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Sources of methane in a ruminant production system

In dairy systems: probably close to half/half

Methanobrevibacter
Sources of GHG on a dairy farm

Owen & Silva, 2015 – European meta-analysis

Methane:
- Anaerobic lagoon = 368 kg/hd/yr
- Enteric fermentation = 120 kg/hd/yr
Factors affecting enteric methane emission

Driven by DMI

Other factors:
- Animal genetics
- Diet composition: fiber/starch
- Fat

$R^2 = 0.86$
Diurnal pattern of methane emissions in dairy cows

Hristov et al. (2015)
Enteric methane emission rates by cattle categories

Hristov, 2015
Enteric methane yield by cattle category

Hristov, 2015

- Dairy cows: 19 g methane/kg DMI
- Beef cows: 22 g methane/kg DMI
- Cattle on feed: 9.5 g methane/kg DMI
Total GHG emissions from dairy and beef cattle in the US (MMT CO₂ eq)

- **Enteric CH₄**
  - Dairy cattle: 42
  - Beef cattle: 117

- **Manure CH₄ & N₂O**
  - Dairy cattle: 38
  - Beef cattle: 11
Spatial distribution of livestock methane emissions in the US

Hristov et al., 2017
We have to measure enteric methane emissions in the animal: poor relationship between in vitro and in vivo data.
Chamber Techniques
The GreenFeed system
The $\text{SF}_6$ technique
Mitigation approaches

• Nutritional approaches – will be discussed in this presentation

• Genetic selection for low emitters
  – Low heritability; problems with measuring methane emission at the population scale; potentially selecting for lower DMI or poor fiber digestibility
  – Selection for feed efficiency

• Microbiome manipulation, vaccination

• Animal health

• Productivity gains
GHG Mitigation Options for the Livestock Industries

FAO, 2013
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Long-term experiments with high-producing animals are lacking
Forage quality

- Increased forage digestibility is expected to increase animal production and decrease enteric CH\textsubscript{4} production per unit of product (Ei).
- It appears, C\textsubscript{4} grasses produce more CH\textsubscript{4} than C\textsubscript{3} grasses and introduction of legumes in warm climate may offer a potential mitigation opportunity, although low persistence and a need for long establishment periods are important agronomic constraints.
- Enteric CH\textsubscript{4} emission may be reduced when corn silage replaces grass silage.
- Legume silages may also have an advantage over grass silage due to their lower fiber content and the additional benefit of replacing inorganic N fertilizer.
- With all silages effective preservation will improve silage quality and reduce GHG emission intensity.
- Forage with higher sugar content (high-sugar grasses or harvested in the afternoon) may reduce urinary N losses and consequently, N\textsubscript{2}O emission from manure applied to soil, but more research is needed.
- The best mitigation option in this category is to increase forage digestibility in order to enhance digestible energy intake and animal productivity, thus reducing overall GHG emissions per unit of animal product.

Hristov et al., 2013
Feed intake and concentrate inclusion effects on methane emission

![Graph showing the relationship between dry matter intake, proportion of concentrate in diet DM, and CH₄ emission (g/kg DOM)].

Sauvant and Nozière, 2016
Dietary lipids

- Lipids have a proven enteric CH$_4$-mitigating effect:
  - However, may depress DMI
  - Which may actually increase feed efficiency (??)
- May decrease milk production and milk fat test
  - Potentially enhanced by combination with other rumen modifiers – monensin

- A meta-analysis of 31 studies (with 105 treatments) in which lipid supplementation was the main effect:
  - DMI was reduced in 49% of the studies (by 5.6%)
  - 29 studies with dairy cows – milk production was reduced in 15% of the studies (by 9%)
  - CH$_4$ production reduced in 81% of the studies (by 20%)
PBAC – tannins & saponins

• Tannins – meta-analysis of in vivo experiments (up to 40 exp.)
  – Negative slopes for OMD, CPD, NDFD, total VFA, propionate, butyrate, ammonia, bacteria, protozoa
  – Reduced enteric CH$_4$ emission

