

**INTERBEEF Working Group meeting**  
**25<sup>th</sup> October 2016**

1. Welcome and Introduction.....	1
2. Adoption of Agenda.....	1
3. Minutes of Meeting 9 <sup>th</sup> March 2016 Salzburg, Austria .....	1
4. Update of the Interbeef Technical Committee – Eric Venot (FRA).....	1
5. Interbull Centre Update (Eva Hjerpe).....	2
6. Draft ICAR/Interbull Service Agreements (Martin Burke ICAR) .....	2
7. Growing the ICAR/INTERBEEF service in the future (Thomas Schmidt) (see presentation).....	5
8. GENOEX PSE. ....	6
9. Future research priorities & collaboration .....	7
10. Finances.....	7
11. Next Meeting.....	7

1. Welcome and Introduction

Brian Wickham as stand-in chairman of the Interbeef Working Groups welcomed everyone and explained why Andrew was not available. Brian asked for a round of introductions. Participants and apologies: Attached as appendix 1.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Brian briefly went through the agenda. The agenda which was circulated at the start of the meeting was adopted.

3. Minutes of Meeting 9<sup>th</sup> March 2016 Salzburg, Austria

The minutes from the previous meeting were discussed.

Brian went through the action list from the previous meeting.

4. Update of the Interbeef Technical Committee – Eric Venot (FRA)

Eric as chairman of the TG outlined the report from the TG the previous day.

- There was an agreed action for Eva to assimilate the up-to-date list of contacts for the TG and WG (This arose in a discussion at the TG the previous day in relation to the wrong contacts being on different lists). Brian stated that Cesare Mosconi from ICAR will update his lists as well.
- Discussion on Redmine. Agreed in TG to use it for Interbeef projects. Toine and Brian asked for more details on this. Eva outlined the capacity of Redmine to track progress on projects. Toine asked for clarification on the use of the tool (remit). It is to be used as a tool for communicating on projects. Thierry (TP) outlined that the Interbeef forum did not really work. WG agreed with the TG recommendations.

- Practical recommendations to improve the reporting tools around routine evaluations.
- EV outlined the situation in Germany around the data not going into the IDEA database.
- Bull status. Agreed to add a new column in the 605 file to indicate the bull status.
- Maternal publication rules: Outlined by Laurent (LG). More checking will be done by LG. New file will be circulated to participants on publishable bulls. Will be done after the test run in March.
- The Simmental test run got the green light to move to a routine run in January 2017.
- Inclusion of crossbred data in weaning weight evaluation report by Thierry. IRE crossbred data will be included for CHA and LIM in the next routine evaluation.
- Interbull centre sent a survey to participants to assess the level of interest in evaluating crossbred animals. CHE and FRA need to fill in the survey for the first time. DEU needs to fill it in again with the views of the commercial partners as well as VIT. More crossbred data is available for carcass traits. In March 2017 a test run will be done with new crossbred data included for countries in addition to Ireland. Crossbred info can be uploaded to the animalinfo table in IDEA. Agreement will be reached by the TG on the scope of the net test run in 2017.
- Research reports.
  - Calving Traits. Parameters are estimated for CHA and are running for LIM. Test run will take place in 2017. Thomas Schmidt added that DEU will come into the calving evaluation research as soon as possible (data call will be needed).
  - Female Fertility Traits: There will be a full report at the next meeting. Genetic parameters are being developed. Thomas: In house software will be used first followed by Mix99.
  - Carcass Traits: Mike Coffey outlined the current research that is focussing on a joint evaluation between the UK and Ireland.

#### 5. Interbull Centre Update (Eva Hjerpe)

The Service calendar has been updated. BW asked if everyone was happy with the service calendar. Toine announced that he has presented it yesterday in the Interbull open session. Agreement that everyone is happy with them. Proposal they would be set a year in advance from now on.

#### 6. Draft ICAR/Interbull Service Agreements (Martin Burke ICAR)

(Refer to note from Andrew)

Martin outlined that the new agreements were an opportunity to improve the governance of ICAR and its services. He would like comments from the Interbeef group to take back to the ICAR legal representative to formulate new contracts. Currently Interbeef has contracts with multiple entities. The objective was to put a service in place and then expand to new

countries/organisations. The initial agreement has worked well but needs updating to allow a more seamless process to all new countries into Interbeef.

