

2012 Interbull Meeting May 27 – May 29, Cork, Irland



Implementing a national routine genetic evaluation for milk fat compositions as first step towards genomic predictions

N. Gengler¹, T. Troch¹, S. Vanderick¹, C. Bastin¹ and H. Soyeurt^{1,2}

¹ Animal Science Unit, Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, University of Liège (GxABT, ULg) – Gembloux, Belgium
² National Fund for Scientific Research (FRS-FNRS) – Brussels, Belgium

Walloon Region of Belgium:

- collecting fatty acid composition since March 2005
- first experimental on 25 farms
- currently nearly all cows under milk recording



Walloon Region of Belgium:

- collecting fatty acid composition since March 2005
- first experimental on 25 farms
- currently nearly all cows under milk recording

Data collection status (April 2010): 864 835 test-days with fatty acid (all-lactation)

Walloon Region of Belgium:

- collecting fatty acid composition since March 2005
- first experimental on 25 farms
- currently nearly all cows under milk recording

Data collection status (April 2010):

864 835 test-days with fatty acid (all-lactation)

INTERBULL Report 2010: development of a genetic evaluation system

This report:

- Status of the data collection
- Status of the model and needed (co)variances
- Expressing results
 - Nutritional Quality Index (NQI)
- First computations and results
 - Some examples of evaluated sires
- Towards genomic predictions
 - Using MACE for correlated traits
 - A proposal !
- Other traits

Status of Data Collection

Reminder:

fatty acids (FA) predicted from MIR spectral data
 use of latest equation (Soyeurt et al., 2011)

April 2010: 864 835 test-day MIR spectra records (all-lactation)

March 2012: 2 150 404 test-day MIR spectra records (all-lactation)

Status of Data Collection

Reminder:

fatty acids (FA) predicted from MIR spectral data
 use of latest equation (Soyeurt et al., 2011)

April 2010: 864 835 test-day MIR spectra records (all-lactation) We are adding approximately 55 000 FA records / month March 2012. 2 150 404 test-day MIR spectra records (all-lactation)

Previous research done has shown for milk fat composition traits (e.g., Soyeurt et al., 2008): genetic variation and medium to high hertitabilities Some modelling issues however: repeated records Iongitudinal traits □ highly correlated traits with traditional traits (milk, fat, protein) □ among different fatty acids and fatty acid groups

Previous research done has shown for milk fat composition traits (e.g., Soyeurt et al., 2008): genetic variation and medium to high hertitabilities Some modelling issues however: □ repeated records More data, but rep. model Iongitudinal traits □ highly correlated traits with traditional traits (milk, fat, protein) among different fatty acids and fatty acid groups

Previous research done has shown for milk fat composition traits (e.g., Soyeurt et al., 2008): genetic variation and medium to high hertitabilities Some modelling issues however: □ repeated records Iongitudinal traits **Random regression model** □ highly correlated traits with traditional traits (milk, fat, protein) □ among different fatty acids and fatty acid groups

Previous research done has shown for milk fat composition traits (e.g., Soyeurt et al., 2008): genetic variation and medium to high hertitabilities Some modelling issues however: □ repeated records Iongitudinal traits □ highly correlated traits with traditional traits (milk, fat, protein)

Use of historical test-day data

Previous research done has shown for milk fat composition traits (e.g., Soyeurt et al., 2008): genetic variation and medium to high hertitabilities Some modelling issues however: □ repeated records Iongitudinal traits □ highly correlated traits □ among different fatty acids and fatty acid groups

Large number of relevant traits

Selection of traditional traits based on INTERBULL traits □ milk, fat, and protein yield Selection of milk fat composition traits □ based on potential place in breeding goal □ milk pricing □ saturated fatty acid content (SFA) in milk (g/100g) potentially health related monounsaturated fatty acid content (MUFA) in milk (g/100g)

\Rightarrow ML – MT – TD – RRM

Heritabilies (diagonal) and used genetic correlations (above) expressed on a lactation base

