



**HEREFORDS**  
Australia



# milestone report

Project code: P.PSH.0503

Prepared by: Michael Beattie and Kirsty Moore  
Herefords Australia Ltd and AGBU

Date published: 18 June 2021

PUBLISHED BY  
Meat and Livestock Australia Limited  
Locked Bag 1961  
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

## Hereford Information Nucleus & Young Sire Progeny Test Project

### Final Report

Meat & Livestock Australia acknowledges the matching funds provided by the Australian Government to support the research and development detailed in this publication.

This publication is published by Meat & Livestock Australia Limited ABN 39 081 678 364 (MLA). Care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication. However MLA cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in the publication. You should make your own enquiries before making decisions concerning your interests. Reproduction in whole or in part of this publication is prohibited without prior written consent of MLA.

## **Abstract**

The final report for the Hereford Information Nucleus and Young Sire progeny Test Project outlines the project design of the BIN projects over multiple phases and a ten-year time span. With over a hundred sires progeny tested, a summary of records collected for BIN animals and of note is the significant contribution the project has made to the Hereford reference population. Animals are not only genotyped but have also been recorded for hard to measure but important traits including abattoir carcase, meat quality and feed efficiency traits. The records collected and sires tested over the life of the BIN project is documented within this report.

## Table of contents

1	Milestone description.....	4
2	Project objectives .....	4
3	Success in meeting the milestone .....	4
3.1	Overview of project - cohorts 1 (2011) to 9 (2020) .....	4
3.1.1	Participating herds .....	5
3.1.2	Project sires .....	6
3.1.3	Project animals .....	6
3.1.4	Traits recorded.....	7
3.1.4.1	Calving traits.....	7
3.1.4.2	Live weights.....	8
3.1.4.3	Docity, condition and muscle scores of live animals.....	8
3.1.4.4	Structural soundness.....	12
3.1.4.5	Heifer and steer ultrasound carcass composition .....	12
3.1.4.6	Abattoir carcass composition .....	13
3.1.4.7	Net feed intake.....	17
3.1.5	Genotyping .....	17
4	Conclusions/recommendations.....	18
5	Appendix.....	19
5.1	Sires with 10 or more progeny in the BIN program.....	19

## 1 Milestone description

**Final milestone** – The final report will deliver complete details of the young sire evaluations. It will also provide an inventory of the phenotypic data collected and stored during the entire life of the project.

## 2 Project objectives

To progeny test approximately 15 young Hereford sires each year cohort in co-operator herds. The design and size of the project has evolved throughout the project based on funding models and evolving technologies. Extensive data was collected on BIN animals for the following information.

- Birth information – date, weight, sex, calving difficulty, gestation length.
- Weaning information – date, weight, docility score
- Post Weaning information – 400 and 600 day weights, ultrasound scanning (EMA, IMF, P8 and Rib)
- Structural Soundness – feet angle, claw set and rear legs.
- Chiller assessment – carcass weight, fat depth, eye muscle area, marbling score, pH, meat colour
- Meat science lab – shear force, compression, IMF%, cooking loss
- Feed efficiency
- DNA – parent verification and SNP genotyping

## 3 Success in meeting the milestone

### 3.1 Overview of project - cohorts 1 (2011) to 9 (2020)

The Hereford Information Nucleus and Young Sire progeny Test Project (BIN project) has operated for over ten years and is on-going with matings for cohort 11 currently underway. During the course of the BIN project there have been three distinct phases. The first two phases received MLA Donor Company funding and the current phase self-funded by Herefords Australia Limited (HAL).

#### *Phase 1 (2011 – 2014) - MLA Donor Company funding*

The first phase of the BIN project produced four cohorts of progeny from 12 Hereford co-operator herds were located across southern Australia (south-east of South Australia to southern-western Queensland). Within each year there were eight co-operator herds participating representing southern (VIC and SA) and northern (NSW and QLD) Hereford herds. The project design was essentially to mate cows via Artificial Insemination (AI) to progeny test approximately 15 sires each cohort. Both southern and northern herds used the same sires, and reared progeny to weaning before HAL purchased the steers. Post weaning steers from the southern and northern regions were managed together throughout backgrounding, feed lotting and slaughter.

#### *Phase 2 (2015 – 2017) - MLA Donor Company funding*

The second phase of the BIN project produced three cohorts of progeny from six Hereford co-operator herds. Within each year there were between two and five co-operator herds participating, with the larger herds located in the southern region. The project design was similar to the first phase, but post weaning the steers were not pooled together for backgrounding, feed lotting and slaughter. Instead, post weaning management was undertaken on a herd level and in practice varied depending

on the herd circumstances. For example, a group of steers may be backgrounded in a location other than the birth herd, but the contemporary group structure was maintained through to slaughter.

### *Phase 3 (2018 – 2022+) – Self-funded by Herefords Australia Limited*

The third and current phase was self-funded by HAL and is currently ongoing. Two cohorts have been slaughtered, with another three cohorts at different stages. Again, the project design was like previous phases with two key co-operator herds participating.

Project calves were the result of AI using project sires and, in some herds, additional naturally mated animals. Calves were reared under standard conditions for the co-operator herd and were recorded for a large number of traits including existing BREEDPLAN traits, but steers were also backgrounded (grass or grain) and Net feed intake, abattoir carcass and UNE meat quality measurements collected. HAL funded the additional costs of collecting records (i.e., feed intake tests and ultrasound scanning). To help off-set the AI costs, co-operator herds received a fee per calf at 400 days of age, paid by the owner of the AI bull being progeny tested.

#### **3.1.1 Participating herds**

Registered and commercial breeders were able to express an interest in being a co-operator herd for the Young Sire progeny Test Project. Most co-operator herds became involved in phase 1 and the two co-operator herds currently producing BIN progeny have been involved across all three phases. Table 1 outlines the herds participating in the project.

