301/>
6. Dual Purpose Simmental-Fleckvieh conquers the World - WSFF, https://www.wsff.info/files/congress_08_uk/dual_purpose_in_europe.pdf
7. Impact of cow strain and concentrate supplementation on grazing, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/animal/article/impact-of-cow-strain-and-concentrate-supplementation-on-grazing-behaviour-milk-yield-and-metabolic-state-of-dairy-cows-in-an-organic-pasturebased-feeding-system/252B4FFE7E5C1D4185DCBD8B89632527>
8. A comparison of different dairy cow breeds on a seasonal grass, <https://research.ucc.ie/en/publications/a-comparison-of-different-dairy-cow-breeds-on-a-seasonal-grass-ba-3/>
9. Comparative Study on Milk Production, Milk Components, Feed, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391868199_Comparative_Study_on_Milk_Production_Milk_Components_Feed_Intake_and_Efficiency_Parameters_of_Fleckvieh_German_Simmental_Brown_Swiss_and_Fleckvieh_Red_Holstein_Dairy_Cows
10. Analysis of lactating cows in commercial Austrian dairy farms, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1828051X.2019.1569485>

11. ESTIMATING DRY MATTER INTAKE FOR VARIOUS BREEDS/AGE,
<https://e-dairytrainingmodules.africa/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/2021201-T3L1-Estimating-DM-intake-for-various-breeds-or-age-categories.pdf>
12. Nutritional Requirements of Dairy Cattle - MSD Veterinary Manual,
<https://www.msdsvetmanual.com/management-and-nutrition/nutrition-dairy-cattle/nutritional-requirements-of-dairy-cattle>
13. Nutritional Guidance for the Milking Herd | Helping farmers in Scotland,
<https://www.fas.scot/article/nutritional-guidance-for-the-milking-herd/>
14. Rationing essentials for dairy diets - AHDB,
<https://ahdb.org.uk/knowledge-library/rationing-essentials-for-dairy-diets>
15. Grazer's Math: Matching Forage to Animal Demand - NCAT,
<https://www.ncat.org/publication/graziers-math-matching-forage-to-animal-demand/>
16. Article: New GfE Recommendations for Dairy Cow Feeding,
<https://hybrimin.com/new-gfe-recommendations-dairy-cow-feeding/>
17. Neue Versorgungsempfehlungen für Milchkühe - proteinmarkt.de,
<https://www.proteinmarkt.de/aktuelles/rinder/details/news/neue-versorgungsempfehlungen-fuer-milchkuehe>
18. Feed Tables - Ruminants - Luonnonvarakeskus,
<https://www.luke.fi/en/luonnonvaratieto/science-and-information/finnish-feed-tables-and-nutrient-requirements/feed-tables-ruminants>
19. DLG Information,
https://www.dlg.org/fileadmin/downloads/Landwirtschaft/Tierhaltung/Futtermittel/Fachinfos/Rinder/DLG_Information_01_25.pdf
20. 23. BOKU-SYMPOSIUM TIERERNÄHRUNG,
https://boku.ac.at/fileadmin/data/H03000/H97000/H97600/Symptagungsbaende/23_BOKU_Symposium_Tierernaehrung_2025_erratum.pdf
21. Nutrient requirements of dairy cows - CSIRO Publishing,
<https://www.publishing.csiro.au/ebook/chapter/SA0501051>
22. Metabolomics of Milk Reflects a Negative Energy Balance in Cows,
<https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jproteome.9b00706>
23. Negative Energy Balance in Transition Cows Induces Complex,
<https://www.mdpi.com/2218-1989/16/2/103>
24. How to make the most of feed for the dry cow | Dellait,
<https://dellait.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/1-PD-How-to-make-the-most-of-feed-for-the-dry-cow.pdf>
25. Impact of negative energy balance and postpartum diseases during,
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/veterinary-science/articles/10.3389/fvets.2023.1328700/full>
26. Decoding early-lactation energy balance in dairy cows using blood co,
<https://pure.qub.ac.uk/files/690029268/PIIS002203022600233X.pdf>
27. Effects of concentrate supplementation strategies during the,
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/1eda389dfc169317e05f3c3c5c1c22e700646008>
28. Growing and finishing cattle: nutritional guidance for dairy beef - AHDB,

