Annals of Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW Animal Science No 54 (1), 2015: 83–94 (Ann. Warsaw Univ. of Life Sci. – SGGW, Anim. Sci. 54 (1), 2015)

# Analysis of Limousine beef cattle recording results in Poland

TOMASZ PRZYSUCHA, MARCIN GOŁĘBIEWSKI, HENRYK GRODZKI, KAROLINA WNĘK, JAN SLÓSARZ, MAŁGORZATA KUNOWSKA-SLÓSARZ. PIOTR TOKARSKI

Department of Animal Breeding and Production, Warsaw University of Life Sciences - SGGW

Abstract: Analysis of Limousine beef cattle recording results in Poland. The aim of the study was to assess the utility of selected results of the French Limousine breed with respect to their compliance with the breeding goal and standards adopted by the Polish Association of Breeders and Producers of Beef Cattle (PABPBC). The subject of the analysis were the results of the assessment of recording results of the French Limousine breed in Poland. The study is based on data for the years 2002-2013 of PABPBC and the National Center of Animal Breeding (NCAB) for 1996-2001. The data set included: N – the number of animals tested, min. - minimum values in the studied traits, max. - maximum value of the selected traits, average - average values of the analyzed traits, SD - standard deviation. Evaluated traits are: average weight of cows (kg), average body weight of calves after birth (kg), average daily gains for age 210 days (g), average body weight of calves at the age of 210 days (kg), average milk yield (kg), terms of cows and heifers calving aptitude, distribution of the population according to the order of calving cows. The share of purebred and crossbred Limousine cows in the national beef cattle population is dominant and in 2013 constituted 81.2%. The average body weight of cows do not depart from the masses assumed to culture. Higher birth weight bulls had reached in 2013. Weight of 37.5 kg. The difference between bulls and heifers was 3 kg. Calves were characterized by high body weight daily gains during rearing: 900–1009 g respectively for heiferss and 973-1088 g for the bulls. It should be noted that since 2002 bulls exceeded daily gains of 1000 g. The Polish Limousine cattle herds in recent years from 30.1 to 44.7% of cows calved during the relevant period. Thanks to the consistent growth of the population of Limousine, primiparous cows and cows calving for the second time amounted to about 40% of the population, despite the growing number of older cows. In 2000, only 2 cows were after 7 calvings, and in 2013 there were 1416 already (12.6%). It mean that the life of the cow increases, which is of particular economic importance.

Key words: beef cattle, Limousine, beef cattle recording

### INTRODUCTION

Currently in Poland there are registered 14 specialized breeds of beef cattle for which records are kept and evaluation of breeding value is conducted. Herdbook and recording assessment are conducted by the Polish Association of Breeders and Producers of Beef Cattle (PABPBC). PABPBC breeding goal for Limousine breed is to maintain high performance slaughter parameters, good weight, ease of calving course maintaining and improving weight gain of calves as an indicator of maternal milk production. The parameters for the growth of adult cows - body weight of 600-650 kg with a height of 135 cm in sacrum, bulls – body

weight 1100 kg with height of 145 cm in sacrum. In the national breeding program for Limousine cattle there are defined, inter alia, the following breeding standards for cows entered in the introductory part of the book: the minimum weight gain from birth to 210 days of age – 850 g, the minimum weight after first calving – 480 kg. The aim of the study was to assess selected recording results of the French Limousine breed with respect to their compliance with the breeding goal and standards adopted by PABPBC.

### MATERIAL AND METHODS

The subject of the analysis were beef cattle recording results for the French Limousine breed in Poland, with respect to their compliance with the goal of racial breeding and standards adopted by the Polish Association of Breeders and Producers of Beef Cattle (PABPBC). The subject of the analysis were recording results of the Limousine beef cattle breed in Poland. The study was based on data for the years 2002-2013 of PABPBC and the National Center of Animal Breeding (NCAB) for 1996-2001. The data set included: N – number of animals tested. min. - minimum values in the studied traits, max. - maximum value of the selected features, average - average values of the analyzed traits, SD - standard deviation. Evaluated properties are: average weight of cows (kg), the average body weight of calves after birth (kg), the average daily gains for age 210 days (g), the average body weight of calves at the age of 210 days (kg), the average milk yield (kg), the terms of cows and heifers calving aptitude, the distribution of the population according to the order of calving cows. The calculation of standardized animal body weight for given day in its life was done according to the following formula:

$$MCS = [(MCB - MCU) / WW] \times WS + MCU$$

where:

MCS – standardized animal body weight (kg);

MCB – mean body weight of the animal on the actual weighing (kg);

MCU – actual body weight set for 48 hours, at birth (kg);

WW – mean age of the animal on the weighing (days);

WS – standardized age of the animal (s).

There were calculated the average daily weight gain of the animal from the day of birth to 210 days of age, according to the formula:

$$PDMC = [(MCC - MCP) \times 1000] / (WK - WP)$$

where:

PDMC – means of increase in daily body weight (g);

MCC – final body weight of the animal on the weighing day (kg);

MCP – initial body weight of the animal on the weighing (kg);

WK – mean age of the animal on the final weighing (days);

 WP – mean age of the animal on the initial weighing (days milk yield in dairy cows is expressed in kg of milk per convention.

