

AVAILABILITY OF WASTE MATERIALS FOR LIVESTOCK FEED AT THE ERAVUR D.S. DIVISION

By

MOHAMED ALIYAR SHAKEER ALI



Project Report
Library - EUSL



DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SCIENCE

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE

EASTERN UNIVERSITY

SRI LANKA.

2017

PROCESSED
Main Library, EUSL

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out on the availability of waste feed materials from waste generating places such as vegetable stalls, fruit stalls, grocery, beef stalls, fish stalls, chicken stalls, hotels and bakery at the Eravur Divisional Secretariat of Batticaloa district. More specially, this study dealt with identifying availability of vegetable waste, fruit waste, meat waste, fish waste and other feed by products at the waste generating places. This study was conducted using sample of one hundred and sixty from eight waste generating places from Eravur DS division in Batticaloa District. Stratified random sampling technique was used to draw the sample. A structured questionnaires, personal observation and key informants were the methods used to collect the primary data and secondary data obtained from government institution and key organizations. Tool of data analysis included descriptive statistics and frequencies by using statistical software of SPSS. Aspects of socioeconomic characteristics of farmers, monthly income, quality of feed waste, customer demand of feed waste, preference of feed waste to use as livestock feed were studied. Lack of education of the sellers and farmers, low quality of feed waste, lack of waste treatment facilities and lack of demand, were most important constraints.

The study revealed that 95.6% of the sellers at the Eravur Divisional Secretariat of Batticaloa district were male and 4.4% were female. The ethnicity distribution revealed 0.6% sellers were Hindu and 99.4% Muslims. The maximum numbers of sellers (39.38%) were in the age group of 30-40 years where as 29.38%, 15.63%, 13.75%,

1.25% and 0.63% were reported for the age group of 40-50, 50-60, 25-30, <25 and > 60 years of age respectively.

The education level revealed that 0.5% no schooling sellers, 11.9% primary educated sellers, 43.8% secondary educated sellers and 43.8% advanced level. The average overall family size was 3- 5. The average monthly income was Rs. 33,500 /=- and 37.5% sellers were 10-20 years well experienced. Mostly available type of waste feed was meat (50.73%) and fish, vegetable, fruit, chicken, hotel waste, bakery waste and grocery waste were 3.49%, 2.87%, 3.22%, 21.19%, 8.71%, 8.24% and 1.53% respectively. Mostly available meat waste were chicken and beef. Although pineapple, apple and papaya were commonly available fruits waste in the stalls. Pineapples waste is most prominent. Considering about vegetable brinjal and leafy vegetables were generated more amount of waste at the stalls. The results revealed that 42.5% of feed waste were with intermediate quality level and other 33.1% and 24.4% were with high and low-quality levels. The results revealed that 79.4% of survey respondents state that farmers were not demanded feed waste, 15.6% and 5% of respondents were with intermediate and high-quality levels respectively. The results revealed that 34.4% of survey respondents' state that farmers were not preferred food waste to use as livestock feed and only 3.1% of respondents state that farmers were with highly prefer, 31.3% of respondents state that farmers were with not prefer and 31.3% of respondents state that farmers were with less prefer. That may be due to the lack of knowledge about amount feed waste generation from the waste generating places and also may be due to contamination problem of feeds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Page No
ABSTRACT	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IIV
LIST OF TABLES	VIII
LIST OF FIGURES	IX
ABBREVIATIONS	X
CHAPTER 01	1
1.0.INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General Introduction	1
1.2 Main Objective	4
1.3 Sub Objectives	4
CHAPTER 02	5
2.0 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
2.1 Types of feed waste available for animals.	5
2.2 Vegetable crop residue	5
2.2.1 Bottle gourd (<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i>)	5
2.2.2 Cabbage (<i>Brassica oleracea</i>)	6
2.2.3 Carrot (<i>Daucus carota</i>)	6

2.2.4	Cucumber (<i>Cucumis sativus</i>)	7
2.2.5	Pea (<i>Pisumsativum</i>)	7
2.2.6	Potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>)	7
2.2.7	Pumpkin (<i>Cucurbita pepo</i>)	8
2.2.8	Sweet corn (<i>Zea mays var.rugosa</i>)	8
2.2.9	Tomato (<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i>)	8
2.2.10	Manioc/ Cassava/ Tapoica (<i>Manihot esculenta</i>)	8
2.2.11	Sweet Potato (<i>Ipomea batatas</i>)	9
2.2.12	Maize (<i>Zea mays</i>) residues	10
2.3	Fruits waste as feed	10
2.3.1	Citrus (<i>Citrus spp</i>) – Citrus pulp	10
2.3.2	Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) – Mango pulp and peels	11
2.3.3	Pineapple (<i>Ananus comosus</i>)	12
2.3.4	Banana (<i>Musa spp</i>)	12
2.3.5	Jackfruit (<i>Artocarpus heterophyllus</i>)	14
2.3.6	Other fruit wastes	14
2.4	Grocery by-product wastes	14
2.5	Fish stall waste	15
2.5.1	Fish waste/ by-products utilization	16
2.6	Sea food waste as a ruminant feeddstuff	17
2.7	Utilization of poultry by-products	17
2.8	Utilization of bone	18
2.9	Nutritive value of meat by-products	19

2.10 Hotel and Bakery Wastes for Animal Feed	20
CHAPTER 03	21
3.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS	21
3.1 Study Area	21
3.2 Selection of samples	21
3.3 Questionnaire and Survey	21
3.4 Tabulation and processing of data	22
3.5 Data analyst	22
CHAPTER 04	23
4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	23
4.1 Socio economic status of respondent	23
4.2 Feed waste types available in the shops	27
4.2.1 Type of fruit waste	28
4.2.2 Type of vegetable waste	29
4.2.3 Availability of meat and fish waste	30
4.3 Physical quality of waste feed materials	30
4.4 Customer demand of waste feed materials	31
4.5 Preference of feed waste to use as livestock feed	32