

Albert G.J. Tacon PhD Aquatic Feeds & Nutrition Consultant agjtacon@aquahana.com



A'ohe hana nui ka alu'ia No task is too big when done together

Presentation outline

- Importance of biosecurity & definitions
- Feed biosecurity risks associated with viable pathogens, feed formulation, feed processing & onfarm feed management
- Future role of nutrition, genetics & environmental control in improving shrimp health management & the need for a new generation improved biosecure shrimp feeds & feed management systems
- Future roles & responsibilities of feed companies, farmers & government authorities





Increasing risk of disease outbreaks & losses



Acute Hepatopancreatic Necrosis Syndromecontinued



Normal shrimp hepatopancreas with distinct R, B, F and E (inset) cells. Source: C Lavilla-Pitogo



hepatopancreas with dysfunction of R, B, F and E cells. Source: D Lightner



Enlarged HP nuclei Hemocytic infiltration Secondary bacterial infection

Histopathology of Penaeus vanname/ hepatopancreas from Thailand affected by AHPNS Source: T Flegel





Major Issues & Challenges in Shrimp Aquaculture in Latin America GOAL 2017 Survey – Anderson, Valderrama & Jory (2017)







According to the FAO, "Biosecurity is defined as the implementation of measures that reduce the risk of disease agents being introduced and spread. It requires that people adopt a set of attitudes and behaviors to reduce risk in all activities involving domestic, captive/exotic, and wild animals and their products"

FAO/OIE/World Bank. (2008). Biosecurity for highly pathogenic avian influenza. Issues and options. FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 165. FAO, Rome, Italy.

BIOSECURE FEEDS & FEEDING PRACTICES

<u>means</u> that "Feed, whether live, fresh or formulated, and the management of the feed on the farm, should not be an entry point of potential pathogens and/or toxins to the animal or culture system"



Biosecurity nightmare

the -

Commence of a start and and start and and the start of the Start of Start Start





Problem: Variety of Farming Systems

Wide range of production systems earth pond, lined pond, raceway, tank, cage

Wide range of stocking densities employed <1 to >600/m³

Wide range of water management practices 0 >100%/day, green-water, zero-exchange

Wide range of aeration methods None, paddle wheel, aerotube, HP/ha

Wide range of feeds employed low/high protein/energy, pelleted/extruded

Wide range of feeding methods hand, boat, truck, feeding tray, auto feeder

Salmon - cage, intensive, extruded feeds









Problem: Variety of Shrimp Feeds

Natural wild live foods: Natural diet of shrimp (extensive), including aerial insects

Wild caught live and/or processed natural foods: Artemia, Squid, Mussels, Oysters, Polychaetes, Crabs, Shrimp

Cultured live and/or processed natural foods: Algae, Rotifers, Artemia, Polychaetes, Biofloc

Supplementary & Farm-made feeds: Fermented feedstuffs, Farm-made feed mashes & pelleted feeds

Commercial formulated nutritionally complete feeds: Semi-moist or dry steam pelleted feeds & extruded feeds



Presentation outline

- Importance of biosecurity & definitions
- Feed biosecurity risks associated with viable pathogens, feed formulation, feed processing & onfarm feed management
- Role of nutrition, genetics & environmental control in improving shrimp health management & the need for a new generation improved biosecure shrimp feeds & feed management systems
- Roles & responsibilities of feed companies, traders, farmers & government authorities



Environmental interactions between nutrition & health

(modified after Waabo, 1994; Tacon, 1997)







Feed Biosecurity Risks

Viable Pathogens



- White spot syndrome virus (WSSV):
- polychaete Dendronereis spp. (Desrina 2016); polychaete Pereneis nuntia (Laoaroon et al. 2005), polychaete worms (Vijayan et al. 2005); Artemia biomass (Chang et al. 2002; Sahul Hameed et al. 2002; Li et al. 2003; Parenrengi 2004; Alday-Sanz 2016); phytoplankton, rotifer, Artemia, shrimp (Jiang 2012); copepods, amphipods, nonpenaeid shrimp, crabs (Song et al. 2001); shrimp – cannibalism (Satoh 2012); hermit crabs (Chang et al. 2012); live molluscs (Tendencia et al. 2011)





- Hypodermal hematopoietic necrosis baculovirus (HHNB): shrimp, phytoplankton, small crustaceans, fish (Huang et al. 1995)
- Infectious hypodermal and hematopoietic necrosis virus (IHHNV): wild shrimp and crabs (Lavilla-Pitogo et al. 2009), Artemia biomass (polymerase chain reaction [PCR] positive; Alday-Sanz 2016)