• Other issues: LONG-TERM effects??
  – Very variable results - type, concentration and astringency of the tannins
  – Yields of temperate and tropical tanniferous legumes is usually less than that of corresponding grasses
  – Anti-nutritional when dietary CP concentrations are limiting production

• Positive effects reported for tea saponins....need confirmation.....
Essential oils

- **Proven antimicrobial effects**
  - in vitro, in vivo in monogastrics
- **Large doses required in vivo**
  - Higher doses are likely to affect negatively DMI and animal production
- **So far, no consistent positive effects in vivo**
- **Adaptability, long-term effect??**

Figure 1. Effect of supplementation dose of essential oils and their bioactive compounds (EOBC; g/kg diet DM) on changes in protozoa numbers ($10^5$mL) relative to control (no EOBC supplementation) in ruminants (○, beef cattle; □, dairy cattle; △, small ruminants). Equation is: Protozoa counts = 0.210 (±0.0418; $P < 0.001$) – EOBC dose × 0.973 (±0.1613; $P < 0.001$), n = 24, root mean square error = 0.1513.

Khiaosa-ard and Q. Zebeli, 2014

Hristov et al., 2013
Mitigation through rumen protozoa

Guyader et al., 2014

**Figure 1** Relationship between methane emission and rumen protozoa concentration (raw data). The black dashed line represents the average within-experiment relationship (equation (2)).

Rumen protozoa are often colonized by methanogens, and the methanogens literally “suck” hydrogen from their “hydrogenosomes.”

© Rumen Microbiology and Its Role In Ruminant Nutrition: 2002.
(Courtesy S.H. Zinder)
Nitrates – an example of a promising rumen modifier with uncertain side effects.

- Alternative electron sink... does reduce enteric \( \text{CH}_4 \) emission
- Persistency of the effect (??)
- Toxicity of intermediate products – nitrite
  - The rumen ecosystem can adapt, however, the adaptation can be lost quickly
- Do we need more N in the diet? May be applicable to diets that need NPN
  - If used in licking blocks – access has to be limited
- Nitrate in the basal diet? \( \text{NH}_3 \) losses and manure \( \text{NH}_3/\text{N}_2\text{O} \); \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) production in the rumen

About 16% reduction in a meta-analysis by Lee et al. (2015)
Nitrate may increase $N_2O$ emission and urinary nitrate excretion

Petersen et al., 2015

The mitigation effect of nitrates decreased by 12 to 18% due to $N_2O$ emissions

Table 5. Emissions of $CH_4$ and $N_2O$ were calculated for the 24-h period and used for periods 4 and 5, $N_2O$ emissions after upscaling based on dry matter (DM) intake (see text). The percentage greenhouse gas mitigation for the treatments relative to the control and to $CH_4 + N_2O$ were calculated. Cows on the individual treatments are identified in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diet</th>
<th>$CH_4$ emission</th>
<th>GHG mitigation, $N_2O$</th>
<th>GHG mitigation, $CH_4 + N_2O$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g NO$_3^-$ kg$^{-1}$ DM</td>
<td>g CO$_2$ eq kg$^{-1}$ DM</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Period 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>974.3a (31.0)</td>
<td>0.4d (0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>697.8b (15.7)</td>
<td>3.7cd (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>733.6bc (39.4)</td>
<td>14.1b (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>519.7d (34.3)</td>
<td>67.2a (4.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>816.5a (60.0)</td>
<td>0.5c (0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>689.8a (46.7)</td>
<td>4.0c (1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>791.8a (40.9)</td>
<td>13.5b (2.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>658.5a (14.4)</td>
<td>15.3a (0.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mitigation effect of nitrates decreased by 12 to 18% due to $N_2O$ emissions.
Other mitigation options

- **Ionophores:**
  - Ionophores, through their effect on feed efficiency, would likely have a moderate CH$_4$ mitigating effect in ruminants fed high-grain or grain-forage diets. In ruminants fed pasture this effect is less consistent.