The conversion 210 day lactation and is calculated according to the formula:

WMM210 =  $(McOds \times 1700)$  / calf age

### where:

WMM210 - value of mother milk - milk yield for 210 day lactation conversion assuming calf birth weight 35 kg, per 1 kg body weight gain, which drank 10 kg milk a day during the first 3 months, and the remaining months of 8–9 kg a day;

McOds (kg) – actual weight of the calf at weaning;

calfage (days) - actual age of the calf at the time of weaning from the mother.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the quantitative changes of the female population of Limousine cattle in Poland in the years 1996-2013. It may be noticed a systematic increase in population from 1998 to 2006, while in 2007, a noticeable decrease. The reason is not a drastic decrease in the number of purebred cows and heifers, but the changes in the presentation of results. Until 2006 statement included heifers and cows, while in 2007, is given only the number of cows. The share of purebred and crossbred Limousine cows in the national beef cattle population is dominant and in 2013 constituted 81.2%.

TABLE 1. Quantitative changes of the female population of Limousine cattle in Poland\*

|      | Beef bree | ed female po   | opulation | Limousine           | Limousine            | Limousine                            | Limousine                           |
|------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Year | pure-bred | cross-<br>bred | total     | breed<br>(purebred) | breed<br>(crossbred) | breed<br>(purebred +<br>+ crossbred) | breed share<br>in the<br>population |
| 1996 | 3 939     | 4 952          | 8 891     | 1 109               | 3 211                | 4 320                                | 48.6                                |
| 1997 | 6 063     | 5 772          | 11 835    | 1 846               | 3 344                | 5 190                                | 43.9                                |
| 1998 | 7 227     | 7 601          | 14 828    | 2 362               | 4 314                | 6 676                                | 45.0                                |
| 1999 | 8 375     | 8 243          | 16 618    | 2 882               | 4 919                | 7 801                                | 46.9                                |
| 2000 | 9 085     | 9 468          | 18 553    | 3 226               | 6 176                | 9 402                                | 50.7                                |
| 2001 | 9 129     | 9 748          | 18 877    | 3 159               | 6 837                | 9 996                                | 53.0                                |
| 2002 | 9 735     | 8 968          | 18 703    | 3 248               | 6 564                | 9 812                                | 52.5                                |
| 2003 | 11 768    | 9 382          | 21 150    | 4 653               | 6 925                | 11 578                               | 54.7                                |
| 2004 | 13 884    | 10 925         | 24 809    | 5 684               | 8 125                | 13 809                               | 55.7                                |
| 2005 | 17 130    | 11 710         | 28 840    | 8 578               | 9 073                | 17 651                               | 61.2                                |
| 2006 | 19 597    | 13 100         | 32 697    | 9 689               | 10 108               | 19 797                               | 60.5                                |
| 2007 | 14 541    | 11 676         | 26 217    | 7 443               | 9 070                | 16 513                               | 63.0                                |
| 2008 | 17 481    | 12 097         | 29 578    | 9 856               | 10 142               | 19 998                               | 67.6                                |
| 2009 | 15 435    | 7 711          | 23 146    | 9 995               | 6 682                | 16 677                               | 72.1                                |
| 2010 | 16 436    | 7 576          | 24 012    | 11 037              | 6 684                | 17 721                               | 73.8                                |
| 2011 | 16 216    | 7 459          | 23 675    | 11 310              | 6 653                | 17 963                               | 75.9                                |
| 2012 | 16 724    | 7 070          | 23 794    | 11 879              | 6 389                | 18 268                               | 76.8                                |
| 2013 | 17 481    | 6 633          | 24 114    | 12 586              | 6 987                | 19 573                               | 81.2                                |

<sup>\*</sup>From 2007 the list includes only the cows.

The average body weight of purebred cows is shown in Table 2. Optimum weight and dimensions depend mainly on cattle production system (Morris and Wilton 1976, Andersen 1978, Dickerson 1978, Fitzhugh 1978, Nogalski et al. 2000). Genotype and weight of mother cows are always described among the many factors responsible for normal growth and development of calves. Many studies have shown that the weight of the cow has a significant impact on calf birth weight, as well as daily gains during rearing (Przysucha et al. 2002). Therefore, the weight of a cow in adulthood is an important feature to be considered for breeding programs (Anderson 1978, Brown et al. 1989). According to the breeding goal of PABPBC, cows body weight in adulthood should be 600--650 kg for Limousine breed. Analysis of the recording results shows that the average body weight of cows did not differ from the breeding goal.

to a calf body weight at weaning at the age of 210 days. The calves with highest body weight at birth also typically have the highest body weight at the end of the rearing (Przysucha et al. 2002, Przysucha et al. 2005). Bulls had reached higher birth weight in 2013 (37.5 kg). The difference between bulls and heifers was 3 kg. Nogalski et al. (2000) reported a greater number of falls of small, less vital calves. They also noticed that the mothers of dead calves were significantly lighter and in worse condition, and consequently created worse conditions for the development of the fetus, and were less prepared to make the effort in delivery.