**Table 1: Herds participating in the Hereford Information Nucleus and Young Sire progeny test project including the length of involvement, location and available cow information.**

<b>Herd</b>	<b>Herd Name</b>	<b>S/N<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Cohorts</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Cow herd information<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>Y1001</b>	John Wyld	S	1	SW VIC	NPR
<b>Y1002</b>	Waterloo Grazing Pty Ltd	S	1	SE SA	NPR
<b>Y1003</b>	Roly Day	S	1-3	SE SA	NPR
<b>Y1004</b>	Tarcombe Herefords	S	1, 3-11	VIC	NPR
<b>Y1005</b>	Wirruna Poll Hereford Stud	N	1-4a	S NSW	PR
<b>Y1006</b>	Yalgoo Partnership	N	1-3	NE NSW	NPR
<b>Y1007</b>	KA & HE Blake	N	1-4a, 5	NE NSW	NPR
<b>Y1008</b>	Koomoorang Past Co	N	1-4a	E NSW	NPR
<b>Y1009</b>	BN & JM Bell & Sons	S	2-11	SE SA	NPR
<b>Y1010</b>	John Windeyer	N	2	E NSW	PR
<b>Y1011</b>	Hornet Bank Past Co	N	2	SE QLD	NPR
<b>Y1012</b>	Tondara	N	4	S NSW	PR
<b>Y1013</b>	Europambela	N	6-7	NE NSW	NPR
<b>Y1014<sup>3</sup></b>	Melon Pastoral	N	6	E NSW	NPR
<b>Y1015</b>	King Island Cattle Company	S	6-7	TAS	NPR

<sup>1</sup> Southern (May/June joining) or Northern (Oct/Nov joining) herd

<sup>2</sup> Non-performance recorded (NPR) or Performance recorded (PR) cows

<sup>3</sup> This herd was predominately cross-bred so was not included into the BREEDPLAN database. The herd only participated in Cohort 6 group of animals and won't be considered further in this report

#### *Co-operator herd selection criteria*

In phase 1 of the project, expressions of interest were sought from potential co-operator herds. Herds had to have 50 or more cows available for the project, suitable production, and management practises to weaning and agree to collecting data using project protocols. The cows available to the project were required to be Hereford but did not need to be pedigree performance recorded cows.

In most co-operator herds the cows were commercial with little pedigree and performance information known about them. A limitation of using commercial cows is that only half the genetic contribution of project animals was known, and we need to assume that all cows were essentially the same and this may reduce statistical power. However, performance cows are valuable and therefore difficult to source for use in a BIN project. Ensuring sufficient progeny numbers per sire can provide statistical power to analyse data that does not have a significant maternal contribution, i.e., later in life traits like abattoir carcass traits. Traits like 200 day weight where there is a significant maternal effect will be impacted by this design, as the use of a commercial dam will not enable the maternal effect to be estimated. The target number of co-operator herds in phase 1 was eight – four from both southern and northern regions. With some exceptions there were two co-operator herds included on phases 2 and 3. In total, there were 15 co-operator herds recruited into the project over the three phases. These herds were involved for differing time points and represented different regions (northern or southern).

### **3.1.2 Project sires**

Nominations for sires were open to all HAL members. From these nominated sires approximately 15 sires were identified to use each year for AI mating in co-operator herds. Cows that do not conceive to the AI bulls are then mated to the back-up bulls used in the co-operator herds. Sires were identified to represent the diversity present in the Hereford population, with particular caution not to only use sires with genetics at one end of the distribution as this would cause bias and reduced variation in the analysis. Within a sire team, care was also taken to provide linkage to previous cohorts and key industry projects. In particular, the sires selected for cohort 6 were linked to the Hereford black baldy trial and the NZ maternal productivity trail and in recent cohorts' linkage with the Southern Multi-breed project are considered with BIN sire details provided to Southern multi-breed for consideration in their sire choices. At all BIN phases there was consultation between HAL and other stakeholders in the selection of sires. The owners of sires that are included provide semen at no cost and agree to pay a fee to the relevant co-operator herds for each calf reaching 400 days to help offset the cost of producing BIN animals for the progeny test.

Over ten cohorts, 114 different sires produced 10 or more BIN progeny. These sires sired 3,490 of the reference animals and a full list of sires is included in the Appendix. The average number of progeny per sire was 31, ranging between 10 and 118 progeny per sire. Sires were predominately AI sires but there were also natural mated bulls with 10 or more progeny. In total, there were 903 animals with sire unknown in the BREEDPLAN database. Within cohorts, the number of animals with unknown sire was quite small – especially for calves produced with AI - with most unknown sires coming from herd Y1009 who included a large number naturally mated cows. However, genotyping undertaken in this herd may help resolve the parentage of calves from these natural matings. Sires with 10 or more progeny were born between 2002 and 2017 with 81.6% of all sires were born 2008 or later. There were 82 unique sires of the reference sires, the largest contribution these sires had was that there were four different sires that each had four sons selected as reference sires.

All AI sires were parent verified and genotyped.

### **3.1.3 Project animals**

The BIN projects have collected information from 4,577 animals over three phases, ten birth cohorts (2011-2020) and 14 co-operator herds, with more cohorts underway. The table below characterises the number of animals recorded by herd and birth cohort. In phase 1, more herds participated (n = 5 to 8) with the later phases being smaller and focused on two main co-operator herds. The animals recorded are mostly purebred Hereford with a small number of animals from herd Y1013 being 75% Hereford. In most cases the cows were commercial non-performance recorded animals, although in

phase 1 there were three co-operator herds that utilised performance recorded cows. HAL are continuing to self-fund the scheme and the matings to produce cohort 11 due to calve in 2022 are currently underway. Herd Y1009 contributed extra animals to the BIN project via natural mating, and this can be seen in the higher progeny numbers in this herd from 2014 onwards. All calves in the project, especially the calves produced via AI, were sire verified with later cohorts being genotyped as well.

**Table 2: The number of animals recorded by herd and cohort as part of the Hereford Information Nucleus and Young Sire progeny test project.**

Cohort (birth year)	Phase 1			Phase 2				Self-funded			Total
	1 (11)	2 (12)	3 (13)	4a (14)	4b (15)	5 (16)	6 (17)	7 (18)	8 (19)	9 (20)	
Y1001	120										120
Y1002	16										16
Y1003	82	77	57								216
Y1004	78		84	92	65	109	64	94	87	97	770
Y1005	46	47	41	60							194
Y1006	31	27	32								90
Y1007	43	54	51	22		17					187
Y1008	30	43	34	48							155
Y1009		92	154	460	121	166	346	188	397	412	2336
Y1010		24									24
Y1011		17									17
Y1012			83								83
Y1013							100	44			144
Y1015							129	96			225
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>682</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>4577</b>
<b>AI prog</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>3004</b>

### 3.1.4 Traits recorded.

Co-operator herds were briefed on data collection protocols to ensure that the traits were recorded according to best practice. All data was stored in the HAL data located at ABRI database. This included the traits incorporated into existing BREEDPLAN evaluations and those yet to be included i.e., meat quality. The following section outlines the records collected on BIN animals.

