

## **Quality Control Parameters: From the Feedmill to the Farm**



Basilisa P Reas (Neneth, DVM Msc Technical Director, Animal Protein-USSEC SEA

## Content

- Premise of Quality Assurance Program
- What to check in raw materials and feeds
- Quality parameters for soybean meal
- Recommendations



## Quality Assurance (QA) vs Quality Control (QC)

**QA** - The process of verifying or determining whether the products or services meet or exceed customer satisfaction

**QC** - The operational techniques and activities for controlling, checking, or testing that specifications are met

- involves sampling, inspecting and testing of starting materials, in process, intermediate, bulk and finished products.
- includes where applicable, review of batch documentation, sample retention program, stability studies, product complaints, product recalls, and maintaining correct specifications of materials and products.



# Practical Application Of QA & QC



#### **Premises of Quality Assurance Program**

You can not improve what you do not control

You can not measure what you do not define You can not control what you do not measure







#### FEED QUALITY PARAMETERS; WHAT & WHERE TO CHECK?





# Receiving

- Entrance control sampling, sensory, quick tests
- Laboratory checks and tests sampling prep, proximate analyses,etc
- Storage & warehouse

#### **First line of defense**



#### **Sampling – the distribution Pproblem**

#### Non-homogeneous and Homogeneous Distribution





Adapted from; E Yeow, 2013.

## What to check in raw materials and feeds?

#### Physical:

Damaged, contaminated or infected raw materials from harvests; immature seeds, insect damaged, molds & lumps.











## At the lab



## **Nutritional/Chemical:**

- Proximate analysis
- Nutrient variability
- Anti nutritional factors (ANFs)
- Chemical (dioxin)
- Contamination and residues,
- Presence of bacteria
- Molds/mycotoxins.



## **Errors in Analysis**



# We need amino acids!

## By the Nutritionist & Feed Formulator





- Availability & supply of raw materials
- Chemical analysis assays/ profile
- Nutrient specifications
- (Updated) Database of all ingredients
- Target production performance
- Prices



#### .. Feed Formulation

- Carbohydrates (Energy)
- Protein (essential AA)
- Fats/lipids
- Vitamins
- Minerals
- Water

- Nutrient requirement of the animal
- Raw material nutrient content
- Availability
- Safety
- Cost

					E Equation of feed formulation					×	
13	1 Mar		Daning a	1000		Equation r	lanter -	Volue			-
19	7 March 2000 R 301-Growing Pbg				2 Lysine a	ic globlewh	6.52				
						37. Metail	unine :	36.04			
201-Linneing Prg.			Intal amount \$250.00			1: Met-Cyc as Lyone 56		56.18			
						Ti Tripfop	han as kys	36.67			- 1
14	Code II	rgredent name	Amount	SAs led.	32,04 3	11.Threoner	e ac Lyone	60.53			
Ц	1 8	loker Rice	200.00	16.000	16.000	California	Not Swene	2.32			
늰	3 6	Cessava	343.00	27,440	27.440	Digest, Ly	C. C. Parage	1.30			
	10 P	tice-bran Oil	18.29	1.463	1.465					_	_
Ц	20 F	Care loce bran	364.90	29.192	29.792		The .		3.00	5.09	- 1
н	30 5	cy bean neal	161.66	12 933	25.800	15	Calcium		0.99	1.16	
	32 F	What say bean meal	34.00	1.120	1.120	37.	Total Shore	phonus	0.74	1.03	
曰	40 8	Sub-tread SER	126.00	10.000	10.000	_ 73 JU	Aval Phot	for Swine	0.45	0.50	
Ц	50 L	- tysze	2.79	0.223	0.223	130.	Sal.		0.30	0.34	
Ц	51 0	C-methionine	1.14	0.091	E 091	240	Lycine		1.05	7.14	
Ц	53 L	- Evenine	1.09	0.000	0.000	220.	Methionine	- Cystine	0.60	0.64	
	50 N	forodicalciumphosphala?	6,78	0.543	0.543	- 72	Methorine		0.32	0.42	
	65 T	incakkan phosphate B1	9.39	0.751	0.751	0	Theoreme		0.65	0.69	
	20 5	lat.	0.96	0.076	0.076	2.00	Stopkophan		0.28	0.19	
1.00	101 (***					×111					



### **Possible Feed production errors**

Failure of process to achieve target weights

- ✓ FIFO management of ingredients & complete feed
- Uncontrolled hand add ingredients
- Cross contamination & mill hygiene
- Physical quality
- Medication selection

#### ;.. At the Feedmill.



### What to check at the farm

✓ failure of the diet to meet nutrient specifications

- At the Farm
- ✓ inconsistent quality of raw materials
  - ✓ sudden changes in ingredients use
  - ✓ inappropriate particle size
  - ✓ inadequate/inconsistent feed mixing
  - ✓ deterioration of feed and ingredients in storage





## Application of Quality Control in SBM



### **Average nutrient components of raw soybeans**

Average inclusion rate of SBM: 20 to 25%

**Contributes:** 

- Morethan 50% protein & EAA
- About 25% of Energy



All Soybean Meals are <u>NOT</u> created Equally!!
Variability cost you \$

- **Degree of cooking;** over cooked or under cooked SBM reduced nutrient availability
- Level of fiber affects energy in SBM
- Particle size affects digestibility
- re grinding adds to the cost

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_6.jpeg)

#### Sources of variability of nutrient values of SBM

- <u>Soybean quality at harvest</u> (% damaged beans, FM)
   US soy are graded according to pre-determined quality parameters
- Post-harvest handling, storage and transport

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

- Processing involved
  - Degree of heat treatment overcooked/undercooked SBM reduced AA dig
  - Level of fiber & ash dilutes nutrient and energy in SBM
  - Particle size reduced digestibility in young animals, re-grinding adds to the

![](_page_19_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### US vs Brazilian Soybean Damage at

Harvest. Uranga et al, 2021

#### **US & BR Total Damage Content**

![](_page_20_Figure_4.jpeg)

- US has 4.18% lower average total damage (5.39% vs 1.21%)
- Brazil allows a max of 8% of total damage while US allows a max of 3% for Grade 2.