Bacteria – general: Artemia (Igarashi et al. 1989; Hoj et al. 2009); Luminous bacteria: Artemia (Abraham & Palaniappan 2004); Enterococcus spp: Artemia (Babu et al. 2014); Vibrio parahaemolyticus: broodstock, fresh feed (Yingkajorn et al. 2014), pond **zooplankton** (Karunasagar 2016); Vibrio: Artemia (Vaseeharan & Ramasamy 2003; Lavilla-Pitogo 2016); Vibriosis contamination: mantis shrimp Squilla spp. (Lee & Najiah 2009), live polychaetes & bivalves for maturation (Songsangjinda et al. 2016)







Bacteria - Acute hepatopancreatic necrosis disease (AHPND): live polychaetes & bivalves (NACA 2014, 2015); filter feeders & zooplankton (Brock 2016); polychaetes, squid, Artemia, clams (positive for AHPND AP2 detection; Flegel 2016a); Artemia contamination during the nursery phase (Chanratchakool 2016); polychaetes (PCR positive; Desrina 2016)









- Microsporidean parasites: sergestid shrimp Acetes spp. (Turnbull et al. 1994); polychaetes, mussels, and other filter feeders; crustaceans (Alday-Sanz 2016)
 - *Enterocytozoon hepatopenaei*: live polychaetes (NACA 2014, 2015); live diseased shrimp, frozen *Aremtia* biomass (Han et al. 2016); polychaetes, clams, snails (PCR positive; Flegel 2016b); polychaetes
- (PCR positive: Desrina 2016); live feeds, including bloodworms, bivalves & gastropods (Tran 2016)



- Use of <u>pathogen contaminated</u> feed ingredients within larval, juvenile, grow-out, broodstock & maturation feeds, including imported dry feeds:
- **<u>Crustacean meals</u>**: Shrimp head meal, Acetes indicus, Artemia biomass/cysts, Crab meal,
- Other marine meals: Fishmeals (local), Squid meal, Squid liver powder, Polychaete meals, Snail meals, Bivalve meals:
- Prohibition of feeding shrimp to shrimp or intra-species feeding: GlobalGap, GAA, FAO

MICROBOUND FEED ZOEA MYSIS EARLY PL LATE PL

is a highly balanced, nutritious a feed formulated for shrimp lar on simulates the macro nutrient conimp larvae itself. **2-MEL** protein so elected using freshly dried material (A) of the Highly Unsaturated Type is fatty acid profile of **2-MEL** show her materials ($205 \otimes 3$) and December (A) Acids, two important HURAs in second INGREDIENTS: DRIED SHRIMP (ACETES), DRIED SU FISH MEAL, BREAD FLOUR, COD LIVER OIL, SOYE LECITHIN, CHOLESTEROL, VITAMIN MIX, MIN MIX, AND BHT.

Feeding Instructions:

Generally, a feeding level of 0.3 to 1 gran cubic meter of rearing water per di recommended. The feed can be divided into rations for maximum results. Feeding shou adjusted from day to day depending on the fee response as well as the growth and the surf the larvae.

For optimum results, phytoplan (Chaetoceros sp, Skeletonema sp., etc.) be used in combination with Z-MEL parties during the zoeal stages. Newly hatched Min nauplii can be introduced beginning PL, (min old postlarvae) alternately with Z-MEL

ADULTERANTS

Traders - Asia

SOC. PESQUERA

HARINA DE CRUSTACEOS COQUIMBO - CHILE PLANTA Nº ... 4018

Krill meal

or

Shrimp head meal





7. Environment (All Production Systems) Feed Biosecurity Fishmeal and Fish Oil Conservation

7.6: No feeds that contain material derived from the flesh or carcasses of the same species that is reared in the facility shall be used, even if such materials have supposedly been disinfected by cooking or other treatment.



Feed Mills BAP Standards, Guidelines

BEST AQUACULTURE PRACTICES CERTIFICATION

The following Best Aquaculture Practices standards and guidelines apply to facilities that process and manufacture finished feeds for the culture of fish, crustaceans and other aquatic animals.

The BAP standards are achievable, science-based and continuously improved global performance standards for the aquaculture supply chain that assure healthful foods produced through environmentally and socially responsible means. They are designed to assist program applicants in performing self-assessments of the environmental and social impacts, and food safety controls of their facilities, and to lead to third-party certification of compliance. For further information, please refer to the additional resources listed.

BAP standards demand compliance with local regulations as the first step toward certification. However, not all regulations are equally rigorous. For this reason, BAP standards set out requirements for documentation and procedures that must be in farm management plans, whether they are prescribed by local regulations or not. By so doing, they seek, where possible, to impose consistency in performance among facilities in different producing regions and to engage the industry as a whole in a process of continuous improvement.

