

COUNCIL FOR SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH



Food Research Institute

EXPERIENCES IN THE APPLICATION OF HAACP TO TRADITIONAL
FOOD PROCESSING AT A SEMI-COMMERCIAL KENKEY
PRODUCTION PLANT IN ACCRA, GHANA

SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF FOOD MICROBIOLOGY

BY

AMOA-AWUA, W. K. A. ¹, NGUNJIRI, P. ², ANLOBE, J. ¹, KPODO, K. ¹, HALM, M. ¹,
AND JAKOBSEN, M. ³

¹ FOOD RESEARCH INSTITUTE

² KENYA INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

³ DEPARTMENT OF DAIRY AND FOOD SCIENCE, THE ROYAL VETERINARY AND
AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

2004

EXPERIENCES IN THE APPLICATION OF HACCP TO TRADITIONAL FOOD
PROCESSING AT A SEMI-COMMERCIAL KENKEY PRODUCTION PLANT IN
ACCRA, GHANA

Wisdom Kofi Amoa-Awua^{1*}, Phyllis Ngunjiri², John Anlobe¹, Kafui Kpodo¹, Mary Halm¹,
Mogens Jakobsen³

¹ Food Research Institute

Council for Scientific and Industrial Research,

P.O. Box M.20,

Accra.

Ghana.

² Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute

P.O. Box 30650,

Nairobi,

Kenya.

³ Department of Dairy and Food Science,

The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University,

Rolighedsvej 30,

DK-1958 Frederiksberg C,

Copenhagen.

Denmark.

Author to whom correspondence should be addressed;

W.K. Amoa-Awua, Food Research Institute, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research,

P.O. Box M.20, Accra, Ghana.

Tel: + 233 21 500451

Fax: + 233 21 500331

e-mail: wamoa@libr.ug.edu.gh.

1 **Abstract**

2

3 Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point was implemented at a traditional semi-commercial
4 plant for processing maize into Kenkey. The quality system was assessed for its effectiveness
5 over a two months period, involving evaluation of the resident microbiota in the air and on
6 the surface of processing equipment on three separate occasions, monitoring of Kenkey
7 production on two occasions and laboratory analysis of raw materials, intermediary and final
8 product on two separate occasions as a means of verification. Air sampling revealed a
9 population of aerobic mesophiles ranging between 23 and 45 cfu/min; and yeasts and moulds
10 between 12 and 16 cfu/min. The population of aerobic mesophiles on the surface of the
11 steeping tank between batch productions was between 3.1×10^5 and 1.3×10^6 cfu/g; count on
12 MRS between 4.6×10^5 and 5.7×10^5 cfu/g; and yeasts and moulds between 7.7×10^3 and 3.1
13 $\times 10^4$ cfu/g. The fermentation trough also recorded aerobic mesophilic population ranging
14 between 4.1×10^4 and 6.1×10^5 cfu/g; MRS counts between 2.1×10^3 and 5.0×10^6 cfu/g;
15 and yeasts and moulds counts between 2.6×10^3 and 8.4×10^3 cfu/g. The aerobic mesophiles
16 found at the plant included *Bacillus* spp., *Staphylococcus* spp. and *Micrococcus* spp. The
17 lactic acid bacteria population was composed of *Lactobacillus fermentum* and pediococci;
18 and the moulds *Aspergillus* spp., *Mucor* spp., *Penicillium* spp. and *Fusarium* spp. Very little
19 variation was observed between the monitoring results on the two separate occasions and they
20 all fell within the stipulated critical limit in each instance. Laboratory analysis showed the
21 presence of coliforms and *E. coli* in the steep-water on the first occasion of sampling but
22 could not be detected after 24 h of dough fermentation. Of the pathogens tested for on the
23 second occasion of sampling, *E. Coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Enterococcus*, *Salmonella*, and
24 *Vibro cholera* were not detected in any of the fermented maize dough and Kenkey samples
25 analysed. *Bacillus cereus* was found in the fermented dough but was not detected after

1 cooking into Kenkey. The level of total aflatoxin in the maize samples were 17.0 and 13.7
2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ and in the Kenkey samples 17.2 and 14.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$. Levels of aflatoxins in Kenkey
3 reported at the plant before implementation of HACCP ranged from 64.1 to 196 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$.

5 1. Introduction

7 Kenkey which is a cooked stiff porridge prepared from fermented maize dough, is a major
8 staple food consumed in Ghana. In recent years it has received extensive scientific research
9 at the Food Research Institute of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research in Ghana,
10 in collaboration with the Department of Dairy and Food Science, The Royal Veterinary and
11 Agricultural University, Denmark (Halm et al., 1993, 1996, 2004; Halm and Olsen 1996;
12 Jespersen et al., 1994; Kpodo et al., 1995, 2000; Kpodo 2003; Olsen et al., 1995; Hayford,
13 1998; Hayford and Jespersen, 1999; Hayford and Jakobsen, 1999; Hayford et al., 1999;
14 Annan et al., 2003a; 2003b; 2003c).

16 Initial studies by Halm et al. (1993) found the microbial population at the advanced stage of
17 maize dough fermentation to consist of lactic acid bacteria and yeasts dominated by an
18 obligately heterofermentative lactobacilli whose pattern of carbohydrate fermentation was
19 closely related to *Lactobacillus fermentum* and *Lactobacillus reuteri*. RAPD profiling by
20 Hayford et al. (1999) confirmed the dominant lactobacilli as *Lactobacillus fermentum*. The
21 study by Hayford et al. (1999) also showed the presence of several strains of *Lactobacillus*
22 *fermentum* based on DNA specific-probe hybridization. *Candida krusei* and *Saccharomyces*
23 *cerevisiae* were identified by Jespersen et al. (1994) as the dominant yeasts in Kenkey
24 fermentation based on phenotypic methods. These results were confirmed by Hayford and
25 Jakobsen (1999) and Hayford and Jespersen (1999) using whole cell DNA, PCR and REA

1 profiling. Hayford and Jespersen (1999) also showed the presence of four different *MAL*
2 genotypes within the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* group.

3
4 Annan et al. (2003a) identified a total of 76 aroma compounds in fermented maize dough by
5 GC-MS analysis including 21 carbonyls, 19 alcohols, 17 esters, 12 acids, a furan, 2 phenolic
6 compounds, an alkane and four unidentified compounds. GC-sniffing technique showed 46
7 compounds as contributing to the aroma of fermented dough.

8
9 In 1996, Kpodo et al. had identified mycotoxin contamination of maize as a major hazard in
10 kenkey production, and over an 18 months sampling period analysed twelve samples of
11 fermented maize dough from two kenkey production sites in Accra. They reported aflatoxin
12 levels ranging from 0.7 to 313 µg/kg, with seven of the samples containing more than 100
13 µg/kg aflatoxin.