#### 3.1.4.1 Calving traits

Information was collected on all animals at birth. This included dates of birth, sex, birth weight, calving difficulty and if the calf was born dead or alive. The accurate recording of dead calves provides an opportunity to look at calf survival work.

Gestation length was recorded from AI sired calves, as the number of days between conception (AI insemination date) and the date of birth for the resulting calf. Birth weight was recorded on animals at birth within 24 hours of birth using scales. Both traits are included in the BREEDPLAN genetic evaluation and standard deviations indicate that there is variation in the data collected.

Calving difficulty was scored for each calf on a 1 to 6 scale: unassisted (1), easy pull (2), hard pull (3), surgical assistance (4), Mal-presentation (5) and elective surgical (6). Nearly 4,000 calving difficulty records were collected, and in most years, the majority of calves were born with no assistance.

**Table 3: Summary of the raw records collected for gestation length (days) and birth weight (kg)**

Cohort (birth year)	Gestation length (days)					Birth weight (kg)				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	392	283.4	4.8	271	304	428	40.6	5.9	24	61
<b>2 (2012)</b>	347	283.2	5.3	264	300	365	40.6	6.2	21	61
<b>3 (2013)</b>	438	283.3	4.8	267	302	500	39.6	5.8	20	66
<b>4a (2014)</b>	281	284.4	4.9	273	302	335	38.9	5.8	20	53
<b>4b (2015)</b>	163	284.0	6.0	273	303	177	38.1	4.7	27	50
<b>5 (2016)</b>	243	281.8	5.5	268	302	283	37.0	6.1	23	57
<b>6 (2017)</b>	307	283.1	5.3	271	303	621	39.4	7.5	16	62
<b>7 (2018)</b>	236	283.1	6.5	267	302	399	37.7	7.8	16	56
<b>8 (2019)</b>	199	280.6	4.3	270	294	363	33.0	5.2	20	50
<b>9 (2020)</b>	230	280.7	4.9	271	292	500	34.8	5.5	19	57
<b>Total</b>	<b>2836</b>	<b>282.9</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>3971</b>	<b>38.1</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>66</b>

**Table 4: Summary of the raw records collected for calving difficult (1-6 score)**

Cohort (birth year)	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	% No assistance
<b>1 (2011)</b>	433	419	5	2	3	4	0	96.8
<b>2 (2012)</b>	363	354	1	4	1	3	0	97.5
<b>3 (2013)</b>	500	492	1	2	0	5	0	98.4
<b>4a (2014)</b>	339	335	1	1	0	2	0	98.8
<b>4b (2015)</b>	186	184	1	0	0	1	0	98.9
<b>5 (2016)</b>	291	246	34	3	0	7	1	84.5
<b>6 (2017)</b>	466	440	17	3	0	6	0	94.4
<b>7 (2018)</b>	290	284	5	0	0	1	0	97.9
<b>8 (2019)</b>	478	465	10	0	0	3	0	97.3
<b>9 (2020)</b>	511	476	20	7	1	7	0	93.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>3854</b>	<b>3692</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>95.8</b>

### 3.1.4.2 Live weights

Live weights were recorded for 200, 400 and 600 day live weight and these were included into the routine BREEDPLAN genetic evaluation. Over the ten-year period, the standard deviations demonstrate that there was lots of variation observed within the BIN animals. All animals were weighed for 200 and 400 day but in phase 1 only the females were recorded for 600 day weight as the steers had been moved off co-operator herds for backgrounding and finishing. In the later phases all animals were weighted for 600 day weights and a summary of the live weight data collected is shown in Table 5. Animals born in 2020 have yet to have live weight information added to the HAL database.

### 3.1.4.3 Docility, condition and muscle scores of live animals

A number of scored traits on live animals have been collected in the BIN project (Table 6). In phase 1 and 2, temperament was assessed by scoring docility on a 1 (calm) to 5 (aggressive) scale. In all cohort years the majority of animals scored 1 and 2 for docility. Phase 2 and 3 animals were condition scored based on a 1 (leaner) – 6 (fatter) scoring system and all phases assessed the muscle score on a A+ to E- scale for animals. In these metrics, animals tended to have condition scores of 3 or 4 and were in the C muscle score grades.



**Table 5: Summary of the raw records collected for 200, 400 and 600 day live weights (kg)**

Cohort (birth year)	200 day (kg)					400 day (kg)					600 day (kg)				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	566	261.9	59.1	101	432	409	379.2	79.8	211	620	228	493.9	101.5	334	730
<b>2 (2012)</b>	370	278.0	52.5	115	408	434	440.0	106.9	201	700	239	492.9	92.4	300	770
<b>3 (2013)</b>	503	218.5	61.5	61	379	416	441.3	96.3	218	678	153	483.4	77.1	351	698
<b>4a (2014)</b>	334	243.4	43.9	72	349	171	406.3	55.0	278	552	240	515.3	98.6	300	752
<b>4b (2015)</b>	297	265.1	46.5	148	396	142	501.6	80.1	319	688					
<b>5 (2016)</b>	197	259.6	42.4	161	360	154	355.1	61.9	202	560	212	542.9	98.8	362	726
<b>6 (2017)</b>	475	228.0	31.9	152	330	461	321.6	63.3	153	536	450	482.6	94.4	306	762
<b>7 (2018)</b>	340	210.1	55.0	75	394	162	324.4	63.3	226	499	383	498.2	123.9	290	788
<b>8 (2019)</b>	375	253.3	36.7	165	376	469	359.2	62.6	215	598	272	563.5	106.6	335	781
<b>Total</b>	<b>3457</b>	<b>245.0</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>2818</b>	<b>388.3</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>2177</b>	<b>507.3</b>	<b>105.5</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>788</b>