In common with ISO usage, these standards use the words "shall" to mean compliance is required and "should" to mean compliance is recommended. Auditable points are "shall" statements listed at the end of each standard.

To obtain BAP certification, applicants shall be audited by an independent, BAP-approved certification body. To apply for certification, contact:

Best Aquaculture Practices Management P. O. Box 2530 – Crystal River, Florida 34423 USA Telephone: +1-352-563-0565 – Fax: +1-425-650-3001 Web: www.bestaquaculturepractices.org – E-mail: info@aquaculturecertification.org, aquacert@tampabay.rr.com

The audit consists of an opening meeting, a site assessment, the collection of necessary samples, a review of management records and procedures, and a closing meeting. All points in the standards shall be addressed. Any non-conformity raised during the evaluation is recorded by the auditor in the formal report as:

Critical – When there is a failure to comply with a critical food safety or legal issue, or a risk to the integrity of the program, the auditor immediately informs the certification body, which then informs BAP Management. Pending clarifications, failure to certify or immediate temporary suspension can ensue.

Major – When there is a substantial failure to meet the requirements of a standard but no food safety risk or immediate risk to the integrity of the program, the auditor notifies the certification body and records this in the report. Verification of the implementation of corrective actions shall be submitted to the certification body within 28 days of the evaluation. (Major non-conformities typically reflect issues with general policies.)

Minor – When full compliance with the intent of the standards has not been demonstrated, the auditor notifies the certification body and records this in the report. Verification of the implementation of corrective actions shall be submitted to the certification body within 28 days of the evaluation. (Minor non-conformities typically reflect general housekeeping issues.)

BAP standards are developed by committees of technical experts following a process aligned to the FAO Technical Guidelines on Aquaculture Certification. See www.gaalliance.org/bap/standardsdevelopment.php.

6. Food Safety HACCP Process Controls, Good Manufacturing Practices

The refeeding of a given species back to the same or closely related species in the form of processed and/or non-processed aquaculture feeds shall be avoided to block this possible route for the spread of disease

Standards and guidelines copyright 2014, Global Aquaculture Alliance. Do not reproduce without permission.
Page 1 Global Aquaculture Alliance • 4111 Telegraph Road, Suite 302 • St. Louis, Missouri 63129 USA • www.gaalliance.org Rev. 7/14



Environmental interactions between nutrition & health

(modified after Waabo. 1994; Tacon, 1997)



- Use of feed ingredients containing high levels of endogenous anti-nutritional factors (ANFs) and/or contaminated with mycotoxins, and their possible negative effect on gut integrity & shrimp health;
- For example, microbial toxins (produced from bacteria & fungi) promote infection & disease by directly damaging host tissues & disabling the immune system (Bordoloi & Ganguly, 2014);





Ingredients that may promote leaky guts



Reported ANF & mycotoxins negatively affecting gut permeability

- Saponins (Salmonids Knudsen et al. 2008, Yamamoto et al., 2012);
- Oxidized fish oil (Grass carp Chen, Ye & Cai, 2016; Huang, 2015);
- Deoxynivalenol (DON) targets epithelial cells of the GI tract leading to immunosuppression & facilitation of persistence of intestinal pathogens in the gut, rendering host more vulnerable to luminal toxic compounds (Ghareeb et al. 2015)



- Mycotoxins (> 400) are capable of reducing feed intake and causing abnormalities in gut morphology & nutrient absorption (D'Mello, 2006);
- Aflatoxin is a serious immune suppressant in aquaculture, with evidence demonstrating that the consumption of diets contaminated with mycotoxins suppress the immune system and decreases disease resistance (Hasan & Goncalves, 2017);

