United States of America

Country

Trait category:

Conformation

Reproduction-calving

Individual trait(s):

Dystocia (direct) Somatic cell score Udder Locomotion Other Productive life

Longevity

Health

Calving performance: National Association of Animal Breeders P.O. Box 1033 Columbia, Missouri 65205-1033 U.S.A. Telephone +1 573 445 4406 Facsimile +1 573 446 2279 E-mail "s=naab.css/o=naab/"@sprint.com

Conformation traits of Holstein: Holstein Association 1 Holstein Place Brattleboro, Vermont 05301 U.S.A. Telephone +1 802 254 4551 Facsimile +1 802 254 8251 E-mail lawlor@holstein.com

Conformation traits (breeds other than Holsteins), somatic cell count and productive life:Animal Improvement Programs LaboratoryBuilding 263, BARC-East10300 Baltimore AvenueBeltsville, Maryland 20705-2350 U.S.A.Telephone+1 301 504 8334Facsimile+1 301 504 8092E-mailrlaipl@ggpl.arsusda.gov

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reproduction calving traits	Dystocia (direct)		
Breed(s)	Holstein Red & White		
Trait definition and unit(s) of measuring	Scored in 5 categories; no problem (1), slight problem (2), needed assistance (3), considerable force (4), extreme difficulty (5)		
Method of measuring and collecting data	Scored by dairyman and collected by milk recording programs or AI-organizations		
Time period for data inclusion	Since 1985		
Age groups	All		
Genetic parameters	$h_{calving performance (on underlying scale)}^2 = 0.147$		
Sire categories	AI-bulls		
Environmental effects pre-adjustment evaluation model	None Herd x year x season, sex of calf, parity		
Base for age adjustment	None		
Use of genetic groups and/or relationships	Bulls are grouped by birth year of bull. Relationships considered are sire and MGS of bulls with progeny		
Method (model) of genetic evaluation	ST Threshold model SM		
System validation	Genetic trend calculated at each run		
Expression of proof	PTA as percentage of difficult births for heifer calving in winter, difficult birth is defined as score 4 (considerable force) or 5 (extreme difficulty), $M = 9.05\%$ and $SD = 5.42\%$		
Genetic (reference) base	Fixed base of bulls born prior to 1977		
Criteria for official publication of sire proofs	≥ 20 calvings		
Number of evaluations/ publications per year	Two; January, July		
Use in total merit index	No		
Key reference on methodology applied	 Berger, P.J., 1994. Genetic prediction for calving ease in the United States: Data, models and uses by the dairy industry. J. Dairy Sci. 77: 1146 Clutter, A.C., P.J. Berger & J.M. Mattison, 1989. Threshold model analysis of dystocia in dairy cattle when progeny information is limited. J. Dairy Sci. 72: 3264 Djemali, M., P.J. Berger & A.E. Freeman, 1987. Ordered categorical sire evaluation for dystocia in Holsteins. J. Dairy Sci. 70: 2374 		