Average daily weight gains of purebred calves to the age of 210 days are shown in Tables 5 and 6. The data presented show that the calves were characterized by high body weight gains during rearing: 900–1009 g respectively for heifers and 973–1088 g for the bulls. It should be noted that since 2002 bulls

| TABLE 2. | Body | weight o | of pureb | red l | Limousine cows |
|----------|------|----------|----------|-------|----------------|
|----------|------|----------|----------|-------|----------------|

| Year  | N    | Cow body weight (kg) |      |         |      |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|------|----------------------|------|---------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| rear  | IN   | min.                 | max. | average | SD   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999  | 1126 | 350                  | 900  | 634.0   | 73.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000  | 1504 | 382                  | 890  | 619.1   | 76.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001  | 1568 | 430                  | 890  | 618.0   | 72.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002  | 1557 | 370                  | 850  | 606.2   | 76.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003  | 1999 | 420                  | 850  | 596.6   | 73.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004  | 2190 | 320                  | 850  | 597.1   | 71.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005* | 733  | 480                  | 710  | 543.2   | 33.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006* | 1489 | 440                  | 796  | 552.1   | 36.1 |  |  |  |  |  |

<sup>\*</sup>Body weight after first calving

Tables 3 and 4 present the mean body weight of purebred calves after birth. Many authors have shown a significant effect of calves body weight after birth

exceeded daily gains of 1000 g. These gains make, that after a short (about 1 month) supplementary fattening, bulls with a body weight of about 300 kg

TABLE 3. Average body weight of purebred heifers at birth

| Year  | N    |      | Body w | eight (kg) |     |
|-------|------|------|--------|------------|-----|
| rear  | IN . | min. | max.   | average    | SD  |
| 1999* | 1284 | 16   | 67     | 34.3       | 5.9 |
| 2000  | 650  | 22   | 55     | 33.1       | 5.2 |
| 2001  | 736  | 17   | 58     | 34.6       | 5.0 |
| 2002  | 785  | 20   | 55     | 34.7       | 4.4 |
| 2003  | 939  | 20   | 60     | 33.7       | 4.2 |
| 2004  | 1036 | 17   | 49     | 33.4       | 3.9 |
| 2005  | 1784 | 15   | 48     | 33.1       | 3.8 |
| 2006  | 2935 | 17   | 50     | 34.7       | 3.4 |
| 2007  | 3377 | 19   | 55     | 33.5       | 4.2 |
| 2008  | 4705 | 16   | 58     | 34.2       | 4.1 |
| 2009  | 5522 | 20   | 56     | 34.3       | 4.2 |
| 2010  | 5732 | 15   | 57     | 34.3       | 3.9 |
| 2011  | 5936 | 15   | 54     | 34.4       | 3.9 |
| 2012  | 6466 | 15   | 57     | 34.5       | 4.1 |
| 2013  | 6107 | 14   | 56     | 34.5       | 4.2 |

<sup>\*</sup>Regardless of sex.

TABLE 4. Average body weight of purebred bulls at birth

| Voor  | N    |      | Body we | eight (kg) |     |
|-------|------|------|---------|------------|-----|
| Year  | IN . | min. | max.    | average    | SD  |
| 1999* | 1284 | 16   | 67      | 34.3       | 5.9 |
| 2000  | 655  | 18   | 57      | 34.5       | 6.4 |
| 2001  | 716  | 18   | 53      | 36.2       | 5.5 |
| 2002  | 723  | 23   | 52      | 36.0       | 4.7 |
| 2003  | 994  | 20   | 50      | 35.3       | 4.3 |
| 2004  | 1103 | 15   | 50      | 35.3       | 4.4 |
| 2005  | 1745 | 18   | 52      | 35.3       | 4.1 |
| 2006  | 2774 | 20   | 55      | 36.2       | 4.2 |
| 2007  | 2924 | 20   | 65      | 35.7       | 4.8 |
| 2008  | 4249 | 16   | 61      | 36.8       | 4.5 |
| 2009  | 4995 | 20   | 60      | 37.0       | 4.6 |
| 2010  | 5349 | 18   | 65      | 37.2       | 4.5 |
| 2011  | 5506 | 20   | 65      | 37.4       | 4.4 |
| 2012  | 5879 | 20   | 70      | 37.7       | 4.4 |
| 2013  | 5626 | 15   | 60      | 37.5       | 4.6 |

<sup>\*</sup>Regardless of sex.

