

Pasture-based automatic milking systems in Australia

Dr. Nicolas Lyons EAAP 2015 – Warsaw, Poland



Agenda for today

- Australian dairy industry
- Australian automatic milking systems (AMS)
- Research on milking intervals, incentives, impact and management
- Current & future industry issues around AMS



Australian dairy industry

- 3rd largest rural industry
- 1.69 million dairy cows (76% HF)
- ~6,200 dairy farms
- ~9.500 million litres of milk
- Average farm: 270 cows (5,500 lts/cow)



AMS status in Australia



AMS status in Australia

Robots





Cows





144 robots

~10,250 cows

~56 mill litres milk

AMS status in Australia

Indoor systems

Corral based systems

Pasture-based systems





6%

11%



AMS in pasture-based systems



What had already been proven?

AMS could work in pasture-based systems and achieve high levels of pasture utilisation



Clark et al. (2015) GFS, doi: 10.1111/gfs.12171.

Grazing and AMS



Lyons et al. (2014) Liv. Sci., 159, 102-116.

Concept of extended milking intervals



Milking intervals in pasture-based AMS



So what next?

How can we ..?

↓milking interval - ↑milking frequency - ↑milk yield



2 vs 3 way grazing trial

Hypothesis

- Frequency size of allocations
- Smaller allocations
- Depleted quicker
- Cows would traffic out sooner
- Lower milking intervals
- Higher milk yield



2 vs 3 way grazing trial: Design

2WG



9 kg DM/cow 12h grazing





6 kg DM/cow 8h grazing 2 vs 3 way grazing trial: Results

↓ Milking interval - ↑ Milking frequency - ↑ Daily yield (-31%) (+40%) (+20%)



Lyons et al. (2013) J. Dairy Sci, 96, 4494-4504.

PRE vs POST feeding trial

Hypothesis

- Immediate reward
- Quicker return to the dairy
- Lower milking interval
- Higher milking frequency
- Higher daily milk yield



PRE vs POST feeding trial: Design



PRE vs POST feeding trial: Results

PRE POST Significance

Difference in time spent on each area, but not on daily yield!

Lyons et al. (2013) J. Dairy Sci, 96, 4397-4405.

PRE vs POST feeding trial: Results



Lyons et al. (2013) J. Dairy Sci, 96, 4397-4405.

Main findings of my research

- Achievable targets for pasture-based AMS
- Identification of factors that affect milking intervals
- Incentive management (frequency, size & location)



What could the future look like?



How will Australian cows be milked in the future?

How will Australian cows be milked?

- 48% of dairy sheds were commissioned more than 15 years ago
- 56% of dairy farms spend more than 4h/d milking
- 50% of farmers are considering installing a new dairy in the future
- 50% of farmers would consider installing AMS (+22% not sure)

How will Australian cows be milked?

Reasons to consider AMS	Reasons to not consider AMS
Lifestyle (66%)	Economic (75%)
Make dairy attractive (58%)	Farm layout (41%)
Data and information (57%)	Financial (38%)
Higher MF and milk yield (56%)	Support (25%)
Reduce labour units (50%)	Being on call (23%)

Interest for more information



Fact sheet:

create an improved (more flexible) and attrac Other reasons may encourage farmers to con Other reasons may encourage tarmers to com-miking systems as a viable option for their op-include the possibility of achieving higher millis (especially in early lactation), incluidual quarter possibility to feed coves incluidually, as well as that should allow for improved herd managem

What are the key things I must be aware decision making and what homework st decision making and what nomework is if you are considering a switch to automatic should have realistic expectations and devot and care to plan the farm kayout, taking into-actual farm practices. Seek advice from, any have arready adopted automatic miking to is as essential design elements and gain from 1

What is the technology? Automatic miking systems (AMS) have been developed for dairy farms to rectuce the labour required for mik harvesting. The technology has become increasingly common on overseas farms that typically operate small herds in indoor systems, with or without limited grazing during certain months of the year.

Automatic milking systems provide greater flexibility of milking Automatic milding systems plotticit greater rescaling for manage systems, eliminating the need to mail, cover at regular set times. This alrows the operation to shift their focus to other areas of on-form management such as feeding animats, animal health restricts, iscentification and call resign. Apport and information management becomes viate to the successful operation of automatic milding systems.

Operating to traditional services a processing and the service automatic miking into pasture-based production systems while miking into pasture-based production systems while ministraining production tragets. Australian pasture-based systems often manage modurate to large hereds innore than 00 miking could and here barge distances between through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full and any could bar through the full head bar project (www.full head bar through the full head bar thead bar through through the full head bar through the ful helped develop management practices around automatic miking systems that are useful for farmers considering or currently working with this technology

How does the technology work? Each cow is fitted with a unique electronic identification that allows the cow to be "recognised" electronically at gates and in the miking rups and sprays the tests of each cow. Each quarter mining cups and spinys the tests of reach cow, each quarter is miked individually and cups are removed based on the milk flow from each teat, thereby minimising overmiking of each quarter. Most automatic miking systems have the capacity to feed grain-based concentrate at each miking.