**Table 6: Summary of the raw records collected for docility, condition and muscle scores of live animals.**

Cohort (birth year)	Docility Score (1-5)					Condition Score (1-6)						Muscle Score (A+ - E-)											
	N	1	2	3	4	5	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	N	B-	B	C-	C	C+	D-	D	D+	
<b>1 (2011)</b>	356	49	266	34	7	47	2	27	18					158	3		7	55	89				4
<b>2 (2012)</b>	372	148	211	12	1	39	1	19	18	1				274	3		57	122	85	1	2		4
<b>3 (2013)</b>	344	99	212	27	6	34	8	19	7					262			75	78	28	1	10		70
<b>4a (2014)</b>	314	104	198	11	1	28	1	19	7	1				218			24	70	63	1	17		43
<b>4b (2015)</b>	88	51	23	6	8									88	1		23	25	14	6	3		16
<b>5 (2016)</b>	210	89	104	13	4	91		7	82	2				91			9			1	13		68
<b>6 (2017)</b>	209	95	96	10	8	113	3	64	46					238	2		34	61	59	5	41		36
<b>7 (2018)</b>						101	2	44	55					213	2		22	65	74		26		24
<b>8 (2019)</b>						227		174	52	1				39			1	25	13				
<b>Total</b>	<b>1893</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>1110</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>5</b>				<b>1581</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>252</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>112</b>		<b>265</b>

**Table 7: Summary of the raw records collected for Feet angle of the front and rear feet.**

Cohort (birth year)	Feet Angle – Front foot									Feet Angle – Rear foot										
	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>1 (2011)</b>	244					74	156	14			244			1	28	185	27	3		
<b>2 (2012)</b>	286				2	80	150	45	8	1	286			2	26	183	70	4	1	
<b>3 (2013)</b>	274					65	167	36	6		274				29	164	76	5		
<b>4a (2014)</b>	245					75	157	12	1		245			1	23	152	60	9		
<b>4b (2015)</b>	88					12	69	7			88				3	41	44			
<b>5 (2016)</b>	91					25	51	13	2		91			1	3	60	26	1		
<b>6 (2017)</b>	238				1	71	146	19		1	238				12	147	77	2		
<b>7 (2018)</b>	213					45	141	27			213				6	133	74	27	12	
<b>8 (2019)</b>	39					10	26	3			39					27	12			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1718</b>				<b>3</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>1063</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1718</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>1092</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	

**Table 8: Summary of the raw records collected for Claw set of the front and rear feet.**

Cohort (birth year)	Claw set – Front foot									Claw set – Rear foot										
	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>1 (2011)</b>	244					19	186	37	2		244				31	194	19			
<b>2 (2012)</b>	286				3	18	163	85	17		286				8	44	192	41	1	
<b>3 (2013)</b>	274			1	5	30	166	68	1	3	274			5	39	54	151	22	2	1
<b>4a (2014)</b>	245				9	26	172	35	3		245			2	30	43	140	23	5	2
<b>4b (2015)</b>	88				9	9	43	27			88			1	36	13	36	2		
<b>5 (2016)</b>	91					14	47	29	1		91					9	65	16	1	
<b>6 (2017)</b>	238				2	20	146	65	4	1	238				12	42	162	21	1	
<b>7 (2018)</b>	213				1	23	146	43			213			1	9	53	135	15		
<b>8 (2019)</b>	39					1	29	8	1		39					1	30	8		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1718</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>1098</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1718</b>			<b>9</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>1105</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>

**Table 9: Summary of the raw records collected for the rear legs with a hind and side view.**

Cohort (birth year)	Rear Legs – Hind view									Rear Legs – Side view										
	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>1 (2011)</b>	244					29	211	4			244					37	202	5		
<b>2 (2012)</b>	286					104	167	14	1		286		3	6	91	161	24	1		
<b>3 (2013)</b>	274				1	73	147	51	2		274				109	97	53	15		
<b>4a (2014)</b>	245				3	80	122	37	3		245			4	121	69	45	6		
<b>4b (2015)</b>	88				1	1	15	58	12	1	88			3	1	9	39	31	5	
<b>5 (2016)</b>	91					14	77				91			1	48	42				
<b>6 (2017)</b>	238				5	39	148	44	2		238			14	79	65	72	8		
<b>7 (2018)</b>	213					17	138	56	2		213			6	82	42	74	9		
<b>8 (2019)</b>	39					9	30				39				27	12				
<b>Total</b>	<b>1718</b>				<b>10</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>1055</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1718</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>5</b>	

### 3.1.4.4 Structural soundness

Structural soundness was assessed by scoring the feet angle (Table 7) and claw set (Table 8) of the front and rear legs and assessing the rear legs (Table 9) from a hind and side view. Each of the traits was scored on a 1 to 9 scale. This collection of structure soundness traits constitutes approximately 20% of the total structural soundness data recorded in the Hereford database, and significantly have been collected on animals with good contemporary grouping structure maximising the value of the records.

### 3.1.4.5 Heifer and steer ultrasound carcass composition

All BIN cohorts were routinely ultrasound scanned for fat depth at P8 and Rib sites (Table 10) intramuscular fat percent and eye muscle area (Table 11). Although the raw phenotype averages vary across cohorts due to different environmental effects, in all years there appear to be variation observed in cohorts and no cohorts had a lot of skinny animals.

**Table 10: Summary of the raw records collected for ultrasound fat depth at P8 and RIB sites**

Cohort (birth year)	P8 fat depth (mm)					RIB fat depth (mm)				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	364	9.0	3.7	3	19	364	7.1	2.7	3	14
<b>2 (2012)</b>	315	11.5	4.3	3	21	316	9.4	3.6	2	18
<b>3 (2013)</b>	304	9.0	4.0	2	19	301	6.7	2.7	2	13
<b>4a (2014)</b>	249	10.2	4.2	3	22	242	7.5	2.6	2	15
<b>4b (2015)</b>	86	12.5	2.8	7	18	87	9.1	2.3	5	16
<b>5 (2016)</b>	198	13.3	3.8	5	23	195	8.9	2.2	3	14
<b>6 (2017)</b>	321	9.4	4.9	3	21	316	6.4	2.5	2	12
<b>7 (2018)</b>	213	11.2	6.9	3	28	216	7.6	3.5	2	20
<b>8 (2019)</b>	204	6.9	4.1	2	21	208	5.4	3.0	2	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>2254</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2245</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>