Health traits	Somatic cell score		
Breed(s)	Holstein, Red & White, Ayrshire, Brown Swiss, Guernsey, Jersey, Milking Shorthorn		
Trait definition and unit(s) of measuring	Somatic cell score is lactation mean of log 2 somatic cell counts		
Method of measuring and collecting data	Collected by milk recording program		
Time period for data inclusion	Since 1987		
Age groups	1 st to 5 th lactation		
Genetic parameters	$h^2_{\text{somatic cell score}} = 0.10, t = 0.35$		
Sire categories	All bulls		
Environmental effects pre-adjustment evaluation model	Days in milk, calving age, calving month Management group (as for yield)		
Base for age adjustment	Average age of 46 months for Holstein, Red & White, Ayrshire, Brown Swiss and Milking Shorthorn Average age of 49 for Jersey and Guernsey		
Use of genetic groups and/or relationships	All relationships used. Unknown parents grouped by sex and year		
Method (model) of genetic evaluation	ST BLUP AM		
System validation	Separate regional analyses were compared pre-implementation		
Expression of proof	PTA, adjusted so cows establishing genetic bases have the following means: Holstein 3.20, Red & White 3.20, Ayrshire 3.15, Brown Swiss 3.22, Guernsey 3.35, Jersey 3.31, Milking Shorthorn 2.87. Higher values indicate a higher somatic cell score		
Genetic (reference) base	5-year stepwise, cows born in 1990		
Criteria for official publication of sire proofs	Published if yield evaluation published		
Number of evaluations/ publications per year	Two; January, July		
Use in total merit index	USDA: net merit \$: 0.70 x milk-fat-protein \$ + 11.30 x productive life - 28.22 x (somatic cell score - breed average) Relative emphasis = 10: 4 : -1		
Key reference on methodology applied	Schutz, M.M., 1994. Genetic evaluation of somatic cell scores for United States dairy cattle. J. Dairy Sc. 77: 2113		

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Conformation traits	Udder: Locomo Other:	fore udder attachment, rear udder height, rear udder width, udder cleft, udder depth, front teat placement, teat length (only for Holstein, Guernsey and Jersey) tion: foot angle, rear legs (side view) Stature, strength, body depth (only for Holstein, Guernsey and Jersey), dairy form, rump angle, thurl width (only for Holstein, Guernsey and Jersey), final score
Breed(s)	[H] [O]	Holstein Other breeds: Ayrshire, Brown Swiss, Guernsey, Jersey, Milking Shorthorn, Red & White
Trait definition and unit(s) of measuring	[H,O]	Ayrshires are scored on 1-9 point scale, other breeds scored on a 1-50 point scale
Method of measuring and collecting data	[H,O]	Scored visually by breed association classifiers/appraisers
Time period for data inclusion	(H) [O]	Final score since 1955, other traits since 1982 Final score since 1976, other traits since 1980
Age groups	[H,O]	All
Genetic parameters	[H] [O]	$ \begin{aligned} h_{udder \ traits}^{2} &= 0.23 \ to \ 0.29, \ t = 0.37 \ to \ 0.46 \\ h_{locomotion \ traits}^{2} &= 0.15 \ to \ 0.21, \ t = 0.25 \ to \ 0.32 \\ h_{other \ traits}^{2} &= 0.26 \ to \ 0.42, \ t = 0.30 \ to \ 0.60 \\ r_{g(between \ linear \ traits)}^{2} &= -0.34 \ to \ 0.92 \\ h_{udder \ traits}^{2} &= 0.16 \ to \ 0.27, \ t = 0.40 \ to \ 0.652 \\ h_{locomotion \ traits}^{2} &= 0.12 \ to, \ t = 0.288 \\ h_{other \ traits}^{2} &= 0.16 \ to \ 0.40, \ t = .40 \ to \ 0.65 \end{aligned} $
Sire categories	[H,O]	All bulls
Environmental effects		
pre-adjustment	[H]	None
evaluation model	[O] [H] [O]	Age at calving, stage of lactation Herd x classification date, animal, permanent environment, herd x sire-interaction, age at calving, stage of lactation Herd x classification date x parity, genetic groups, herd x sime interaction
Base for age adjustment	(H)	5 year old cow, born in 1990 and milking in her 5 th month of her 3 rd lactation
	[0]	Set so actual and age adjusted scores are equal for breed-trait
Use of genetic groups and/or relationships	[H] [O]	All relationships and unknown parent groups Grouping on pedigree index for final score
Method (model) of constic	<u>[1]</u>	MT BLUP AM different traits avaluated
evaluation	[0]	simultaneously ST BLUP SM

UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERICA
--------	--------	----	---------