- **Probiotics:**
  - There is not sufficient evidence for direct enteric CH$_4$ mitigating effect of yeast and other microbials with probiotic mode of action. Yeast products, however, appear to stabilize pH and promote rumen function, especially in dairy cattle, resulting in small but relatively consistent responses in animal production and feed efficiency, which might moderately decrease CH$_4$ emission per unit of product.

- **Manipulation of rumen archaea and bacteria:**
  - None of the existing technologies are ready for practical application, but vaccines could be applied to all ruminants, including those with little human contact, such as sheep and beef animals on pasture. **To be effective, the vaccines have to cover the entire methanogen community.** The extent of reductions in methanogenesis may only be 5-10 %, and **persistence of the effect is unknown.**
Monensin & methane meta-analysis

### Table A: Monensin Effect on Methane Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) and Year</th>
<th>CTL_Ym (%)</th>
<th>Monen_Ym (%)</th>
<th>Standardized MD [95% CI]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grainger et al., 2010 (Exp 1)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.3 [-0.4, 1.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainger et al., 2010 (Exp 2)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.3 [-0.6, 1.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton et al., 2010</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.3 [0.3, 2.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainger et al., 2008 (Exp 1)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-1.2 [-2.3, -0.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waghorn et al., 2006</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.2 [-0.9, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odongo et al., 2007</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-2.5 [-3.5, -1.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Vught et al., 2005 (Exp 1)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-3.1 [-4.1, -2.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Vught et al., 2005 (Exp 2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-0.3 [-1.3, 0.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Vught et al., 2005 (Exp 3)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.2 [0.3, 2.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Vught et al., 2005 (Exp 4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-2.2 [-3.2, -1.2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B: Monensin Effect on Methane Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) and Year</th>
<th>CTL_Ym (%)</th>
<th>Monen_Ym (%)</th>
<th>Standardized MD [95% CI]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guan et al., 2006 (Exp 1)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-0.7 [-1.9, 0.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guan et al., 2006 (Exp 2)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.1 [-2.3, 0.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwenya et al., 2004</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3.6 [-5.7, -1.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGinn et al., 2004</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-1.7 [-3.3, -0.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Kelly and Spiers., 1992 (Exp 1)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-2.3 [-3.8, -0.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Kelly and Spiers., 1992 (Exp 2)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.1 [0.7, 5.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedegaertner and Johnson, 1983</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.8 [-2.0, 0.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton and Owens, 1981 (Exp 1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-1.2 [-2.9, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton and Owens, 1981 (Exp 2)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.9 [-3.2, -0.6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton and Owens, 1981 (Exp 3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-1.4 [-2.7, -0.2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Forest plot showing mean dietary gross energy lost via CH₄ (Yₑ, %) in control (CTL_Ym) and monensin treatment (Monen_Ym) groups along with standardized mean difference (MD) and its 95% CI for dairy cow (A) and beef steer (B) studies. The dotted line represents a 0 standardized mean difference.

-6 g/d (non-significant) and -19 g/d reduction in dairy (A) and beef (B) cattle, respectively
Precision feeding

• The original term “precision agriculture” was coined in relation to plant nutrition, namely “a series of technologies that allow the application of water, nutrients and pesticides only to the places and at the times they are required, thereby optimizing the use of inputs”

• In animal nutrition, precision feeding may have different dimensions, but from a practical standpoint and farm sustainability perspective it refers to matching animal requirements with dietary nutrient supply
Precision feeding technologies in animal nutrition
An inhibitor persistently decreased enteric methane emission from dairy cows with no negative effect on milk production


Department of Animal Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802; Departamento de Zootecnia, Universidade Estadual de Maringá, PR 87020-900, Brazil; Agriculture Research Division, Department of Economic Development Jobs Transport and Resources, Ellinbank Centre, Ellinbank 3821, Victoria, Australia; Animal Nutrition and Health, DSM Nutritional Products, Basel CH-4002, Switzerland; and Research Centre for Animal

