

**The development of water quality guidelines for poultry production  
in southern Africa**

by

**CHRISTÉL BLANCHÉ COETZEE**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF  
**PHILOSOPHEA DOCTORE: ANIMAL SCIENCE**

DEPARTMENT: Animal and Wildlife Sciences

in the

FACULTY OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES  
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA  
PRETORIA

December 2005



SciScribe

This is to certify that I edited the Thesis :

The Development of Water Quality Guidelines for Poultry Production in Southern Africa  
by Christél Coetzee.

Anthony Mawbey

Telephone 033-394-9503  
E-mail mawbey@caramail.com  
SciScribe <http://membres.lycos.fr/mawbey/sciscrib.htm>  
8 Parview, 15 Prince Alfred St,  
Pietermaritzburg  
3201



## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>INTRODUCTION.</b>	
Introduction_____	1
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>A national survey of the quality of groundwater used by poultry producers in South Africa_____</b>	<b>6</b>
Introduction_____	6
Materials and Methods_____	6
Borehole selection_____	6
Sample collection_____	7
Laboratory analysis_____	8
Statistical evaluation_____	8
Result of water analysis_____	8
The Western Cape_____	8
The North West Province_____	12
Gauteng_____	15
The Freestate_____	19
The Eastern Cape_____	23
Department of Water Affairs and Forestry sampling results (1996-2001)_____	39
Discussion_____	40
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
<b>Minerals in drinking water and layer production</b>	
Introduction_____	41
Sodium_____	41
Chloride_____	41
Sulphate_____	41
Magnesium_____	41
Materials and Methods_____	42
Statistical Analysis_____	45
Results and Discussion_____	45
Levels of Cl, Na, SO <sub>4</sub> and Mg ions (mg/kg) present in the eggs_____	62
Chloride contents of the eggs_____	62
Sulphate contents of the eggs_____	62
Sodium contents of the eggs_____	62
Magnesium contents of the eggs_____	62
Calcium contents of the eggs_____	63
Conclusion_____	65

## CHAPTER 3

### The effect of elevated levels of NaNO<sub>3</sub> in drinking water of layers and broilers

Introduction_____	67
Materials and Methods_____	71
Experiment 1: Layers_____	71
Statistical Analysis_____	73
Results_____	73
Histopathology_____	75
Hearts_____	75
Kidneys_____	75
Intestines and pancreas_____	75
Livers_____	76
Discussion_____	87
Conclusion_____	88
Experiment 2: Broilers_____	88
Materials and Methods_____	88
Statistical Analysis_____	89
Methods for the determination of the Vitamin A content of the chicken livers_____	89
Results_____	89
Histopathology Results_____	89
Hearts_____	90
Kidneys_____	90
Discussion_____	97
Conclusion_____	98

## CHAPTER 4.

### Influence of Ca and P in the drinking water on egg production, egg quality, bone integrity and shell strength.

Introduction_____	99
Materials and methods_____	99
Results and discussion_____	101
Histopathology results_____	127
Conclusion_____	127

## CHAPTER 5.

### Theoretical Modelling Approach

Introduction_____	129
Generic WQGIS_____	131



Introduction	131
Generic guidelines within incidence categories	131
Definitions used for the Generic Guidelines	132
Generic guidelines – Trigger values	137
Generic WQGIS – Software Environment	139
Specific WQGIS	144
Basis of the Specific Water Quality Application Level	145
An example of a typical WIRRD	145
Modifying system factors	146
Site-Specific factors addressed	147
WIRRD Constituents	149
User interface of the specific model	149
Set user format	151
Help files	158
Conclusion	158
<b>APPENDIX 1 to Chapter 5</b>	<b>159</b>
Animal	
Feed intake	159
Water intake	159
Body weight	160
Mortalities	161
Body weight gain and feed conversion	161
Egg production	161
Gender Ratio	162
Beak trimming	162
Environmental detail	164
Environmental	
Housing	164
Ventilation rate	164
Air velocity	164
Lighting	165
Stocking density	166
Feeder space	168
Drinking space/type	168
Relative Humidity	169
Temperature	171
Floor type	172
Nutrition detail	172
Feeding program	172



