# **CARCASS CHARACTERISTICS OF NORDIC NATIVE CATTLE BREEDS**

Nicolai Jensen<sup>1</sup>, Mogens Vestergaard<sup>1</sup>, Morten Kargo<sup>1</sup>, Liisa Keto<sup>2</sup>, Per Ertbjerg<sup>3</sup>, Gudjon Thorkelsson<sup>4,5</sup>, Maria Gudjónsdóttir<sup>4,5</sup>, Maria Kjetså<sup>6</sup>, Mervi Honkatukia<sup>6</sup>, Bjørg Egelandsdal<sup>7</sup>, Nina Svartedal<sup>8</sup>, Morten Røe<sup>9</sup>, Freddy W. Fikse<sup>10</sup>, Anders H. Karlsson<sup>11</sup>, Anna Hessle<sup>11</sup> and Margrethe Therkildsen<sup>1\*</sup>

 <sup>1</sup>Aarhus University, Denmark, <sup>2</sup>Natural Resources Institute Finland, Animale, Finland, <sup>3</sup>University of Helsinki, Finland, <sup>4</sup>University of Iceland, Iceland, <sup>5</sup>Matis Food and Biotech R&D, Iceland, <sup>6</sup>Nordic Genetic Resource Center (NordGen), Sweden, <sup>7</sup>Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway, <sup>8</sup>Norwegian Genetic Resource Centre, NIBIO, Norway, <sup>9</sup>Animalia, Norway, <sup>10</sup>Växa, Sweden, <sup>11</sup>Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden \*Email of corresponding author <u>margrethe.therkildsen@food.au.dk</u>

## I. INTRODUCTION

Livestock has been part of the history of the Nordic people, however today there is a low number of Nordic native cattle breeds as commercial breeds can deliver either higher slaughter weight or higher milk production. Traditionally, Nordic native cattle were raised as dual-purpose breeds giving both milk and meat. This can reduce the total climate impact compared to the separate production of each [1]. Variability of genetic resources supports sustainable agriculture and food security and provides a spectrum of farm product quality [2], however no study on carcass qualities have been carried out. This study aimed to characterize carcass traits of Nordic native cattle breeds according to age categories and categorize them in relation to commercial breeds found in four of the five countries.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The characterisation was done for native breeds selected in each country. From Denmark: Jysk Kvæg and RDM-1970; from Finland: Länsisuomenkarja (Western Finncattle), Itäsuomenkarja (Eastern Finncattle) and Pohjoissuomenkarja (Northern Finncattle); from Iceland: Íslenska kúakynid; from Norway: Sidet Trønderfe og Nordlandsfe (STN), Telemarkfe, Dølafe, Østlandsk Rødkolle, Vestlandsk Raudkolle and Vestlandsk Fjordfe; and from Sweden: Fjällko, Rödkulla, Väneko, Bohuskulla and Ringamålako. The study also included reference beef and dairy breeds: sub-populations of Charolais, Hereford, Holstein, and red dairy cattle (NRF and SRB). Data was based on the national databases of cattle recordings. The characterisation included categories of young bulls (< 12 mo), bulls (> 12 mo), heifers, steers, young cows (< 42 mo) and cows (> 42 mo). Here we present the characteristics of bulls. An adjusted carcass weight at 21.5 mo was calculated using daily net-gain for the breed (Adj. carcass wgt = Carcass wgt + (21.5 mo – slaughter age) \* daily net-gain). More details can be found in [3].

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The native breeds can be categorised into breeds having an adjusted carcass weight of about 255 kg, and smaller sized breeds with an adjusted carcass weight of about 210 kg (Table 1). The native breeds had lower adjusted carcass weights than the beef and dairy reference breeds. The beef breeds all had higher conformation score than the native breeds, although Jysk kvæg scored almost like Hereford. The conformation score of some of the heavier native breeds (Jysk kvæg, RDM, Rödkulla, Väneko, and Ringamålako) were higher than for the dairy breeds and the small sized native breeds. The heavier native breeds, except Østlandsk Rødkolle, and Fjällko and Itäsuomenkarja had comparable fat scores to the dairy and beef breeds whereas most of the small sized native breeds had a low fatness score.