**Table 11: Summary of the raw records collected for ultrasound eye muscle area and intra-muscular fat percent.**

Cohort (birth year)	Eye muscle area (cm)					Intra-muscular fat percent (%)				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	364	68.6	9.4	42	96	363	4.4	1.6	0.5	7.4
<b>2 (2012)</b>	318	70.0	10.1	47	95	317	5.3	1.5	0.8	8.2
<b>3 (2013)</b>	309	64.7	12.2	39	91	309	4.3	1.8	0.5	7.9
<b>4a (2014)</b>	248	67.6	12.2	42	96	251	4.4	1.6	0.5	7.7
<b>4b (2015)</b>	88	76.6	9.1	52	97	88	5.5	0.7	4.1	7.0
<b>5 (2016)</b>	209	71.8	9.3	52	93	209	5.3	1.6	1.0	7.7
<b>6 (2017)</b>	325	62.3	12.0	38	89	323	4.6	1.7	0.5	7.9
<b>7 (2018)</b>	214	69.9	12.1	44	98	215	5.0	1.8	0.5	8.0
<b>8 (2019)</b>	209	65.2	10.1	45	88	213	3.2	1.9	1.0	7.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2284</b>	<b>67.7</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>8.2</b>

### 3.1.4.6 *Abattoir carcass composition*

A key set of traits that have been measured in the Hereford BIN projects has been abattoir carcass traits. Over the life of the BIN projects approximately 1,500 abattoir carcass records have been collected and this accounts for approximately half the carcass records recorded in the HAL database. Importantly, these abattoir carcass traits were collected on animals from a structured design with a good contemporary group structure, maximising the values of the data collected. As well as traits of interest a number of slaughter fixed effects were also recorded in the HAL database, but not always for all cohorts or animals. These fixed effects include kill site, body number, dentition, boning group and quartering site. Abattoir carcass traits are included into the BREEDPLAN genetic evaluation with the trait's carcass weight, eye muscle area, fat depth (P8 and RIB) and intra-muscular fat (IMF% and marbling score) included (Tables 12, 13 and 14).

**Table 12: Summary of the raw records collected for Abattoir carcass weight and eye muscle area.**

Cohort (birth year)	Carcass weight (kg)					Eye muscle area (cm)				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194	308.2	36.9	203	384	194	68.5	6.1	51	81
<b>2 (2012)</b>	178	323.4	36.8	206	439	139	74.3	5.7	64	90
<b>3 (2013)</b>	230	331.4	30.6	260	418	229	76.4	6.8	61	93
<b>4a (2014)</b>	149	314.3	32.8	239	409	145	73.4	7.1	58	91
<b>4b (2015)</b>	83	299.5	34.4	216	376	83	70.9	6.1	59	84
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104	331.3	26.4	277	400	104	84.3	8.2	67	117
<b>6 (2017)</b>	291	290.4	37.5	203	412	291	74.7	8.8	46	111
<b>7 (2018)</b>	167	356.5	27.5	266	415	150	83.1	8.3	59	107
<b>8 (2019)</b>	169	335.3	30.4	242	422	130	83.6	6.4	67	100
<b>Total</b>	1565	319.8	38.9	203	439	1465	76.1	8.8	46	117

Meat samples were collected from BIN animals to be assessed in the UNE meat science laboratory. A range of traits was measured including shear force tenderness measurements (Tables 15 to 19). The BIN projects have collected almost 1,400 shear force records and this constitutes a large proportion of the available information for an important eating quality trait. For a lot of meat quality traits the BIN animals represent the entire data set for traits like ossification, MSA index and cooking loss, and are approaching a volume which may make analysis of the data meaningful. For example, as a direct result of the BIN projects a shear force tenderness EBV may be possible based on the outcome of data analysis. Due to the COVID pandemic restricting movements, meat samples for 2019 BIN animals from herd Y1009 were not possible.

**Table 13: Summary of the raw records collected for Abattoir carcass fat depth (P8 and Rib) and intra-muscular fat percent**

Cohort (birth year)	P8 fat depth (mm)					RIB fat depth (mm)					Intra-muscular fat percent (%)				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194	16.5	5.8	3	32						194	4.3	1.4	1.6	11.6
<b>2 (2012)</b>	139	17.7	4.1	5	30						139	4.1	1.2	1.9	8.6
<b>3 (2013)</b>	228	15.5	4.0	7	26	226	9.2	3.6	3	23	229	4.3	1.4	2.0	9.0
<b>4a (2014)</b>	147	14.4	4.3	6	27	148	9.3	3.9	3	19	148	3.2	1.4	1.6	8.3
<b>4b (2015)</b>	83	19.0	5.7	10	35	82	8.4	3.4	3	22	83	3.8	1.2	2.3	7.8
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104	18.4	3.7	11	29	104	9.0	3.0	4	19	104	4.4	1.2	2.4	7.8
<b>6 (2017)</b>	271	13.0	5.1	3	27	291	7.7	2.9	2	18	291	3.7	1.2	1.7	7.6
<b>7 (2018)</b>	112	18.1	5.5	10	34	165	9.5	3.7	1	21	167	5.2	1.8	2.0	11.5
<b>8 (2019)</b>	130	17.3	4.3	8	29	169	8.2	2.7	3	14	169	5.8	1.5	2.0	10.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1408</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1185</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1524</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>11.6</b>

**Table 14: Summary of the raw records collected for Abattoir carcass marbling on Ausmeat and MSA scoring systems**

Cohort (birth year)	Ausmeat marble score							MSA / USDA marble score					Old MSA marble score				
	N	0	1	2	3	4	5-9	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194	68	118	8				194	298.8	60.2	130	470					
<b>2 (2012)</b>	139	20	85	29	5								139	3.6	0.5	2.5	4.9
<b>3 (2013)</b>	233	17	169	41	5	1							223	3.7	0.6	2.0	6.0
<b>4a (2014)</b>	151	19	109	19	4			149	346.7	23.8	230	520					
<b>4b (2015)</b>	87	13	71	3				83	327.8	39.9	230	440					
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104	2	83	19				104	360.5	43.2	270	490					
<b>6 (2017)</b>	291	58	211	22				291	321.6	49.7	140	450					
<b>7 (2018)</b>	167	10	99	53	5			167	358.4	77.8	100	530					
<b>8 (2019)</b>	169	4	78	83	4			169	365.3	82.7	100	560					
<b>Total</b>	<b>1535</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>1023</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1157</b>	<b>336.6</b>	<b>65.5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>