TABLE 5. Average daily gains of purebred heifers to 210 days of age

| Year | N     |      | Daily gains (g) |         |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------|-------|------|-----------------|---------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ieai | IN    | min. | max.            | average | SD    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 241   | 550  | 12 989          | 900.4   | 136.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 497   | 518  | 1 495           | 954.8   | 163.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 494   | 494  | 1 421           | 915.5   | 124.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 641   | 429  | 1 619           | 937.8   | 142.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 654   | 417  | 1 514           | 974.2   | 122.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 1 007 | 510  | 1 686           | 991.5   | 136.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 1 574 | 509  | 1 389           | 1 005.0 | 99.9  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 2 544 | 401  | 2 241           | 959.9   | 126.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 4 202 | 343  | 1 611           | 963.0   | 126.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 4 999 | 351  | 1 482           | 964.9   | 124.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 5 430 | 372  | 1 548           | 967.8   | 106.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 5 381 | 489  | 1 480           | 983.3   | 88.7  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 5 932 | 332  | 1 676           | 1 009.7 | 63.6  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 5 632 | 332  | 1 676           | 1 000.9 | 133.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 6. Average daily gains of purebred bulls to 210 days of age

| Year | N     |      | Daily g | ains (g) |       |
|------|-------|------|---------|----------|-------|
| rear | IN.   | min. | max.    | average  | SD    |
| 2000 | 280   | 617  | 1 446   | 973.7    | 164.4 |
| 2001 | 463   | 522  | 1 478   | 986.8    | 177.8 |
| 2002 | 369   | 546  | 1 427   | 1 007.1  | 122.3 |
| 2003 | 603   | 541  | 1 575   | 1 014.9  | 152.4 |
| 2004 | 692   | 541  | 1 452   | 1 047.8  | 125.7 |
| 2005 | 834   | 420  | 1 748   | 1 088.5  | 155.4 |
| 2006 | 1 624 | 381  | 2 324   | 1 064.1  | 152.1 |
| 2007 | 2 011 | 417  | 1 828   | 1 064.2  | 137.5 |
| 2008 | 3 671 | 474  | 1 835   | 1 051.1  | 128.6 |
| 2009 | 4 359 | 348  | 1 693   | 1 051.6  | 121.7 |
| 2010 | 4 677 | 405  | 1 599   | 1 051.2  | 116.2 |
| 2011 | 4 681 | 346  | 1 746   | 1 071.4  | 88.6  |
| 2012 | 5216  | 346  | 1 746   | 1 076.6  | 46.8  |
| 2013 | 5053  | 378  | 1 913   | 1 094.6  | 152.1 |

previously eliminated from breeding can be sold for export at a good price. The gains considerably in excess of the gains of heifers defined in the breeding standard ensure that after weaning with proper nutrition they obtain the required body weight for mating (Przysucha et al. 2006) at the age of 15 months. Among the Limousine breed calves there is very low percentage of mortality by as much as 3% lower in the French breeding conditions. Besides they are characterized

by rapid growth and development, and vitality (Przysucha et al. 2005). In study of Pogorzelska et al. (1998) Limousine bulls daily gains from birth to weaning were more than 1000 g, and at the age of 3-4 months obtained body weight of approximately 170 kg. It should be emphasized that the average daily gains of calves ranged considerably in the last vears of assessment. This is confirmed by the high standard deviations.

The average body weight of purebred calves at 210 days of age are presented in Tables 7 and 8. The body weights at the time of weaning were at the level of the 222-253 kg for heifers and 238--274 kg for bulls. The highest weight at the age of 210 days for heifers was reached in 2006 and for the bulls in 2007. The studies lead to the conclusion that by the breeding standards weights at weaning for both heifers and bulls were at medium level, but fall within the French standards. The average weight of bulls was evaluated by approximately 20 kg higher than the average weight of heifers of the same age.

Table 9 shows the average milk yield of purebred cows in different years of assessment. As can be seen from the following statement, the average milk yield of Limousine cows was 2002.4 kg in the last year of the assessment and did not undergo significant changes in subsequent years. The minimum value of this trait was 640 kg and the maximum 3312 kg. The data should be approached with great caution because milk yield was calculated based on the weight gain of calves, and as we know in the herd calves can always be found that approach to other cows choke or are fed by the breeder. For this reason, since 2010, evaluation of this feature was a ceased.

TABLE 7. Average body weight of purebred heifers at 210 days of age

| Voor  | N    |      | Body we | eight (kg) |      |
|-------|------|------|---------|------------|------|
| Year  | IN . | min. | max.    | average    | SD   |
| 1999* | 873  | 70   | 213     | 140.6      | 21.5 |
| 2000  | 241  | 149  | 315     | 221.7      | 29.7 |
| 2001  | 499  | 155  | 347     | 237.2      | 34.3 |
| 2002  | 497  | 128  | 329     | 227.0      | 26.8 |
| 2003  | 642  | 120  | 370     | 230.2      | 30.6 |
| 2004  | 654  | 118  | 350     | 238.2      | 26.4 |
| 2005  | 1007 | 110  | 380     | 241.6      | 29.1 |
| 2006  | 1574 | 120  | 397     | 246.2      | 34.3 |
| 2007  | 2544 | 103  | 395     | 236.4      | 31.5 |
| 2008  | 4202 | 127  | 371     | 237.7      | 32.5 |
| 2009  | 4999 | 110  | 398     | 240.1      | 32.8 |
| 2010  | 5430 | 120  | 500     | 239.0      | 31.4 |
| 2011  | 5381 | 122  | 365     | 247.1      | 22.3 |
| 2012  | 5918 | 104  | 401     | 253.3      | 13.7 |
| 2013  | 5632 | 135  | 410     | 251.7      | 11.7 |

<sup>\*</sup>Regardless of sex.

