

Experiences with genomic prediction

NAV workshop

10 January 2013

Ulrik Sander Nielsen

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdi Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Genomic prediction

Past and present

- **First genomic prediction for HOL in fall 2008**
- **Results from research project that continuously is exploited in practice**

GEBV's published for candidates bulls calves in May 2011- only small changes since

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdi Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Methods to analyse quality of genomic prediction

- Objective tests:
 - Test increase in reliability by genomic prediction in relation to pedigree index for recent cohorts of bulls with offspring
 - Testing if traditional breeding values and GEBV is expressed on the same scale (Interbull genomic test)
- Practical results:
 - Analysis bulls that have got traditional breeding values

Reliabilities for Holstein

	Reliability (%)		Gain	
	Genomic	Pedigree	Reliability (%)	Daugh.
Yield	55	23	32	9
Growth	48	23	25	8
Fertility	47	18	28	66
Udder health	45	14	31	43
Other diseases	39	20	19	77
Body	35	11	24	5
Feet and legs	33	16	17	12
Mammary	58	10	48	19
Longevity	52	33	19	35

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdi Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Reliabilities for RDC

	Reliability (%)		Gain	
	Genomic	Pedigree	Reliability (%)	Daugh.
Yield	35	11	24	4
Growth	43	34	9	3
Fertility	29	12	17	27
Udder health	28	9	19	19
Other diseases	30	16	14	47
Body	40	16	24	6
Feet and legs	31	11	20	13
Mammary	34	21	13	4
Longevity	44	29	15	22

Reliabilities for Jersey

	Reliability (%)		Gain	
	Genomic	Pedigree	Reliability (%)	Daugh.
Yield	22	22	0	0
Fertility	17	17	0	0
Udder health	37	17	20	25
Other diseases	11	5	6	14
Body	31	19	12	3
Feet and legs	15	12	3	2
Mammary	19	7	12	2
Longevity	17	11	6	5

Reasons for different reliabilities

- **No. of bulls in reference population**
- **Definition of traits across countries**
 - Euro Genomics, Geno
- **Homogeneity of reference population**
- **Reliability of traditional EBV**
 - Heritability
 - Size of progeny group

NAV



Stability of NTM

- **Comparison of breeding values for bulls where breeding values were based :**
 - **Exclusively on genomic information in May 2011**
 - **Exclusively on progeny test in November 2012**

These bulls are selected as young bulls before start of genomic prediction

The bulls are grouped according to their GEBV's in May 2011

NAV



Stability of NTM

EBV's based on progeny test are indicator of the efficiency of genomic prediction, but:

- Reliability is not 100 %
- Genomic test and a progeny test are two independent tests of the same animal, and the changes will be bigger compared to a progeny test based on few daughters and a later test based on more daughters

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdis Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Stability of NTM

Genomic prediction

Equals

10 daughters

Progeny test

100 daughters

10 daughters

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdi Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Stability of NTM - differences

Holstein November 2012 EBV's versus May 2011 GEBV's

Dif.	Level of GEBV in May 2011									
	-8	-4	0	4	8	12	16	20	24	28+
<-10	1	7	2	4	9	15	10	2	3	1
-10 - -6	1	6	4	5	19	13	16	13	2	4
-5 - -1	3	8	14	16	35	30	22	8	7	
0 - 5	2	8	22	18	19	15	18	11	1	
6 - 10	5	4	7	8	16	6	3		1	
>10	2	1	5	2	1	1	1	1		

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdi Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Stability of NTM - level

Holstein November 2012 EBV's versus May 2011 GEBV's

Level Nov. 2012	Level of GEBV, May 2011									
	-8	-4	0	4	8	12	16	20	24	28+
<11	13	34	49	46	86	52	28	8	2	
11-12	1		3	3	9	12	7	6	1	
13-14			1	3	6	4	9	3	1	
15-16			1		6	7	11	3	1	
17-18				1	1	2	5	3	1	
19-20					1	2	5	2	3	3
21-22						1	4	6	3	1
23-24								3		1
25-26							1		1	1
27-28										1
29-								1	1	

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdi Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Stability of NTM - differences

RDC November 2012 EBV's versus May 2011 GEBV's

Dif.	Level of GEBV in May 2011							
	-8	-4	0	4	8	12	16	20
<-10			2	5	3	2	1	
-10 - -6	1	3	3	13	11	11	3	1
-5 - -1	1	13	7	26	12	9	5	1
0 - 5	1	11	21	20	18	9	5	2
6 - 10	1	7	16	15	19	3	1	
>10	3	2	6	7	4	4	2	

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdi Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation

Stability of NTM - level

RDC November 2012 EBV's versus May 2011 GEBV's

Level Nov. 2012	Level of GEBV, May 2011								
	-8	-4	0	4	8	12	16	20	
<11	11	34	48	69	36	18	6	1	
11-12		1	3	5	6	4	3		
13-14		1	2	6	4	2			
15-16			1	4	5	2	1	1	
17-18			1	1	2	5	1		
19-20					2	1	3	1	
21-22				1	1	2	1	1	
23-24					1	1			
25-26									
27-28						1	1		
29-30							1		

NAV



Stability of NTM - differences

Jersey November 2012 EBV's versus May 2011 GEBV's

Dif.	Level of GEBV in May 2011					
	-4	0	4	8	12	16
<-10			2	1		1
-10- -6			1	3	4	
-5 - -1		1	6	9	4	
0 - 5	1	2	9	7	5	4
6 - 10	3		5	4	4	1
>10		3		2		

NAV



Stability of NTM - level

Jersey November 2012 EBV's versus May 2011 GEBV's

Level Nov. 2012	Level of GEBV, May 2011					
	-4	0	4	8	12	16
<11	4	3	19	14	8	1
11-12			3	4		
13-14		1	1	2	3	
15-16		2		2	1	1
17-18				2	2	1
19-20				1	3	1
21-22						
23-24						
25-26				1		
27-28						
29-30						

NAV



Summary

- **Effective selection of bull calves- the level of young bulls is raised significantly**
- **Among the selected bulls it is difficult to identify the very best**
- **The best HOL bulls drop in level, whereas RDC and JER are stable**

NAV



Nordisk Avlsværdis Vurdering • Nordic Cattle Genetic Evaluation