Quality of Soybeans collected in the different ports in Spain, 2022. G Mateos, 2023

	Brazil	USA
Farm gate <sup>b</sup>	> 4.5	≤ 1.0
Port of origin <sup>c</sup>	> 6.2	1.1
Port of destinations <sup>d</sup>	9.4	3.6

<sup>b</sup> Samples collected at Mato Grosso and Iowa
 <sup>c</sup> Average 2022 (FGIS and Ag Commodities)
 <sup>d</sup> Europe, Spain ports

## What do we want from Soybean meal? Precision Animal Nutrition

- Soybean meal value should be based on:
  - Digestible amino acids (Crude Protein is reported based on Nitrogen, and not all N are true protein and therefore are not digestible)
  - Energy (comes from digestible protein, fats/oil, starch and sucrose)
  - Consistency each point of SD adds to the cost in formulating diets. The higher the SD, the higher the effects on safety margin during feed formulation.
  - Moisture content every 1% of moisture in SBM is equivalent to US5.00/MT (at US\$500.00/MT price)

![](_page_21_Picture_6.jpeg)

#### **Quality variability**

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### SOY EXCELLENCE CENTER A SOY program

#### **Analysis of SBMs from Different Origins**

Origi n	No	C.P. (%)	Dig coef C.P,%	Dig CP (%)	Tot Lys (%)	Tot Met (%)	Dig coef Lys (%)	Dig coef Met(%)	Dig Lys (%)	Dig Met (%)
Arg	16	<b>46.9</b> <sup>bc</sup> (1.08)	82 <sup>a</sup> (4.1)†	<b>38.6</b> <sup>b</sup> (1.96)†	<b>2.84</b> (0.19)	<b>0.68</b> <sup>bc</sup> (0.04)	<b>86</b> <sup>a</sup> (4.5)	86 <sup>a</sup> (3.4)	<b>2.44</b> <sup>a</sup> (0.23)	<b>0.59</b> <sup>b</sup> (0.04)
Brazil	10	<b>48.2</b> <sup>a</sup> (1.65)	<b>83</b> a (3.6)	<b>39.8</b> <sup>a</sup> (1.99)	<b>2.79</b> (0.25)	0.69 <sup>ab</sup> (0.07)	<b>85</b> <sup>a</sup> (5.3)	<b>87</b> <sup>a</sup> (3.7)	<b>2.39</b> <sup>ab</sup> (0.33)	0.60 <sup>ab</sup> (0.06)
USA	16	<b>47.3</b> <sup>b</sup> (0.50)	85 <sup>a</sup> (1.8)	<b>40.0</b> <sup>a</sup> (0.82)	<b>2.88</b> (0.20)	<b>0.72</b> <sup>a</sup> (0.02)	88 <sup>a</sup> (2.4)	88 <sup>a</sup> (1.7)	<b>2.52</b> <sup>a</sup> (0.22)	<b>0.63</b> <sup>a</sup> (0.02)
Proba bility		**	**	* * *	NS	**	*	**	*	***

Ravindran 2014. Internal Poultry Journal

<sup>†</sup> Values within parenthesis represents standard deviation

![](_page_23_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### **Apparent Metabolizable Energy (AME), kcal/kg**

Origin	Νο	AME (Range, kcal/kg)	AME (Mean, kcal/kg)	US vs Other Origin, kcal/kg
Argentina	16	1796 – 2417	2227 <sup>b</sup> (148)†	148
Brazil	10	2003 – 2531	<b>2317</b> <sup>ab</sup> (165)	58
India	13	1567 – 2299	2000 <sup>b</sup> (191)	237
USA	16	2120 – 2541	2375 <sup>a</sup> (114)	
Probability		* * *	* * *	

Every 150 kcal of extra energy is equivalent to about US\$2.00/MT (based on corn priced at US\$400.00/MT)

SOY EXCELLENCE CENTER A SOY program

#### **Effect of heat treatment on ANFs and protein or** amino acid digestibility.

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

CENTER

## **Recommendations: Quality Control Points**

- 1. Creation of standards
- 2. Stipulation of quality standards at purchasing
- 3. Quality assurance on raw material deliveries
- 4. Quality assurance in raw material storage
- 5. Quality assurance in feed production
- 6. Quality assurance in finished feeds storage

![](_page_26_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **Recommendations:** *Quality management..;*

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Summary & Conclusions**

- Feed Quality is equal to animal performance
- Controlling feed quality should start from the point of raw material entry, storage, formulation, processing and finally to the farm;
- Quality Control application should be a responsibility of whole production chain

![](_page_28_Picture_4.jpeg)

••••

![](_page_29_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Animal Performance is the Ultimate test!

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

# Thank you for your time

![](_page_30_Picture_1.jpeg)