TABLE 8. Average body weight of purebred bulls at 210 days of age

| Year  | N    |      | Body weight (kg) |         |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|------|------|------------------|---------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| rear  | IN.  | min. | max.             | average | SD   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999* | 873  | 70   | 213              | 140.6   | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000  | 280  | 162  | 351              | 238.5   | 36.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001  | 466  | 153  | 348              | 245.5   | 37.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002  | 370  | 143  | 336              | 247.5   | 27.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003  | 608  | 146  | 363              | 248.0   | 32.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004  | 692  | 142  | 339              | 255.4   | 27.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005  | 834  | 119  | 393              | 246.3   | 33.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006  | 1624 | 113  | 430              | 249.0   | 48.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007  | 2011 | 120  | 450              | 260.7   | 36.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008  | 3671 | 150  | 406              | 258.7   | 34.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009  | 4359 | 119  | 440              | 261.6   | 34.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010  | 4677 | 126  | 430              | 259.4   | 33.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011  | 4681 | 128  | 420              | 269.2   | 28.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012  | 5216 | 138  | 431              | 271.5   | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013  | 5053 | 107  | 450              | 274.7   | 33.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

<sup>\*</sup>Regardless of sex.

TABLE 9. The average milk yield of purebred cows

| Year | N     | Estimated milk yield of cows (kg) |         |         |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|------|-------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| ieai | IN.   | min.                              | max.    | average | SD    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 858   | 745.0                             | 3 250.0 | 1 884.8 | 315.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 795   | 1020.0                            | 3 311.9 | 1 951.4 | 354.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 796   | 971.4                             | 2 833.3 | 1 914.2 | 232.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 1 249 | 971.4                             | 2 995.2 | 1 933.8 | 265.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 1 346 | 951.9                             | 2 833.1 | 1 999.8 | 227.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 1 628 | 640.0                             | 2 395.0 | 1 881.0 | 206.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 3 205 | 1 009.0                           | 3 087.0 | 2 069.2 | 238.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 9 157 | 899.0                             | 2 958.0 | 2 002.4 | 231.6 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 10 summarizes the terms of cows and heifers calving aptitude in the coming months in the year, in the years 1999–2013. Season of birth has a significant impact on the vitality and growth pace of reared calves. which directly affects the economic effects of the rearing (Makulska et al. 2002, Przysucha et al. 2005). Seasonality

in calvings in breeding herds is very important. because appropriate term of calving in the future allows to receive breeding material of a very good quality with the least amount of cost of rearing (maximum utilization of pastures). Many authors believe (Dobicki 1996, Jasiorowski 1999, Jasiorowski and Przysucha 2004). that the period

