

# Quantifying the whole farm systems impact of nitrogen

## BEST PRACTICE ON AN IRRIGATED DAIRY FARM

### About the research

The More Profit from Nitrogen Program (MPfN Program) is a cross-sector partnership between Australia's four intensive agricultural users of Nitrogen (N) fertilisers, formed to undertake research into improving nitrogen use efficiency (NUE). As part of the collaborative research, The University of Melbourne (UoM), Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture (TIA) and Queensland University of Technology (QUT), supported by Dairy Australia, used whole farm system analysis to validate current N best management practices (BMPs) at both the component and farm system level.

Biophysical modelling (DairyMod) was used to determine 90% of maximum pasture dry matter (DM) growth potential, over 18 years, comparing a seasonally adjusted N fertiliser application rate with a fixed monthly N rate.

The research highlighted inefficiencies in applying a fixed monthly rate of N, demonstrating that a fixed rate and timing would not deliver optimal NUE.

### Analysis of farm level economic benefits

A farm level partial budget framework was developed to evaluate the economic implications of adopting the seasonally modified N fertiliser rate strategy for a dairy farm near Taree, NSW, that is irrigated during the annual ryegrass period, 1 April to 31 October annually. The framework was based on the principle of profit maximisation, given the decreasing marginal returns from N application.

An example of a typical seasonal fixed N rate strategy for a dairy operation near Taree<sup>1</sup> was compared with the seasonally modified strategy identified in the research.

1 Industry feedback for the Taree region identified a typical fixed rate application of either 0 or 30 kg N/ha/month from Nov to Mar for the kikuyu phase and 40 kg N/ha/month from Apr to Oct for the ryegrass phase. The economic analysis presented in this case study is for the fixed rate application of 30 kg N/ha/month for the kikuyu phase, representing the lower limit of the benefit. These typical N rates were used to calculate corresponding DM production using the same approach as the seasonally modified N rate in the research. Applying a typical fixed rate kikuyu application of 0 kg N/ha/month increases the results to \$575/ha/year on average.

Across 18 years of data (June 1999–May 2017), the change in cost of N was compared to the change in value of pasture DM produced, to determine if the practice change was economically justified.

### KEY MESSAGES

Economically beneficial to adopt a seasonally modified N application approach based on seasonal conditions and local growth potential.

In most years, marginally increasing the annual N rate is economically sound.

In some seasons and years, reducing the N rate and offsetting with increased supplementary feed purchases is justified.

Table 1 shows the average change in N applied across the four seasons between the fixed and seasonally modified N rates, identified within the research. Table 2 shows the resultant impact on pasture DM production.

Combining the change in the cost of applied N and the change in the value of DM production generated a financial return of an additional \$162/ha/year.

**Table 1** Comparison of fixed rate (FR) and seasonally modified (SM) N application for the Taree site over 18 years.

| Season              | FR N<br>(kg/ha/month) <sup>1</sup> | SM rate N<br>(kg/ha/month) | Change in N<br>(kg/ha/month) | \$/t<br>urea <sup>2</sup> | Change in cost<br>of N (\$/ha) |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Summer              | 30                                 | 33                         | +3                           |                           | +\$3                           |
| Autumn              | 37                                 | 35                         | -1                           |                           | -\$2                           |
| Winter              | 40                                 | 50                         | +10                          | \$596                     | +\$13                          |
| Spring              | 37                                 | 46                         | +10                          |                           | +\$13                          |
| <b>Annual total</b> | <b>430</b>                         | <b>493</b>                 | <b>+63</b>                   |                           | <b>+\$82</b>                   |

**Table 2** Comparison of fixed rate (FR) and seasonally modified (SM) DM production for the Taree site over 18 years.

| Season              | FR DM<br>(t/ha/month) | SM DM<br>(t/ha/month) | Difference in DM<br>(t/ha/month) | \$/t<br>hay <sup>3</sup> | Change in value<br>DM (\$/ha) |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Summer              | 2.6                   | 2.7                   | +0.1                             | \$191                    | +\$26                         |
| Autumn              | 1.2                   | 1.2                   | -0.0                             | \$186                    | -\$1                          |
| Winter              | 2.2                   | 2.4                   | +0.1                             | \$238                    | +\$34                         |
| Spring              | 1.6                   | 1.7                   | +0.1                             | \$241                    | +\$22                         |
| <b>Annual total</b> | <b>22.6</b>           | <b>23.7</b>           | <b>+1.1</b>                      | <b>\$222</b>             | <b>+\$244</b>                 |

Combining the change in the cost of applied N (Table 1) and the change in the value of DM production (Table 2), analysis shows a net positive economic impact of an additional \$162/ha/year (Table 3).

**Table 3** Net economic impact of employing a seasonally modified rate of N for the Taree site (18-year averages).

| Season              | Average<br>change in<br>cost N<br>(\$/ha/month) <sup>2</sup> | Average<br>change in<br>value DM<br>(\$/ha/month) <sup>3</sup> | Net impact<br>(\$/ha/month)<br>(benefit-cost) |
|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Summer              | \$3  | \$26   | \$23  |
| Autumn              | -\$2   | -\$1   | \$1   |
| Winter              | \$13   | \$34   | \$21  |
| Spring              | \$13   | \$22   | \$9   |
| <b>Annual total</b> | <b>\$82</b>  | <b>\$244</b>   | <b>\$162</b>                                  |

## Variability and sensitivity analysis

Across the 18 years simulated in the research, the annual impact of switching from a fixed rate to a seasonally modified rate of N application ranged between \$63/ha/year and \$370/ha/year. This variation is due to the influence of different climatic conditions on the pasture DM response.