80 mg/kg feed dry matter, decreased methane emissions from high-producing dairy cows by 30% and increased body weight gain without negatively affecting feed intake or milk production and composition. The inhibitory effect persisted over 12 wk of treatment, thus offering an effective methane mitigation practice for the livestock industries.

an effect in sheep (12). The nutrient requirements of high-producing dairy cows are much greater than those of nonlactating or low-producing cows (13) and hence any reduction in feed intake caused by a methane mitigation compound or practice would likely
Effect of 3NOP on methane emission

29% lower; Means: 481, 363, 333, and 329 g/cow/d; SEM = 15.9; $P_L < 0.001$
Effect on methane emission intensity

31% lower; Means: 12.0, 8.7, 7.9, and 8.3 g/kg ECM; SEM = 0.48; $P_L < 0.001$

Hristov et al., 2015
# Production data

Table 1. Effect of 3-nitrooxypropanol on feed dry matter intake, lactation performance, and body weight change of Holstein dairy cows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Treatment¹</th>
<th>P-value²,³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Low3NOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry matter intake, kg/d</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk yield, kg/d</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM yield, kg/d</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed efficiency, kg/kg</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk fat, %</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk fat yield, kg/d</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk protein, %</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk protein yield, kg/d</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk lactose, %</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk lactose yield, kg/d</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body weight, kg</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body weight change, g/d</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Control = 0 mg/kg of 3NOP, Low3NOP = 40 mg/kg of 3NOP, Medium3NOP = 60 mg/kg 3NOP, and High3NOP = 80 mg/kg 3NOP (dietary dry matter basis). Data, except body weight change, are presented as covariate-adjusted means.

2 Contrasts: C vs. Trt., Control vs. all 3NOP treatments; L, linear effect of treatment; Q, quadratic effect of treatment.

3 Treatment x experimental week interactions for dry matter intake, milk yield, feed efficiency, and body weight: P = 0.05, 0.97, < 0.001, and 0.93, respectively; milk composition and ECM yield data P ≥ 0.17.
Overall mitigation effect of 3NOP

(Penn State data from over 700 cow-observations)

Overall, 26% reduction
SEM = 5.3; $P < 0.001$
No effect on:
DMI (58 vs. 57 lb/d)
Milk yield (97 vs. 98 lb/d)
Seaweed

• In 2015 a Canadian study reported up to 18% methane reduction by stormtoss seaweeds in vitro

• An Australian study found 99% methane reduction with 2% (feed DM) *Asparagopsis taxiformis* in vitro
Asparagopsis taxiformis

- The bioactives from *Asparagopsis* have been identified as bromoform and dibromochloromethane.
- Mechanism similar to that of bromochloromethane (BCM) – reacts with reduced vitamin B$_{12}$ inhibiting cobamide-dependent methyl groups leading to methanogenesis, thus inhibiting methane production.

- A study with sheep (restricted feeding @ 1.5% of BW)
- Sharp reduction in methane emission
- Effects on DMI, fiber digestibility, and animal productivity are unclear at this point

![Graph showing methane emissions over time](image)

- Control
- 0.5% Asp
- 1% Asp
- 2% Asp
- 3% Asp

Li et al., 2016
Take-home message

- Discrepancies in top-down vs. bottom-up methane emission inventories
- There are several established methods for measuring enteric and manure methane emissions
- We have a pretty good idea of enteric emissions from livestock, but we may be underestimating manure emissions – large uncertainties with both
- There are a variety of mitigation techniques available to the livestock industries
- Mitigation techniques targeting enteric CH$_4$ emissions may be difficult to implement and yield a limited effect
  - Assessment techniques can affect experimental outcomes
  - The ultimate verification for a rumen modifier (for dairy cows) is a long-term, continuous design experiment
- Improving forage digestibility and feed efficiency and use of effective feed additives are among the most realistic and applicable short-term mitigation practices for intensive dairy production systems
- Other nutritional approaches may also be promising
- Manipulating the host and microbial genetics may be promising mitigation options in the future
- Approval and use of 3NOP could lead to a substantial reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from the ruminant livestock sector
QUESTIONS?