Conformation traits continued	Udder Locom Other	otion
System validation	(H)	Validation of genetic trend, monitoring of changes in genetic predictions
	[0]	Examination resulted in addition of parity to model
Expression of proof	[H] [O]	Most traits have a PTA with $M = 0$ and $SD = 1$ Final score is expressed in PTA PTA with $M = 0$
Genetic (reference) base	[H,O]	5-year stepwise, cows born in 1990
Criteria for official	(H)	\geq 10 daughters (and for Guernsev)
publication of sire proofs	[0]	Published if yield evaluation published and if ≥ 5 daughters and REL $\ge 20\%$
Number of evaluations/ publications per year	[H,O]	Two; January, July
Use in total merit index	[H]	<u>Holstein</u> : Type-Production Index (TPI): [3 x protein (lb.) / 19.0 + fat (lb) / 22.5 + final score / $0.7 + UDC / 0.8$] x 50 + 576 <u>UDC</u> = [udder composite = 0.30 x udder depth + 0.16 x fore udder + 0.16 x teat placement + 0.16 x rear udder height + 0.12 x rear udder width + 0.10 x udder cleft]
	[0]	Other breeds: Production-type index (PTI): Ayrshire: [4 x protein (kg) + 2 x fat (kg) + 1 x final score] (100 / 7) Brown Swiss: [5 x protein (kg) + 1 x fat (kg) + 1 x final score] (100 / 7) Guernsey: [5 x protein (kg) + 1 x fat (kg) + 1 x functional herdlife] (100 / 7) Jersey: [8 x protein (kg) + 2 x fat (kg) + 2 x functional trait index + 2 x productive life (mo) - 1 x SCS] (100 / 13) Functional trait index = 0.15 x stature + 0.11 x strength + 0.40 x dairy form - 0.20 x rear legs + 0.30 x foot angle + 0.49 x fore udder attachment + 0.63 x rear udder height + 0.42 x rear udder width + 0.22 x udder cleft + 0.55 x teat placement + 1.00 udder depth Milking Shorthorn: [4 x protein (kg) + 2 x fat (kg) + 1 x final score] (100 / 7) NB: All variables are in units of SD (divided by SD)
Key reference on methodology applied	[H] [O]	Misztal, I., T.J. Lawlor & T.H. Short, 1993. Implementation of single and multiple trait animal models for genetic evaluations of Holstein type traits. J. Dairy Sci. 76: 1421 Norman, H.D., B.G. Cassell, G.J. King, R.L. Powell & E.E. Wright, 1979. Sire evaluation for conformation of Jersey cows. J. Dairy Sci. 62:1914

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Longevity traits	Productive life		
Breed(s)	Holstein, Red & White, Ayrshire, Brown Swiss, Guemsey, Jersey, Milking Shorthorn		
Trait definition and unit(s) of measuring	Total months of milk production, limited to 10 mo/lactation and 7 year of age		
Method of measuring and collecting data	Calculated from predicted and realized data of milk recording program, augmented by conformation data for Holsteins		
Time period for data inclusion	Since 1960		
Age groups	\geq 3 years		
Genetic parameters	$h_{\text{productive life}}^2 = 0.085$		
Sire categories	All bulls		
Environmental effects pre-adjustment evaluation model	Incomplete records are extended Birth year x season		
Base for age adjustment	None		
Use of genetic groups and/or relationships	All relationships used. Unknown parents grouped by sex and year		
Method (model) of genetic evaluation	ST BLUP AM		
System validation	-		
Expression of proof	PTA in months, with $SD = 1.9$ months, higher values are more desirable		
Genetic (reference) base	5-year stepwise, cows born in 1990		
Criteria for official publication of sire proofs	Published if yield evaluation published		
Number of evaluations/ publications per year	Two; January, July		
Use in total merit index	Included, see pages 155 (USDA) and 157 (PTI)		
Key reference on methodology applied	VanRaden, P.M. & G.R. Wiggans, 1995. Productive life evaluations: calculation, accuracy and economic value. J. Dairy Sci. 78: 631		