Watering program_____	174
Feed texture/Pellet size_____	175
Phase feeding_____	177
Additives_____	177
Vitamin and mineral premixes_____	179
Interrelationships_____	179
Protein_____	181
Energy_____	182
<b>Appendix 2 to Chapter 5</b>	
Site specific factors_____	183
<b>CHAPTER 6.</b>	
<b>Summary, Application and Recommendations</b>	
Case Study_____	195
Conclusion_____	201
<b>REFERENCES_____</b>	<b>203</b>

## TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1.1: Maximum acceptable levels of water quality constituents found in literature_____	1
Table 1.2: Water Quality Constituents (mg/l), pH and electrical conductivity (mS/m) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in the Western Cape (n = 35)_____	9
Table 1.3: Water quality constituents (µg/l) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in the Western Cape (n = 35)_____	11
Table 1.4: Highest recorded levels of constituents in the Western Cape_____	12
Table 1.5: Water quality constituents (mg/l), pH and electrical conductivity (mS/m) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in the North West Province (n = 9)_____	13
Table 1.6: Water quality constituents (µg/l) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in the North West Province (n = 9)_____	14
Table 1.7: Highest recorded levels of constituents in the North West Province_____	15
Table 1.8: Water quality constituents (mg/l), pH and electrical conductivity (mS/m) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in Gauteng (n = 9)_____	17
Table 1.9: Water quality constituents (µg/l) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in Gauteng (n = 9)_____	18
Table 1.10: Highest recorded levels of constituents in Gauteng_____	19
Table 1.11: Water quality constituents (mg/l), pH and electrical conductivity of borehole water from selected poultry farms in the Free State (n =17)_____	21
Table 1.12: Water quality constituents (µg/l) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in the Free State (n =17)_____	22
Table 1.13: Highest recorded levels of constituents in the Freestate_____	23
Table 1.14: Water quality constituents (mg/l), pH and electrical conductivity (mS/m) of borehole water from selected poultry farms in the Eastern Cape (n = 3)_____	25
Table 1.15: Water quality constituents (µg/l) of borehole water from selected farms in the Eastern Cape (n = 3)_____	26
Table 1.16: Highest recorded levels of constituents in the Eastern Cape Province_____	27
Table 1.17: Water quality constituents (mg/l) of boreholes from selected farms in the Western Cape, North West, Gauteng, Free State and Eastern Cape Province_____	28
Table 1.18: Water quality constituents (µg/l) of boreholes from selected farms in the Western Cape, North West, Gauteng, Free State and Eastern Cape Province_____	29
Table 2.1: Inclusion levels of constituents_____	44
Table 2.2: Mean egg production criteria of hens receiving different levels of Mg, SO <sub>4</sub> , Na chloride in the drinking water_____	46
Table 2.3: Weekly egg production of hens receiving 12 different combinations of sodium, chloride, magnesium and sulphate_____	48
Table 2.4: Weekly egg production (%) of hens receiving 12 different combinations of sodium, chloride, magnesium and sulphate_____	49

