namely, Dega, Woina Dega and Kola which account for about 11%, 27% and 62% of the total area, respectively.

browses, home le over, a ermaths and supplements were the major feed resources for sheep and goat in the current study area. However the dominant feed resources in the area was di er among the season. During dry season major feed resources were categorized under local fodder trees and browses which are evergreen, crop residues, and a ermaths and other supplements with their indices value; 0.196284, 0.23571, 0.125946, 0.112044 respectively. However sometimes prolonged drought may cause the decrements of local browse and fodder trees in their quantity and nutritional quality. e availability of the feed resources listed in the above could also vary among two agro ecologies. During dry season the crop residues were ranked were ranked 1st with indices values of 0.2459 followed by local fodder trees and other browses with index value of 0.2546 in midland agro ecology. Whereas during wet season natural pasture was ranked as 1st indices value of 0.278 and 0.283 for low land and mid land agro-ecologies respectively. is result was in line with Samson et al., [7] for jig-jiga zone Ethiopian Somali region, Tekleyohannes et al., [8] for Bena-tsemay and Hamer districts of south Omo zone southern Ethiopia, and Felekech et al. [9] for central ri valley of Ethiopia and Mulugeta et al., [10] for Tahtay Koraro district Northern Ethiopia.

[illegible]

About 85% of respondents witnessed that season are one of the major factors which determine availability of livestock feed in quality and quantity. . Since the animals of tropics and sub-tropics majorly rely on the feed resources from communal grazing land, natural pasture, and range lands, seasonal variations has signi cant e ect in the productivity of rangelands. us, availability in quantity and quality is di ering from season to season. is was also holds true for the current study area in which availability of feed vary from season to season even month to month (Table 2).

Chemical composition and invitro dry matter digestibility of the major feeds for goats' in study area was presented in Table 3. e results revealed that the DM content of major feeds in study area was ranged from 88.36% for *Grewia .F* to 97.02% for *Balanites Aeg ptiaca* (Table 3). e result also showed that DM content of leaf of *Balanites Aeg ptiaca* was 96.02% which was comparable with the result of Nigatu [11] which was 95.2% for the same study District. According to the current ndings the CP for *Terminalia Brwonii* was recorded to be 17.38% (Table 3), which was slightly higher than the previous ndings of Muluken et al. [12]; 16.6% for north eastern dry lands of Ethiopia. is might be due to eco-type di erences of the study areas. e dry matter of *Terminalia Brwonii* was 94.02% which was also slightly higher than the nding of above author (92.64%). is could also be due to eco-type di erences of the browse tree. e crude protein content of *Terminalia Brwonii*, *Balanites Aeg ptiaca* and *Str chnos* ranges between(16.08% to .nd qualu16respectively (Table 3).

tree fruit leaves of *Balanites Aeg ptiaca* e was also used as feed for goats. is indicates that the leaf from those browse trees had higher CP content from natural pasture and other crop6residues irrespective (regardless16of season. e high amount of CP might allow chance for them as supplementary feeds with low quality feeds from natural pasture and crop6residue. e NDF contents of the major feeds vary between 37.97% in *Balanites Aeg ptiaca* to 59.2% in natural pasture

e ADL content *Terminalia Brownii was* slightly higher than the result of Muluken et al., [12] for North Eastern Ethiopia which was 7.29%. is might be due to eco-type di erences with the browse species. e same author reported that nitrogen content of *Terminalia Brwonii* was 16.6% which is slightly lower than current result which was 17.38%. is could be due to ecotype di erence with the species. e current nding also revealed that the NDF, ADF and ADL result of *Terminalia Brwonii* browse was 42.97%, 29.12% and 11.64%, respectively which was comparable with ndings of Nigatu [11].

Table 4 indicates the major feeding practices of sheep and goats in the study area. e major feeding practices of sheep and goats in the study area were free grazing and browsing in communal grazing lands, herded grazing on road side and marginal areas of farm lands and tethering. During dry season an overall feeding practices in the study area were 48.12%, 5.17%, 44.09%, were free grazing, tether feeding and herded grazing, respectively Table 4. On the other hand during wet season an overall feeding system of small ruminants in the study area were 28.92% free grazing, 8.5% tether feeding, and 59.25% herded grazing, respectively Table 4.

e feeding practices and feeding system of the small ruminants in the study area were signi cantly di erent among season P<0.05). ere is the variation among agro-ecologies and seasons on application those

Conflict of Interest

Authors declared that they have no conflict of interests.

References

1. Jimma A, Tessema F, Gemiyo D, Bassa Z (2016) Assessment of Available Feed Resources. Feed Management and Utilization Systems in SNNPRS of Ethiopia. J Fish Livest Prod 4(3): 1-9.
2. Tolera A, Merkel RC, Goetsch AL, Sahlu T, Negesse T (2000) Nutritional constraints and future prospects for goat production in East Africa. In: Opportunities and Challenges of Enhancing Goat Production in East Africa, A conference held at Awassa College of agriculture, Debub University pp: 10-12.
3. Chernet TF (2012) On-farm phenotypic characterization of goat genetic resources in Bench Maji zone, southwestern Ethiopia.
4. Yisehak K, Janssens GP (2014) The impact of Feed supply and Requirement on productivity of Free-Ranging Tropical Livestock Units: Links of multiple Factors.
5. Van Soest PV, Robertson JB, Lewis BA (1991) Methods for dietary ýber, neutral detergent ýber, and nonstarch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. J Dairy Sci 74(10): 3583-3597.
6. Tilley JMA, Terry DR (1963) A two-stage technique for the in vitro digestion of forage crops. Grass Forage Sci 18(2): 104-111.
7. Samison H, Abdo M, and Keýyalewu G (2017) Identiýcation and Nutritional Characterization of Major Sheep and Goats Feed Resource in Jigjiga Zone, Ethiopia Somali Regional State. World Appl Sci J 35 (3): 459-464.
8. BerhanuT, Abebe G, Thingtham J, Tusdri S, Prasanpanich S (2017) Availability of feed resources for goats in pastoral and agro-pastoral districts of South Omo Zone, Ethiopia. Int J Res Granthaalayah 5(3): 154-160.
9. Lemecha F, Thiengtham J, Tudsri S, Prasanpanich S (2013) Survey of goat feed sources and supplements in central rift valley of Ethiopia. Agric Nat Resour 47(5): 712-719.
10. Berihu M, Berhane G, Gebrechiristos S (2015) Feeding and management practices of free range goat production in Tahtay Koraro district northern Ethiopia. Am J Soc Manag Sci 6(2): 40-47.
11. Dejene N (2017) Assessment of production and marketing systems, and on-farm evaluation of the e ect of supplementation with Balanites aegyptica and maize grain on fattening performance and economic return of indigenous goats in Gamogofa zone.
12. Girma M, Animut G, Assefa G (2015) Chemical composition and in vitro organic matter digestibility of major indigenous fodder trees and shrubs in Northeastern drylands of Ethiopia. Livest Res Rural Dev 27(2): 26.
13. Funte S, Negesse T, Legesse G (2009) Feed resources and their management systems in Ethiopian highlands: The case of Umbulo Whaco watershed in Southern Ethiopia. Trop Subtrop Agroecosystems 12(1): 47-56.
14. Kocho TK (2007) Production and marketing systems of sheep and goats in Alaba, Southern Ethiopia.