TABLE 10. Time of purebred cows and heifers calving

| 37   | T T :4 |      |      |      |      |      | Mo   | nths |      |     |     |     |     | T-4-1 |
|------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Year | Unit   | I    | II   | III  | IV   | V    | VI   | VII  | VIII | IX  | X   | XI  | XII | Total |
| 1000 | N      | 127  | 127  | 172  | 177  | 171  | 103  | 101  | 71   | 58  | 81  | 68  | 73  | 1329  |
| 1999 | %      | 9.6  | 9.6  | 12.9 | 13.3 | 12.9 | 7.8  | 7.6  | 5.3  | 4.4 | 6.1 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| 2000 | N      | 107  | 135  | 235  | 191  | 166  | 115  | 111  | 88   | 70  | 95  | 83  | 122 | 1518  |
| 2000 | %      | 7.0  | 8.9  | 15.5 | 12.6 | 10.9 | 7.6  | 7.3  | 5.8  | 4.6 | 6.3 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 100.0 |
| 2001 | N      | 174  | 156  | 203  | 211  | 159  | 104  | 123  | 110  | 79  | 84  | 83  | 90  | 1576  |
| 2001 | %      | 11.0 | 9.9  | 12.9 | 13.4 | 10.1 | 6.6  | 7.8  | 7.0  | 5.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 100.0 |
| 2002 | N      | 148  | 142  | 214  | 244  | 182  | 135  | 79   | 97   | 89  | 71  | 85  | 84  | 1570  |
| 2002 | %      | 9.4  | 9.0  | 13.6 | 15.5 | 11.6 | 8.6  | 5.0  | 6.2  | 5.7 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| 2003 | N      | 147  | 236  | 276  | 279  | 241  | 191  | 150  | 96   | 73  | 96  | 91  | 126 | 2002  |
| 2003 | %      | 7.3  | 11.8 | 13.8 | 13.9 | 12.0 | 9.5  | 7.5  | 4.8  | 3.6 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| 2004 | N      | 165  | 177  | 323  | 336  | 233  | 223  | 172  | 111  | 124 | 131 | 89  | 107 | 2191  |
| 2004 | %      | 7.5  | 8.1  | 14.7 | 15.3 | 10.6 | 10.2 | 7.9  | 5.1  | 5.7 | 6.0 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 100.0 |
| 2005 | N      | 232  | 356  | 435  | 325  | 365  | 286  | 245  | 216  | 220 | 152 | 122 | 156 | 3110  |
| 2003 | %      | 7.5  | 11.4 | 14.0 | 10.5 | 11.7 | 9.2  | 7.9  | 6.9  | 7.1 | 4.9 | 3.9 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| 2006 | N      | 750  | 768  | 843  | 567  | 332  | 456  | 567  | 456  | 312 | 345 | 123 | 190 | 5709  |
| 2000 | %      | 13.1 | 13.5 | 14.8 | 9.9  | 5.8  | 8.0  | 9.9  | 8.0  | 5.5 | 6.0 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| 2007 | N      | 389  | 484  | 678  | 893  | 800  | 624  | 497  | 428  | 464 | 447 | 389 | 403 | 6496  |
| 2007 | %      | 6.0  | 7.5  | 10.4 | 13.7 | 12.3 | 9.6  | 7.7  | 6.6  | 7.1 | 6.9 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 100.0 |
| 2008 | N      | 531  | 673  | 927  | 936  | 1085 | 787  | 481  | 485  | 484 | 424 | 404 | 406 | 7623  |
| 2000 | %      | 7.0  | 8.8  | 12.2 | 12.3 | 14.2 | 10.3 | 6.3  | 6.4  | 6.4 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 100.0 |
| 2009 | N      | 670  | 676  | 1087 | 1335 | 1208 | 805  | 596  | 560  | 500 | 459 | 590 | 581 | 9067  |
| 2007 | %      | 7.4  | 7.5  | 12.0 | 14.7 | 13.3 | 8.9  | 6.6  | 6.2  | 5.5 | 5.1 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 100.0 |
| 2010 | N      | 739  | 762  | 1175 | 1581 | 1201 | 835  | 694  | 591  | 550 | 447 | 533 | 580 | 9688  |
| 2010 | %      | 7.6  | 7.9  | 12.1 | 16.3 | 12.4 | 8.6  | 7.2  | 6.1  | 5.7 | 4.6 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| 2011 | N      | 913  | 761  | 1195 | 1349 | 1417 | 1016 | 733  | 546  | 604 | 473 | 494 | 635 | 10136 |
|      | %      | 9.0  | 7.5  | 11.8 | 13.3 | 14.0 | 10.0 | 7.2  | 5.4  | 6.0 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| 2012 | N      | 953  | 942  | 1374 | 1491 | 1439 | 976  | 738  | 664  | 595 | 547 | 562 | 762 | 1043  |
|      | %      | 8.6  | 8.5  | 12.4 | 13.5 | 13.0 | 8.8  | 6.7  | 6.0  | 5.4 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 2013 | N      | 1058 | 960  | 1257 | 1508 | 1337 | 1046 | 818  | 727  | 598 | 600 | 677 | 600 | 11186 |
|      | %      | 9.5  | 8.6  | 11.2 | 13.5 | 12.0 | 9.4  | 7.3  | 6.5  | 5.3 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 100.0 |

of mating and the resulting of calving aptitude time should not be longer than 2-3 months. Beef cows maintained all year round in grazing system should make the best offspring in the winter. Calves born in the period after the completion of the first period of milk drinking are prepared to make full use of the pasture. then their growth rate is fast. calves are healthy and good developed

and breeder bear the smallest rearing costs. It should also be noted that in the winter calvings weaning calves moment coincides with the impoverishment of pastures in autumn. the consequence is natural dry-off pregnant cows. With winter calvings cows mostly deliver in the barn so that it is easier to monitor deliveries and possible assistance in the event of complications. Analyzing the obtained results and assuming that the most favorable period of cows calving aptitude is the period from December to March. It should be noted that from 30.1 to 44.7% of the Polish Limousine cows delivered in recent years during the relevant period cows. It follows that more than half of the calves born at other times of the year only to a small degree can take full advantage of the pasture.

Table 11 shows the percentage distribution of calving aptitude of purebred Limousine cows according to calving order. Limousine breed is considered to be long-lived and early maturing breed.

