Dedication

Verily, my prayer, my sacrifice, my living and dying are for Allah, the Lord of the Worlds

To my beloved mother and to the memory of my late father

To my relatives

And all members of my family for support and encouragements

Fatima

Acknowledgements

The present dissertation would not have been possible without the help and support of many people. My profound appreciation to Dr Salwa Mansour Abdel hameed my supervisor whose encouragements, and efforts helped me to achive the goals of conducting this research. Great thanks to my co-supervisor Dr Shadia Abdel Atti.

I am grateful to Prof. Dr. F. Liebert for his valuable support and supervision of my lab work at Institute for Animal Nutrition and Animal Physiology at George-August-University, Gottingen, Germany. I am also grateful to DAAD (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst) for the financial support of this work.

My sincere thanks to Germany Embassy in Khartoum, especially to Suzan Al Gadi for her advice. Many thanks to Dr. Michael Hoppert and Helma Kateel in the lab at Gottingen University, who helped me so much in learning the microscopic technique and showed me a different approach working in the lab. Also my thanks to Miss Hiltrud Marbell the secretary of institute.

I am indebted to Dr. Sayda Mahgoub for her advice and great support during doing part of this work at Seed Center of the Forestry Research Center. Also my thanks to Suleiman El Bagir Ahmed, the senior technician of the lab of Seed Center who had always helped me to do the test of germination. Special thanks to Dr Amal Omer for her help. I wish to thank Dr. Mohammed Tag AL Deen for his advice regarding the Statistical analysis. My grateful thanks to all the members of Wildlife Conservation General Administration at Dinder National Park for their help and assistance.

My grateful appreciation to my Mother who had long lonely evenings when I was sitting in the lab and who always believed in my work.

I am deeply grateful to Gahda and Asma "I finally finished my Master!" and to all my family.

Many thanks for my colleagues and students in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Sciences, Sudan University of Science and Technology, Collage of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Production.

Abstract

This study was conducted in Dinder National Park (D.N.P.) during the dry season 2004 (March, April and May). Waterbuck (Kobus defassa), warthog (Phacochoerus aethiopicus) and tiang (Damaliscus korrigum) are among the large herbivores in D.N.P were chosen for this study. Mayas (meadows) habitat are used by these herbivores during the dry season when forage quality and quantity are generally low. Samaaya and Gererrisa mayas were chosen for the study of tiang. Abdel Ghani, Ein El Shames and Samaaya mayas were chosen for studying warthog. Abdel Ghani, Ein El Shames and Musa mayas were chosen for studying waterbuck.

The objectives of this study are to determine the botanical composition of the diets of the three herbivores by Microhistological Analysis of fecal samples and to examine the role of the three animals in relation to the distribution of the preferred forage plants in the different habitats. Through the test of germination of undigested seeds being separated from fecal samples of the herbivores. The plant and fecal samples were collected from the above mentioned mayas. Herbarium specimen had been collected and the unknown plant species were identified in Wildlife Research Center and the Herbarium of the Forestry Research Center. Because tiang is an endangered species, few pellets were found and collected from Samaaya maya. Only 18 animals were seen during this study.

Analysis of fecal samples indicated that the three herbivores grazed on wide range of species (Mixed diet) from preferred habitats.

Tiang foraged on 35 (mostly forbs) forage plants. The forbs showed highest percentage (44.02%) in total diet of tiang. The major plant species selected by tiang from Samaaya maya were *Achyranthes sp*, *Hibiscus sp*, *Dichrostachys glomerata* and *Beckeropsis sp*.

Warthog ate 46 plants. The woody plants are the major components of the diet of warthog. Ein El Shames maya provide 51.95% of its food and Abdel Ghani maya provide 39.55%. In Samaaya maya, the major components in the diet of warthog are grasses (40.29%). The major forage plants selected by warthog from three mayas were *Achyranthes sp, Dichrostachys glomerata*, *Ziziphus spina-christi* and *Echinochloa sp*.