14
15 Different strategies were devised by the CSIR-Food Research Institute to manage mycotoxin
16 contamination of maize and maize products in Ghana. (i) The relevant agencies were made
17 aware of the problem and there are programmes now which educate farmers on procedures
18 for handling and storing maize efficiently, in order to minimise contamination with moulds
19 and mycotoxin production. (ii) An HACCP system was also developed for the processing of
20 maize into fermented maize meal and Kenkey to assure the microbiological and
21 mycotoxicological safety of the products (Amoa-Awua et al. 1998). (iii) In collaboration with
22 the Institute of Hygiene and Toxicology, Karlsruhe, Germany and other institutions, microbial
23 species capable of degrading aflatoxins were isolated. (iv) Finally, starter cultures have also
24 been developed for use in Kenkey production based on their antimicrobial and probiotic
25 properties amongst other factors (Halm et al, 1996; Hayford 1998; Annan 2003b, 2003c).

1 In testing the effectiveness of the HACCP system developed, it was implemented at a
2 traditional semi-commercial Kenkey production plant in Accra after the plant had been
3 upgraded. The Kenkey plant, which is owned by a traditional processor, consists of a small
4 processing hall and a detached maize storage room as well as a milling room. It processes
5 about five tons of maize per week into fermented maize meal and Kenkey, and these are
6 retailed directly to the general public. This work was carried out to assess the effectiveness
7 and impact of the HACCP system at the plant by evaluating the resident microbiota on the
8 three separate occasions and carrying out laboratory analysis of raw materials, intermediary
9 and final products on two occasions over a two months period.

10

11 **2. Materials and methods**

12

13 *2.1. Determination of the microbiota in the air and on the surface of the steeping tank and* 14 *fermentation troughs*

15

16 The microbiota in the air and on the surface of the steeping tank and four fermentation
17 troughs were sampled on three separate occasions between batch productions within a period
18 of two months.

19

20 *2.1.1. Sampling of air*

21 Plate Count Agar (PCA Difco 0479-17-3, Difco Laboratories, Detroit, USA) and Malt Extract
22 Agar (Merck 5398, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) plates containing 100 mg chloramphenicol
23 (Sigma C-0378, Sigma Chemical Co, St Louis. MO, USA) and 50 mg chlorotetracycline
24 (Sigma C-4881) were exposed in the processing hall for 5 min. The lids were replaced and
25 the plates sent immediately to the laboratory for incubation at 30°C for 3 - 5 d.

1 2.1.2. *Swabs*

2 A sterile swab was dipped into sterile peptone water containing 0.1 % peptone (Difco 0118-
3 17, Becton Dickinson & Co, Sparks, USA) and 0.85 % NaCl with pH adjusted to 7.2 and
4 used to swab an area of 5 cm x 5 cm of the inner surface of either the steeping tank or a
5 fermentation trough and plunged into 10 ml of sterile peptone water in a test tube. Swabs
6 were taken from four different areas of the inner surface of the steeping tank and from four
7 different fermentation troughs. Swabs were placed in an ice chest and taken immediately to
8 the laboratory for analysis.

9

10 2.2. *Production of Kenkey*

11

12 On two separate occasions within a period of two months, Kenkey being produced at the plant
13 was monitored and also sampled for laboratory analysis. On each occasion, about 1.8 tons of
14 maize were washed and soaked in water in the steeping tank for 24 h. The steep-water was
15 drained off and the maize grains milled in a plate mill (Premiere-Lister, U.K.). The meal was
16 kneaded in lots of about 10 kg of dough with 3 l of water to make a dough of about 50 – 55%
17 moisture. The dough was packed in lots of about 50 kg per fermentation trough and
18 fermented for 48 h. After fermentation, one-third of the fermented dough was partially
19 cooked and mixed with the remaining uncooked dough into Aflata. The mixture was
20 moulded into balls, wrapped in maize husks and cooked for 3 h into kenkey.

21

22 2.2.1 *Monitoring of Kenkey production*

23 The monitoring procedure used was according to the HACCP Plan of Amoa-Awua (1998) for
24 Kenkey production shown in Table 1. This involved a visual examination of maize kernels,
25 water, steep-water, milled maize and maize husks. Maize kernels were assessed for their

1 extent of dryness by their shininess and crispiness. Steep-water and water for mixing dough
2 were visually examined for clarity and odour and pH by use of a pH strip. The milled maize
3 meal was visually examined for the presence of metal pieces, whilst fermenting maize dough
4 was examined for pH, odour and mould growth on the surface. Maize husks were visually
5 examined for discolouration and mould growth.

6

7 2.2.2 Verification of HACCP

8 Maize kernels, 0-h and 24-h steep-water, fresh dough, 24-h and 48-h fermented dough and
9 Kenkey were sampled on the two occasions that monitoring was carried out and analysed in
10 the laboratory for pH, titratable acidity, aerobic mesophilic count, yeasts and moulds count,
11 enumeration/detection of coliforms, *E. coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Bacillus cereus*,
12 *Enterococci*, *Salmonella* and *Vibrio cholera*.

13

14 2.3 Microbiological analysis

15

16 The four swab samples from the steeping tank were pooled together and shaken to dislodge
17 the microorganisms from the swabs. The four samples from the different fermentation
18 troughs were also pooled together. Each pooled swab sample was homogenised in a
19 Stomacher (Lab Blender, Model 4001, Seward Medical, London, England) for 30 s at normal
20 speed. For maize dough samples, 10 g were homogenized in 90 ml sterile diluent containing
21 0.1 % peptone, 0.8% NaCl, pH 7.2 using Stomacher (Lab Blender, Model 4001) for 30 s at
22 normal speed. From appropriate tenfold dilutions, aerobic mesophiles were enumerated on
23 Plate Count Agar (PCA Difco 0479-17-3) incubated at 30° C for 3 d. Lactic acid bacteria were
24 enumerated on deMan, Rogosa and Sharpe Medium (MRS, Merck 10660) incubated
25 anaerobically at 30° C using Anaerocult A (Merck) for 5 d. Yeasts and moulds were

1 enumerated on Malt Extract Agar (Merck 5398) added per 1000 ml, 100 mg chloramphenicol
2 (Chloramphenicol Selective Supplement Oxoid) and 50 mg chlortetracycline (Sigma
3 Chemical Co.) incubated at 25° C for 7 d.