Table 2.5:	Weekly egg weight (g) of eggs of hens receiving 12 different combinations of sodium, chloride, magnesium and sulphate_____	51
Table 2.6:	LS Means for food intake (kg) of hens receiving different levels of magnesium, sulphate, sodium and chloride in the drinking water_____	53
Table 2.7:	Weekly food intake (kg) of hens receiving 12 different combinations of sodium, chloride, magnesium and sulphate_____	54
Table 2.8:	LS Mean for body weight (kg/hen) of hens receiving different levels of magnesium, sulphate, sodium and chloride in the drinking water_____	56
Table 2.9:	Weekly body weight (kg/hen) of hens receiving 12 different combinations of sodium, chloride, magnesium and sulphate (SD±0.024) ground water_____	57
Table 2.10:	LS Mean for water intake (l) of hens receiving different levels of sodium, magnesium, chloride and sulphate in the drinking water_____	59
Table 2.11:	Weekly water intake of hens receiving 12 different combinations of sodium, chloride, magnesium and sulphate_____	60
Table 2.12:	Levels of chloride, sodium, sulphate and magnesium ions present in the eggs_____	64
Table 3.1:	A Guide to the use of waters containing nitrate for livestock_____	72
Table 3.2:	Inclusion levels of nitrates_____	72
Table 3.3:	The vitamin A levels present in the feed_____	72
Table 3.4:	Nitrite levels in the caecum and colon (mg/kg)_____	74
Table 3.5:	Percentage of methemoglobin in blood_____	74
Table 3.6:	Number of lymphoid foci in the kidneys_____	75
Table 3.7:	Number of serositis in the Intestines and pancreas_____	76
Table 3.8:	Weekly egg production (egg/hen/week) of layers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vitamin A_____	77
Table 3.9:	Weekly egg weight of eggs of layers received 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit.A _____	79
Table 3.10:	Daily food intake (g) of layers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit A_____	81
Table 3.11:	Daily water intake (ml) of layers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit.A_____	83
Table 3.12:	Weekly body weights of layers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit.A _____	85
Table 3.13:	Inclusion levels of nitrates _____	89
Table 3.14:	Number of lymphoid foci found in the hearts_____	90
Table 3.15:	Treatment where mild and moderate lymphoid foci were observed feed_____	90
Table 3.16:	LS Means of daily food intake (g) of broilers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit. A_____	91



Table 3.17:	LS Means of daily water intake (ml) broilers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit. A _____	92
Table 3.18:	LS Means of weekly body weights of broilers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit. A _____	93
Table 3.19:	LS Means of weekly feed conversion ratios of broilers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit. A _____	95
Table 3.20:	LS Means of methemoglobin content (%) in blood (P = 0.8335) (SD±0.2476)_____	96
Table 3.21:	LS Means of liver weights (g) of broilers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit. A (P = 0.2200) (SD±4.0644)_____	96
Table 3.22:	LS Means of thyroid weights (g) of broilers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vit. A (P = 0.7564) (SD±1.1905)_____	96
Table 3.23:	LS Means of liver Vitamin A concentration (mg/100g wet liver) of broilers receiving 6 different levels of sodium nitrate, each treatment with and without the addition of 8000 mg/l of Vitamin A (P = 0.0001)_____	97
Table 4.1:	Inclusion levels of calcium and phosphorus_____	101
Table 4.2:	The factors that increase or decrease intestinal calcium absorption_____	102
Table 4.3:	Blood calcium levels of hens receiving different levels and combinations of Ca and P (mg/l) P = 0.2394 _____	105
Table 4.4:	LS Means of body weight (kg) of hens receiving different levels of calcium and phosphorus in the drinking water_____	106
Table 4.5:	Mean body weight of birds over time (kg) P = 0.7624_____	108
Table 4.6:	LS Means of egg production (eggs/hens/week) of hens receiving different levels of calcium and phosphorus in the drinking water (SD±0.2127)_____	110
Table 4.7:	LS Means of egg weight (g) of eggs produced by hens receiving different levels of calcium and phosphorus in the drinking water (SD±2.3615)_____	112
Table 4.8:	Mean egg production and egg weight per treatment over weeks_____	114
Table 4.9:	Phosphorus contents of the egg shells (%)_____	114
Table 4.10:	Calcium contents of the egg shells (%)_____	115
Table 4.11:	Eggshell thickness of hens receiving different levels and combinations of Ca and P (mm) P = 0.4213_____	115
Table 4.12:	Eggshell breaking strength of hens receiving different levels and combinations of Ca and P (N) P = 0.4213 water_____	115
Table 4.13:	Roche egg yolk colour score of hens receiving different levels and combinations of Ca and P (N) P = 0.4213 water_____	120
Table 4.14:	LS Means of daily food intake (g) of hens receiving different levels of calcium and phosphorus in the drinking water_____	121
Table 4.15:	Mean food intake of birds over time (g/hen/day) P = 0.7351_____	123