Waterbuck ate 67 plant species. The total diet of waterbuck showed the highest percentage of grasses (50.90%) from Musa maya. While the diet from Abdel Ghani maya, the forbs made the highest percentage (51.61%). The woody plants showed the highest percentage (42.46%) from Ein El shames maya. *Achyranthes sp, Achyranthes aspera, Tribulus terrestris, Dichrostachys glomerata, Rottboelia exaltalt* and *Echinochloa sp* were the major forage plant consumed by waterbuck.

Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient was used to test the variation in diet composition between the four mayas and the three herbivores. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to test the herbivores selectivity of the available forage plant in the mayas or the surroundings.

All herbivores showed a significant rank order correlation but not in all months. Warthog versus tiang showed significant correlation in May at the level ($P \le 0.01$) from Samaaya maya. Although warthog versus waterbuck showed significant correlation between mayas. Ein El Shames maya showed significant rank order correlation during May, while Abdel Ghani

maya showed significant correlation during April, both at the level (P \leq 0.05).

The diet of the three herbivores in the four mayas showed high significant correlation at the level $(P \le 0.05)$ and level $(P \le 0.01)$.

Forage plants that were recovered from the fecal samples of tiang and warthog, in Samaaya maya showed no significant correlation with the forage plants estimated by quadrates. Although warthog in Abdel Ghani and Ein El Shames mayas and waterbuck in Abdel Ghani, Ein El Shames and Musa mayas were significantly correlated (P < 0.05).

The processes of the digestive systems of the herbivores have positive effect on seed germination. This may result from complex herbivores-specific interactions between animal behaviors (chewing) and seeds characteristics (size, seeds coat, shape). Seeds of *Acacia nubica*, *Acacia seyal* and *Piliostigma reticulatum* that were separated from the fecal samples of waterbuck showed a highly increased rate of germination above the control. *Acacia polycantha* and *Sesbania sesban* showed decreased rate of germination below the control. The germination rate of *Acacia siberiana* showed no positive effect (zero) versus the control. The germination rate of the seeds of *Ziziphus-spina-christi* remained more or less above control 53% and 50% respectively.

The germination of seeds of *Ziziphus spina-christi* from fecal samples of warthog showed a higher increased rate of germination. The results of this study confirmed that the three wild herbivores are grazers, but they shift their diets towards forbs, woody plants and fruits of leguminous trees during the dry season. They depend on the mayas for their diets, but they select other plant species from the surrounding. Therefore the waterbuck, tiang and warthog have great role in the dispersal of seeds of forage plants

in their habitats. This study provides the information regarding the food habits and the feed requirements of these wild herbivores. Such information might help in the management of the habitat (Mayas) and the wild herbivores in D.N.P.

ملخص الدراسة

هذه الدراسة أجريت بمحمية الدندر الاتحادية خلال فترة الصيف للعام 2004 (مارس، ابريل و مايو). وجد أن الكتمبور (Kobus defassa) ، الحلوف (Phacochoerus aethiopicus) و التيتل (Damaliscus korrigum) من العشبيات التي تستخدم الميعات بمحمية الدندر إذ تشكل بيئة الميعات منطقة هامة لهذه الحيوانات خلال فترة الصيف حيث تتخفض كمية ونوعية النباتات العلفية عموماً.

تم اختيار ميعتا سمعاية و قريريصة لدراسة التيتيل واختيرت ميعة عين الشمس ، ميعة عبد الغنى و ميعة سمعاية لدراسة الحلوف بينما اختيرت ميعة عبد الغنى ، ميعة عين الشمس وميعة موسى لدراسة الكتمبور لوجود هذه الحيوانات دوماً في هذه الميعات .هدفت هذة الدراسة لتحديد مكونات وجبات الحيوانات الثلاثة وكذلك دور هذه الحيوانات وعلاقتها بانتشار النباتات المفضلة لها في بيئاتها المختلفة.