4

5 *2.3.1 Isolation, characterization and identification of bacteria*

6 Colonies totalling about 20 from a segment of the highest dilution or suitable plate were
7 subcultured in the corresponding broth medium and streaked onto the agar substrate until pure
8 cultures were obtained. PCA isolates were characterised by cell morphology, Gram reaction
9 and catalase catalase test

10

11 *2.3.2. Identification of lactic acid bacteria*

12 Isolates on MRS were examined by Gram reaction, catalase production, oxidase test, aerobic
13 and anaerobic growth, colony and cell morphology. Gram-positive catalase-negative regular
14 rods, coccoid and cocci were examined by gas production in MRS broth (Merck 10661) with
15 Durham tube and also in MRS broth in which glucose was replaced with gluconate as sole
16 carbon source; growth at 10 °C and 45 °C, at pH 4.4 and 9.6, in 6.5 and 18% (w/v) NaCl; and
17 Hugh and Leifson's test (Hugh and Leifson, 1953). The species of isolates were identified by
18 determining their pattern of carbohydrate fermentation and comparing them to known
19 carbohydrate fermentation profiles (Kandler and Weiss 1986). Modified MRS-broth was
20 prepared from 10 g peptone (Oxoid L37, Oxoid, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England), 5 g yeast
21 extract (Difco,212750, Becton Dickenson and Co, Sparks, MD, USA), 1ml polyoxyethylene
22 sorbitan mono-oleate (Tween 80) (Merck Art 822187, Merck-Scuhardt, Schuhardt,
23 Hohenbrunn, Munich, Germany), 2 g K₂HPO₄ (Merck 4873.025, Merck, Darmstadt,
24 Germany), 5 g sodium acetate trihydrate (Sigma S-8625, Sigma Chemical Co, St Louis, MO,
25 USA) 2 g triammonium citrate (Aldrich 37,469.5, Aldrich Chemical Co Inc., Milwaukee, WIS,

1 USA), 0.2 g magnesium sulphate heptahydrate (Sigma M.1880), 0.05 g manganese sulphate
2 monohydrate (Merck 1.05963, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany), 1000 ml distilled water, 0.2 %
3 chlorophenol red, pH 6.2. A 10 % solution of 17 different carbohydrates all obtained from
4 Merck (amygdalin, arabinose, cellubiose, fructose, galactose, glucose, gluconate, lactose,
5 maltose, mannitol, melezitose, melibiose, raffinose, salicin, sorbitol, sucrose and trehalose)
6 was each filtered sterile and 4.5 ml of the modified MRS broth added to 0.5 ml of each
7 carbohydrate. Each broth containing a different carbohydrate was inoculated with the isolate
8 and incubated at 30 °C for 7 d. Fermentation of the carbohydrate was indicated by a change
9 in colouration from red to yellow as a result of acid production. By comparing the
10 carbohydrate fermentation profile of each isolate to known profiles (Kandler and Weiss,
11 1986) the species of the isolate was identified.

12

13 *2.3.3. Identification of yeasts*

14 Yeasts were examined by colony and cell morphology. Their pattern of fermentation and
15 assimilation of glucose, sucrose, raffinose galactose, maltose, lactose, trehalose, cellobiose,
16 xylose and meliobiose were determined according to Kreger-Van Rij (1984).

17

18 *2.3.4 Identification of moulds*

19 Moulds were identified by morphological characteristics according to Samson et al. (1994).
20 Isolates were inoculated at three points on Czapek Yeast Extract Agar (CYA) and Malt
21 Extract Agar (Merck 5398) incubated in the dark at 25 °C for 7 d. Czapek Yeast Extract Agar
22 contained g/l distilled water; 3.0, NaNO₃ (Merck 11,8598), 1.0, K₂HPO₄ (Sigma no P5504), 0.5,
23 KCl, 0.5, MgSO₄.7H₂O (Merck 11,5573), 0.01, FeSO₄.7H₂O (Merck 11,4006), 5.0, yeast
24 extract (Oxoid L21, Oxoid Ltd., Basingstoke, Hampshire, England), 30.0, sucrose (Sigma no
25 S9378) and 20.0, agar (Merck 1.01614), pH 6.5. The colony diameter was measured after 5 d

1 and colony characteristics observed. Morphological examination was carried out by staining
2 and wetting a piece of the mould on a microscope slide with lactophenol (Merck), squashing
3 the fruit bodies and teasing the mycelium to determine the general form of growth.

4 5 *2.3.5. Detection of indicator organisms and pathogens*

6 Coliform bacteria was detected according to NMKL 44 (1995). Enterococci were enumerated
7 according to NMKL 68 (1992). Coagulase positive Staphylococci were enumerated
8 according to NMKL 66 (1992). *Bacillus cereus* was determined according to NMK 67
9 (1996) using *Bacillus cereus* selective agar (Oxoid CM617). *Salmonella* was determined
10 according to NMKL 71 (1999). *Vibrio cholera* was determined according to NMKL

11 12 *2.4. Chemical Analysis*

13 14 *2.4.1. pH determination and titratable acidity*

15 Samples of dough weighing 10 g, were mixed with 90 ml distilled water and pH determined
16 with a pH meter (Crison pH meter, Crison Instrument, S.A. France). Titratable acidity was
17 determined by the titration of 80 ml of filtrate obtained from 10 g of dough dissolved in 200
18 ml distilled water, against 0.1N NaOH with 1% phenolphthalein. 1ml of 0.1N NaOH was
19 taken as equivalent to 9.008×10^{-3} g lactic acid.

20 21 *2.4.2. Determination of aflatoxins*

22 Aflatoxins were extracted based on the procedure of Pons (1979) as described by Kpodo et al.
23 (1994; 2000). Finely ground maize kernels, fermented dough or Kenkey were extracted with
24 methanol followed by precipitation of colour pigments using zinc acetate then extraction into
25 dichloromethane, with further clean-up by column chromatography using cellulose and silica

1 gel. Aflatoxins were eluted with dichloromethane:acetone (80:20 v/v), which was evaporated
2 off, and the residue quantitatively transferred into 10ml of HPLC-grade dichloromethane.
3 Five millilitres were evaporated to dryness under a stream of nitrogen, and the final residue
4 dissolved in 0.1-1.0 ml of HPLC mobile phase and used for HPLC analysis.