Table 4.16:	LS Means of daily water intake (ml/hen/day) (SD±0.004)	124
Table 4.17:	Mean water intake of birds over time (ml/hen/day) P = 0.8833	126
Table 4.18:	Mean breaking strength of femora (N) P = 0.0615	126
Table 5.1:	Potentially hazardous water quality constituents for poultry watering, selected on the basis of incidence of occurrence in the natural aquatic environment	132
Table 5.2:	WQC addressed as Single Trigger Guidelines for the Generic System	137
Table 5.3:	WQC with a WIRRD	149
Table 5.4:	Daily ad libitum water consumption of poultry (l/100birds)	160
Table 5.5:	Egg production and water consumption of layers	161
Table 5.6:	Recommended male female ratios)	162
Table 5.7:	Feed consumption and body weights of pullets on various debeaking treatments)	162
Table 5.8:	Effects of age at final beak trimming on age at 50% production, mortality, feed consumption, egg mass and egg production form 140 to 441 days)	163
Table 5.9:	Effects of beak treatment and age on body weight, weight gain, feed intake and the feed to gain ration of pullets from 4 to 7 weeks of age)	163
Table 5.10:	Effect of beak trimming on body weight gain and feed consumption of broiler fed feed in mash and pellet form	163
Table 5.11:	Influence of lighting on sexual maturity, laying house mortality and egg production	165
Table 5.12:	Age at lighting and egg size	166
Table 5.13:	Improvements with various lighting programs	166
Table 5.14:	Effect of short day length on male broiler performance	166
Table 5.15:	Stocking densities for broilers	167
Table 5.16:	Relationship between temperature and relative humidity	170
Table 5.17:	% Increase in feed consumption between two temperatures as temperature increase	171
Table 5.18:	% Increase in feed consumption between two temperatures as temperature decrease	172
Table 5.19:	Effect of floor type on feed consumption	172
Table 5.20:	Water intake of broilers by line to 49 days of age	173
Table 5.21:	Mean feed and water consumption and egg production of hens during and after a 6-week period with water supply restricted to 90% of ad libitum intake	174
Table 5.22:	Effect of water restriction on weekly feed consumption of broilers	175
Table 5.23:	Mean body weights, feed intake and water intake by dietary treatment and age	176
Table 5.24:	Recommended Vitamin and Trace mineral levels	179
Table 5.25:	ME/P ratios for varying caloric and protein content of the diet	180
Table 5.26:	Diet salt and litter moisture)	180
Table 5.27:	Mean feed and water intake and water/feed ratios from 0 to 16 days of age by dietary treatments	181
Table 5.28:	Growth, feed and water consumption of birds on different levels of soyabean oil meal in the diet over 8 weeks)	182

Table 5.29	Performance of broilers fed diets of variable energy content_____	182
Table 5.30	Effect of energy dilution of finisher diet on growth of broilers_____	182
Table 6.1	Water quality constituents and effects on poultry production found in water analyzed_____	193
Table 6.2	Maximum allowed levels of constituents investigated and the maximum levels administered in the subsequent trials_____	194
Table 6.3	Analysis results obtained from water sample taken in the Eastern Cape Province <u>196</u>	
Table 6.4	Ingestion rates (mg) of constituents present in the water_____	198
Table 6.5	Vitamin and mineral premixes used in the broiler diets_____	198
Table 6.6	Sulphate content of water ingested as well as premix ingested_____	199
Table 6.7	Diets fed_____	199
Table 6.8	The contribution of salt to the sodium and chloride intake of a 3 week and 6 week old broiler_____	200
Table 6.9	The effect of removing the salt from the diet_____	200
Table 6.10	Total Na and Cl intake after the salt was removed from the diet and adding the minerals from the water_____	200

## FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
Map 1.1:	Potentially hazardous levels for livestock watering occurring in South African ground water _____ 7
Map 1.2:	The Western Cape region where the water samples were taken _____ 9
Map 1.3:	The North West Province where the water samples were taken _____ 12
Map 1.4:	The Province of Gauteng where the water samples were taken _____ 15
Map 1.5:	The Freestate Province where the water samples were taken _____ 19
Map 1.6:	The Eastern Cape Province where the water samples were taken _____ 23
Map 1.7:	Monitoring points of the National Ground Water Quality Monitoring project of SA _____ 31
Map 1.8:	Distribution of Poultry Producers (>20 000 birds) in South Africa _____ 32
Map 1.9:	The sample points where chloride was measured at levels higher than 250 mg/l _____ 33
Map 1.10:	The sample points where sodium was measured at levels higher than 50 mg/l _____ 34
Map 1.11:	The sample points where nitrates were measured at levels higher than 10 mg/l _____ 35
Map 1.12:	The sample points where magnesium was measured at levels higher than 125 mg/l _____ 36
Map 1.13:	The sample points where fluoride was measured at levels higher than 5 mg/l _____ 37
Map 1.14:	The sample points where sulphates were measured at levels higher than 250 mg/l _____ 38
Map 1.15:	The sample points where calcium was measured at levels higher than 600 mg/l _____ 39
Figure 2.1:	Water treatment system with calibrated cylinders _____ 43
Figure 2.2:	Inclusion levels of constituents (mg/l) _____ 44
Figure 3.1:	A simplified pathway for nitrates in swine and poultry _____ 68
Figure 3.2:	pH of gastro intestinal tract of the chicken _____ 87
Figure 4.1:	A simplified model of the relationship between calcium homeostasis and calcium appetite _____ 103
Figure 4.2:	Lateral view of the eggshell from an egg of Treatment 1 (x200) _____ 116
Figure 4.3:	Lateral view of the eggshell from an egg of Treatment 7 (x200) _____ 117
Figure 4.4:	Lateral view of the eggshell from an egg of Treatment 9 (x200) _____ 117
Figure 4.5:	Outer shell of Treatment 1 (x10 000) _____ 118
Figure 4.6:	Outer shell of Treatment 7 (x10 000) _____ 119
Figure 4.7:	Outer shell of Treatment 9 (x10 000) _____ 119
Figure 5.1:	Systems diagram of the Generic application level _____ 131
Screens 5.1:	Generic WQGIS – Software environment _____ 140
Figure 5.2:	Schematic demonstration of the specific model _____ 144
Figure 5.3:	Effect of temperature on consumption of water in poultry _____ 147
Figure 5.4:	Basic model for the specific application for poultry _____ 150
Screens 5.2:	User interface of the Specific WQGIS _____ 151
Figure 5.5:	The relationship between dry bulb temperature, wet bulb temperature, equivalent temperature, vapour pressure and dew point _____ 170
Map 6.1:	Mineral Map of the Eastern Cape _____ 195

### **Abstract**

The objective of this study was to develop water quality guidelines for poultry reared under South African conditions and production systems. This was achieved by a modeling approach that was based on a survey of water used by poultry producers throughout the country. Potentially hazardous constituents identified were – Sodium, Magnesium, Chloride, Sulphate, Nitrate, Calcium and Phosphorus. Three experiments were conducted to test these constituents' effects on poultry production. Experiment 1 examined the influence of different levels of magnesium, sodium, sulphate and chloride in the drinking water of layers and the effect thereof on their production. The study showed that 12 different combinations of Mg, Na, Cl and SO<sub>4</sub> had no significant effect on growth, food and water intake, and egg production or egg quality. Poultry producers in areas with naturally high levels of these minerals in their ground water can therefore continue to function successfully if the concentrations present are up to 250 mg/l of Mg, 500 mg/l of Cl, 500 mg/l of SO<sub>4</sub> and 250 mg/l of Na. Experiment 2 examined the effect of elevated levels of NaNO<sub>3</sub> in the drinking water of layers and broilers. No negative effects on broiler production and growth were observed. The only mineral ion to show a significant effect on performance was nitrate, with lower nitrate concentrations in well water being associated with better performance. Experiment 3 examined the effects of Ca and P in the drinking water on egg production, egg quality, bone integrity and shell strength. The results showed that water can be a valuable asset to increase eggshell integrity, but waterline maintenance may be increased because of the tendency of calcium to precipitate. Water should be seen as a dietary source of minerals (Ca + P) and should be taken into consideration when nutrient specifications are set for feed formulations to be used in the various poultry production systems. The preceding results served as basis for developing a modeling approach to water quality guidelines for poultry.