**Table 15: Summary of the raw records collected for MSA index, shear force and carcass ossification**

Cohort (birth year)	MSA index (30-80)					Shear force					Carcass ossification (100-200)				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194	61.2	1.3	57.2	64.6	194	3.7	0.8	2.3	5.9					
<b>2 (2012)</b>	139	64.0	1.8	57.1	68.4	139	3.4	0.8	2.4	7.1					
<b>3 (2013)</b>	230	63.6	1.6	58.8	68.4	231	3.4	0.5	2.4	5.3					
<b>4a (2014)</b>	143	62.1	1.7	58.1	66.3	149	3.7	0.7	2.6	7.9	151	134.5	12.7	100	190
<b>4b (2015)</b>	87	61.7	2.5	55.7	65.7	81	3.9	1.4	2.4	10.3	87	139.2	31.6	100	200
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104	62.5	1.3	59.0	65.8	104	3.4	0.4	2.6	4.5	104	130.8	12.5	100	170
<b>6 (2017)</b>	275	60.7	1.7	56.9	65.5	290	3.2	0.6	1.7	5.0	291	136.2	18.1	100	190
<b>7 (2018)</b>	165	62.2	2.0	55.5	66.9	166	3.0	0.5	2.1	5.1	167	139.9	17.7	100	180
<b>8 (2019)</b>	169	61.8	2.2	55.0	66.6	39	3.1	0.5	2.4	5.2	169	141.0	18.4	100	180
<b>Total</b>	<b>1506</b>	<b>62.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>68.4</b>	<b>1393</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>969</b>	<b>137.1</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>200</b>

**Table 16: Summary of the raw records collected for cooking loss and carcass pH**

Cohort (birth year)	Cooking loss (%)					Carcass pH					Carcass lab pH				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194	25.1	3.4	16.4	39.7	194	5.5	0.08	5.3	5.7	194	5.5	0.05	5.4	5.7
<b>2 (2012)</b>	139	22.2	3.8	8.5	32.1	139	5.5	0.11	5.4	6.3	139	5.5	0.10	5.4	6.4
<b>3 (2013)</b>	230	22.6	2.4	15.9	28.5	233	5.5	0.09	5.3	5.9	231	5.6	0.06	5.4	5.7
<b>4a (2014)</b>	150	23.8	2.7	12.8	29.9	150	5.5	0.10	5.4	5.9	150	5.6	0.05	5.5	6.0
<b>4b (2015)</b>	85	23.5	1.9	19.7	28.1	83	5.6	0.11	5.4	5.9	85	5.5	0.04	5.4	5.6
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104	23.6	2.3	17.4	29.4	104	5.5	0.06	5.4	5.7	104	5.6	0.06	5.5	5.7
<b>6 (2017)</b>	260	23.2	2.6	16.7	34.0	291	5.6	0.12	5.3	6.2	290	5.6	0.13	5.4	6.1
<b>7 (2018)</b>	166	22.5	2.1	18.3	27.3	167	5.5	0.08	5.2	5.7	166	5.6	0.07	5.4	6.0
<b>8 (2019)</b>	38	24.2	2.0	18.6	28.7	169	5.6	0.09	5.3	5.7	39	5.6	0.04	5.5	5.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1366</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>1530</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>1398</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>6.4</b>

**Table 17: Summary of the raw records collected for abattoir meat and fat colour**

Cohort (birth year)	Carcase meat colour								Carcase fat colour						
	N	1B	1C	2	3	4	5	6	N	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194	25	130	36	3				194		94	94	6		
<b>2 (2012)</b>	139	16	50	68	3		1	1	139	41	95	3			
<b>3 (2013)</b>															
<b>4a (2014)</b>	150	1	30	65	46	7		1	150	28	51	61	10		
<b>4b (2015)</b>	83			5	46	28	2	2	83	74	9				
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104	2	22	40	37	3			104	84	19	1			
<b>6 (2017)</b>	291	1	22	45	104	105	12	2	291	78	48	105	60		
<b>7 (2018)</b>	167		12	44	104	7			167	30	59	52	22	4	
<b>8 (2019)</b>	169	5	12	64	85	3			169	76	69	18	5		1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1297</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1297</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>

**Table 18: Summary of the raw records collected for meat colour assessed in the lab**

Cohort (birth year)	Carcase meat colour - L					Carcase meat colour - A					Carcase meat colour - B				
	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194	42.3	2.4	36.6	49.2	194	23.4	1.5	18.6	27.8	194	11.1	1.0	7.9	13.5
<b>2 (2012)</b>	139	43.1	2.7	31.8	49.8	139	23.7	1.7	12.7	27.4	139	11.1	1.0	4.2	12.9
<b>3 (2013)</b>	231	41.5	2.1	35.5	49.9	231	22.9	1.6	18.7	27.3	231	10.7	0.9	8.1	12.8
<b>4a (2014)</b>	150	40.3	2.2	32.0	45.7	150	23.0	1.6	14.0	26.1	150	10.3	1.2	4.9	13.1
<b>4b (2015)</b>	85	40.7	2.2	35.5	46.1	85	23.0	1.5	19.1	26.1	85	10.1	1.1	6.9	12.0
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104	41.7	2.0	36.9	47.8	104	24.5	1.3	21.7	28.2	104	11.5	0.8	9.9	13.6
<b>6 (2017)</b>	290	41.6	2.7	34.2	48.5	290	23.0	2.1	15.3	29.1	290	10.6	1.4	4.7	14.1
<b>7 (2018)</b>	166	42.1	2.3	36.1	47.3	166	24.2	1.5	20.5	28.4	166	11.0	1.2	8.1	14.5
<b>8 (2019)</b>	38	42.0	2.5	36.6	48.1	38	23.7	1.5	19.8	26.7	38	11.3	1.2	7.1	13.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1397</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>49.9</b>	<b>1397</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>1397</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>14.5</b>



**Table 19: Summary of the raw records collected for carcass muscle score**

Cohort (birth year)	Carcass muscle score (A+ to E-)								
	N	B-	B	C-	C	C+	D-	D	D+
<b>1 (2011)</b>	194		5	32	138	2	2	5	10
<b>2 (2012)</b>	139		1		135			3	
<b>3 (2013)</b>									
<b>4a (2014)</b>									
<b>4b (2015)</b>									
<b>5 (2016)</b>	104		7		97				
<b>6 (2017)</b>	96				96				
<b>7 (2018)</b>	78		5		73				
<b>8 (2019)</b>									
<b>Total</b>	611		18	32	539	2	2	8	10

### 3.1.4.7 Net feed intake

The cost of feed is significant making feed efficiency an important, but hard to measure, trait of interest. Feedlot Net Feed Intake (NFI) is constructed by adjusting the daily feed intake for the metabolic mid weight and average daily gain. It is expected that the population has an average phenotype of 0 with both negative and positive phenotypes observed. The phenotypes collected by the BIN project are all negative with the positive NFI values in the population being measured in the 1990's. The NFI records collected as part of the BIN project are the only recent source of feed efficiency records and account for almost 70% of all the Hereford feed efficiency records.