5
6 Aflatoxin standards were obtained from Sigma Chemical Co. Ltd (St Louis, MO, USA).
7 Standard stock and HPLC working solutions were prepared by evaporating and dissolving in
8 a mobile phase consisting of methanol, acetonitrile and water (10:30:60 v/v/v) to give
9 concentrations of 0.1 μ g/ml for aflatoxins B₁ and G₁ and 0.03 μ g/ml for B₂ and G₂. Reagents
10 used for HPLC separations were of HPLC grade (Merck Chemicals, Darmstadt, Germany).
11 All other chemicals and reagents were of analytical grade. Distilled and deionized water were
12 used throughout. All mobile phase solutions were filtered through a 0.45 μ m Millipore HV
13 disc filter. They were degassed prior to use through a Millipore filtration unit (Millipore
14 Corp. Bedford, MA, USA)

15
16 HPLC analysis for aflatoxins was by reversed-phase liquid chromatography with post-column
17 iodine derivatization. Separation of aflatoxins was carried out on a Spherisorb S5 ODS-1
18 column of dimension 25 x 4.6mm packed with 5 μ m particles (Phase Separations Inc.,
19 Norwalk, CT, USA) maintained at 35°C. The flow rate of the HPLC mobile phase was 1.2
20 ml/min and post-column iodine derivatization of aflatoxins B₁ and G₁ was achieved using
21 saturated iodine solution according to the procedure of Shepherd and Gilbert (1984). Iodine
22 was pumped at a flow rate of 0.4 ml/min using an Eldex precision metering pump (Eldex
23 Laboratories Inc., San Carlos, CA, USA). The derivatization tube consisted of stainless steel
24 tubing (5m x 0.3mm) maintained at 75°C. The excitation and emission wavelengths used

1 were 360 and 440 nm respectively. The aflatoxins were identified by their retention times,
2 and peaks areas were used to determine their concentrations in the samples by reference to
3 standard curves obtained by chromatographing pure aflatoxin standard solutions under
4 identical conditions.

5
6

7 **3. Results and discussion**

8

9 *3.1. Upgrading of the traditional Kenkey plant*

10 Kenkey was produced at the traditional processing plant by steeping maize in large plastic
11 drums in the courtyard for 2 d. After steeping, the grains were drained and milled in a plate
12 mill in a room detached from the small processing hall. The milled maize was kneaded with
13 water into a dough in wooden containers, and left in the processing hall to ferment for at least
14 48 h. Part of the fermented dough was cooked in the processing hall on an open fire using
15 firewood, and kneaded with the rest of the fermented dough into Aflata. The mixed dough
16 was kneaded into balls, wrapped with maize husks, and cooked into Kenkey on the open fire
17 in the processing. In upgrading the traditional plant, the small processing hall was renovated,
18 the walls painted, and the open windows covered with a nylon mesh to keep away flies and
19 other flying insects. A large soaking tank was constructed in the processing hall using cement
20 blocks lined with white porcelain tiles. This replaced the metal drums used to steep maize
21 kernels in the courtyard. Large aluminium containers for fermenting maize dough were
22 constructed and placed on metal shelves erected in the processing hall. Two large gas stoves
23 were constructed to replace the traditional tripod firewood stoves.

24
25

3.2. Implementation of HACCP

HACCP was implemented at the plant based on the system described by Amoa-Awua et al (1998). The staff were given adequate training before implementation of HACCP. After six months the system was audited and corrective actions taken.

3.3. The resident microbiota at the Kenkey production plant

The micropopulation on the surface of the steeping tank, fermentation trough and in the air at the Kenkey production plant sampled on three separate occasions over a two months period are presented in Table 2. The micropopulation of aerobic mesophiles in the air ranged from 23 to 45 cfu/min, on the surface of the steeping tank from 10^5 to 10^6 cfu/ml, and in the fermentation trough from 10^4 to 10^5 cfu/ml. The population of the aerobic mesophiles in all instances were dominated by Gram-positive, catalase-positive rods which bore phase bright spores and were assumed to be *Bacillus* spp. The population of aerobic mesophiles also contained glucose fermenting Gram-positive aerobic cocci which were catalase positive and occurred in pairs or clusters, were non-motile and non-sporing and were suspected to belonged to the genus *Staphylococcus* or *Micrococcus*.

The resident microbial population enumerated on MRS incubated anaerobically were found at levels of 10^5 cfu/g on the surface of the steeping tank and 10^3 to 10^6 cfu/g on the surface of the fermentation trough (Table 2). The cultures were mostly Gram-positive, catalase-negative, oxidase-negative regular fermentative rods, which produced gas from glucose and were considered to be lactic acid bacteria. The most frequently occurring rods fermented arabinose, fructose, galactose, glucose, gluconate, lactose, maltose, melibiose, raffinose, sucrose and

1 trehalose and were tentatively identified as *Lactobacillus fermentum*. *Lactobacillus*
2 *fermentum* had previously been isolated from the plant by Halm et al. (1993) as the dominant
3 lactic acid bacteria responsible for the fermentation of maize dough. The micropopulation on
4 MRS also contained Gram-positive, catalase negative cocci that did not produce gas from
5 glucose and occurred in pairs and tetrads, and were suspected to be pediococci. Halm et al.
6 (1993) had isolated *Pediococcus pentosaceus* and *Pediococcus acidilactici* in the flora of
7 fermented maize dough produced at the Kenkey plant.

8

9 The population of yeasts and moulds in the air at the plant were between 12 and 16 cfu/min,
10 on the surface of the steeping tank between 7.7×10^3 and 3.1×10^4 cfu/g and on the
11 fermentation troughs between 2.6×10^3 and 8.4×10^3 cfu/g. Cultures isolated on Malt Extract
12 Agar (Merck 5398) from the steeping tank and fermentation troughs, consisted of yeasts and
13 moulds based on their cell and colony morphologies. The yeasts were similar in colony and
14 cell characteristics to dominating yeasts isolated from fermenting maize dough at the plant in
15 a previous study (Jespersen et al., 1994) and were tentatively identified as *Saccharomyces*
16 *cerevisiae* and *Candida krusei* based on their patterns of carbohydrate fermentation and
17 utilisation (results not shown).

18

19 Various types of moulds were isolated from the air and the surfaces of the steeping tank and
20 fermentation troughs. One type of mould attained a size of 4.5 cm on MEA after 5 d at 25 °C
21 and had black conidiophores with a radiate black conidial head, floccose smooth-walled
22 conidiophore stipes, globose to subglobose vesicle and conidia, septate metulae and an
23 unbranched tall sporulating structure. These moulds were tentatively identified as *Aspergillus*
24 *niger*. A second type of mould which was whitish to cream in colour, also attained a diameter
25 of 4.5 cm, and had branched conidiophores with slender mono and poly phialides, floccose

1 aerial mycelium, one celled micro-conidia produced in false heads in the aerial mycelium,
2 three to five slightly sickle shaped macro-conidia and was tentatively identified as *Fusarium*
3 *subglutinans*.

