**Appendix 2** Deliberating divergent views on grouse management

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Actor** | **Frame used** | **Deliberation mechanism** |
| Conservationist 6 | Environmental frame:  *Brings up the impact on grouse breeding on peat quality, suggests payments for restricting numbers:*  *‘… at the moment we have an artificially high level of grouse on the moor. And it’s kept artificially high through a number of management techniques, which include predator control, include burning and it includes medicated grit. … As a result the peatland itself, the condition of it, is less good than optimum. … So the idea would be to make some kind of payment to keep grouse to an optimum density.’* | Cueing |
| Business 3 | Localisation frame:  *Contradicts by arguing that measuring grouse numbers locally is not feasible.* | Keying, Persuasive communication |
| Conservationist 5 | Environmental frame, localisation frame:  *Introduces the possibility of payment by results based on proximal measures of moor quality:*  *‘So you’re finding a way of effectively saying, your bog is in great nick and according to these proxies it’s delivering carbon, it’s delivering enhanced water quality, improved water flows, so you qualify.’* | Merging, Rational problem solving |
| Business 3 and 4 | Localisation frame:  *Explains that the quality of grouse moors depends on local conditions more than grouse numbers:*  *‘Some grouse moors are traditionally naturally good. Doesn’t matter which way the wind blows, how much rain you get, how much snow you get, they’ll come up good.’* | Amplifying |
| Conservationist 5 | Environmental frame, localisation frame:  *Suggests controlling cutting and burning as a solution instead of controlling grouse numbers.* | Amplifying, Rational problem solving |
| Business 3 | Contradicts on facts: Increased cutting can lead to higher grouse numbers:  *‘But that’s not like on outcomes of how many grouse you shot. If you cut more and you grow less, if you stop burning altogether and you cut more, you might have twice as many grouse, how would that work with you?’* | Break of interpretation, Rational problem solving |
| Conservationist 5 | Environmental frame:  *‘Ultimately it’s not so much about the number of grouse, it’s the condition of the bog. And if your outcome is an improved condition of the bog, that’s the key thing.’* | Amplifying, break of interpretation |
| All participants in the conversation | Environmental frame, localisation frame:  *All involved confirm this conclusion, reach agreement:*  *‘Business 3: I think that’s what we need to put our emphasis on, and not try and put it to the number of grouse.*  *Conservationist 6: I said, you know, it’s a thought that I haven't thought through, so that’s why we’re having the discussion. I think you’re right, I think maybe that’s not the way to go with the numbers of grouse, but it’s a starting point.*  *Conservationist 5: What we might find is you could have that enhancement in bog condition and still have loads of grouse.*  *Conservationist 6: Yes. Yes.*  *Business 3: Yeah, exactly. So if you have to segregate the condition of the bog and how many grouse is produced on that, want it totally, totally remote. You could be right.*  *Conservationist 5: Like I said, I don’t think the amount of grouse is relevant at all really, in terms of – that should be taken completely out of it.*  *Conservationist 8: There’s not a direct relationship between number of grouse and bog condition.*  *Business 3: No, there’s not.*  *Conservationist 8: There’s so many other factors.*  *Business 3: Exactly. So you take the number of grouse completely out. It’s the condition of the bog and what outcomes you’re getting from that improved condition of the bog, that is the key.*  *…*  *Facilitator: All right. That was a kind of unexpected consensus (laughter).’* | Amplification, rational problem solving |