intake protein (UIP). The balance of amino acids depends upon the proportion of UIP and the amino acid spectrum of the UIP. Therefore, it is absolutely essential to measure or predict the relative amounts of MP (metabolizable protein) from microbes and UIP in any given feeding scenario. Both the production potential of the beef animal and microbial protein synthesis are driven by energy. It is impossible to predict MP supplied to the lower gut and MP needs of the animal without having accurate estimates of energy needs, energy supplies and ruminal energy availability. While there are many variations on beef production systems, most are based on high grain (finishing) diets or high forage diets. Forage contains little UIP and that UIP appears to be poorly digested (<50%). Without supplements, essentially all of the MP in forage feeding situations is supplied by microbes. Site of carbohydrate digestion (NDF) is relatively predictable and methodology for measuring forage protein degradation is relatively precise (NDF-N). Degradable intake protein (DIP) may be deficient in some situations. Microbial protein synthesis efficiency decreases as diet TDN decreases from 60% down to 45 to 50%. Low microbial production and low forage UIP create MP deficiencies in many forage feeding situations. On high grain diets, energy supply is high but microbial efficiency is limited by low ruminal pH. Site of carbohydrate digestion (starch) varies with grain type and processing. Estimation of ruminal degradation of grain (starch and protein) is not precise. DIP is usually required. Byproducts reduce starch, raise pH and add protein (maybe DIP or UIP depending on byproduct). Corn is high in UIP and the UIP is highly digested (>90%). Therefore feedlot cattle generally have adequate supplies of MP. It is difficult to produce an amino acid deficiency in feedlot cattle. Growing cattle can be deficient in specific amino acids depending upon the amino acid balance in the UIP.

358 Mathematical models used to determine ruminant protein requirements and availabilities. R. A. Kohn^{*1} and M. D. Hanigan², ¹University of Maryland, College Park, ²Land O' Lakes/Farmland Feeds, LLC, St. Louis, MO.

The objective of this presentation is to review the functional differences between mathematical models that are used to formulate diets for beef and dairy cattle with respect to protein and amino acid requirements. An ideal model for diet formulation would require minimal data input to accurately predict the amount and form of protein required by the animal and supplied by available feedstuffs. Where appropriate, there should be a means to incorporate feed analysis results into the model to improve predictions. All current models divide dietary crude protein into two parts: that required by ruminal microbes and that required at the small intestine as true feed protein that has not been digested by ruminal microbes. The most recent models have established specific requirements and availabilities of the first limiting amino acids (e.g. lys, met). The Cornell model (CNCPS) also formulates for required amino acid and peptide protein (as opposed to non-protein nitrogen) for rumen fermentation. The 2001 NRC can incorporate soluble protein information, and the CNCPS can use protein solubility in buffers and detergents as indicators of protein degradation. When several models (NRC, 1989; CNCPS, CPM Dairy) were compared for their ability to predict protein flows to the small intestine for typical diets and cows, there were no obvious advantages for any one model. However, the NRC, 1989 was best able to predict losses in milk production due to underfeeding of protein to dairy cows. The 2001 NRC increased both RDP and RUP requirements for dairy cows without affecting the supply. As a result, the total CP recommended in diets increased for the 2001 NRC compared to the 1989 version. However, the amount recommended in the 1989 NRC was adequate. The various models that currently are available differ substantially in their level of complexity and the number and type of feed analyses that can be used. But, there is little evidence that this increased complexity has improved the accuracy of model predictions for typical farm conditions.

Key Words: Beef Cattle, Metabolizable Protein, Amino Acids

Key Words: Protein Requirements, Mathematical Models

Swine Species Symposium. Improving Sow Productivity: Recent Developments in Gilt and Lactation Management

359 Increasing weaning age improves pig performance and profitability in a multi-site production system. R. G. Main*, S. S. Dritz, M. D. Tokach, R. D. Goodband, and J. L. Nelssen, *Kansas State University, Manhattan*.