## Acknowledgements

- Prof. Norman Casey for his mentorship and patience.
- The Water Research Commission for financial assistance throughout the duration of the project.
- Roelf Coertze for statistical analysis.
- Ollie Coetzee for burning the midnight oil with me.
- Daniel for being my inspiration.

*For the LORD giveth wisdom: out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding. Proverbs 2:6*



<b>List of abbreviations</b>	
°C	Degrees Celcius
BHA	Butylated hydroxy-anisode
BHT	Butylated hydroxytoluene
BW	Body Weight
Ca	Calcium
CIRRA	Constituent Ingestion Rate Risk Assessment
Cl	Chloride
CM	Cumulative Mortalities
COC	Constituent of Concern
CT	Calcitonin
DES	Diethylstilbestrol
DFU	Daily Food Use
DPPD	Diphenylparaphenyliediamine
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
DWU	Daily Water Use
EDTA	Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid
EP	Egg Production
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FC	Feed Conversion
FI	Feed Intakes
G	Gain
GAL	Guideline Application Level
GI	Gastro Intestinal
GLM	General Linear Model
HI	Heat Index
HPLC	High Performance Liquid Chromatography
IU	International Unit
K	Wind Chill Index
KOH	Potassium hydroxide
LBW	Live Body Weight
LS	Least Square
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
ME	Metabolzable Energy
Mg	Magnesium
MINRD	Mineral Reference Document
N	Newton
Na	Sodium
NO3	Nitrate
NRC	National Research Council



NTS	Nucleus Tractus Solitarius
O2	Oxide
P	Phosphorus
PCR	Peripheral calcium receptors
PHC	Potentially Hazardous Constituent
PTH	Parathyroid Hormone
RD	Reference Document
RH	Relative Humidity
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SD	Standard Deviation
SFO	Subfornical organ
SO4	Sulphate
T	Temperature
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TWI	Total Water Intake
TWQR	Target Water Quality Range
WI	Water Intake
WIR	Water Ingestion Rate
WIRRD	Water Ingestion Rate Reference Document
WQC	Water Quality Constituent
WQG	Water Quality Guideline
WQGIS	Water Quality Guideline Index System
WQI	Water Quality Index
WRC	Water Research Commission



## Introduction

Water quality concerns have often been neglected because good quality water supplies were plentiful and readily available. This situation is changing in many areas. Sound planning is now required to ensure that water of the quality available is put to the best use.

The climate in South Africa varies from desert and semi-desert in the west, to sub-humid along the eastern coastal areas, with an average annual rainfall for the country of just over half of the average for the rest of the world. South Africa's water resources are limited and, in global terms, are considered sparse. The natural availability of water across the country is distributed unevenly, with more than 60% of the river flow arising from only 20% of the land area. In addition, as the country is mainly underlain by hard rock formations, it is poorly endowed with groundwater in some areas and does not have many groundwater springs (Millard, 1999).

Minister Ronnie Kasrils, the South African Minister for Water Affairs, started his address to parliament in commemoration of water week (19 March 2001) by saying the following:

*“This week is National Water Week, when South Africans are called upon to re-evaluate their attitude to the single most important asset South Africa has – WATER.”*

(Pretoria News, March 2001)

To make optimal use of this valuable asset it is important to understand the dynamics involved in the use and quality of water in agriculture. The validity of existing water quality guidelines in their application to South Africa's unique circumstances require examination. Water quality refers to the characteristics of a water supply that will influence its suitability for a specific use. Each specific use has a different quality requirement and one water supply is considered more acceptable if it produces better results or causes fewer problems than an alternative water supply.

