

Appendix 12a

Reply from Brian van Doormaal to Wim's comments 05/06/15

Reply from Suzanne to wim comments 05/06/15

Wim's comments 05/06/15

Hello all,

Thank you to all who have responded since it is important for the ICAR Board to have a good sense of the support for this document as well as any outstanding issues/concerns.

Wim, I want to be clear that your first point is fully intended and stated in this document. Regarding your two other points, the document allows those countries desiring to exchange SNPs beyond the ISAG 200 for parentage discovery and microsatellite imputation. In some countries, it will be extremely important to have all three of these uses of SNPs allowable for parentage analysis. In other countries, the exchange of ISAG SNPs for parentage verification will already be a significant improvement over the current bi-lateral exchange procedures that are highly manual.

Again, thank you all for your feedback and comments.

Regards,

Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: "Suzanne Harding" <suzanne@thecis.co.uk>

To: "Wim van Haeringen \(\VHL\)" <wha@vhladmin.nl>, "Brian Van Doormaal" <brian@cdn.ca>, "Andrew Cromie" <acromie@icbf.com>, "Hossein Jorjani" <Hossein.Jorjani@slu.se>, <reinhard.reents@vit.de>, "Martin Burke" <martin@icar.org>, <Hans.Wilmink@crv4all.com>

Cc: <sophie.mattalia@jouy.inra.fr>, "Matthew Shaffer" <MShaffer@dairyaustralia.com.au>

Date: Thu, 4 Jun 2015 08:27:41 +0000

Subject: RE: Version 6 of GENOEX-PSE Document

Dear all,

I am not in agreement about Wims third point. I agree that ISAG have the say on the official markers that are used for parentage verification, but the additional markers are for parentage discovery, and microsatellite imputation. In my view especially the imputation markers should be available under the new guidelines from GENOEX. Otherwise organisations will go outside ICAR to exchange SNPs for this purpose, and once this begins, it will be very difficult to get them back into the 'fold' later on when / if ISAG ratify the imputation SNPs. The same arguments can be used for discovery.

best wishes Suzanne

-----Original Message-----

From: Wim van Haeringen (VHL) [mailto:wha@vhladmin.nl]

Sent: 04 June 2015 09:06

To: 'Brian Van Doormaal'; 'Andrew Cromie'; 'Hossein Jorjani'; reinhard.reents@vit.de; 'Martin Burke'; Hans.Wilmink@crv4all.com

Cc: Suzanne Harding; sophie.mattalia@jouy.inra.fr; 'Matthew Shaffer'

Subject: RE: Version 6 of GENOEX-PSE Document

Dear all,

Notwithstanding the short timeframe, our WG has a few comments on the much improved document.

Basically, these have been formulated previously and consist of three main issues:

- the exchange of data should not include the possibility for Interbull to run parentage analysis. This should be done locally to prevent complicated situations.
- microsatellites are not a part of GENOEX and should be completely removed from the document.
- currently and historically, ICAR has followed the ISAG guidelines on marker selection. Thus, only the ISAG primary and ISAG backup panel (total 200 SNPs) should be included in the first stage of GENOEX.

Best, Wim

Wim van Haeringen
Managing Director
Dr. Van Haeringen Laboratorium B.V.
Tel: (+31) 0317 416 402

-----Oorspronkelijk bericht-----

Van: Brian Van Doormaal [mailto:brian@cdn.ca]

Verzonden: woensdag 3 juni 2015 15:27

Aan: Andrew Cromie; Hossein Jorjani; 'reinhard.reents@vit.de'; Martin Burke; Hans.Wilmink@crv4all.com

CC: Wim van Haeringen (VHL); Suzanne Harding; sophie.mattalia@jouy.inra.fr; Matthew Shaffer (MShaffer@dairyaustralia.com.au)

Onderwerp: Version 6 of GENOEX-PSE Document

Hello GENOEX-PSE Task Force Members, Hans, Martin and Reinhard,

I am not sure if all Task Force members noticed my Forum post on Monday with the updated Version 6 of the GENOEX-PSE document but I have not seen any comments/responses posted afterwards so I am attaching the document here.

Since the ICAR Board meets on Monday and this document will be provided for discussion purposes, I am also including Hans, Martin and Reinhard on this message. To allow ICAR sufficient time to receive and review this document, I would suggest that we have about 24 hours left (by this time tomorrow, Thursday) to provide your input.

Therefore, to assist Hans in the ICAR review and approval process, it would be very helpful if you could send a reply message to this email indicating either:

- (a) your support for this version, for ICAR discussion purposes, OR
- (b) outlining any concerns you still have with it.

At this stage, I would expect that concerns at a "high" level would be minimal but please advise if this expectation is incorrect since it is important to reach agreement at that level before the document goes to the ICAR Board. Minor changes in choice of wording and/or grammar can be discussed at the Task Force Forum level so that we can reach a final version of the document for the Interbull meetings in Orlando (if different that what is presented to the ICAR Board).

Thanks in advance.

Brian