Two trials were conducted to determine the effects of weaning age on growing pig biologic and economic performance in a multi-site production system. Trial 2 also evaluated the effects of modifying nursery feed budgets according to weaning age. In trial 1 (2,272 pigs), treatments included weaning litters at 12, 15, 18, or 21 d of age. In trial 2 (3,456 pigs), litters were weaned at 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, or 22 d of age and categorized into three treatments (15.5, 18.5, or 21.5 d of age). In trial 2, pigs in each age group were fed a nursery feed budget classified as more or less complex. Since feed budget did not affect (P > 0.27) performance, only weaning age effects are presented. Each trial was conducted as a randomized complete block design with four blocks of linked nursery and finishing sites (6 and 10 reps/block in trials 1 and 2, respectively). All wean age treatments were weaned from a 7,300-head sow farm on the same day into the same nursery. Each block remained intact as pigs moved from nursery to finishing site. Costs and revenue were measured for each pen. Increasing weaning age (12, 15, 18, or 21; and 15.5, 18.5, or 21.5 in trials 1 and 2, respectively) improved (linear, P < 0.03) wean-tofinish ADG (580, 616, 637, 687 \pm 8 g/d; 676, 697, 722 ± 6 g/d), mortality rate (9.4, 7.9, 6.8, 3.6 ± 0.95 %; 3.9, 3.4, 2.5 ± 0.5 %), weight sold per pig weaned (94.1, 100.5, 104.4, 113.1 ±1.3 kg, 107.6, 111.6, 116.2 ± 1.1 kg), income over costs (2.00, 5.11, 7.12, 11.19 \pm 0.52/pig; 7.99, 10.04, 12.46 ± 0.46 /pig), and cost per hundred kg sold (\$86.19, 83.24, 81.49, 78.36 ± 0.46 ; \$80.80, 79.25, 77.50 ± 0.32). The improvements in growth and mortality largely occurred in the initial 42 d after weaning, with smaller growth improvements in finishing. These studies indicate that increasing weaning age up to 21.5 d predictably improves grow-finish throughput (1.80 ± 0.12 kg sold/pig/d of age) and profitability (\$0.89 $\pm 0.05/\mathrm{pig/d}$ of age) within this multi-site production system.

360 Behavior of sows during lactation. J. McGlone*, Pork Industry Institute, Texas Tech University, Lubbock.

Sow behavior is influenced by their genes and by their environment. During lactation, sows undergo significant changes in physiology that cause large behavioral changes. The objective of this review is to summarize the literature on sow behavior during lactation and the effects of management practices (such as weaning age and housing system) on sow behavior. Also, this review will summarize sow behaviors that lead to problems with the lactating sow or piglets. Sows undergo four major phases of behavior in the peri-lactation phase. First, prior to farrowing, sows undergo nest-building behavior that may involve building of an actual nest if sows are given building materials or expression of phantom nest-building behaviors in the absence of building materials. The second phase involves the establishment of the maternal-neonatal bond. This phase requires 12 to 24 h and is critical for piglet survival and growth. Maternal pheromones are secreted and the piglet is able to suckle in the presence of maternal pheromones. The piglet also is able to recognize its mother by her odor signature. The third phase is the lactation phase in which sows and piglets organize suckling with an interval of 40 to 50 min between nursing bouts. As piglets become larger, they will have larger, but less frequent meals - this trend continues from birth through market age. If given the opportunity, sows will spend less time with piglets as lactation progresses. The fourth phase is the weaning phase which can be gradual or abrupt and includes weaning and the weaning to estrus interval. Natural weaning by the sow can take place at any time from 3 d to 6 months of age. Sow genotype and the housing system can have major impacts on pig behavior during each phase. Weaning age will significantly impact phase 3 and 4 sow behaviors. Sow welfare including stress-related behaviors, wounds, scratches, injuries, weight loss and body condition are influenced by the behavior sows express as a result of their genotype, housing system and management practices.

Key Words: Weaning Age, Pigs, Economics

Key Words: Pigs, Lactation, Behavior