There have been a number of different water quality guidelines for livestock watering. Each has been useful but none has been entirely satisfactory because of the wide variability in findings and applications (Table 1.1).



**Table 1.1 Maximum acceptable levels of water quality constituents found in literature.**

CONSTITUENT	MAX ACCEPTABLE LEVEL	REFERENCE
Aluminium	0.25 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.2 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
	5 mg/l	Mancl et al., 1991.
Arsenic	0.2 mg/l	Carter, 1985, Keshavarz, 1987 & Mancl et al., 1991
	1 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.05 mg/l	Vohra, 1980 & Zimmerman, 1995
Bacteria	Total = 100/ ml	Schwartz, 1994 & Waggoner et al., 1994
	Coliform=50/ml	Schwartz, 1994 & Waggoner et al., 1994
Barium	1 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
	2 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
Bicarbonate	98 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
	500 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
Cadmium	50 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.01 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
	0.005 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
	0.05 mg/l	Mancl, et al., 1991
Calcium	402 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	600 mg/l	Carter, 1985 & Keshavarz, 1987
	200 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
Chloride	250 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994, Ernst, 1989 & Zimmerman, 1995
	1500 mg/l	Carter, 1985
	200 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
	600 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
Chromium	5 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.05 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
	0.1 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
	1 mg/l	Mancl et al., 1991
Copper	0.06 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994 & Waggoner et al., 1994
	2 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994 & Waggoner et al., 1994
	2.5 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.5 mg/l	Good, 1985
		Carter, 1985, Keshavarz, 1987 & Mancl et al., 1991
	1.5 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
	0.6 mg/l	Ernst, 1989
	1.3 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
Fluoride	2 mg/l	Carter, 1985, Keshavarz, 1987 & Mancl et al., 1991
	0.9-1.7 mg/l (air temp 10-12°C)	Vohra, 1980
	0.06-0.08 mg/l (air temp 26.2-32.6°C)	Vohra, 1980
	4 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
Iron	0.3 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994 & Ernst, 1989
	1.2 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	6 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
	0.1 mg/l	Vohra, 1980

**Table 1.1 Maximum acceptable levels of water quality constituents found in literature (continued)**

CONSTITUENT	MAX ACCEPTABLE LEVEL	REFERENCE
Lead	0.02 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994 & Ernst, 1989
	0.1 mg/l	Carter, 1985, Keshavarz, 1987 & Mancl et al., 1991
	0.5 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.05 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
	0.015 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
Magnesium	125 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994 & Ernst, 1989
	350 mg/l	Carter, 1985
	50 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
	150 mg/l (if 250 mg/l sulphate is present)	Vohra, 1980
Manganese	4.6 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.05 mg/l	Carter, 1985 & Vohra, 1980
	0.6 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
Mercury	10 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.002 mg/l	Vohra, 1980 & Zimmerman 1995
Nickel	0.001 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
	1 mg/l	Mancl et al., 1991
Nitrates	25 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994, Ernst, 1989 & Mancl et al., 1991
	200 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	20 mg/l	Good, 1985 and Keshavarz, 1987
	10 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995; Waggoner et al., 1994.
Nitrites	4 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994 & Ernst, 1989
	1 mg/l	Zimmerman, 1995
	3 mg/l	Mancl et al., 1991
pH	> 6.0	Schwartz, 1994 & Waggoner et al., 1994
		10-Feb Kempster, et al., 1981
	> 5.9	Good, 1985
Phosphate	5 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981
	0.7 mg/l	Carter, 1985
Selenium	0.05 mg/l	Kempster, et al., 1981, Zimmerman, 1995 & Mancl et al., 1991
	0.01 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
Sodium	200 mg/l	Ernst, 1989
	50 mg/l	Ernst, 1989
	75 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
Sulphate	250 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994 & Ernst, 1989
	60 mg/l	Keshavarz, 1987
	400 mg/l (if Na & Mg are present)	Vohra, 1980
	300 mg/l	Mancl et al., 1991
Zinc	1.5 mg/l	Schwartz, 1994, Waggoner et al., 1994 & Ernst, 1989
	2.5 mg/l	Carter, 1985 & Keshavarz, 1987
	15 mg/l	Vohra, 1980
	25 mg/l	Mancl et al., 1991

In evaluating the usability of any particular water, local conditions and availability of alternate water sources will play an important role. The following factors need to be taken into consideration:

- Species - Variation in tolerance to different water quality constituents is considerable between animal

species and breeds within a species according to the production status.

