IDENTIFICATION OF MOST SUITABLE SILO FOR LIVESTOCK FARM IN EASTERN UNIVERSITY, SRI LANKA



BY

A.G.D. THILINA MADUSHANKA WIJERATHNA



FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE
EASTERN UNIVERSITY, SRI LANKA
2018

ABSTRACT

Limitation of feeds in dry season is the main barrier of small scale and medium scale dairy farmers in eastern region in Sri Lanka. And also it causes to low production in dry season. Forage conservation in the form of silage is an option to increase dry season feed availability.

Therefore, this study was carried out in the Livestock Farm, Faculty of Agriculture, Eastern University, Sri Lanka to identify the most suitable silo among plastic barrel silo, polybag silo, stack silo and trench silo.

The four silos mentioned above were used as treatments with four replications. The experiment was conducted as Complete Randomized Design because of all silos that used for the experiment were in same environmental condition.

Chopped CO3 grasses were used as silage material and silos were filled and sealed properly. Sugar was added by mixing with silage material as a silage additive.

After 21 days silos were opened and samples were taken for analyzing silage characteristics. Physical properties such as colour, odour and texture of silage from four different silos were measured by eye appraisal and sensory evaluation.

Wastage and pH were measured using pH meter and balance and proximate composition of silage was measured and analyzed.

Among the barrel silo, polybag silo, stack silo and trench silo, the barrel silo has low pH value and low wastage. In barrel silo proximate composition of silage also in agreement with the standard range of proximate components. There are high pH value and high wastage of silage from polybag silo than plastic barrel silo, stack silo and trench silo.

Proximate composition of silage from plastic barrel silo has significantly higher difference than polybag silo. Based on the results it was concluded that plastic barrel is the most suitable silo for the Livestock Farm in Eastern university, Sri Lanka.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	Ι
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTI	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
LIST OF TABLEV	II
CHAPTER 01	1
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 02	4
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1. Silage making:	4
2.2. Advantages of silage making	5
2.3. Feed resources in tropical regions:	5
2.3.1. Hybrid Napier grass (variety CO-3):	7
2.3.2. Hybrid Napier grass (variety CO-4):	8
2.4. Preparation and storage of silage for the dry season:	
2.4.1. Packing and Filling:	8
2.4.2. Sealing:	9
2.5. Ensiling process:	1
2.5.1. Period I - Initial aerobic phase	1
2.5.2. Period II – Main fermentation phase:	2
2.5.3. Period III – Stable silage phase:	2
2.5.4. Period IV – Feed-out phase:	3
2.6. Biochemical changes in the ensiling process:	4
2.7. Respiration:	4
2.8. Enzymatic reactions:	
2.9. Lactic acid fermentation:	.5

2.10. Secondary fermentation:	16
2.10.1. Factors responsible for the activity of butyric acid bacteria:	16
2.11. After-fermentation:	16
2.12. Other changes:	17
2.13. Color formation:	17
2.14. Loss of vitamins:	17
2.15. Development of molds:	18
2.16. Rate of changes in silage:	18
2.17. Methods for the control of changes:	18
2.17.1. Addition of sugar:	19
2.17.2. Addition of acid:	19
2.18. Silo types:	20
2.18.1. Stack silo:	22
2.18.1.1. Advantages of stacks:	23
2.18.1.2. Disadvantages of stack silo:	23
2.18.2. Trench silo:	23
2.18.2.1. Advantages of trench silo:	
2.18.2.2. Disadvantages of trench silo:	24
2.18.3. Temporary and portable silo:	24
2.18.4. Plastic bag silo:	24
2.18.5. Fenced silo (framed silo):	25
2.19. Problems in silage making and Barriers Faced by Farmers in Hot Ro	egions:25
2.19.1. Economics:	27
2.19.2. Ensiling Expertise:	
CHAPTER 03	29
MATERIALS AND METHODS	29
3.1. Experimental site:	29

3.2. Silage making:	29
3.3. Data collection:	31
3.3.1. Color:	31
3.3.2. Odor:	31
3.3.3. pH:	31
3.3.4. Proximate analysis:	32
CHAPTER 4	33
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	33
4.1. Silage qualities of fodder CO3 using four different	silos33
4.1.1. Colour	33
4.1.1.2. Odour	34
4.1.1.3. Texture	35
4.2. pH and wastage	35
4.2. Proximate parameters of CO3 silage:	36
4.2.1. Dry matter content of silage:	36
4.2.2. Crude protein	38
4.2.3. Crude fiber	38
4.2.4. Ash content	39
CHAPTER 05	40
CONCLUSION	40
REFERENCES	