- <https://ahdb.org.uk/knowledge-library/growing-and-finishing-cattle-nutritional-guidance-for-dairy-beef>
29. Energy Requirements of Growing and Finishing Beef Cattle,
<https://www.merckvetmanual.com/multimedia/table/energy-requirements-of-growing-and-finishing-beef-cattle>
 30. Effects of increased dietary roughage during the late finishing period,
<https://zootechnical.com/article/161977/en>
 31. Increasing the content of physically effective fiber in high,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342062412_Increasing_the_content_of_physically_effective_fiber_in_high-concentrate_diets_fed_to_beef_heifers_affects_intake_sorting_behavior_time_spent_ruminating_and_rumen_pH
 32. (PDF) Subacute ruminal acidosis in cattle: A critical review of clinical,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394361460_Subacute_ruminal_acidosis_in_cattle_A_critical_review_of_clinical_management
 33. Subacute ruminal acidosis in cattle: A critical review of clinical ... - PMC,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12328524/>
 34. Physicochemical Evaluations of Diets, Rumen Fluid, Blood and,
<https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/12/22/3114>
 35. Implementing physically effective neutral Detergent Fiber to,
https://cphcattle.ku.dk/research-files/publications/Frederik_Peter_Brndum_Laustsen_Bacheloropgave.pdf
 36. Evaluating Beef Fatty Acid Composition and Lipid Quality in ... - MDPI,
<https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/16/6/923>
 37. Genetic and Environmental Determinants of Beef Quality—A Review,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8907586/>
 38. Effects of Silage Type and Feeding Intensity on Carcass Traits and,
<https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/13/19/3065>
 39. Carcass Traits and Meat Quality in Cattle - MDPI,
https://mdpi-res.com/bookfiles/book/10903/Carcass_Traits_and_Meat_Quality_in_Cattle.pdf?v=1788743592
 40. Assessment of the variation of marbling and intramuscular fat,
<https://kobra.uni-kassel.de/bitstreams/0d5e63ca-5b93-4ce5-834b-9415b0150694/download>
 41. Mineral nutrition for grazing beef cows | TSLN.com,
<https://www.tsln.com/news/mineral-nutrition-for-grazing-beef-cows/>
 42. Nutrition - microminerals for beef cattle,
<https://brahman.com.au/nutrition-microminerals-for-beef-cattle/>
 43. Copper–molybdenum interactions in ruminant nutrition ... - Frontiers,
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/veterinary-science/articles/10.3389/fvets.2026.1878484/full>
 44. Comparative Trace Element Nutrition - Four Season,
https://www.fourseasonco.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Bioavailability_of_Minerals_20120626.pdf
 45. Mineral Supplementation of Beef Cows in Texas,
<https://beefskillathon.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2015/10/nutrition-mi>

[neral-supplementation.pdf](#)

46. Proper mineral supplement can prevent grass tetany - Grainews,
<https://www.grainews.ca/cattlemans-corner/proper-mineral-supplement-can-prevent-grass-tetany/>
47. Planned worm control for the beef herd - Farm Advisory Service,
<https://www.fas.scot/downloads/tn573-planned-worm-control-for-the-beef-herd/>
48. Ruminant Magnesium Transport Revisited: Apparent Absorption and,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC13372400/>
49. Assessment of magnesium intake according to requirement in dairy,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332680783_Assessment_of_magnesium_intake_according_to_requirement_in_dairy_cows
50. Grass tetany (hypomagnesaemia) in beef cattle — a selective review,
<http://www.flockandherd.net.au/cattle/reader/grass-tetany-review.html>
51. Examining Leaf Nutrient Content of Established Tall Fescue,
<https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4645&context=theses>
52. Effect of Dairy Pond Sludge/Supernatant Application on Ryegrass,
<https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/12/3/351>
53. A Comprehensive Guide to Rotational Grazing for Cattle - Cattlytics,
<https://www.cattlytics.com/blog/rotational-grazing-for-cattle/>
54. Grazer's math: calculating carrying capacity of a grazing system,
<https://cropsandsoils.extension.wisc.edu/articles/calculating-carrying-capacity/>
55. Optimising intensive grazing: a comprehensive review of rotational,
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-agricultural-science/article/optimising-intensive-grazing-a-comprehensive-review-of-rotational-grassland-management-innovative-grazing-strategies-and-infrastructural-requirements/83B2836F3D4706BFD3A6F80DB610DAC1>
56. Four Steps to Rotational Grazing - Penn State Extension,
<https://extension.psu.edu/four-steps-to-rotational-grazing>
57. Free Stocking Rate Calculator (2026) | Cows Per Acre & AUM Tool,
<https://cattly.io/resources/calculators/stocking-rate-calculator>
58. Paddock Size Calculator (Rotational Grazing) - CoryVu,
<https://coryvu.com/paddock-size-calculator/>
59. Free Pasture Carrying Capacity Estimator — Grazing Days & Rotation,
<https://conductscience.com/tools/pasture-carrying-capacity-calculator>
60. Opportunities and challenges for the adoption of multispecies ... - Brill,
<https://brill.com/edcollchap-oa/book/9789004751163/BP000002.xml>
61. Pruefungspool-Landwirtschaft-Pflanzenproduktion.pdf - LELF,
<https://lfl.brandenburg.de/sixcms/media.php/9/Pruefungspool-Landwirtschaft-Pflanzenproduktion.pdf>
62. Energetische Nutzung von Grünlandaufwüchsen,
https://www.lfl.bayern.de/mam/cms07/ipz/dateien/tagungsband_aggf_2012_final.pdf
63. Diplomarbeit - Bayerische Landesanstalt für Landwirtschaft - LfL,