TABLE 11. Distribution of the order of calving

| Voor | Unit |      |      |      |      |      | Moi  | nths |      |     |     |     |       | Total  |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|--------|
| Year | Onit | I    | II   | III  | IV   | V    | VI   | VII  | VIII | IX  | X   | XI  | ≥ XII | Total  |
| 2000 | N    | 360  | 282  | 323  | 364  | 158  | 25   | 2    | -    | -   | _   | -   | -     | 1514   |
| 2000 | %    | 23.8 | 18.6 | 21.3 | 24.0 | 10.4 | 1.7  | 0.1  | _    | _   | _   | -   | _     | 100.0  |
| 2001 | N    | 363  | 299  | 222  | 274  | 278  | 124  | 12   | 2    | -   | _   | -   | -     | 1574   |
| 2001 | %    | 23.1 | 19.0 | 14.1 | 17.4 | 17.7 | 7.9  | 0.8  | 0.1  | _   | _   | -   | _     | 100.0  |
| 2002 | N    | 387  | 300  | 193  | 164  | 186  | 196  | 104  | 19   | _   | _   | -   | _     | 1549   |
| 2002 | %    | 25.0 | 19.4 | 12.5 | 10.6 | 12.0 | 12.7 | 6.7  | 1.2  | _   | _   | _   | _     | 100.0  |
| 2003 | N    | 474  | 369  | 353  | 218  | 191  | 156  | 146  | 67   | 12  | _   | -   | _     | 1986   |
| 2003 | %    | 23.9 | 18.6 | 17.8 | 11.0 | 9.6  | 7.9  | 7.4  | 3.4  | 0.6 | _   | _   | _     | 100.0  |
| 2004 | N    | 544  | 412  | 287  | 271  | 179  | 174  | 149  | 122  | 45  | 8   | -   | _     | 2191   |
| 2004 | %    | 24.8 | 18.8 | 13.1 | 12.4 | 8.2  | 7.9  | 6.8  | 5.6  | 2.1 | 0.4 | -   | _     | 100.0  |
| 2005 | N    | 919  | 573  | 412  | 326  | 268  | 166  | 148  | 149  | 102 | 40  | 7   | _     | 3110   |
| 2003 | %    | 29.5 | 18.4 | 13.2 | 10.5 | 8.6  | 5.3  | 4.8  | 4.8  | 3.3 | 1.3 | 0.2 | _     | 100.0  |
| 2006 | N    | 1484 | 1235 | 1123 | 943  | 345  | 359  | 56   | 76   | 56  | 12  | 8   | 12    | 5709   |
| 2000 | %    | 26.0 | 21.6 | 19.7 | 16.5 | 6.0  | 6.3  | 1.0  | 1.3  | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2   | 100.0  |
| 2010 | N    | 2362 | 2124 | 1960 | 1352 | 803  | 403  | 248  | 169  | 117 | 67  | 34  | 49    | 9688   |
| 2010 | %    | 24.3 | 21.9 | 20.2 | 13.9 | 8.2  | 4.1  | 2.5  | 1.7  | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4   | 100.0  |
| 2011 | N    | 2335 | 2090 | 1717 | 1586 | 1047 | 616  | 303  | 172  | 115 | 79  | 42  | 34    | 10 136 |
| 2011 | %    | 23.0 | 20.6 | 16.9 | 15.6 | 10.3 | 6.0  | 2.9  | 1.6  | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2   | 100.0  |
| 2012 | N    | 2564 | 1947 | 1756 | 1477 | 1396 | 834  | 482  | 273  | 135 | 77  | 53  | 49    | 11 043 |
| 2012 | %    | 23.2 | 17.6 | 15.9 | 13.3 | 12.6 | 7.5  | 4.3  | 2.4  | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3   | 100.0  |
| 2013 | N    | 2153 | 2110 | 619  | 1522 | 1262 | 1105 | 636  | 346  | 216 | 100 | 61  | 56    | 11 186 |
| 2013 | %    | 19.2 | 18.9 | 14.5 | 13.6 | 11.3 | 9.9  | 5.7  | 3.1  | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.5   | 100.0  |

Average life expectancy of cows is 8–11 vears, and the number of calves born during the lifetime of a single cow an average 7 pieces. Cows of this breed very well take care of their offspring – are very good and caring mothers (Pogorzelska et al. 1998). It should be noted that due to the systematic increase in the population of Limousine breed cows, primiparous cows and cows calving for the second time constitute about 40% of the population, despite the growing number of older cows. In 2000, only 2 cows were after 7 calving, and in 2013 there were already 1416 (12.6%). It proves that the life of the cow increases, which is of particular economic importance. Long life of cows in herds of beef cattle is one of the main factors allowing for reducing the cost. so the breeders should try to use cows as long as possible.

### CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of selected results of the evaluation of the French utility Limousine with regard to their compliance with the breeding goal and standards adopted by PABPBC shows maintenance of high standards of the national breeding population of this breed of cattle.

### REFERENCES

- ANDERSEN B.B., 1978: Animal size and efficiency, with special reference to growth and feed conversion in cattle. Anim. Prod. 27: 381–391.
- BROWN C.J., JOHNSON Z.B., BROWN A.H. jr., 1989: Between and within breed variation in mature weight and maturing interval of beef cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 67 (Suppl. 2): 9.
- DICKERSON G.E., 1978. Animal size and efficiency: basic concepts. Anim. Prod. 27: 367–379.