تم استخدام تقانة مايكروهستلوجيا (Microhistological analysis) النبات لمعرفة مكونات وجبة هذه الحيوانات وذلك من خلال روث هذه الحيوانات و اختبار اثر هذه الحيوانات على إنبات البذور التي تم عزلها من روثها. تم قياس التردد للنباتات الموجودة في تلك الميعات المذكورة أعلاه لمعرفة الأنواع النباتية المتواجدة في الميعات و مدى اعتماد هذه الحيوانات عليها أو على أنواع نباتية أخرى توجد حول هذه البيئات. كما تم جمع عينات للنباتات الغير معروفه وتم تصنيفها في معشبة مركز بحوث الحياة البرية و معشبة الغابات بسوبا.

توصلت الدراسة إلى أن هذه الحيوانات تفضل رعى أنواع معية ومتنوعة من النباتات في بيئة الميعات. حيث وجد أن حيوان التيتل يرعى 35 نوعاً من نباتات المرعى. وقد شكلت الأعشاب نسبة 44.02% في وجبة التيتل من ميعة السمعاية. بينما وجد أن شيليني معاك Dichrostachus) ، البامية الخلوية (Hibiscus sp.) ، البامية الخلوية (Beckeropsis sp) و الموريب (glomerata). هي النباتات المفضلة للتيتل في ميعة السمعاية.

بينما الحلوف يفضل 46 من النباتات حيث شكلت النباتات العشبية اعل نسبة في غذاء الحلوف في ميعة عين الشمس (51.95 %) و ميعة عبد الغنى بنسبة 39.55 % بينماشكلت الحشائش (40.29 %) المكون الرئيسي لغذائه في ميعة سمعاية.

وجد أن الكداد (Dichrostachys glomerata) ، شيليني معاك (Dichrostachys glomerata) ، الضريسة الاركلة (Achyranthes aspera) ، خشم النسيبة (Echinochloa sp) ، الضريسة (Ziziphus) ، أبو بليلة (Rottboelia exaltala) و السدر (spina-christi) هي النباتات المفضلة للحلوف في الميعات المذكورة أعلاه .

وجد أن الكتمبور يرعى 67 نوعاً من أنواع النباتات الرعوية حيث شكلت الحشائش أعلى نسبة (50.90%) في غذاء في ميعة موسى ، بينما شكلت الأعشاب نسبة (51.61% في غذاء الكتمبور في ميعة عبد الغنى وأظهرت النباتات العشبية أعلى نسبة (42.46%) في ميعة عين الشمس. والنباتات المفضلة للكتمبور في الميعات المذكورة أعلاه تشمل خشم النسيبة (Achyranthes sp) ، شيليني معاك (Achyranthes sp) ، الضريسة (Achyranthes aspera) ، الكداد (Dichrostachys glomerata) ، أبو بليلة (Echinochloa sp) ، أبو بليلة (Echinochloa sp).

أظهر التحليل الاحصائى بأن هنالك علاقة مباشرة بين معدل النباتات التي ظهرت في روث هذه الحيوانات وتركيبية النباتات العلفية في بعض الميعات الأربعة بينما لم تكن هنالك نفس العلاقة في ميعات أخرى ولذلك فإن قدرة هذه الحيوانات لاختيار النباتات العلفية من الميعات أو البيئات المجاورة لها تعتمد على استساغة الحيوانات لتلك النباتات. في ميعة السمعاية وجد أن النباتات العلفية الموجودة في روث التيتل و الحلوف لم تتطابق مع نسبة وجودها في الميعة. ألا

أن الحلوف في ميعه عين الشمس، ميعة عبد الغنى و الكتمبور في ميعة عبد الغنى، ميعة عين الشمس وميعة موسى تطابقت نسبة وجود النباتات العلفية مع نسبة وجودها في روثهما.

نجد أن معدلات الإنبات للبذور غير المهضومة للكتمبور و الحلوف أظهرت تأثيراً إيجابياً في إنباتها نتيجة لمراحل عملية هضم الحيوانات لبذور هذه النباتات مع خصائصها (حجم البذرة، غطاء البذرة، شكل البذرة) التي تتغذى عليها هذه الحيوانات.

