

Graph 21: Comparison of the test weight per province over two seasons

The nutritional component analyses, namely crude protein, - fat, - fibre and ash are reported on a dry/moisturefree basis (db) for the current as well as the three previous surveys. For comparison purposes the national 'as is' basis results are provided in Table 3. These 'as is' values were calculated using the weighted national average values.

Table 3: Comparison of weighted average nutrional component values ona dry and 'as is' basis over four seasons								
Season	2014/2015		2013/2014		2012/2013		2011/2012	
Moisture, % (17hr, 103°C)	7.0		7.1		7.2		6.8	
Moisture basis	Dry basis	As is						
Crude protein, %	39.89	37.10	39.84	37.01	40.63	37.70	39.42	36.74
Crude fat, %	19.3	17.9	19.7	18.3	18.8	17.4	18.7	17.4
Ash, %	4.64	4.32	4.66	4.33	4.65	4.32	4.62	4.31
Crude fibre, %	6.4	6.0	6.1	5.7	-	-	-	-
No. of samples	150		150		150		100	

The weighted average crude protein content this season was 39.89%, comparing very well with the 39.84% of the previous season. Mpumalanga showed the highest weighted average crude protein content of 40.44% and Limpopo the lowest of 36.16%. The weighted average crude fat percentage decreased from 19.7% in 2013/2014, to 19.3% this season. The samples from Limpopo had the highest weighted average crude fat content of 23.6%. The lowest average fat content was observed in Gauteng with 18.9%.

The national weighted average ash content did not vary significantly over the four seasons that this survey has been conducted, 4.64% this season compared to the 4.66% 4.65% and 4.62% for the previous three seasons. Samples from the Northern Cape and Limpopo tend to show higher ash contents over seasons. The weighted average percentage crude fibre varied from 4.9% in Limpopo to 7.5% in the Northern Cape. The RSA weighted average was slightly higher this season (6.4%), compared to 6.1% the previous season.

Graphs 22 to 25 on page 14 provide comparisons between provinces for the above mentioned components.

A summary of the RSA Soybean Crop Quality averages of the 2014/2015 season compared to those of the 2013/2014 season, is provided in Table 4 on page 15.

All fifteen samples tested for genetic modification (GM), tested positive for the presence of the CP4 EPSPS trait (Roundup Ready^{*}). Please refer to the results in Table 5 on page 16 of this report.

Please see pages 17 to 24 for the average soybean quality per region.