4

5 A third type of mould which was tentatively identified as *Mucor racemosus*, was fast growing
6 forming a dense mycelium mat which covered the whole MEA plate in 7 d at 25 °C. It had
7 white hyphae with both short and tall branched smooth-walled ellipsoidal to subglobose
8 sporangiophores, the short branches sometimes recurved with encrusted walls. The sporangia
9 hyaline became brownish to grey with age and the collumella was ovoid or ellipsoidal,
10 slightly pyriform with truncated base. Another type of mould isolated, grew very rapidly on
11 MEA appearing as a dense mat when sporulating and covered the agar plate within 7 d. The
12 colonies which were cottony white, became dark grey with age. Smooth-walled globose,
13 ovoid or irregular shaped unbranched sporangiophores rose directly from stolons without
14 rhizoids and the sporangia were globose or subglobose, whilst the columella was ovoid or
15 globose. This type of mould also produced asexual spores and had a single septa which
16 separated the mycelium from the sporangium, and was tentatively identified as *Rhizopus*
17 *oryzae*. The last type of mould isolated, was tentatively identified as *Penicillium citrinum*. It
18 attained a size of only 1.5 cm after 5 d growth on CYA and had dense felt conidiophores
19 which appeared leathery and blue green, with a pale yellow colony reverse. The
20 conidiophores were smooth walled with divergent metulae, and the phialides were flask
21 shaped. The conidia, which were produced in columns, were globose to subglobose, smooth
22 walled or finely rough hyaline to greenish.

23

24 The population of the different types of moulds found in the air and on the surfaces of the
25 steeping tank and the fermentation trough are presented in Table 3. Isolation of various

1 moulds in the air sample and from the surfaces of the two equipment examined, was not
2 surprising. This is because in Ghanaian households, fermented maize dough is usually seen
3 covered with moulds which are scrapped off before the dough is used. Jespersen et al (1994)
4 isolated *Penicillium*, *Aspergillus* and *Fusarium* species from raw maize, but during the maize
5 dough fermentation, the initial high counts of 10^5 cfu/g were reduced to less than 10^2 cfu/g
6 within 24 h.

7

8 *3.4 Monitoring of the processing of maize into Kenkey*

9

10 The results of monitoring carried out during the production of Kenkey on the two separate
11 occasions are presented in Table 4. Visual assessment of maize used for Kenkey production
12 on both occasions, indicated that the maize supplied was of satisfactory quality since it did
13 not contain discoloured grains and was very crispy and shiny. This suggested that on both
14 occasions, the maize was fairly well inspected before it was purchased.

15

16 The washed maize contained many pieces of broken cobs and chaff, and had therefore not
17 been adequately dry cleaned and sorted. The use of such inadequately cleaned maize is
18 expected to have an adverse effect on the organoleptic but not the microbiological quality of
19 the product. Pipe borne water used for steeping maize on both occasions was clear, odourless
20 and had almost a neutral pH. It was therefore suitable for the production of good quality
21 Kenkey.

22

23 Steeping was carried out successfully on both occasions, since there was a drop in pH to
24 levels indicating rapid growth of lactic acid bacteria and conditions not favourable for the

1 proliferation of spoilage microorganisms. This was confirmed by the absence of offensive
2 odour in the 24-h steep-water.

3
4 The grinding plates of the mill used to mill the steeped maize were in good condition and no
5 metal pieces broken off the grinding plates were found in any of the milled products. In both
6 dough fermentations, the final pHs attained were below 4 indicating successful fermentations.
7 The doughs had no offensive smell to indicate proliferation of spoilage microorganisms. The
8 Kenkey on both occasions were cooked by boiling for 3 h.

10 3.5. *Verification of the quality of maize, intermediary products and Kenkey*

11
12 Results of laboratory analysis of samples taken on the two separate occasions during Kenkey
13 production are presented in Table 5. The verification results confirmed that Kenkey had been
14 produced on both occasions within the critical limits for the production of microbiologically
15 safe Kenkey. Steeping was assessed in the first batch production only and by the end of
16 steeping, coliforms including *E. coli* were detected in the steep-water indicating faecal
17 contamination. The likely source of contamination could have been the maize or water used,
18 or from the hands of the processors. Maize dough analysed on both occasions, showed that
19 the final pH attained in each case was close to the optimal value of 3.7. At that low pH value,
20 spoilage organisms and pathogens were not expected to survive the fermentation, and indeed
21 the coliforms including *E. coli*, found in the steep-water in the first batch, were not detected
22 in 10 g of sample at the end of fermentation. In the second batch production, coliforms were
23 detected at 24 h of fermentation but could not be detected in 10 g of dough by the end of
24 fermentation. *E. coli* was not detected in this dough at all.

1 The lowering of pH during maize dough fermentation, correlated with the production of lactic
2 and acetic acids as expected. The percentage of titratable acid produced in both fermentations
3 were between 1.44 and 1.5%. These were within the range of 1.4-2% stipulated as the critical
4 limit for maize dough fermentation during kenkey production (Halm et al., 1996; Amo-
5 Awua et al., 1998). In both dough fermentations there was an increase in the population of
6 aerobic mesophiles enumerated on Plate Count Agar (PCA Difco 0479-17-3) from a level of
7 10^7 to 10^8 cfu/g. In the second batch, a more extensive analysis was carried out to determine
8 the presence of some indicator organisms and pathogens in the fermented dough. Of the
9 pathogens investigated, only *Bacillus cereus* was found present and had a population of 100
10 cfu/g. No counts in cfu/g were obtained for *E. coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and enterococci,
11 and neither *Salmonella* nor *Vibrio cholera* were found in 25 g of sample.

12

13 Three hours of cooking Kenkey on both occasions, was sufficient to render the product
14 microbiologically sterile, and no growths were obtained on Plate Count Agar (PCA Difco
15 0479-17-3) and Malt Extract Agar (Merck 5398). *Bacillus cereus* which was found in the
16 second fermented dough was not detected in the Kenkey produced. It could be concluded that
17 three hours of cooking was sufficient to destroy even the spores of the *Bacillus* species. *E.*
18 *coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, enterococci and *Salmonella* were not found in any of the Kenkey
19 samples. The Kenkey produced on the two occasions were therefore microbiologically safe
20 and any threat of food intoxication would be the result of poor finished product handling
21 during retailing.