Mycotoxins

and their economic impact on aquaculture



Rui Gonçalves, Technical Manager Paula Kovalsky, Product Manager

©2015 BIOMIN Holding GmbH

Table 1. Survey results for various ingredients and by-products.								
Finished aquafeed	Afla	ZEN	DON	FUM	ΟΤΑ			
Number of tests	43	43	43	43	43			
% positive	47%	63%	40%	19%	51%			
Average of positive (µg/kg)	37	23	142	359	2			
Maximum (µg/kg)	180	51	262	615	9			
Corn	Afla	ZEN	DON	FUM	ΟΤΑ			
Number of tests	732	775	810	695	642			
% positive	30%	36%	63%	73%	12%			
Average of positive (µg/kg)	61	177	669	1,995	4			
Maximum (µg/kg)	1.563	5 324	9 910	23 180	44			
	.,	5,521	57510	23/100	<u> </u>			
Corn DDGS	Afla	ZEN	DON	FUM	ΟΤΑ			
Corn DDGS Number of tests	Afla 58	ZEN 58	DON 59	FUM 56	ОТА 52			
Corn DDGS Number of tests % positive	Afla 58 60%	ZEN 58 52%	DON 59 73%	FUM 56 79%	OTA 52 27%			
Corn DDGS Number of tests % positive Average of positive (µg/kg)	Afla 58 60% 9	ZEN 58 52% 94	DON 59 73% 1,241	FUM 56 79% 2,852	OTA 52 27% 13			
Corn DDGS Number of tests % positive Average of positive (µg/kg) Maximum (µg/kg)	Afla 58 60% 9 23	ZEN 58 52% 94 434	DON 59 73% 1,241 7,030	FUM 56 79% 2,852 26,828	OTA 52 27% 13 43			
Corn DDGS Number of tests % positive Average of positive (µg/kg) Maximum (µg/kg) Soybean meal	Afla 58 60% 9 23 Afla	2EN 58 52% 94 434 ZEN	DON 59 73% 1,241 7,030 DON	FUM 56 79% 2,852 26,828 FUM	OTA 52 27% 13 43 OTA			
Corn DDGS Number of tests % positive Average of positive (µg/kg) Maximum (µg/kg) Soybean meal Number of tests	Afla 58 60% 9 23 Afla 50	ZEN 58 52% 94 434 ZEN 55	DON 59 73% 1,241 7,030 DON 55	FUM 56 79% 2,852 26,828 FUM 52	OTA 52 27% 13 43 OTA 51			
Corn DDGS Number of tests % positive Average of positive (µg/kg) Maximum (µg/kg) Soybean meal Number of tests % positive	Afla 58 60% 9 23 Afla 50 16%	2EN 58 52% 94 434 2EN 55 22%	DON 59 73% 1,241 7,030 DON 55 11%	FUM 56 79% 2,852 26,828 FUM 52 15%	OTA 52 27% 13 43 OTA 51 12%			
Corn DDGS Number of tests % positive Average of positive (µg/kg) Maximum (µg/kg) Soybean meal Number of tests % positive Average of positive (µg/kg)	Afla 58 60% 9 23 Afla 50 16% 2	2EN 58 52% 94 434 2EN 55 22%	DON 59 73% 1,241 7,030 DON 55 11% 428	FUM 56 79% 2,852 26,828 FUM 52 15% 226	OTA 52 27% 13 43 OTA 51 12% 2			

Aquaculture 451 (2016) 1–10



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Aquaculture

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/aqua-online

Review

Mycotoxins and their consequences in aquaculture: A review



Aquaculture

Amanda Anater^a, Lara Manyes^b, Giuseppe Meca^b, Emilia Ferrer^b, Fernando Bittencourt Luciano^a, Cláudia Turra Pimpão^{a,*}, Guillermina Font^b

Aquatic animal health

Volume XVIII No. 1, January-March 2013 Importance of mycotoxins in aquaculture feeds

Vikash Kumar^{1*}, Suvra Roy¹, Debtanu Barman², Aditya Kumar¹, Lokesh Paul² and Wakambam Anand Meetei¹

1. Central Institute of Fisheries Education, Mumbai, India, 400061; 2. College of Fisheries, Central Agricultural University, Lembucherra, Tripura-799210, India. Correspondence: kumar.vika.vikash2@gmail.com

Rul A. Goncalves, Karin Naehrer & Goncalo A. Santos. (2016). Occurrence of mycotoxins in commercial aquafeeds in Asia and Europe: a real risk to aquaculture? Reviews in Aquaculture (In Press), 1-16p.



Reported endogenous anti-nutritional factors (ANFs) and possible contaminants present in soybeans



www.shutherstock.rsm 107308046



Reported endogenous ANFs

- Protease inhibitors
- Phyto-haemagglutinins
- Glucosinolates
- Phytic acid
- Saponins
- Estrogenic factors
- Flatulence factor
- Anti-vitamin E factor
- Anti-vitamin A factor
- Anti-vitamin D factor
- Anti-vitamin B12 factor
- Allergens
- Non-starch polysaccharides

Reported contaminants*

- Mycotoxins
- Glyphosate & AMPA

Use of Solid State Fermentation to better utilize locally available agricultural feed & food wastes & for the reduction of the anti-nutritional factors present in plant proteins such as soybean, rapeseed, lupin & pea







Analysis of raw copra meal compared to fermented bio-treated copra meal

COMPONENT (%)	Raw Copra Meal (% DM)	Bio-treated copra meal (% DM)
Crude protein	21.60	43.30
Crude fiber	11.27	7.58
Crude fat	7.10	8.42
Ash	7.30	8.01
Carbohydrate	64.00	39.17
Aflatoxin , ppb	126	Not detected



REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

DOST - PCAARRD Providing science solutions for a vibrant agriculture, aquatic and natural resources

Reported successful feeding trails with tilapia, shrimp & milkfish



www.fao.org/uploads/tx_chcforum/Fish%20Feed%20Project.doc



66 .nutra The Most Safe & Sound Soy Peptide PepSoyGen[®] Low Molecular Soy Peptide Degraded Anti-Nutritional Factors Live Microorganisms **Beneficial Metabolites** Global Ferm-Leader Natural Ferm-Tech

Comparison of physicochemical properties between soybean meal and fermented soybean meal

items	common soybean meal	soybean meal fermented by mixed fermentation of P23	soybean meal fermented by single fermentation of
		and TP6 strains	TP6 strain
dry matter, DM (%)	88.04	91.01	89.68
CFU/g DM	N.D.	$6.6 x 10^9$	$2.0 x 10^9$
lactic acid(g/kg DM)	N.D.	74.3	N.D.
pH	6.7	4.75	8.19
crude protein(%)	48.5	56.2	56.4
trypsin inhibitor(TI)	9.01	0.64	0.47
KOH solubility	84.97	61.3	59.21
total carbohydrate(%)	32.5	23.99	25.29
Raffinose(%)	1	0.05	0.82
Stachyose(%)	3	0.1	2.19
poly-y-glutamic acid(%)	N.D.	0.5	0.6





1. Background of Development - Concept



- Cost efficient
- Low protein content
- High ANFs

electa

- High Protein (60%)
- Decreased ANFs
- : CHOs Alcohol washout
- Cost efficient

- Low protein allergen
- Conglycinin etc.
- Low trypsin inhibitor
- · Low CHOs (by fermentation)
- High protein Content (64%)
- high digestible protein
- Cost efficient



Feed Biosecurity Risks Feed Processing

- Although reported that viable pathogens such as WSSV which may be present within contaminated feed ingredients are readily destroyed during the conventional steam pelleting process (Pongmaneerat et al. 2001);
- There is risk that more heat-resistant pathogens & parasites may survive the pelleting process: as compared with extrusion processing in which higher cooking temperatures are involved & the feed is usually completely pasteurized (Muñoz 2011);
AQUATIC FEEDS VARIOUS PROCESSING METHODS





Benefits of extruded feeds

- Reduced feed ingredient costs
- Improved feed water stability
- Reduced nutrient leaching
- Improved nutrient digestibility
- Increased oil & energy addition
- Higher starch gelatinization
- Improved feed efficiency
- Less fines & feed wastage
- Facilitate use of wet waste streams
- Improved feed biosecurity



Extrusion



Report of experience of Guabi with extruded shrimp feeds

Manufacturing extruded shrimp feeds in Brazil for the past 13 years



Temperatura: 110 a 180°C Gelatinização do amido: alta (80% a 95%)









Feed Biosecurity Risks Feed Management

Risk of negatively effecting shrimp growth & health through the use of poor on-farm feed management practices, including feed storage, and the consequent loss of nutrients through oxidation, spoilage or contamination;

Main factors affecting <u>on-farm shrimp feed performance</u>



Main factors affecting on-farm fish & shrimp feed performance

- Minimum dietary nutrient profile for each shrimp size group
- Hatchery feed, Nursery feed, Grow-out feed, Broodstock feed
- CP, CL, CF, EAA, EFA,
 Phospholipids, Cholesterol,
 Minerals, Vitamins
- Feed ingredient selection & use (min & max constraints)
- Aquatic & terrestrial animal protein & lipid sources
- Plant protein & lipid sources, cereals, binders, feed additives
- Feed formulation on a total or digestible nutrient basis



The essential dietary nutrients of fish & shrimp

 H_20

PROTEINS

LIPIDS

ASH

















The essential dietary nutrients of fish & shrimp



46-50 essential dietary nutrients present in a digestible & available form



Approaches currently used by feed companies to formulate their fish & shrimp feeds



1. Formulating feeds based on published NRC <u>total</u> nutrient basis (where data is available) or on government guidelines (60-70%);



Recently, the Government started paying attention to the quality of feed used in aquaculture. It has set feed standards for some important species such as carps, tilapia, trout and eel. Most of these standards were formulated in 1997. Some of them are: "Nutritional Standard of Formulated Feed for Common Carp, SC/T *1026-1997*" for common carp, "*Nutritional Standard of Formulated Feed for Grass Carp, SC/T 1024-1997*" for grass carp, "Nutritional Standard of Formulated Feed for *Tilapia, SC/T 1025-1997*" for tilapia, "*Technical Criteria in* Rainbow Trout Culture-Formulated Pellet Feed for *Rainbow trout, SC/T 1030-1997.7*" for rainbow trout and "Formulated Feed for Japanese Eel, SC 1004-1992" for eel.