#### Code of Practice document

Brian outlined the new code of practise document for Interbeef. The lawyer involved in constructing the new contracts was the existing lawyer who helped formulate the original Interbeef contract (Paul Wescott based in Bandon, Co. Cork, Ireland). This code of practise document was circulated to the WG ahead of the meeting by Andrew Cromie to members for review and feedback. ICAR as part of the new proposal is delegating the maintenance of the code of practise agreement to the Interbeef WG. Laurent stated that it was difficult to develop an overall perspective just yet as there was a lot of information in all the documents.

Toine outlined the code of practice as being a practical document to be used to clarify existing arrangements/services. BW stated that the code of practise had most un-needed legal jargon/ references removed. It would be a dynamic document and the Interbeef WG would have the responsibility to maintain it. The operating arrangement is between the Interbull centre and the client i.e. the Interbeef WG. Toine stated that essentially it is a living document to be adapted over time. Eva asked about the legal documents and where they are visible. Martin stated that the legal signed documents would not be publicly available but the unsigned version could be made available publicly. Brian acknowledged that ICAR now want to hand the code of practice document back to the Interbull centre and the Interbeef WG. Thomas questioned one responsibility in the document (4.1 H) on the publishing of the evaluations in their country specific scale. Toine stated that it should be stated in the document that they are Interbeef proofs. Brian stated that 4.1 I is covering this area but that the WG should amend this if they feel it needs amending. Thomas stated that this was very political issue and it is important for breeders to realise the benefit of Interbeef participation through the identification of the proof as an Interbeef enhanced evaluation. This led to a discussion on logos.

#### Logos.

Martin Burke stated that ICAR will come back with some suggestions on branding of Interbeef. Eric stated that he looked up the internet and found an INTERBEEF company in Poland. Martin stated they have protected the logo/brand and are currently assessing the legal standing on actions to help address these issues.

#### Agreement for the Supply of Services document

Brian asked people to focus on the Agreement for the Supply of Services document as this would be the only document that would be requested of countries to sign at the moment. Eric asked what happens when a country has new breeds/traits to be evaluated. Brian acknowledged this as a very important point and that the new agreement would be very easy to update. Thomas asked about currency fluctuations over time and the impact on services. Brian acknowledged this and would take note of it.

#### Agreement between ICAR and the Interbull Centre in relation to Interbeef.

Brian stated this was not an issue for the clients to deal with but they still need to be comfortable with its details. The contract is in relation to the Interbull Centre/SLU in the provision of services. It is to allow protection from an ICAR level where if the Interbull Centre/SLU were no longer able to provide the services that ICAR could move the data/evaluations to another service provider. Rob Banks asked if this agreement was exclusive to the Interbull Centre or if there could be multiple providers. Martin Burke stated that the agreement was not exclusive to the Interbull Centre and that other service providers could get involved.

Toine outlined the dairy scenario. ICAR have an arrangement with the Interbull Centre who then have agreements with the clients. The Interbull Centre have taken legal advice on this and he outlined that advice. Martin acknowledged Toine's comments and position and stated that ICAR would be engaging with the ITB centre/SLU on this issue. This particular document is the responsibility of ICAR and SLU to sort out. Separate agreements will likely be discussed for all other services such as dairy work (INTERBULL) and GENOEX.

#### Annex on Intellectual Property assignment

This document states that the IP resides with ICAR and that the Interbull Centre accepts that. The crucial issue is the data provided and the where the IP of that data resides. Eva asked about what happens to data when a country leaves. Brian stated that this is covered or should be covered in the Code of Practise. Brian stated that it needs to be very clear as to how the data will be handled and that it is not currently very clear in the current documents. He would be going back to the ICAR legal representative to deal with this. Hugh Nivision stated that the Terms and Conditions need to be discussed around the data and what each partner can do with it. Brian stated this would be discussed next.

#### General Terms and Conditions

Brian stated that Andrew Cromie had some concerns in the Terms and Conditions around an inconsistency in the agreement between English law and Irish law. There was a consensus though that the legal approach should be at least English speaking based law. Toine stated that from the Interbull centre point of view that Swedish law would be preferable. Toine stated that at the end of the day the document may not be needed much but in the event of a sizeable development such as the movement of evaluation services to another provider that the document can allow that and has clarity.

Rob Banks asked about the benefits of participation in ICAR. In the event of an organisation getting involved in running a service for ICAR then IP issues need to be put in place. Brian outlined that for organisations not providing services to ICAR the benefits include availability/option to attend conferences, standards provisions etc. Martin Burke stated that item 3.3 and 3.4 covers this. Toine asked a question concerning membership and if there was anywhere in the documents stating that clients of ICAR have to be members. Brian and Martin were not clear on this and would check it out. Rob Banks gave an example where a country leaves and takes out their data but that they could not take any IP related to the project.