لقد وجد أن بذور اللعوت (Acacia nubica) ، الطلح (Acacia seyal) و الخروب البذور الباتها أعلى من إنبات البذور (Pilostigma reticulatum) من روث الكتمبور كانت نسبة إنباتها أعلى من إنبات البذور غير المعاملة بينما استجابة إنبات بذور الكاكاموت (Acacia polycantha) والسيسبان (Sesbania sesban) أقل من إنبات البذور غير المعاملة. كما أن اثر الكتمبور على إنبات بذور الكوك (Acacia siberiana) و السدر (Ziziphu spina-christi) ضعيف. بينما أظهر الحلوف أثرا واضحاً في إنبات بذور السدر المفصولة من روثه بنسبه أعلى من إنبات البذور غير المعاملة (Control).

خلصت الدراسة إلى أن هذه الحيوانات خلال فترة الجفاف لا تعتمد على نبات معين واحد فان وجبتها تتكون من عدد كبير من نباتات مشكله من الحشائش ، نباتات عشبية و ثمار أشجار أي أنها وجبه مختلطة (Mixed feed). تعتمد هذه الحيوانات على النباتات الموجودة في الميعة المعينة و البيئة حول الميعة. وقد اتفقت هذه النتائج مع دراسات أخرى أثبتت أن الحيوانات البرية تعمل على سد النقص في قيمة غذائها أثناء فترة الصيف بتناول نباتات وثمار أخرى.

كما خلصت الدراسة إلى إن الكتمبور، الحلوف و التيتل تلعب دوراً كبيراً في نشر وتوزيع بذور النباتات في بيئاتها المختلفة. من الممكن أن تساعد نتائج هذه الدراسة في إدارة بيئات الميعات وتحسين المرعى لتوفير غذاء هذه الحيوانات وحمايتها في محمية الدندر الاتحادية.

List of Contents

| Dedication | I |
|------------------|------|
| Acknowledgement | II |
| Abstract English | |
| IV | |
| Abstract Arabic | VII |
| List of contents | X |
| List of Tables | XII |
| List of Figures | XIII |

| Chapter One | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Introduction | | |
| 1 | | |
| | | |
| Objectives | | |
| 4 | | |
| Chapter Two | | |
| 2.1. Study area | | |
| 5 | | |
| 2.1.1 Historical background | | |
| 5 | | |
| | | |
| 2.1.2. Climate | | |
| 6 | | |
| 2. 1.3. Topography and soil | | |
| 7 | | |
| 2.1.4. Vegetation ecosystem | | |
| 7 | | |
| 2.2. Mayas | | |
| 9 | | |
| 2.2.1. Young mayas | | |
| 10 | | |
| 2.2.2. Mature mayas | | |
| 11 | | |
| 2.2.3. Old mayas | | |
| 11 | | |
| 2.3. Fauna and avifauna | | |
| 13 | | |
| Chapter Three | | |
| Literature Review | | |
| 15 | | |

| 3.1. Fecal analysis | |
|--|----|
| 17 | |
| 3.2. Feed selection | |
| 21 | |
| 3.3. Ecology of studied herbivores | |
| 23 | |
| 3.3.1. Waterbuck | |
| 23 | |
| 3.3.2. Tiang | |
| 26 | |
| 3.3.3. Warthog | |
| 27 | |
| 3.4. Relationships between animals and forage plants | 28 |
| | |
| Chapter Four | |
| Materials and Methods | |
| 42 | |
| 4.1. Vegetation sampling and assessment | |
| 42 | |
| 4.2. Fecal sampling and investigation | |
| 43 | |
| 4.3.1. Isolation, assessment and germination of undigested seeds | 45 |
| | |
| 4.5. Statistical analysis | |
| 45 | |
| Chapter Five | |
| Results | |
| 46 | |
| 5.1. Vegetation samples | |
| 46 | |
| 5.2. Diet composition of herbivores | |
| 47 | |
| | |

| 5.2.1. Tiang | |
|---|-----|
| 47 | |
| 5.2.2. Warthog | |
| 51 | |
| 5.2.3. Waterbuck | |
| 61 | |
| 5.3. Relationship between animal and forage plants | |
| 71 | |
| 5.4. Relationship between animal distribution and seed dispersal. | 78 |
| | |
| Chapter Six | |
| Discussion | |
| 82 | |
| Conclusions and Recommendation | |
| 91 | |
| References | |
| 95 | |
| Appendix (1) List of National Park in the Sudan | 119 |
| | |
| | |
| | |