COMPOUND FEED FOR WHITE LEG SHRIMP TCVN 10325:2014 Ministry of Agriculture, Hanoi 2014

Feed #	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feed diameter mm	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.8	2.2	2.5
Length/diameter	1.5-2	1.5-2	1.5-2	1.5-2	1.5-2	1.5-2
Crumble/dust % max	1	1	1	1	1	1
Water stability h min	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
Moisture % max	11	11	11	11	11	11
Crude protein % min	38	36	34	34	33	32
Crude lipid % min	5-7	5-7	5-7	4-6	4-6	4-6
Crude fibre % max	3	4	4	4	4	4
Ash % max	14	14	15	15	16	16
Sand % max	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.7
Lysine % min	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.5
Methionine % min	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6
Calcium % max	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Ca/Phosphorus	1-1.5	1-1.5	1-1.5	1-1.5	1-1.5	1-1.5
Salt % max	2	2	2	2	2	2
Insects Salmonella Aspergillus flavus Aflatoxin B ₁ max ug/kg Melamine max mg/kg Antibiotic	ND ND 10 2.5 ND	ND ND 10 2.5 ND	ND ND 10 2.5 ND	ND ND 10 2.5 ND	ND ND 10 2.5 ND	ND ND ND 10 2.5 ND





Approaches currently used by feed companies to formulate their fish & shrimp feeds



- 1. Formulating feeds based on published total nutrient basis (where data is available) or on government regulations (60-70%);
- 2. Formulating feeds on a <u>digestible</u> nutrient basis, based on existing published data from researchers (5-10%);
- 3. Formulating feeds on a <u>digestible</u> nutrient basis, based on inhouse data on the nutrient digestibility of the different feed ingredients used (10-20% total aquafeed production);



Digestibility systems - Ubatuba – USP/Brazil

Dietary nutrient requirements



More is better when the level of the nutrient in the diet is in the deficient range but the key point is that more is <u>not</u> better when the level is in the optimum range and is indeed barmful thereafter.

Aquatic protein meals & oils	5-20%
Fishmeals & oil: wild & farmed	5-20
Squid meal, krill meal	2-10
Seaweed meals & products	1-5
Cultured microbial biomass	1-5
Terrestrial animal proteins & oils	5-10%
Terrestrial animal proteins & oils Poultry by-products	5-10% 5-10
Terrestrial animal proteins & oils Poultry by-products Porcine by-products	5-10% 5-10 2-5
Terrestrial animal proteins & oilsPoultry by-productsPorcine by-productsRuminant by-products	5-10% 5-10 2-5

Terrestrial plant proteins & oils	10-30%		
Oilseed protein by-products	10-30		
Cereal protein by-products	5-15		
Pulse protein by-products	5-15		
Other plant proteins	5-15		
Other plant meals & fillers	25-40%		
Other plant meals & fillers Cereal meals & by-products	25-40% 15-50		
Other plant meals & fillersCereal meals & by-productsRoot meals & extracts	25-40% 15-50 2-10		
Other plant meals & fillersCereal meals & by-productsRoot meals & extractsFruit meals & by-products	25-40% 15-50 2-10 1-5		

Ingredients commonly used in feeds for PENAEID SHRIMP SPECIES



Vitamins, antioxidants, pigments, emulsifiers, MCTs

0-5%

Minerals, trace elements, salt

Amino acids, nucleotides, feeding attractants

Enzymes, gut modifiers, prebiotics, probiotics, acidifiers

Immune enhancers, anti-fungal, anti-viral, anti-parasitical

Binders, growth promoters, antibiotics, cholesterol

Improving the utilization of feed ingredients

Use of renewable nutrient sources







- Improved nutrient digestibility
- Improving feed efficiency
- Release of trapped nutrients
- Breakdown of anti-nutritional factors
- Improved gut health
- Reducing environmental impacts (N, P)

Phytase Xylanase

β – glucanaseCellulase

Amylase Protease

Lipase Micotoxinase Mannanase α - galactosidase



Improving the utilization of feed ingredients

Use of renewable nutrient sources

SOME ENZYMES USED WITHIIN AQUAFEEDS

- Enzyme Common source organism
- Amylases: Aspergillus spp., Bacillus spp.,
- Phytases: Aspergillus spp.,
 - Proteases: Aspergillus spp., Bacillus spp.,
- Fiber degrading:

٠

Asperginus spp., bacinus spp.,

Aspergillus spp; Trichoderma longibrachiatum



DSM & Novozymes: Delivering feed enzyme innovations



Functional ingredients with reported health benefits

<u>Nutrients</u>

EAA - amino acids Nucleotides Fatty acids Vitamins Minerals

Others

MCTs Essential oils Organic acids Prebiotics Probiotics



Non-nutrients

Alginates Beta glucans Carageenans Chitosans Lactoferrin Mannans Peptidoglycan Plant extracts

Ingredients with functional properties may improve shrimp survival but are not a panacea to eliminate a disease problem

Main factors affecting on-farm fish & shrimp feed performance

- Feed processing method
- Pelleting, extrusion cooking
- Size reduction (grinding)
- Pre & post-pellet conditioning
- Pellet drying, top coating
- Sifting, crumbler
- Percent fines & reuse
- Bagging & labeling
- Use of specific BMPs or GMPs
- Feed quality control
- Ingredient & feed storage
- > Quality control methods
- Parameters measured
- Water stability & nutrient leaching (if known)
- Feed safety controls
- Pest control measures



Slow feeding habits of shrimp, and the necessity of shrimp to masticate their feed externally prior to ingestion, and consequent risk of nutrient loss through leaching



Nutrient leaching: can be a problem with feeds left uneaten for long periods of time: nutrient leaching being greater with decreasing feed particle size & salinity, & increasing water temperature



Extru-Tech' s SAS™

....

Low Shear & Low Temperature extrusion of a uniform and pulverized formulation into agglomerated strands. These strands, by cyclonic motion, are then rounded into nutritionally homogenous pellets.

Main factors affecting on-farm shrimp feed performance

- Feed transportation to farmer
- Method of transport truck, boat, rail, plane
- Packaging big bags, sacks, containers
- Protection from elements sun, water, pests
- Location of feed depots & time taken to reach depots
- On-farm feed storage
- Feed record keeping & storage
- Feed storage area & storage conditions - temperature, ventilation, prevention from water damage, pest control
- Use of expired feeds







Main factors affecting on-farm fish & shrimp feed performance





- On-farm feed management
 practice
- Feeding method by hand, boat, feeding tray, autofeeder, truck
- Feed application criteria feeding table, shrimp appetite, feed trays, past experience, water quality parameters
 Frequency of feed application
 - for each shrimp age class
- Application of specific feed additives prior to feeding
- Probiotics, specific vitamins, attractants & method of application
- Record keeping concerning feed use book, board, laptop





Feed Biosecurity Risks Feed Management

Risk of disease transmission through the use of raw and/or inadequately processed contaminated marine/shrimp products (including shrimp pastes, fermentation products, shrimp hydrolysates, and/or shrimp silage) applied through the top-dressing of commercial pelleted shrimp feeds by the farmer prior to feeding;





Study shows automation significantly more efficient than hand feeding Improving the efficiency of aquafeed management in shrimp ponds is critical to improve industry productivity and profitability and minimize any environmental impacts.

Dr Allen Davis personal communication



Driving Aquaculture Productivity

Daniel Gruenberg reported advantages

- Improves feed conversion ratios (FCRs) by 30%
- Improves growth rate up to 30%
- Reduces the amount of feed fed
- Reduces feed costs
- Reduces labor costs by 80%
- Increases the harvest size of shrimp
- Increases the price you get for your shrimp
- Prevents leaching of nutrients
- Prevents degradation of your water quality
- Prevents feed wastes from accumulating on bottom

Main factors affecting on-farm fish & shrimp feed performance



- Production system
- Raceway, earthen pond, lined pond, indoor tank
- Stocking density
- Water management green water, floc or semi-floc, zerowater exchange, flow-through
 - Aeration method used
 - **Application/use of probiotics**
 - Natural food availability over culture period
- Water quality variation (24h)
- Water temperature min/max
- Dissolved oxygen min/max
- \blacktriangleright NH₃ NO₂ pH PO₄ alkalinity
- Bacterial levels
- Phytoplankton/zooplankton
- Algal blooms/crashes



OXYGEN is key – more important than feed Fish & Shrimp cannot digest & make maximum use of the feed fed unless there is sufficient oxygen is available within the culture system

One of the most important pieces of equipment on the farm



Main factors affecting on-farm fish & shrimp feed performance





- Importance of biosecurity & definitions
- Feed biosecurity risks associated with viable pathogens, feed formulation, feed processing & onfarm feed management
- Future role of nutrition, genetics & environmental control in improving shrimp health management & the need for a new generation improved biosecure shrimp feeds & feed management systems
- Future roles & responsibilities of feed companies, traders, farmers & government authorities