	Trait					
Trait	MILK	FAT	PROT	SFA	MUFA	
MILK (kg)	0.37	0.91	0.97	-0.28	-0.38	
FAT (kg)		0.43	0.93	0.00	0.01	
PROT (kg)			0.41	-0.22	-0.23	
SFA (%)				0.71	0.40	
MUFA (%)					0.56	

Bended

Heritabilies (diagonal) and used genetic correlations (above) expressed on a lactation base

				Trait	Ł
Trait	MILK	FAT	PROT	SFA	MNFA
MILK (kg)	0.37	0.91	0.97	-0.28	-0.38
FAT (kg)		0.43	0.93	0.00	0.01
PROT (kg)			0.41	-0.22	-0.23
SFA (%)				0.71	0.40
MUFA (%)					0.56

Expressing Results?

- Should be based on breeding goal !
- Two potential components could contribute to breeding goal (even if there is no consensus)
 - trends In milk pricing: SFA
 - potentially human health related: MUFA
- To avoid: risk of deleterious effects on other important traits especially milk and fat
- Solution: restricted selection index
 - □ Std. relative "a values": -1 SFA and +1 MUFA
 - Restricting changes in milk and fat yields to 0 !!!
 - □ Computation of "b values"

Expressing Results

- Computation of Nutritional Quality Index (NQI)
- Standardized b values:

Milk yield :	+ 0.478
Fat yield :	- 0.425
Protien yield :	0.000
SFA:	- 0.934
MUFA:	+ 0.934

Some parameters for Nutritional Quality Index (NQI)

0.00

0.00

0.05

-0.69

MUFA

0.38

□ Heritability: 0.54

□ Correlation with MILK FAT PROT SFA

First Computations and Results

Data from 1st, 2nd and 3rd lactation

Trait*	Ν	Mean	SD
MILK (kg)	16 029 574	18.80	8.10
FAT (kg)	16 024 529	0.75	0.34
PROT (kg)	15 992 387	0.62	0.25
PFAT (%)	16 024 529	4.03	0.74
PPROT (%)	15 992 387	3.37	0.41
SFA (%)	1 168 692	2.85	0.57
MUFA (%)	1 169 520	1.15	0.27

* FAT = fat yield, PROT = protein yield, PFAT = fat content, PPROT = protein content,
 SFA = saturated fatty acid content in milk and MUFA = monounsaturated fatty acid content in milk

First Computations and Results

EBV for SFA and MUFA and NQI

genetic base put to cow with FA records born 2005 (1196 sires REL ≥ 0.50 and at least one daugh. with SFA/MUFA record)

	EBV		REL	
Trait	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SFA (%)	0.022	0.252	0.77	0.13
MUFA (%)	-0.008	0.053	0.71	0.14
NQI (standardized)	-0.10	0.69	0.75	0.13

Distribution of NQI (1196 sires REL ≥ 0.50 and daugh. with SFA/MUFA)



Distribution of Daughters (1196 sires REL ≥ 0.50 and daugh. with SFA/MUFA)



Some Bulls (Nearly Random) Number of Herds and Daughters with FA Records

Name	Herds	Daughters
ALZI JUROR FORD	229	719
BRAEDALE GOLDWYN	166	593
CAROL PRELUDE MTOTO-ET	109	231
COMESTAR LEE	240	528
ETAZON LORD LILY	65	108
FABER ET	191	594
JOCKO BESN	439	1658
LADINO PARK TALENT-IMP-ET	330	1175
LADYS-MANOR WILDMAN-ET	149	509
LONARD	459	1454
MANAT	330	1142
O-BEE MANFRED JUSTICE-ET	26	101
PICSTON SHOTTLE	49	106
RAMOS	159	519
RICECREST MARSHALL-ET	51	120
ROYLANE JORDAN-ET	218	624

Perspectives

> Adding more data:

- □ currently > 500,000 records added every year
- \Box If international sires used \Rightarrow get reliable proofs

\Rightarrow Opportunity foreign AI centers!

Perspectives

> Adding more data:

- currently > 500,000 records added every year
- \Box If international sires used \Rightarrow get reliable proofs

\Rightarrow Opportunity foreign AI centers!