Farmers adopting this technology generally operate with voluntary oow traffic through the management of incentives that encourage coves to move narisetiated throughout the farm system. The most common and reliable incentives are field grain-based supportents at the daily distinct allocations of posture or aucplements (the daily distinct allocations of posture or aucplements) that, advocuately managed, ensure larger miking largenzies and system utilization are oblived.

align mixing inspances and system cancels in a distribution within to defined mixing session times, mixing events are distributed throughout the day and night based on cov-tails, mixing permission settings and system capacity. Some summers may choose to operate the system with batch mixing by binging opcoupe of coves to the day at defined times to be mitted by the robots. Each firmm will choose the type of mitted by the robots. Each firmm will choose the type of system that best suits their preference and needs. What data does this technology provide?

What data does this technology provide? By miking each quarte individually, the system enables the operator to assess production and some mit, characteristics at an individual quarter level (compared to the whole utilder in conventional miking systems). Mik quality parameters such as conductivity and mits colour can also be measured regularly, as can supplement intake. Somatic cell count is not available on all

AMS brands and is generally an optional 'add-on' to the system. Cow traffic and visitation events are often used as indicators Cow trains and visuation events are often used as inductions of herd and individual cow performance. With automatic systems, farmers will typically also use the support herd management program to store health and breeding records for individual cows within the herd. It is not uncommon for AMS farmers to have additional

It is not uncommon for Avis families to neve additional technology such as the monitoring of cow activity and nimination, to be used as an aid for cestrus detection and early detection of diseases. How can you use this information?

By freeing up time previously spent on miking activities, farm staff can dedicate more time to operational and business management.





NSW DPI Dairy Automatic Milking Systems Newsletter - Issue 1

AMS KPI Project

AMS KPI Project - General farm information

July 2015

The Automatic Milking Systems' KPI Project provides the Dairy Industry with key information of what is achievable under commercial conditions. Information about milk production, AMS utilisation and farm demographics will help understand how these farms 'behave' over a 12 month period.

Table 1: General farm information

	Farm 1	Farm 2	Farm 2	Farm 4 Farm 5		Farm 6	Farm 7	Farm 8	Farm 9
Breed of cows	Holstein, Holstein x Jersey, HJx Brown Swiss, Holstein x Brown Swiss, Red Holstein	Holstein	Holstein	Holstein and Brown Swiss (5%)	Holstein	Holstein	Holstein	Friesian x Jersey	Holstein
Calving system	Year round	Seasonal	Split (3 batches)	Year round	-	Year round	Split (2 batches)	Seasonal	Seasonal
Milking area (ha)	55	60	100	40	100	75	43	90	50
Type of robots	Single box	Single box	Single box	Single box	Single box	Robotic rotary	Single box	Single box	Single box
Number of robots (#)	3	3	3	3	6	-	3	3	3
Feed stations (#)	0	6	4	0	6	14	3	2	2
Gate time changes	6:30, 13:00 & 20:00	1:30, 9:30 & 16:30 (feedpad 23:30)	2:00, 8:00 & 17:00	Barn with free cow traffic	0:00, 10:00 & 16:00	4:00, 11:00 & 19:00	5:00, 14:00 & 22:00	1:30, 9:00 & 16:30	2:30, 9:30 & 16:00

AMS KPI Project

Table 2: Herd information

	Farm 1	Farm 2	Farm 3	Farm 4	Farm 5	Farm 6	Farm 7	Farm 8	Farm 9
Cows in milk (#)	198	41	149	186	310	368	122	66	105
Heifers (%)	34%	34%	34%	32%	15%	36%	26%	68%	36%
Animals that calved (#)	9	1	23	12	26	49	29	3	7
Farm stocking rate (milking cows/ha)	4	0.68	1.49	4.65	3.10	4.91	2.84	0.73	2.10
Robot stocking rate (milking cows/robot)	66	14	50	62	52	368	41	22	35
DIM (#)	160	260	182	144	193	185	162	151	214

Table 3: Daily milk production and quality

	Farm 1	Farm 2	Farm 3	Farm 4	Farm 5	Farm 6	Farm 7	Farm 8	Farm 9
Daily milk production (kg/day)	4,372	993	3,893	5,792	6,834	7,186	2,704	1,080	2,577
Fat (%)	3.87	3.79	3.82	3.96	-	3.15	4.08	4.6	-
Protein (%)	3.34	3.47	3.34	3.35	-	3.3	3.5	3.37	-
Somatic cell count (x 1000)	188	75	172	146	-	320	84	107	-

All this information is available online

AMS farmers priorities

- Feed allocation / management
- Maximizing system capacity
- Data needs to provide information
- Different needs of different farmers





Industry priorities

- Economics and benchmarking
- Training needs
- Herd testing and breeding



40% more milk with 10% less milkings

Conclusion

- AMS is not a new way of farming
- Good understanding of what is achievable
- Still work to be done for pasture-based systems
- Management of huge amount of data
- Need to have an industry approach

Integrations of technologies on dairy farms enable innovation only if they can have a positive impact on farm (sustainability)

Thank you very much for your attention!









FUTUREDAIRY