**Table 20: Summary of the raw records collected for feedlot Net feed Intake (NFI)**

Cohort (birth year)	NFI (kg/day)				
	N	mean	std	min	max
<b>1 (2011)</b>	63	-2.64	0.84	-4.50	-0.94
<b>2 (2012)</b>	93	-3.19	0.88	-5.34	-0.73
<b>3 (2013)</b>	231	-3.47	1.15	-7.95	-0.27
<b>4a (2014)</b>	54	-4.00	1.12	-8.62	-1.79
<b>4b (2015)</b>					
<b>5 (2016)</b>	106	-2.72	0.77	-4.26	-0.58
<b>6 (2017)</b>	51	-2.85	0.90	-7.09	-1.37
<b>7 (2018)</b>	74	-3.91	2.03	-9.32	-0.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>-3.28</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>-9.32</b>	<b>-0.27</b>

### 3.1.5 Genotyping

All AI sires utilised in the project were both parent verified and themselves genotyped. Their progeny were also sire verified but not necessarily genotyped. The sire verification process was until recently undertaken by microsatellites or a small SNP subset instead of utilising higher density SNP panels.

In the current Hereford single-step genetic evaluation, there are nearly 35,000 genotyped animals included in the G matrix. This includes all genotypes including those of recent born selection candidates that are yet to be phenotypes and contribute to the reference population. Overall, 2,385 BIN animals were genotyped and contributing to the G matrix and more importantly the Hereford reference population. Very few animals in phase 1 were genotyped due to the restrictively high cost of genotyping at the time. Now the cost of genotyping has dramatically decreased, almost all animals were genotyped from 2015 onwards, usually at 50K density, with the latest years being at 150K.

Overall the BIN phases, 136 sires were genotyped. Sires were genotyped at higher density, depending on the technology available at the time. Sires tended to be genotyped at 50K and 140K.

The table below outlines the number of animals within a cohort year, how many were genotyped and on what platform. These genotypes are accompanied by high quality phenotypes as outlined in the previous sections; in particular, they represent a unique subset of animals with meat eating quality traits recorded on genotyped animals.

**Table 21: Summary of the genotyping undertaken within the BIN cohorts.**

<b>Cohort (birth year)</b>	<b>N animals</b>	<b>N AI progeny</b>	<b>N genotyped</b>	<b>Genotype platform</b>
<b>1 (2011)</b>	446	426	199	GGP_SUPERLDV4_30k
<b>2 (2012)</b>	381	357		
<b>3 (2013)</b>	536	475	2	GGP_HEREFORD_ULD_30k GGP_HEREFORD_ULD_30k
<b>4a (2014)</b>	682	315	3	GGP_BOVINE_50K GGP_HDV2_140k
<b>4b (2015)</b>	186	163	154	GGPV3_25k GGPV32_26k
<b>5 (2016)</b>	292	260	246	GGP_SUPERLDV4_30k GGP_BOVINE_50K
<b>6 (2017)</b>	639	321	528	GGP_BOVINE_50K
<b>7 (2018)</b>	422	242	343	GGP_BOVINE_50K
<b>8 (2019)</b>	484	203	452	GGP_BOVINE_50K GGP_BOVINE_100K
<b>9 (2020)</b>	509	242	458	GGP_BOVINE_100K
<b>Total</b>	<b>4577</b>	<b>3004</b>	<b>2385</b>	

## 4 Conclusions/recommendations

The Hereford Information Nucleus and Young Sire progeny Test Project (BIN project) has operated for over ten years and is still on-going with matings for cohort 11 currently underway. The initial phases received MLA Donor Company funding but since 2018, Herefords Australia Ltd have self-funded the BIN project with two co-operator herds. A sizable dataset has accrued over the life of the project. In particular, the BIN project represents the Hereford's primary data for key economic traits abattoir carcase, meat quality and feed efficiency. With BIN animals genotyped, they make a valuable contribution to the reference data for Hereford.

## 5 Appendix

### 5.1 Sires with 10 or more progeny in the BIN program

sire	sire_hbn	sireyob	grandsire	grandsire_hbn	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
0					5	13	9	340	23	6	152	113	82	160	903
200423857	216088132	2008	200398644	216066199	6	9									15
200424106	216088406	2008	200372833	677040283	32										32
200592459	216133062	2013	200449450	216100408							21				21
200517833	272110089	2011	200378066	281050218							32				32
200740061	677150368	2015	200630757	677131040									12		12
11706061	AEDD1	2008	11645111	AEDA74	38						2				40
1477125	BMED36	2008	1433098	BMEA24	29										29
12002713	BMEK32	2014	11744898	WNAF382								2	14		16
12216496	BMEM003	2016	11676568	MTTC8									18		18
11720706	BWND203	2008	11551544	AEDW168		17									17
11639551	BWNZ260	2004	200266467	0147S0138	27	10									37
11732912	CDEE27	2009	11678175	SBDB1			40								40
12202152	CDEM003	2016	11891300	OSA43214853AHR								25			25
11777321	CHSG38	2011	11617226	SBPZ933				44	13		2				59
11948243	CRKJ106	2013	1498145	YPHF181							23				23
11737691	DAYE312	2009	11672189	VALA61			36								36
11797116	DAYH38	2012	11706061	AEDD1				33	15						48
11969265	DAYK103	2014	11891286	OSA43269958AHR							32				32
12095490	DAYL142	2015	11922574	DAYJ59								42			42
12361125	DAYN102	2017	200688262	US43500058									28		28
12172417	DRHM011	2016	11676568	MTTC8									16		16
11728253	EKIE02	2009	11684241	WTAC80				22	14						36
11881674	HRPJ051	2013	200353269	347033060							28				28
12062887	HRPL336	2015	12063367	OSA43335233AHR								39			39
1499653	IHSE078	2009	1427070	FLDZ251		22									22
11866065	IHSJ188	2013	11738026	AEDE114						19					19
12049386	IHSK220	2014	11738026	AEDE114							21				21
1407508	IHSY203	2003	1335925	IHSV093	39										39
11742460	JSBF41	2010	11575862	LHBX155				33	15						48
11847137	KIDH273	2012	11725713	WNAE327							25				25
11666475	KMPB184	2006	11594225	MTTY12	16										16
11699136	KMPC223	2007	11549011	LHBW203		22									22
11732705	KMPE212	2009	200366483	277044110		22									22
11775995	KMPG241	2011	11741704	MIH4RAPR						30					30
11997195	KMPK24	2014	11741704	MIH4RAPR							16				16
12071149	KMPL204	2015	11676568	MTTC8								5	16	11	32
12145605	KMPL255	2015	11676568	MTTC8									1	13	14
12194642	KMPM110	2016	11844533	KMPH284									21		21
12316814	KMPM347	2016	11841108	OSA43002897AHR										12	12