Thomas stated that the precedence of the agreements needs to be consistent over all the documents:

- Interbeef Agreement for Supply of Services states: *“2.3 In the event of any inconsistency between the General Terms and Conditions and the terms of the body*

*of this Agreement, the terms of the body of this Agreement shall prevail.”*

- General Terms and Conditions for Services states: 2.2 The Contract will be subject to the Agreement and these Conditions to the exclusion of all other terms and conditions (including any terms and conditions which the Client purports to apply under any purchase order, confirmation of order, specification or other document). Where there is any inconsistency between the Agreement and these Conditions, the Agreement shall apply.

Brian and Martin agreed to resolve this. The goal was to have a settled set of documents in 2017.

Genetic Evaluation Developments. This item was carried over from the Technical Group Meeting on the previous day. Updates were given on developments in Australia (Rob Banks), Ireland (Ross Evans), France (Alexsis Michenet), New Zealand (Graham Alder), DFS (Emma Carlin) and Germany (Thomas Schmidt).

#### 7. Growing the ICAR/INTERBEEF service in the future (Thomas Schmidt) (see presentation).

This report was based on a telephone call on 19<sup>th</sup> October. The report centred around a proposal for how Interbeef should handle smaller countries moving forward. The proposal was that small countries could come into Interbeef via a bigger co-operating partner and the need for acknowledgement that the same financial power as the dairy industry is not available in the beef industry. Currently an agreed basic fee of €4,000 and then increments based on the amount of breeding cows.

- a) Countries merging their data together and submitting as one country e.g. DFS collaboration currently in place. Here the basic fee would be paid once but €1000 for each additional country. So 3 countries = basic of €4k + €2k.
- b) Small countries participating as part of a bigger country i.e. Luxembourg as part of French evaluations. Here the arrangement is the same as in a) i.e. €1000 per country but the big partner can negotiate internally with the smaller partner on their own arrangement.
- c) Small country coming in on their own. Here fees should be limited to €1.25 per head of registered cow but not less than €2000 (equivalent to 5000 cows). So a country with 2000 cows would pay €2500 instead of the current €4000.

Thomas asked if this proposal would be acceptable for DFS and France. Laurent Griffon stated that this arrangement would be acceptable for France. Individual arrangements can be made between each large cooperating partner and each small country wishing to participate. Laurent stated that Portugal, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain and possibly Mexico in future all sent data to France to be included in their evaluations.

Mike Coffey summarised his views on the new proposal as positive for small countries but also asked people to be conscious of the money already expended by the longer term partners and their reaction to new countries coming in at new rate.

Emma Carlen stated there will be an increase in the fees (+2k) for DFS in the new proposal. Emma would need to consult with the organisations she was representing.

Thierry Pabiou agreed that the proposal was a better one than the current arrangement.

Thomas thinks the new proposal is a fairer proposition but it is up to the group to ratify this. Brian summarised the discussion:

- The WG asked a group to come up with a new proposal on fees which has been done.
- This proposal would facilitate smaller countries to now participate in Interbeef.
- Brian summarised that the group was in favour of accepting the new proposal but that Emma would need to clarify and summarise the implications for DFS. He also acknowledged that this was an important decision.

## 8. GENOEX PSE.

Toine gave an update. Brian Van Doormal presented this yesterday. Brian Wickham stated that he was aware from Andrew Cromie about a request from the Interbeef WG for the development of GENOEX v2. Currently it is very useful for existing dairy customers namely those involved in the International Brown Swiss evaluation. For GENOEX PSE there was potential for a broader reach with ICAR participants around parentage verification. Next step is genotype exchange. Toine outlined that the work is currently being done for this extra service. Preference for Toine is to get PSE over the line and operational. Brian asked if the WG wanted to commence discussion on the next iteration which is genotype exchange. Eric outlined the outcomes from the Interbeef workshop in Dublin where the list of genotyped animals from participating countries is collated/available through the IDEA database. Brian outlined the consolidation of 2 groups (Genetic analysis, wet laboratories doing genotyping and parentage recording) into a new ICAR DNA working group. Brian Van Doormal has agreed to chair that new group. That new working group has the objective of discussing how to be more proactive with new technologies coming on stream. Eva Hjerpe has outlined how a potential suggestion on how IDEA could identify animals being genotyped (AnimInfo table). Toine Roozen asked how knowing if the animal was genotyped would help Interbeef participants. Eric stated that this would be a precursor to genotype sharing. Thierry stated that in the short term it would allow the build-up of trust between organisations. Laurent Griffon stated that a first step is to share phenotypes and build International evaluations based on traditional ebvs.