22

23 The main hazard in Kenkey making is the presence of aflatoxin if contaminated maize is used
24 (Kpodo et al. 1995). On the first occasion of sampling, the total aflatoxin content in the
25 maize kernels was 17.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ and on the second occasion 13.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$. The Codex

1 Alimentary standard for aflatoxins in maize is set at 15 ppb (FAO, 1995) and this was
2 exceeded slightly on the first but not on the second occasion. The total aflatoxin content of
3 Kenkey samples collected on the two occasions were 17.2 and 14.7 µg/kg. Earlier studies
4 carried out at this same plant before implementation of HACCP, reported aflatoxin levels in
5 fermented maize meal ranging from 17.9 to 313 ug/kg and in kenkey samples from 64.1 to
6 196 ug/kg. This study was carried by Kpodo et al (1995) over an 18 months period.
7 Therefore, with the implementation of HACCP at the plant which necessitated the changing
8 of the maize supplier, the problem of aflatoxin contamination of Kenkey is being better
9 managed by discriminate purchase of maize, better storage and handling of maize at the plant,
10 and adherence to the principles of HACCP. However, it is necessary for inspection of maize
11 during purchasing to be more stringent to ensure compliance to the critical limits set for
12 aflatoxins at 10 ppb in the HACCP Plan (Amoa-Awua et al. 1998).

13

14 *3.6. Impact of the quality system at the Kenkey Production Plant*

15

16 The monitoring and verification results showed that processing operations were fairly
17 standardised at the traditional semi-commercial Kenkey production plant, at least during the
18 period of evaluation. Little variations were observed in the monitoring and verification
19 results on the two separate occasions. A major factor which affected the organoleptic quality
20 of the Kenkey produced, was the absence of a suitable equipment for cleaning and sorting
21 maize kernels. The maize kernels were cleaned manually using sieves of two different sizes,
22 but because of the relatively large volumes of maize handled, the traditional processors were
23 unable to do this effectively. An unexpected consequence of the upgrading of the plant and
24 implementation of HACCP, was the temptation of the traditional processors to increase the
25 volume of maize which was processed in a batch. This was because the clientele of the plant

1 increased several fold. The plant owner rather than adhere strictly to the parameters which
2 had been laid down, tended to increase the output of the plant to take advantage of the
3 additional clientele to the disadvantage of plant hygiene and the HACCP system, since this
4 led to spillage of maize dough and other materials due to space limitations. This issue was
5 discussed at great lengths with the plant owner but not much progress was made. One could
6 argue that HACCP had been 'imposed' on the traditional plant owner as part of a project
7 rather than the plant owner haven't realised the need to have such a quality system in place at
8 the plant. This emphasises the need for unwavering commitment to HACCP by management
9 of companies implementing the system, and this was the main obstacle to the success of
10 implementing HACCP at the level of traditional food processing in Ghana.

11

12 With the experiences acquired, the CSIR-Food Research Institute build its own Kenkey pilot
13 plant as a model for transferring technology. The plant is installed in a small processing hall
14 measuring 12.8 m by 7.6 m. The objective of the design is to permit an orderly flow of
15 material through the plant, give enough elbow room for processing and cleaning and to
16 prevent/minimise cross contamination of processing materials. The limiting factor in
17 designing the plant layout was the space which was available, since the plant was installed in
18 a hall which had already been put up.

19

20 The processing hall is divided into a main hall, a milling room, a fermentation room and a
21 cooking section. This layout reduces noise pollution by the plate mill due to its seclusion in a
22 milling room. The partitioning of the processing hall, also minimises the possibility of cross
23 contamination of materials during processing. The plant consists of a weighing scale, a maize
24 cleaning and sorting machine, a washing trough, a rinsing trough, four steeping tanks, a plate
25 mill, 20 small plastic fermentation containers, a walk-in cabinet dryer and four gas stoves.

1 Apart from Kenkey, dehydrated fermented maize meal is also produced at the plant by drying
2 fermented maize meal at 60 °C in the walk-in dryer. The product obtained is shelf stable for
3 more than six months as compared to the wet fermented maize meal sold in the local markets
4 which have a shelf life of less than a week.

6 **4. Conclusion**

7
8 This work has demonstrated the possibility of integrating a quality system into traditional
9 food processing in the African context. HACCP proved an effective system which could
10 address some of lapses experienced in traditional food processing which lacks the
11 sophistication of a modern food processing factory. It could be implemented at minimal cost
12 depending on simple techniques and equipment such as visual inspections, pH strips,
13 thermometers and timing of unit operations such as cooking. Implementation of HACCP
14 drastically reduced the levels of aflatoxins which had been recorded at the traditional plant,
15 but for effective maintenance of the system, the commitment of the plant owner and
16 traditional processors to the system is crucial.

19 **Acknowledgement**

20
21 The authors acknowledge the various projects involving the Food Research Institute of the
22 Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Ghana and the Department of Dairy and Food
23 Science, The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University of Denmark which have made the
24 studies on Kenkey fermentation possible and led to the development and implementation of
25 the HACCP system. These are (i) Capability Building for Research into Traditional

1 Fermented Food Processing in West Africa, funded by DANIDA, (ii) U STD 3 project on
2 Capability Building for Research and Development in Quality Assurance and Fermentation
3 Technology for Traditional African Fermented Foods and (ii) EC INCO-DC project on
4 'Biological Degradation of Aflatoxins in Fermented Maize and Sorghum products.

5

6 **References**

7

8 Amoa-Awua, W.K.A., Halm, M. and Jakobsen, M. 1998. HACCP System for African
9 Fermented Foods: Kenkey. ISBN: 87-90737-03-2, World Association of Industrial and
10 Technological Research Organisations, Taastrup, Denmark.

11 Annan, N.T., Poll, L., Plahar, W.A., Jakobsen, M. 2003a. Aroma characteristics of
12 spontaneously fermented Ghanaian maize dough for kenkey. *Eur. Food Res. Technol.*
13 217, 53 – 60.

14 Annan, N.T., Poll, L., Sefa-Dedeh, S., Plahar, W.A., Jakobsen, M. 2003. Volatile
15 compounds produced by *Lactobacillus fermentum*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and
16 *Candida krusei* in single starter culture fermentations of Ghanaian maize dough. *J.*
17 *Appl. Microbiol.* 94, 462 – 474.

18 Annan, N.T., Poll, L., Sefa-Dedeh, S., Plahar, W.A., Jakobsen, M. 2003. Influence of starter
19 culture combinations of *Lactobacillus fermentum*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and
20 *Candida krusei* on aroma in Ghanaian maize dough fermentation. *Eur. Food Res.*
21 *Technol.* 216, 377 – 384.

