Data quality index

- \cdot The issue
- What is happening in other countries
- Review of current solutions in Ireland
- What we want to achieve for Ireland
- \cdot Some options going forward



The issue

- The whole industry benefits from genetic gain, international competiveness
- Rely on pedigree breeders to record data (cost and time) that drives genetic improvement in objective traits
- Free loaders breeders that use indexes to sell bulls but make little effort to record data



Other countries

- Many countries/industries use reliabilities as sole definition of data quality
- Some countries have minimum reliabilities or else no BV available (Breedplan)
- NZ sheep, you can only get BVs out of certain evaluation modules if you record relevant traits.
 - Wormfec certification brand mark on breeder reports
- Gold, Silver, Bronze flock status (Australian lamb plan)
 - Driven by breeders wanting to know what flocks they could safely buy rams from



Other countries cont.

- Take stock -Australia beef
 - Extensive diagnostics to describe genetic progress achieved in pedigree herds and why
 - Science driven
 - Not deployed because
 - Hard to communicate 1 on 1 with many breeders
 - · Losers as well as winners = politics



Ireland currently

How the Herd Data Quality Index is calculated (example only)

Name JIM F	ARMER			Beef Pedig	ree HDQI: 71.28	Vo	-				1.0ve
Address DEME	NSE				Whole	lerd Pedi	ree Con	nmercial			Z HDO
TULL	MORE		Be	ef Cows (at Ye	ar End) 43	21		22			herd sc
CO OI	FALY			Calf Regist	trations 46	36	i	10			7
Herd Designator IE123	1567			AI Bred Regis	trations 36	30		6			
ndex generated on 05-FEE	-13			ET Regist	trations 17	17		0			
Reporting Period 01-FEE	3-12 to 01-FEB-13	Youngstoc	k (250-500	days old, at Ye	ar End) 22	20		2			
leru Storecaru - Peuigra		Birth Ever		4. Birth	5. Pre-Weaning			ning Events			2. 0
Herd Scorecard - Pedigree	1. Insemination	2. Sire Recording	3. Calving Survey	Weights	5. Pre-Weaning Weight	6. Calf Docility	7. Calf Quality	8. Linear Score	9. Post-Weaning Weight	10. Average	2. 0 comple
Events / Calves (A)	1. Insemination 36	2. Sire Recording 36	3. Calving Survey 36	Weights 36	Weight 20	6. Calf Docility 20	7. Calf Quality 20	8. Linear Score 20	9. Post-Weaning Weight 31	10. Average	2. 0 comple sc
	1. Insemination 36 5	2. Sire Recording	3. Calving Survey	Weights	Weight	6. Calf Docility	7. Calf Quality	8. Linear Score	9. Post-Weaning Weight	10. Average 79.66	2. 0 compl sc
Events / Calves (A) Completeness	1. Insemination 36 5 13.89	2. Sire Recording 36 36	3. Calving Survey 36 18	Weights 36 32	Weight 20 20	6. Calf Docility 20 20	7. Calf Quality 20 20	8. Linear Score 20 18	9. Post-Weaning Weight 31 23		2. 0 compl sc
Events / Calves (A) Completeness % of (A) Complete = (B)	1. Insemination 36 5 13.89 2	2. Sire Recording 36 36 100	3. Calving Survey 36 18 50	Weights 36 32 88.89	Weight 20 20 100	6. Calf Docility 20 20 100	7. Calf Quality 20 20 100	8. Linear Score 20 18 90	9. Post-Weaning Weight 31 23 74.19		2. 0 comple sc 3. time sc



9 criteria

- Equal weighting on criteria and on timliness vs completeness
- Future need to emphasise
 - completeness,
 - pedigree, and
 - weights
- \cdot Based on
 - Impact on index reliability



What we want to achieve

- Warn commercial bull and semen buyers of risk of daughters not achieving 4/5 star criteria
- Identify the herds with best data so industry initiatives can be targeted



Key drivers

• For herds

- Connectedness and bull sharing for valid comparisons across contemporary groups
- Number of traits recorded and percent of animal for each trait
- \cdot For individual bulls
- \cdot The index value
- Reliabilities and above herd criteria



Options going forward

- Existing data quality metric to be tweaked for identifying best herds for research and initiatives
- Widespread reporting of a bull level metric of how reliable the data is behind the index prediction