### Intergenomics

Brian asked Toine to clarify the new platform at GENOEX and if it was currently being used for Intergenomics for Brown Swiss. Toine stated that agreements are in place for Intergenomics. Rob Banks asked if the work on genotypes and traditional evaluations could be done in parallel. Brian summarised that most people thought that this was possible. Toine then outlined the current process for Intergenomics. All genotypes are at IDEA, the international evaluations are run and GEBVs sent back to the participants. Klemen Potocnik stated that the first step for Intergenomics for Brown Swiss was a list of genotyped animals in each country. Brian summarised the discussion by referring to the outcomes of the meeting in Dublin, where the preference was to use the tool at IDEA for reporting the genotyped lists and have a report in Edinburgh at the next meeting. Would everyone agree with this? Eric asked to clarify this some more. Eva outlined quickly the animalinfo option where the genotype lists could be uploaded. BW asked various participants about their capacity to upload these lists:

DEU: Thomas said yes this is possible but need to double check, general support

FRA: Eric was supportive as well but need to work on it at the National level

DFS: Emma Carlin stated that DFS don't have a system for current genotype recording.

IREL: Ross Evans stated he doesn't envisage a problem with providing the lists.

Toine asked people to look at the documentation on the tool on the GENOEX site on the Interbull site. It was agreed to pursue this actively ahead of the next meeting.

Thierry asked if these lists were to be available for everyone and not just members. Eric suggested to start with members first. Toine outlined the form for GENOEX and the level of data that could be recorded. Thomas indicated he would like to see if there was a phenotype available for that animal also in the same table. Brian suggested that there could be a flag indicating what data is available on the IDEA database for this animal.

#### 9. Future research priorities & collaboration

Brian Wickham suggested that we defer until next meeting.

#### 10. Finances

Brian Wickham suggested that we defer until next meeting.

#### 11. Next Meeting

Agreed that ICAR in Edinburgh in June 2017 would be the date and venue for the next meeting. Also the EAAP meeting in Tallin Estonia in August was also an option later in the year.

#### 12. Key actions

The key actions from the WG meeting can then be summarised as follows;

- Move to a routine run for BSM evaluations for January 2017.
- Irish cross-bred data to be included in routine evaluations for LIM and CHA for January 2017.
- Target of having routine evaluations for calving traits and test evaluations for female fertility for end 2017.
- Include new bull status column in 605 file.
- New maternal publication rules to be applied onto March 2017 test run.
- New Interbeef agreements, including especially the supply of services, code of practice, general T&C's and IP assignment, to be made forwarded to members.
- Further discussion with members (especially DFS and potential new members) re: proposed fee structure.
- Ensure establishment of an Interbeef infra-structure that ensures the sharing of relevant lists of animals genotyped and/or animal genotypes for the provision of future ICAR/Interbeef genomic services.

#### Attendees:

Eric Venot INRA [eric.venot@inra.fr](mailto:eric.venot@inra.fr)

Klemen Potocnik Biotechnical faculty [klemen.potocnik@bf.uni-lj.si](mailto:klemen.potocnik@bf.uni-lj.si)

Ross Evans ICBF [revans@icbf.com](mailto:revans@icbf.com)

Eva Hjerpe ITBC [eva.hjerpe@slu.se](mailto:eva.hjerpe@slu.se)

Dalia Laurechocite-Tumeliene SABSS [dalia.Laurechocite-Tumeliene@veisliniukeyste.lt](mailto:dalia.Laurechocite-Tumeliene@veisliniukeyste.lt)

Toine Roozen ITBC [toine.toozen@slue.se](mailto:toine.toozen@slue.se)  
Hugh Nivison ABRI [hugh.nivison@abri.une.edu.au](mailto:hugh.nivison@abri.une.edu.au)  
Robert Banks AGBU [rbanks@une.edu.au](mailto:rbanks@une.edu.au)  
Alexis Michenet Alice [alexis.michenet@inra.fr](mailto:alexis.michenet@inra.fr)  
Romain Saintilan Alice [romain.saintilan@alice.fr](mailto:romain.saintilan@alice.fr)  
Thomas Schmidt BDF/D  
Thierry Pabiou ICBF [tpabiou@icbf.com](mailto:tpabiou@icbf.com)  
Emma Carlen Vaxn Sverige [emma.carlen@vxa.se](mailto:emma.carlen@vxa.se)  
Brian Wickham ICAR [brian@icar.org](mailto:brian@icar.org)  
Graham Alder B+LNZ genetics [graham.alder@blnzgenetics.com](mailto:graham.alder@blnzgenetics.com)