- <https://www.lfl.bayern.de/mam/cms07/ipz/dateien/diplom4.pdf>
64. Seasonal influence on botanical composition of plantain, chicory,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299392335_Seasonal_influence_on_botanical_composition_of_plantain_chicory_white-and_red-clover_based_herbage_mixes_Sustainable_use_of_grassland_resources_for_forage_production_biodiversity_and_environmental_pro
 65. Can the inclusion of ribwort plantain or chicory increase the,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377039938_Can_the_inclusion_of_ribwort_plantain_or_chicory_increase_the_seasonal_and_annual_dry_matter_production_of_intensive_dairy_grazing_swards
 66. Integrated parasite management for cattle - Vet Times,
<https://www.vettimes.com/news/vets/livestock/integrated-parasite-management-for-cattle>
 67. Establishing water systems for rotational grazing,
<https://grazingforage.com/blog/water-systems>
 68. Water in rotational grazing – are your cows getting enough?,
<https://pasture.io/grazing-management/water-in-rotational>
 69. Livestock Watering Systems for Pasture,
<https://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/departments/10/agriculture/content/livestock/cattle/pasture.html>
 70. How to Build a Mobile Cattle Water System For Your Pasture Rotation,
<https://www.grass-fed-solutions.com/mobile-cattle-water.html>
 71. Rotational Grazing, <https://www.fas.scot/downloads/rotational-grazing/>
 72. N₂O and CH₄ fluxes in potato fields: Automated measurement,
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256716250_N₂O_and_CH₄_fluxes_in_potato_fields_Automated_measurement_management_effects_and_temporal_variation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256716250_N2O_and_CH4_fluxes_in_potato_fields_Automated_measurement_management_effects_and_temporal_variation)
 73. The Muencheberg Soil Quality Rating (SQR),
https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/643691764f0ee331841022ac/643691764f0ee3889b102901_2007_Mueller-et-al_SQR-field-guide.pdf
 74. (PDF) Effects of cattle treading and soil moisture on phosphorus and,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233124713_Effects_of_cattle_treading_and_soil_moisture_on_phosphorus_and_sediment_losses_in_surface_runoff_from_pasture
 75. Seasonal epidemiology of gastrointestinal nematodes of cattle in the,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8665551/>
 76. Ostertagia ostertagi (Brown Stomach Worm) in Cattle - Zubair Khalid,
<https://www.zubairkhalid.com/knowledge/parasites/livestock-parasites/ostertagia-ostertagi-brown-stomach-worm-cattle-hypobiosis>
 77. Strategic control of gastrointestinal parasites in cattle - Kela Health,
https://www.kela.health/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/KelAcademy_ruminants_article_strategic_control_of_gastrointestinal_parasites_in_cattle_EN_finale_lowres.pdf
 78. Managing parasites in beef cattle - The Bovine Practitioner,
<https://bovine-ojs-tamu.tdl.org/aabp/article/view/9320/8938>