## IV. CONCLUSION

The heavier native breeds, i.e., Jysk Kvæg, RDM-1970, Østlandsk Rødkolle, Väneko and Rödkulla, had carcass characteristics best fitting into the present market preferences, with moderately high carcass weight, whereas the other breeds should aim for alternative value-added markets.

Table 1 Slaughter characteristics of reference and native	e breed bulls categorized according to weight at 21.5 mo.

Breed	Age at	Carcass	EUROP	Fat	Adjusted carcass weight
	slaughter, mo	weight, kg	conformation	class	at 21.5 mo, kg <sup>a</sup>
Beef reference					
Charolais, FI	21.7	432	10.0	6.4	428
Charolais, SV	19.6	374	9.1	6.6	413
Charolais, DK	20.7	385	10.6	7.1	401
Charolais, NO	19.8	365	9.0	5.9	395
Hereford, FI	22.9	380	7.3	8.7	357
Hereford, DK	23.8	366	7.7	9.5	326
Hereford, SV	23.1	349	7.5	7.9	324
Hereford, NO	20.4	295	6.4	7.2	310
Dairy reference					
Holstein, DK	14.4	250	3.5	7.4	364
Holstein, Fl	20.5	338	4.4	6.8	353
Holstein, SV	19.8	319	4.4	6.4	345
Holstein, NO	19.3	302	4.2	6.1	333
NRF, NO	18.5	301	5.2	6.4	346
SRB, SV	20.2	320	5.3	6.8	340
Native breeds ~ medium size 255 kg					
Jysk kvæg, DK	22.7	291	6.2	7.8	275
Länsisuomenkarja, Fl	21.9	275	4.1	7.1	270
RDM-1970, DK	23.6	295	5.2	7.4	267
Rödkulla, SV	24.9	303	5.6	6.6	261
Bohuskulla, SV	21.3	256	4.4	6.6	258
Østlandsk Rødkolle, NO	19.5	227	4.0	5.1	249
Väneko, SV	29.6	326	5.2	6.7	241
Pohjoissuomenkarja, Fl	21.9	244	4.2	7.2	239
Ringamålako, SV	26.1	286	5.6	6.5	238
Native breeds ~ small size 210 kg					
Vestlands Raudkolle, NO	19.3	200	3.9	5.6	221
Fjällko, SV	25.7	258	4.4	6.4	217
Sidet Trønder og Nordlandsfe, NO	19.8	200	3.8	5.9	216
Íslenska kúakynid, IS	25.5	252	4.3	5.3	214
Telemarkfe, NO	18.7	180	4.1	5.3	204
Dølafe, NO	20.5	192	3.9	5.2	200
Vestlandsk Fjordfe, NO	21.0	193	3.9	5.7	198
Itäsuomenkarja, FI	23.2	211	3.8	6.9	196

<sup>a</sup>Slaughter age of bulls were adjusted to 21.5 mo (average age of Charolais and Hereford across countries) and the adjusted carcass weight was calculated based on daily net-gain. Denmark (DK), Finland (FI), Iceland (IS), Norway (NO) and Sweden (SE)

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was the outcome of a Nordic Joint Committee for Agricultural and Food Research (NKJ) network 'Nordic Native Meat' running from 2018-2021. The authors wish to acknowledge the support from NKJ.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. De Vries, M., van Middelaar, C.E. & de Boer, I.J.M. (2015). Comparing environmental impacts of beef production systems: A review of life cycle assessments. Livestock Science 78: 279-288.
- 2. FAO (2007). Commission on genetic resources for food and agriculture global plan of action for animal genetic resources and the Interlaken declaration.: http://www.fao.org/3/a-a1404e.pdf
- 3. Therkildsen, M., Vestergaard, M., Kargo, M., Keto, L., Ertbjerg, P., Thorkelsson, G., Gudjonsdóttir, M., Kjetså M., Honkatukia, M., Egelandsdal, B., Svartedal, N., Røe, M., Fikse, F. W., Karlsson, A. H. & Hessle, A. (2023). Carcass characteristics of Nordic native cattle breeds. Genetic Resources 4 (7): 1-19.