While the results showed an average increase in N application, there is variation in the seasonal application of N across the 18 years. This was particularly driven by the opportunity to increase DM production through additional N application in summer and winter; however, the seasonally modified approach also included seasons (primarily autumn) and years where it was economically justified to reduce the rate of N, and offset the reduced pasture DM production through the purchase of supplementary feed.

**The analysis showed that in some seasons and years, it was economically justified to reduce the rate of N, and offset the reduced pasture DM production, through the purchase of supplementary feed.**

To test the sensitivity of the results to changes in market prices, a range of potential urea<sup>2</sup> and pasture hay<sup>3</sup> values were derived from historical datasets. Table 4 shows how the potential impact (\$/ha/year) of applying the seasonally modified N approach varies with different combinations of urea and pasture hay values. For example, when urea and hay prices were \$596/t and \$222/t respectively, a seasonally modified approach could generate \$162/ha/year above the typical fixed rate approach. As the seasonally modified approach modelled in this case study shows an average annual increase in N application to generate additional DM, the economic viability is supported by high prices of DM, low prices of N, or a combination of both. Table 4 shows that the potential economic impact was positive for all combinations of urea and pasture hay prices identified.

- N was valued using farmgate urea prices (N content of 46%). Average, high and low urea prices were derived from 5 years of TradeMap imported urea data and Ag Econ data. A spreading cost of \$40/t was applied based on Dairy Australia FertSmart Nitrogen Guidelines. All figures adjusted to 2020 prices.
- The modelling assumed that increased pasture DM production was converted to pasture hay (with a DM content of 85%) and either used to offset existing supplementary feed, or sold, at the prevailing market price. Conversely, DM was purchased at the prevailing market price to offset any decreases in production. Market values for DM were derived from five years of Dairy Australia Hay and Grain Report data, using pasture hay prices for North Coast NSW, and adjusted for cartage, or the cost of cutting, raking, baling and field losses as appropriate. All figures adjusted to 2020 prices.

**Table 4** Sensitivity of the economic impact (\$/ha/year) to changes in urea and DM (pasture hay) values.

|                                       |       | Urea price (\$/t) <sup>2</sup> |       |              |       |       |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|
|                                       |       | \$493                          | \$544 | \$596        | \$641 | \$686 |
| Average hay price (\$/t) <sup>3</sup> | \$109 | \$55                           | \$53  | \$51         | \$51  | \$51  |
|                                       | \$165 | \$114                          | \$106 | \$99         | \$94  | \$89  |
|                                       | \$222 | \$179                          | \$171 | <b>\$162</b> | \$156 | \$149 |
|                                       | \$301 | \$271                          | \$263 | \$255        | \$248 | \$241 |
|                                       | \$381 | \$363                          | \$355 | \$347        | \$340 | \$332 |

## Conclusion

By combining economic analysis with the biophysical modelling research undertaken in the MPfN Program, this case study quantified the lost opportunity of following a fixed recipe for N application. By applying a seasonally modified strategy to N application, in combination with irrigation, the annual benefit of increased DM production exceeded the increased cost of fertiliser, generating an average economic benefit of \$162/ha/year. Primarily the benefit is generated from increased N application and DM production in the summer and winter months. Sensitivity analysis showed the economic impact remained positive for a wide range of urea and DM market prices.

At the irrigated Taree site, it was economically beneficial to increase the average annual rate of N, although there were large variations across the 18 years of data. This included some seasons and years where it was economically justified to reduce the rate of N and offset the reduced pasture DM production with increased supplementary feed.

Overall, this case study highlights the benefit of moving from a fixed rate of N application to a rate adjusted each time to local growth potential.

## ENVIRONMENTAL OUTCOMES

By more accurately matching nutrient supply with plant growth, the seasonally modified N application strategy in this case study also leads to:

- Higher and more consistent DM production and therefore increased ground cover through the year.
- Higher root growth leading to higher soil organic matter.
- Improved nitrogen use efficiency in terms of DM production per unit of N applied.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

On the MPfN Program visit [crdc.com.au/more-profit-nitrogen](http://crdc.com.au/more-profit-nitrogen)

For more information on this case study, please contact Cath Lescun, Lead – Soils and Irrigation, Dairy Australia, [Cath.Lescun@dairyaustralia.com.au](mailto:Cath.Lescun@dairyaustralia.com.au)

*This case study was prepared by the dairy research projects of the More Profit from Nitrogen Program, with the assistance of AgEcon, through the MPfN: final evaluation and economic case studies project. The More Profit from Nitrogen Program: enhancing the nutrient use efficiency of intensive cropping and pasture systems is supported by funding from the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment as part of its Rural R&D for Profit program.*



Australian Government  
Department of Agriculture,  
Water and the Environment



*This project is supported by funding from the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment as part of its Rural R&D for Profit program, The University of Melbourne, Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture, Queensland University of Technology and Dairy Australia.*