79. Modelling the consequences of targeted selective treatment,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310473863_Modelling_the_consequences_of_targeted_selective_treatment_strategies_on_performance_and_emergence_of_anthelmintic_resistance_amongst_grazing_calves
80. Best practice | UK Beat the Parasites,
<https://beattheparasites.co.uk/parasite-management/best-practice>
81. Ostertagia ostertagi in first-season grazing cattle in Belgium,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/43079589_Ostertagia_ostertagi_in_first-season_grazing_cattle_in_Belgium_Germany_and_Sweden_General_levels_of_infection_and_related_management_practices
82. Deworming only for individual animals - testing of thresholds in ... - en,
<https://www.thuenen.de/en/institutes/organic-farming/x-1/animal-health-welfare/deworming-only-for-individual-animals-testing-of-thresholds-in-young-cattle>
83. Exposure to Ostertagia ostertagi in Swedish dairy cattle,
<https://research.slu.se/files/19319245/fulltext.pdf>
84. Pasture Management to Control Cattle Worms - WormBoss,
<https://wormboss.com.au/management/non-chemical-worm-control-methods/pasture-management/>
85. Grazing Management - Goats - WormBoss,
<https://wormboss.com.au/tests-tools/grazing-management-goats/>
86. Feed Budgeting Guide for Irish Farmers | Specialist Nutrition,
<https://specialistnutrition.ie/feed-budgeting-guide-for-irish-farmers/>
87. Landsberger Gemenge - PDF | Barenbrug,
<https://www.barenbrug.lu/product/pdf/generate/1541>
88. TerraLife® Landsberger Gemenge Organic | 25 kg | DE-ÖKO-039,
<https://www.agrar.shop/saatgut-silage/zwischenfruechte/terralife-landsberger-gemenge/-organic-de-oeko-039-25kg>
89. TerraLife-Landsberger Gemenge organic,
<https://www.biosaar-muensterland.de/TerraLife-Landsb.-Gemenge-organic>
90. Paper 2.0: Silage fermentation processes and their manipulation,
<https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/aa0e13a1-21d3-43e8-bd59-6903d6e39162/content/x8486e09.htm>
91. Orientierungswerte für gute Grasfuttermittel und Maissilagen - LfL,
<https://www.lfl.bayern.de/ite/rind/333066/index.php>
92. Gärqualität/ Fehlgärung - Grünland - online,
<https://www.gruenland-online.de/html/futter/gaerqualitaet/gaerqualitaet.html>
93. Leitfaden zur Qualitätsbewertung von Silage - Josera Agrar,
<https://josera-agri.com/de/ratgeber/silage/leitfaden-qualitaetsbewertung-silage.html>
94. Zielwerte Silagen Rinderfütterung - Landesvereinigung Milch Hessen,
https://www.milchhessen.de/mediaarchiv/grab_pic.php?id=51704
95. Silage selkä 24ja5.indd,
<http://static.atkft.hu/Dokumentumok/Proceedings2012.pdf>
96. Gärqualität - LUFA Nord-West,
<https://www.lufa-nord-west.de/index.cfm/article/2035.html>

97. Cell wall composition of red clover (*Trifolium pratense* L.) stems and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353038544_Cell_wall_composition_of_red_clover_Trifolium_pratense_L_stems_and_leaves_differing_in_maturity
98. Gute Gärqualität bestimmt die Grundfutteraufnahme - Milchpraxis, <https://www.milchpraxis.com/garqualitat/>
99. Effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*-lactic acid bacteria ... - Frontiers, <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/microbiology/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2026.1753173/pdf>
100. Nitrate Poisoning of Cattle in Alabama, https://www.aces.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ANR-0112.REV_.3.pdf
101. Nitrate poisoning | DairyNZ, <https://www.dairynz.co.nz/animal/animal-health/nitrate-poisoning/>
102. Beef Cattle and Nitrate Toxicity | Newton Agriculture Community Blog, <https://site.extension.uga.edu/newtonextanr/2025/09/beef-cattle-and-nitrate-toxicity/>
103. Dossier Methane emissions in livestock farming (enteric emissions), <https://ilvo.vlaanderen.be/en/dossiers/methane-emissions-in-livestock-farming-enteric-emissions>
104. Enteric Methane Emissions and Animal Performance in Dairy ... - PMC, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9030782/>
105. Predicting Enteric Methane Emissions from Dairy and Beef Cattle, <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/14/23/3452>
106. Understanding and reducing methane emissions, <https://www.fokus-tierwohl.de/en/rind/fachinformationen-milchkuehe/01-methanemissionen>