22 FAO. 1995. Worldwide regulations for mycotoxins. 1995: A compendium. FAO, Rome.

23 Halm, M., Lillie, A., Sorensen, A.K. and Jakobsen, 1993. M. Microbiological and aromatic
24 characteristics of fermented maize doughs for kenkey production in Ghana. *Int. J.*
25 *Microbiol.* 19, 135-143

- 1 Halm, M., Olsen, A. 1996. The inhibitory potential of dominating yeasts against moulds in
2 maize fermentation. In: M Halm and M Jakobsen eds. Fermented food processing in
3 Africa. pp 33-39.
- 4 Halm, M., Osei-Yaw, A., Kpodo, K. and Amoa-Awua, W.K.A. 1996. Experiences with the
5 use of starter culture for the fermentation of maize. World J. Biotech. Microbiol.
6 19,135-143.
- 7 Halm, M., Amoa-Awua, W.K.A. and Jakobsen, M. 2004. Kenkey, an African fermented
8 maize product. In: *Handbook on fermented foods and beverages science and*
9 *technology* eds Hui, Y.H., Toldra, F., Nip, W.K. and Goddickl. Marcel Dekker, New
10 York. In press.
- 11 Hayford, A,E.. 1998. Characterization of the dominant microbiota of Ghanaian maize
12 fermentation (kenkey). PhD thesis. The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University
13 Denmark
- 14 Hayford, A,E., Jespersen, L. 1999. Characterization of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains
15 from spontaneously fermented maize dough by profiles of assimilation, chromosome
16 polymorphism, PCR and *MAL* genotyping. J Appl Microbiol 86, 284-294.
- 17 Hayford, A,E., Jakobsen, M. 1999. Characterization of *Candida krusei* strains from
18 spontaneously fermented maize dough by profiles of assimilation, chromosome profile,
19 polymerase chain reaction and restriction endonuclease analysis. J Appl Bacteriol 87,
20 29-40.
- 21 Hayford, A.E., Petersen, A., Vogensen, F.K., Jakobsen, M. 1999. Use of Conserved
22 Randomly Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) Fragments and RAPD Pattern for
23 Characterization of *Lactobacillus fermentum* in Ghanaian Fermented Maize Dough.
24 Appl Environ Microbiol 65, 3213-3221.

- 1 Hugh, R. and Leifson, E. 1953. The taxonomic significance of fermentation versus oxidative
2 metabolism of carbohydrates by various gram negative bacteria. *J. Bacteriol.* 66, 24-26.
- 3 Jespersen, L., Halm, M., Kpodo, K., Jakobsen, M. 1994. Significance of yeasts and moulds
4 occurring in maize dough fermentation for 'Kenkey' production. *Int J Food Microbiol*
5 24: 239-248.
- 6 Kandler, O, Weiss 1986. Gram positive rods. In: Sneath, P.H.A., Mair, N.S., Sharpe, M.E.,
7 Holts, J.G. (Eds), *Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology*, vol. 2. Williams and
8 Wilkins, Baltimore, pp 1105-1139.
- 9 Kpodo, K., Sorensen, A.K. and Jakobsen, M. 1996. The occurrence of mycotoxins in
10 fermented maize products. *Food Chem.* 56, 147-153.
- 11 Kpodo, K., Thrane, U, Hald, B. 2000. Fusaria and fumonisins in maize from Ghana and their
12 occurrence with aflatoxins. *Int. J. Food microbial.* 61,147-157.
- 13 Kpodo, K. 2003. *Fusarium species and fumonisins in maize and fermented maize products*
14 *in Ghana. Ph.D thesis. University of Ghana.*
- 15 Kreger-Van Rij, N.T. (1984). *The yeast taxonomy study.* 3rd ed. Elsevier . New York.
16 pp.1082–1084.
- 17 Olsen, A., Halm, M., Jakobsen, M. 1995. The antimicrobial activity of lactic acid bacteria
18 from fermented maize (kenkey) and their interactions during fermentation. *J Appl*
19 *Bacteriol* 17: 506-512.
- 20 Pons, W.A. 1979. High pressure liquid chromatographic determination of aflatoxins in corn.
21 *J. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem.* 62, 586 – 594.
- 22 Shepherd, M.J., Gilbert, J. 1984. An investigation of HPLC post-column iodination
23 conditions for the enhancement of aflatoxin B1 fluorescence. *Food Addit. Contam.* 1,
24 325 – 335.

- 1 The Nordic Committee on Food Analysis. 1995. NMKL Method No 44. Coliform bacteria.
2 Detection in foods.
- 3 The Nordic Committee on Food Analysis. 1992. NMKL Method No 66, 2nd ed.
4 *Staphylococcus aureus*. Determination in foods.
- 5 The Nordic Committee on Food Analysis. 1996. NMKL Method No 67. *Bacillus cereus*.
6 Determination in foods.
- 7 The Nordic Committee on Food Analysis. 1992. NMKL Method No 68. *Enterococcus*.
8 Determination in foods.
- 9 The Nordic Committee on Food Analysis. 1991. NMKL Method No 71. *Salmonella*
10 bacteria. Detection in foods.
- 11 The Nordic Committee on Food Analysis. NMKL Method N *Vibrio cholera*. Detection in
12 foods.

Table 1. HACCP Control Plan for the processing of maize into Kenkey (Amoa-Awua et al., 1998)

PROCESS STEP CCP	HAZARD	CONTROL MEASURE	CRITICAL LIMITS	MONITORING PROCEDURE	CORRECTIVE ACTION
MAIZE CCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mycotoxins: Aflatoxins Citrinin fumonisins ▪ Foreign materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Purchase good quality material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ppm aflatoxins ▪ 13.0% moisture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual inspection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reject raw material and inform supplier
STEEPING CCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spoilage and pathogenic micro-organisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clean water ▪ pH control to desired level ▪ keep hands off 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transparent, clear, odourless and colourless ▪ pH 4.2+ 0.1 ▪ Keep hands off. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual inspection ▪ Use of pH strips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boil water ▪ Educate ▪ Steep longer
DOUGH FERMENTATION CCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mycotoxins ▪ Spoilage and pathogenic micro-organisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adherence to fermentation time ▪ Cover dough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Titratable acidity: Lactic: -1.4-2% Acetic:0.18-0.23% ▪ Volatile/Non volatile acid ratio about 0.16 ▪ pH not > 3.9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual inspection ▪ Use of pH strips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If fermentation is slow backslop with old dough
PACKAGING CCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mycotoxins in maize husks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Selection of non-mouldy maize husks ▪ Good Hygiene 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ free from moulds ▪ >.....ppm aflatoxins 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual inspection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reject
COOKING CCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residual mycotoxins in kenkey; ▪ Aflatoxins ▪ Citrinin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate cooking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ not less than 3 hrs cooking ▪ > 10 ppb of aflatoxins 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recording of time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heat longer
KENKEY Final product			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ >100 cfu/g of foreign bacteria (non LAB) ▪ >100 cfu/g of moulds ▪ >10 ppb of aflatoxins 		
CLEANING CCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contamination with spoilage and pathogenic micro-organisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good housekeeping and personal hygiene ▪ Maintenance of equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clean premises, processing equipment and vessels and processing staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual inspection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clean premise, hall equipment and vessels ▪ Clean factory coats ▪ Wash hands ▪ Use gloves