12458259	KMPN224	2017	11957504	WNAK74						11	11	
11745216	M60F31	2010	200345164	889030047	41						41	
11776183	MTTH34	2012	200353269	347033060					41		41	
11929368	MTTK22	2014	11776253	MTTH16				8	5	10	23	
11594225	MTTY12	2003	11585398	PEF821CAPR	28						28	
12039661	PRRL058	2015	11772709	DAYG74					22		22	
1481612	RSHD651	2008	11551544	AEDW168	34		10	18			62	
11872879	RSHJ162	2013	11740820	BWNE332				12	13		25	
1478496	SKLD001	2008	1431745	ARGA001	31						31	
11737768	SODE316	2009	11543844	SCBV086		36					36	
11774729	SODG075	2011	1464827	GRKC093					25		25	
11926898	SODJ157	2013	11841108	OSA43002897AHR					22		22	
11960517	THSK021	2014	11744898	WNAF382					11	9	20	
11960508	THSK022	2014	11744898	WNAF382					27	7	34	
11960462	THSK035	2014	1499812	YPHF107					28		28	
12208241	THSM049	2016	11869785	WNAJ13						15	8	23
12271091	THSN131	2017	11741704	MIH4RAPR							17	17
12340540	THSN213	2017	11957351	WNAK137							19	19
11717360	VALD50	2008	11691757	VALB45	29						29	
11732613	WCPE032	2009	11538006	RMTNGA37HCHR	34						34	
1493742	WCPE140	2009	1336827	CHAV592	33						33	
11754598	WCPF112	2010	1469622	INBC225	34						34	
11773637	WCPG040	2011	11617226	SBPZ933			46	16			62	
11773774	WCPG101	2011	1493725	WCPE110			31	17			48	
11878367	WCPJ121	2013	11773805	WCPG128					36		36	
11985705	WCPK044	2014	11785427	OSA2943647CHR					25		25	
11715456	WKHD543	2008	11551544	AEDW168	46						46	
11730587	WKHE522	2009	11617226	SBPZ933	20						20	
11743753	WLMF145	2010	11684233	WLMC196	33						33	
11743703	WLMF203	2010	11684029	WLMC82	29						29	
11687505	WNAC26	2007	200303566	216000219	30	14					44	
11687526	WNAC68	2007	11525584	WNAV16	35						35	
11705534	WNAD1	2008	11594225	MTTY12	34						34	
11725607	WNAE210	2009	1423243	GAH17NCHR	32						32	
11725572	WNAE99	2009	11597954	SBPY781	36						36	
11744764	WNAF195	2010	200303566	216000219	34	6					40	
11744573	WNAF214	2010	11609694	OPCY118	48						48	
11765527	WNAG134	2011	11687353	WNAC280			37	12			49	
11765113	WNAG171	2011	11705534	WNAD1			32	14			46	
11792779	WNAH47	2012	11732705	KMPE212					35		35	
11869785	WNAJ13	2013	200416049	281070390					32		32	
11862428	WNAJ55	2013	11597954	SBPY781					31		31	
11957154	WNAK326	2014	11792639	WNAH297					107		11	118
11957504	WNAK74	2014	11744573	WNAF214					20	8	28	
12045277	WNAL477	2015	200353269	347033060					38		38	
12158528	WNAM010	2016	11744573	WNAF214						50	50	

12158171	WNAM288	2016	11738026	AEDE114					49	49			
12297896	WNAN049	2017	11957154	WNAK326					31	31			
12297592	WNAN191	2017	11744898	WNAF382					24	24			
1450612	YAVB241	2006	11597954	SBPY781			12			12			
1477818	YAVD026	2008	1423243	GAH17NCHR	30					30			
1489459	YAVE199	2009	11597954	SBPY781		27		7		34			
1508691	YAVF313	2010	11692946	VALB56			54			54			
1512738	YAVG031	2011	11692946	VALB56			36	22		58			
11869201	YAVJ018	2013	11732705	KMPE212					10	3	1	14	
11869142	YAVJ072	2013	1508691	YAVF313				25				25	
11964564	YAVJ452	2013	11701744	WKHC558					13			13	
12013324	YAVK115	2014	11795494	OSA2953537CHR					27	6		6	39
12012602	YAVK214	2014	200416049	281070390					10				10
12013282	YAVK269	2014	11692946	VALB56					9	1	7		17
12037975	YAVK401	2014	11766459	KMPG45					2	4	4	14	24
12038000	YAVK478	2014	11766459	KMPG45							11		11
12154392	YAVL417	2015	12064273	OSA43377074AHR								31	31
12282444	YAVM250	2016	11766459	KMPG45							17		17
12282482	YAVM259	2016	11766459	KMPG45							1	15	16
12264904	YAVM293	2016	11862473	WNAJ134							17		17
12264869	YAVM332	2016	11838903	YAVH491							17		17
12264910	YAVM445	2016	12013324	YAVK115							24		24
12421979	YAVN233	2017	11960453	THSK067								15	15
12415436	YAVN325	2017	11791192	HYAH427								20	20
12415318	YAVN374	2017	12142096	YAVL001								28	28
1460368	YPHC091	2007	1427070	FLDZ251	27	11							38
1489835	YPHE025	2009	1384205	YPHX122		30							30
1498145	YPHF181	2010	1466790	HRPC041			44		4				48
1384205	YPHX122	2002	1307755	YPHU047	30				1				31