Integration of external information for correlated traits:

 ongoing development to integrate MACE EBV for MILK, FAT and PROT (e.g., Vandenplas and Gengler, 2012)

Perspectives

> Adding more data:

- currently > 500,000 records added every year
- \Box If international sires used \Rightarrow get reliable proofs

\Rightarrow Opportunity foreign AI centers!

> Integration of external information for correlated traits:

 ongoing development to integrate MACE EBV for MILK, FAT and PROT (e.g., Vandenplas and Gengler, 2012)

⇒ Towards Genomic Predictions

Remark on International Collaboration

> Phenotypes (the "King" in the World of Genomics):

- Other countries getting FA records (potentially limited subpopulations)
- Pooling phenotypes for FA makes sense!
 - Directly (single evaluation)
 - Indirectly (including external EBV for FA)
- But also for other traits based on MIR:
 - Collaboration and exchange

Remark on International Collaboration

> Phenotypes (the "King" in the World of Genomics):

- Other countries getting FA records (potentially limited subpopulations)
- Pooling phenotypes for FA makes sense!
 - Directly (single evaluation)
 - Indirectly (including external EBV for FA)
- But also for other traits based on MIR:
 - Collaboration and exchange

\Rightarrow Opportunity for partners to join forces

More on International Collaboration

Genotypes:

- Optimum: combining all available phenotypes with genotypes
- □ However:

more Interaction between owners of both needed



More on International Collaboration

Genotypes:

- Optimum: combining all available phenotypes with genotypes
- □ However:

more Interaction between owners of both needed

\Rightarrow Opportunity for both of them

More on International Collaboration

Genotypes:

- Optimum: combining all available phenotypes with genotypes
- **However:**

more Interaction between owners of both needed

\Rightarrow Opportunity for both of them

Until now no genotype / phenotype collaboration for FA on a genetic / genomic evaluation level

Following under hypothesis local development

Following under hypothesis local development
 Single step method:

- specific situation (ML-MT-TD-RRM) well suited to use one step approach (Aguilar et al., 2010)
- □ integration of external MACE EBV straight forward as for normal BLUP only $A \Rightarrow H$
- therefore information of all animals contributes (e.g. MACE EBV of ungenotyped ancestors)

Single step method:

- specific situation (ML-MT-RR-TDM) well suited to use one step approach (Aguilar et al., 2010)
- □ integration of external MACE EBV straight forward as for normal BLUP only $A \Rightarrow H$
- therefore information of all animals contribute (e.g. MACE EBV of ungenotyped ancestors)

 \Rightarrow Opportunity owners of foreign animals

Single step method:

- specific situation (ML-MT-RR-TDM) well suited to use one step approach (Aguilar et al., 2010)
- □ integration of external MACE EBV straight forward as for normal BLUP only $A \Rightarrow H$
- therefore information of all animals contribute (e.g. MACE EBV of ungenotyped ancestors)

\Rightarrow Opportunity owners of foreign animals

Given arrangements (e.g., providing genotypes)
 base for service to provide genomically enhanced NQI

Conclusions

Implementation of genetic evaluation system for milk fat composition in the Walloon Region of Belgium: Expected in June 2012

- First step towards genomic prediction for novel traits
- Not only FA trait, but all you can predict from MIR data
- Example of another novel trait: methane emissions
 - first results indicate R²_{cv} in the direction of 0.80 (Dehareng et al., 2012)
 - other results show genetic variation

Conclusions

Implementation of genetic evaluation system for milk fat composition in the Walloon Region of Belgium: Expected in June 2012

First step towards genomic prediction for novel traits

Not only FA trait, but all you can predict from MIR data

Example of another novel trait: methane emissions

- □ first results indicate R²_{cv} in the direction of 0.80 (Dehareng et al., 2012)
- other results show genetic variation

 \Rightarrow Opportunity for collaborations











Service public de Wallonie



Corresponding author's email: nicolas.gengler@ulg.ac.be

Thank you for your attention!

Study supported by:

- Ministry of Agriculture of the Walloon Region of Belgium (SPW – DGARNE)
- National Fund for Scientific Research (F.R.S. – FNRS)

□ RobustMilk a FP7 KBBE-2007-1 EU Project