List of Tables

| Table | Title | Page. |
|-------|-------|-------|
| No. | | No |

| 1 | The frequency of plants samples in the four mayas of D.N.P | 46 |
|----|---|----|
| | during dry season 2004. | |
| 2 | Botanical composition (%) of diet of tiang from Samaaya maya during dry | 48 |
| | season 2004. | |
| 3 | Botanical composition (%) of diet of warthog in the three mayas, D.N.P | 53 |
| | during dry season 2004. | |
| 4 | Botanical composition (%) diet of waterbuck from the three mayas in D.N.P during dry season 2004. | 63 |
| 5 | Spearman's rank order correlation for the major plants occurring in the | 73 |
| | herbivore's diet in the four mayas of D. N. P., during dry season 2004. | |
| 6 | Spearman's rank order correlation for the major plants occurring in the | 74 |
| | herbivore's diet in the three mayas of D. N. P., during dry season 2004. | |
| 7 | Pearson's rank order correlation for the major plants occurring in | 75 |
| | herbivore's diet in the three mayas of D. N. P. Sudan, 2004. | |
| 8 | Number of seed / 27 kg and / kg of pellets of waterbuck during dry | 79 |
| | season, 2004 from mayas in D. N. P. | |
| 9 | Number of seed / 10 kg and / kg of pellets of warthog during dry season, | 79 |
| | 2004 from mayas in D. N.P. | |
| 10 | Germination of different seed species of plant separated from pellets of | 80 |
| | warthog collected from D.N.P during dry season, 2004 from mayas in | |
| | D.N.P against their control. | |
| 11 | Germination of different seed species of plant separated from pellets of | 80 |
| | warthog collected during dry season 2004 from mayas in D.N.P against | |
| | their controls. | |
| 12 | Germination rate (%) of the soft, medium and hard seeds coat separated | 81 |
| | from fecal samples of waterbuck and warthog and control collected from, | |
| | D.N .P 2004. | |
| | | |

List of figures

| Fig. | Title | Page No |
|------|-------|---------|
| | | |

| No. | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | The percentage of forage plants in the diet composition of tiang from Samaaya | 49 |
| | maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 2 | The mean percentage of grasses, forbs, sedges and woody plants in the diet | 50 |
| | composition of tiang from Samaaya maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 3 | The percentage of forage plants in the diet composition of tiang from Samaaya | 55 |
| | maya during dry season 2004 .D.N.P. | |
| 4 | The mean percentage of grasses, sedges, forbs and woody plants in the diet | 56 |
| | composition of warthog from Samaaya maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 5 | The percentage of forage plants in the diet composition of warthog from Abdel | 57 |
| | Ghani maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 6 | The mean percentage of grasses, forbs, sedges and woody plants in the diet | 58 |
| | composition of warthog from Abdel Ghani maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 7 | The percentage of forage plants in the diet composition of warthog in Ein El | 59 |
| | Shames maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 8 | The mean percentage of grasses, forbs, sedges and woody plants in the diet | 60 |
| | composition of warthog in Ein El Shames maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 9 | The percentage of forage plants in the diet composition of waterbuck in Ein El | 65 |
| | Shames maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 10 | The mean percentage of forbs, grasses, sedges and woody plants in diet composition | 66 |
| | of waterbuck in Ein El Shames maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 11 | The percentage of forage plants in the diet composition of waterbuck in Musa | 67 |
| | maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 12 | The mean percentage of grasses, forbs, sedges and woody plants in the diet | 68 |
| | composition of waterbuck in Musa maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 13 | The percentage the forage plants in the diet composition waterbuck in Abdel Ghani | 69 |
| | maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |
| 14 | The mean percentage of grasses, forbs, sedges and woody plants in the diet | 70 |
| | composition waterbuck in Abdel Ghani maya during dry season, 2004 D.N.P. | |