Nutrition & Genetics determine the health & well-being of all fish & shrimp





Environmental interactions between nutrition & health

(modified after Waabo. 1994; Tacon, 1997)

Conventional shrimp culture conditions

- shallow ponds with large surface area
- variable water temperature from am to pm
- variable dissolved oxygen levels from am to pm
- build-up of uneaten feed & fecal matter on pond bottom
- irregular feeding & increased leaching & nutrient loss
- deteriorating water quality over culture cycle

shrimp stress

Major stressors – through diet, feeding & culture environment






- Importance of biosecurity & definitions
- Feed biosecurity risks associated with viable pathogens, feed formulation, feed processing & onfarm feed management
- Future role of nutrition, genetics & environmental control in improving shrimp health management & the need for a new generation improved biosecure shrimp feeds & feed management systems
- Future roles & responsibilities of feed companies, farmers & government authorities



Suggested Recommendations for Biosecure Shrimp Feeds

Feed Manufacturers Responsibilities

- Formulate nutritionally complete feeds on a digestible nutrient basis for optimum health & wellbeing
- Full ingredient & nutrient disclosure, including prohibiting the use of shrimp/locally sourced crustacean meals
- Feeds should be manufactured & sold as being Biosecure & Pathogen-free
- Discourage farmers top-dressing feeds with unregulated feed additives
- Provide training assistance to farmers, and in particular to small-scale farmers, concerning feed BMPs, including disposal of dead shrimp & moults
- Beware of using adulterated ingredients



Need for the Development of Biosecure Pathogen-free Shrimp Hatchery Feeds

For full shrimp hatchery biosecurity the shrimp industry must move away from the use of live food organisms to the use of fully biosecure water-stable dry or liquid shrimp nutritionally-complete hatchery feeds

There is no nutrient or substance present within live feeds, including algae and Artemia nauplii, that we cannot put into a fully biosecure commercially formulated dry or encapsulated larval shrimp feed!



Need for the Development of Biosecure Pathogen-free Shrimp Nursery & Grow-out Feeds

For full farm biosecurity the shrimp industry must move away from the use of live or processed natural food organisms to the use of fully biosecure nutritionallycomplete water-stable dry shrimp feeds

As mentioned previously, there is no nutrient or substance present within Artemia that we cannot put into a fully biosecure commercially formulated feed!



Need for the Development of Biosecure Pathogen-free Shrimp Broodstock Feeds & Maturation Feeds

For full shrimp and farm biosecurity the shrimp industry must move away from the use of live and/or frozen feeds to the use of fully biosecure water-stable semi-moist and/or dry nutritionally-complete shrimp broodstock & maturation feeds

There is no nutrient or substance present within these live and fresh food organisms that we cannot put into a fully biosecure commercially formulated dry shrimp feed!





Suggested Recommendations for Biosecure Shrimp Feeds

Shrimp Farmer Responsibilities

- Importance of record keeping for monitoring feed intake & feed efficiency on a pond by pond and farm basis
- Only top dress feeds immediately prior to feeding, using only legally approved feed additives of known composition
- Prohibit use of antibiotics (unless under veterinary control) and fresh feed items
- Disposal of dead shrimp and exoskeleton using biosecure protocols
- Adheranace to feed management BMPs
- Feed shrimp at optimum DO levels & temperature on a continuous little & often basis over a 24-h day, preventing over-feeding and feed/sludge settlement





Suggested Recommendations for Biosecure Shrimp Feeds

Government Responsibilities

•Legislate for feed companies to formulate shrimp feeds for optimum health & well-being, with full ingredient use & nutrient level disclosure

Prohibit intra-species recycling and the use of non-biosecure crustacean meals
Legislate for feeds to be certified & sold as being fully Biosecure & Pathogen-free
Prohibit farmers from top-dressing their feeds with unregulated feed additives
Provide training assistance to farmers, and in particular to small-scale farmers, concerning feed BMPs, including disposal of dead shrimp & moults etc

Clamp down on illegal unliscenced traders



A'ohe hana nui ka alu'ia No task is too big when done together

Towards the development of a more sustainable aquafeed sector

Nutrition







Culture

Environment

- Increased feed production/competition
- Rising feed ingredient costs/demand
- Increasing dependency on imports
- Reliance upon fishmeal & fish oil
- Lack nutrient requirement data
- Over formulation of feeds
- Environmental impacts
- Disease outbreaks

Feed biosecurity

- Food safety

Solutions - Increased commitment to R & D - Increased use of local resources - Improved feed formulations - Improved feed processing & Feeding - Improved <u>on-farm feed</u> use Improved feed biosecurity - Improved traceability - Improved food safety - Improved nutrition Sustainability **Health &** Disease