- Ingestion rate - The concentration of a constituent in a water source alone is not indicative of its effect. The ingestion rate of specific constituent should be established.
- Exposure time - Short-term exposure to some constituents can be tolerated by some species.

Not all water quality constituents in animal drinking water are potentially hazardous. Some only cause management problems or are nuisances.

The effect of water quality on the growth and production of livestock and wildlife in South Africa has recently been re-evaluated at the instigation of the Water Research Commission of South Africa (WRC). A new approach to minimising the risk associated with water of varying quality was developed in a series of projects funded by the WRC (Casey, Meyer, and van Niekerk, 1993; Casey, Meyer, Coetzee and Van Niekerk, W.A. 1994 (a); Casey, Meyer, Coetzee and Van Niekerk, 1994 (b); Casey and Meyer, 1993; Casey and Meyer, 1996; Casey, and Meyer, 1996; Casey, Meyer and Coetzee, C.B., 1998 (a); Casey, Meyer and Coetzee, 1998 (b); Casey, Meyer and Coetzee, 1998 (c); Casey, Meyer and Coetzee, 2000 (a); Casey, Meyer and Coetzee, 2000 (b); Meyer, 1998 and Casey and Meyer 2000.)

The South African poultry industry comprises 617 million broilers and 17.8 million layers (Coetzee, 2005). These production systems are intensively operated and function within a small profit margin. Extensive economic losses can result from water quality constituents that are potentially hazardous.

Since Australia is on the same latitude as South Africa and the two countries have similar climatic conditions the Australian Water Quality Guidelines were used as a starting point. These water quality guidelines, however, address livestock watering as a whole and do not specify separate guidelines for poultry. The fact that poultry are less susceptible to high nitrate inclusions in the water than ruminants (Jennings and Sneed, 1996) is but one example where poultry's tolerance to a water quality constituent differs from other livestock. It amplifies the need for a specific set of water quality guidelines for poultry.

The few poultry specific guidelines available are all either outdated or list old guidelines in new publications (Keshavarz, 1987; Vohra, 1980; Carter 1985; Carter and Sneed, 1996). Some poultry water quality standards have been derived from large animal work. Still others are based on poultry mortality rather than effects on growth, reproduction or other production factors (Carter, 1985).

The objective, therefore, is to re-evaluate existing water quality standards for poultry reared under South African conditions and production systems.

A further motivation for this thesis is that South Africa's water quality needs may be different from other production regions in the world, because of the environment that ranges from humid sub-tropical to arid regions and from sea level up to 1800 metres above sea level. Water is scarce and the main water sources available on farms with intensive poultry production are boreholes (ground water). Often the quality of water in these boreholes does not conform to international water quality guidelines. Some

guidelines define the already scarce commodity as unsuitable for poultry. Established water quality guidelines required re-evaluation and modification to a standard suitable for this unique environment.

The hypothesis in this thesis is that current water quality guidelines are inadequate and need re-assessment. A new approach to the development of water quality guidelines for poultry production is needed.

This hypothesis was challenged by reviewing existing international water quality guidelines, which currently serve as the basis for water quality assessment for poultry production in South Africa. This entailed a survey of the water used by poultry producers and analysing the results of a number of trials, which tested inclusion levels of Fluoride, Sodium, Magnesium, Chloride, Sulphate, Nitrates, Calcium and Phosphorus.

A modelling procedure was used to establish a Water Quality Guideline Index System (WQGIS) for commercial poultry farmers in the RSA. This tool will enable maximum utilisation of a water source, by incorporating exposure time, species tolerance and ingestion rates into the model.