Table 2. Microbial population in the air and on processing facilities at the Kenkey production plant

Date	Sampling area	Count on microbiological media		
		Plate Count Agar	MRS Agar	Malt Agar
06/01/03	Sampling of air*	23 cfu/min	No plating	12 cfu/min
	Steeping tank	8.0×10^5 cfu/g	5.1×10^5 cfu/g	7.7×10^3 cfu/g
	Fermentation trough	1.0×10^5 cfu/g	1.1×10^5 cfu/g	2.6×10^3 cfu/g
01/02/03	Sampling of air	45 cfu/min	No plating	12 cfu/min
	Steeping tank	3.1×10^5 cfu/g	4.6×10^5 cfu/g	1.9×10^4 cfu/g
	Fermentation trough	4.1×10^4 cfu/g	2.1×10^3 cfu/g	8.4×10^3 cfu/g
28/02/03	Sampling of air	45 cfu/min	No plating	16 cfu/min
	Steeping tank	1.3×10^6 cfu/g	5.7×10^5 cfu/g	3.1×10^4 cfu/g
	Fermentation trough	6.1×10^5 cfu/g	5.0×10^6 cfu/g	3.0×10^3 cfu/g

* Exposure of Plate Count Agar plate for 5 min.

Table 3. Population of different species of moulds isolated at the Semi-commercial Kenkey Production Plant

Date of sampling	Sampling area	Species of mould isolated	Count in cfu/g
03/05/02	Sampling of air*	<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	3 cfu
		<i>Mucor spp.</i>	1
		<i>Penicillium spp.</i>	2
	Steeping tank	<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	2.0×10^3
		<i>Aspergillus paraciticus</i>	1.0×10^3
		<i>Fusarium spp</i>	2.0×10^3
		<i>Rhizopus spp</i>	2.0×10^3
	Fermentation trough	<i>Mucor spp</i>	1.0×10^3
		<i>Penicillium citrinum</i>	1.0×10^3
09/05/02	Sampling of air	<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	4
		<i>Mucor spp</i>	1
		<i>Penicillium spp.</i>	3
	Steeping tank	<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	3.0×10^3
		<i>Fusarium spp</i>	2.0×10^3
		<i>Mucor spp</i>	2.0×10^3
	Fermentation trough	<i>Mucor spp</i>	10
		<i>Penicillium citrinum</i>	10
		<i>Rhizopus spp</i>	20
15/05/02	Sampling of air	<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	7
		<i>Aspergillus paraciticus</i>	5
		<i>Mucor spp</i>	2
		<i>Penicillium spp.</i>	2
	Steeping tank	<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	2.4×10^3
		<i>Fusarium spp</i>	4.0×10^2
		<i>Mucor spp</i>	5.0×10^2
		<i>Penicillium citrinum</i>	7.0×10^2
	Fermentation trough	<i>Fusarium spp</i>	40
<i>Mucor spp</i>		20	
<i>Penicillium citrinum</i>		60	

* Exposure of Plate Count Agar plate for 5 min

Table 4. Results of monitoring Critical Control Points at the Semi-commercial Kenkey Production Plant in Accra: Visual characteristics and approximate pH of maize and intermediary products during Kenkey production.

Monitoring criterion	First batch	Second batch
<i>Maize</i>		
Discoloured grains	Nil	Nil
Extend of dryness	Very crispy	Very crispy
<i>Steep water</i>		
<u>0 h</u>		
pH	7	7
Clarity	Clear	Clear
Odour	Odourless	Odourless
<u>24 h</u>		
pH	4	4
<i>Dough fermentation</i>		
<u>0 h</u>		
Surface of dough	No visible mould growth	No visible mould growth
pH	5	5
<u>24 h</u>		
Surface of dough	No visible mould growth	No visible mould growth
pH	4	4
<u>48 h</u>		
Surface of dough	No visible mould growth	No visible mould growth
pH	>4	>4

Table 5. Results of verification of HACCP at the Semi-commercial Kenkey Production Plant in Accra: Chemical and microbiological analysis of maize, Kenkey and intermediary products during processing

Test	First batch	Second batch
<i>Maize</i>		
Aflatoxin	17.0 µg/kg	12.7 µg/kg
<i>Steep water</i>		
<u>0 h</u>		
pH	7.48	nd
Aerobic mesophilic bacteria (cfu/ml)	5.9×10^2	nd
Coliforms	Not detected	nd
<u>24 h</u>		
pH	3.96	nd
Aerobic mesophilic bacteria (cfu/ml)	1.2×10^8	nd
Coliforms	Present	nd
<i>E. coli</i>	Present	nd
<i>Dough Fermentation</i>		
<u>0 h</u>		
pH	4.71	4.54
Aerobic mesophilic bacteria (cfu/g)	nd	1.1×10^7
Aflatoxin	22.6 µg/kg	nd
<u>24 h</u>		
pH	3.93	3.97
Titratable acidity (%)	1.44	1.46
Aerobic mesophilic bacteria (cfu/g)	5.6×10^7	1.7×10^6
Yeasts and moulds (cfu/g)	3.4×10^5	5.2×10^6
Coliforms	Not detected	Present
<i>E. coli</i>	Not detected	Not detected
Aflatoxin	30.3 µg/kg	nd
<u>48 h</u>		
pH	3.73	3.75
Titratable acidity (%)	1.41	1.47
Aerobic mesophilic bacteria (cfu/g)	1.4×10^8	2.6×10^8
Yeasts and mould (cfu/g)	9.4×10^4	
Coliforms	Not detected	Not detected
<i>E. coli</i>	nd	0 cfu/g
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	nd	0 cfu/g
<i>Enterococcus</i>	nd	0 cfu/g
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	nd	100 cfu/g
<i>Salmonella</i>	nd	not found in 25 g
<i>Vibro cholera</i>	nd	not found in 25 g
Aflatoxin	36.4 µg/kg	nd
<i>Kenkey</i>		
pH	3.73	3.70
Aerobic mesophiles	No growth*	No growth
Yeast and moulds	No growth	No growth
Coliforms	Not detected	Not detected
<i>E. coli</i>	nd	0 cfu/g
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	nd	0 cfu/g
<i>Enterococcus</i>	nd	0 cfu/g
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	nd	0 cfu/g
<i>Salmonella</i>	nd	not found in 25 g
<i>Vibro cholera</i>	nd	not found in 25 g
Aflatoxin	20.3 µg/kg	14.5 µg/kg

nd = not determined,

*no growth on appropriate 10^{-2} agar plate