- DOBICKIA., 1996: Technologiczne aspekty efektywności produkcji w populacjach mięsnych bydła. Zesz. Nauk. Przegl. Hod. 17: 57–71.
- FITZHUGH H.A., 1978. Animal size and efficiency, with special reference to the breeding female. Anim. Prod. 27: 393–401.
- JASIOROWSKI H., 1999: Blaski i cienie hodowli bydła mięsnego w Polsce. Wieś Jutra 7–8: 27–28
- JASIOROWSKI H., KIJAK Z., POCZYNAJ-ŁO S., WAJDA S., 1996: Program rozwoju hodowli bydła mięsnego w Polsce. Fundacja "Rozwój SGGW", Warszawa: 5–67.
- JASIOROWSKI H., PRZYSUCHA T., 2004: Bydło mięsne: wybór rasy. Top Agrar Polska 1: 102–104.
- KRAJOWE CENTRUM HODOWLI ZWIE-RZĄT, 1997–2000: Ocena wartości użytkowej krów oraz ocena i selekcja buhajów. Wyniki za lata 1996–1999.
- MAKULSKA J., WEGLARZ A., SZAREK J., 2002: Wpływ sezonu urodzenia na produkcyjno-ekonomiczne wyniki odchowu cieląt rasy limousinee. Rocz. Nauk. Zoot. (Supl.) 15: 213–218.
- MORRIS C.A., WILTON J.W., 1976: The influence of body size on the biological efficiency of cows: A review. Can. Anim. Sci. 56: 613–647.
- NOGALSKI Z., KLUPCZYŃSKI J., MICIŃSKI J., 2000. Przebieg porodu, wielkość i żywotność cieląt w zależności od wymiarów ciała krów. Rocz. Nauk. Zoot. 27 (3): 43–57.
- POGORZELSKA J., ROMANOWSKI A., PU-CHAJDA Z., 1998: Analiza użytkowania rozpłodowego i rozwój importowanego z Francji bydła limousinee i charolaise. Zesz. Nauk. AR we Wrocławiu XIX (336): 143–148.
- Polski Związek Hodowców i Producentów Bydła Mięsnego, 2001–2014: Ocena wartości użytkowej bydła ras mięsnych. Wyniki za lata 2000–2013.
- PRZYSUCHA T., GRODZKI H., BRZOZOW-SKI P., ZDZIARSKI K., 2005: Wpływ wybranych czynników na przebieg porodów krów rasy limousine. Medycyna Weterynaryjna 61 (9), 1036–1038.
- PRZYSUCHA T., GRODZKI H., CHARŁAM-POWICZ A., ZDZIARSKI K., 2002: The effect of selected factors on growth rate of Limousinee calves. Anim. Sci. Pap. Rep. 20, (Suppl.) 1: 221–228.

STĄPOREK K., ZIEMIŃSKI R., 2006: Aktualne trendy w chowie i hodowli rasy Limousine. Przegl. Hod. 7: 1–4.

Streszczenie: Analiza wyników oceny użytkowości francuskiej rasy limousine w Polsce. Celem pracy była analiza wybranych wyników oceny użytkowości francuskiej rasy limousine w odniesieniu do ich zgodności z celem hodowlanym i standardami rasowymi przyjętymi przez Polski Związek Hodowców i Producentów Bydła Mięsnego. Przedmiotem analiz były wyniki oceny użytkowości francuskiej rasy bydła mięsnego limousine w Polsce. Opracowanie oparte jest na danych PZHiPBM za lata 2002-2013 oraz Krajowego Centrum Hodowli Zwierzat (KCHZ) za lata 1996–2001. Zbiór danych obejmował: N – liczbę badanych zwierząt, min. – minimalne wartości w badanej cechy, max. - maksymalne wartości badanej cechy, średnia – uśrednione wartości badanej cech, SD – odchylenie standardowe. Oceniane cechy to: średnie masy ciała krów (kg), średnie masy ciała cielat po urodzeniu (kg), średnie przyrosty dobowe do wieku 210 dni (g), średnie masy ciała cielat w wieku 210 dni (kg), średnia mleczność krów (kg), terminy ocieleń krów i jałowic, rozkład populacji krów według kolejności ocielenia. Udział czystorasowych i mieszańcowych krów rasy limousine w krajowej populacji bydła mięsnego jest dominujący i w 2013 roku stanowił 81,2%. Średnie masy ciała krów nie odbiegają

od mas założonych w celu hodowlanym. Wieksza masa urodzeniowa miały buhajki, osiagając w 2013 roku wagę 37,5 kg. Różnicą między buhajkami a jałówkami wynosiła 3 kg. Cieleta charakteryzowały się dużymi przyrostami w okresie odchowu: 900-1009 g odpowiednio dla cieliczek i 973-1088 g dla buhajków. Należy zauważyć, iż od 2002 roku buhajki przekroczyły 1000-gramowe przyrosty dobowe. W polskich stadach bydła limousine cieliło się w ostatnich latach we właściwym okresie od 30,1 do 44,7% krów. Dzieki systematycznemu wzrostowi populacji krów rasy limousine pierwiastki i krowy cielace się po raz drugi stanowią około 40% populacji, mimo stale rosnacej liczby krów starszych. W 2000 roku tylko 2 krowy były po 7. ocieleniu, a w 2013 roku było ich już 1416 (12,6%). Wynika z tego, że wydłuża się czas użytkowania krów, co ma szczególne znaczenie ekonomiczne.

MS received May 2015

### Authors' address:

Tomasz Przysucha Wydział Nauk o Zwierzętach SGGW ul. Ciszewskiego 8 02-786 Warszawa Poland

e-mail: tomasz przysucha@sggw.pl