**Appendix 1**

**Representative quotes and example of views for each frame**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Frame: definition** | **Quote** | **Views**  |
| **Interaction frame:** |  |  |
| Collaboration frame: strong willingness to achieve shared aims across different interests and approaches. | *Estate 1: ‘People were so willing to be there and to talk about it.’**Farmer 3: ‘It was good that everybody was trying to achieve the same objectives. Whereas before you felt it was a bit confrontational, nowadays everybody seems to be trying to do the best we can. And I think the farmers understand what the conservationists are trying to do now and we're trying to work together really.’* *Farmer 2: ‘There were many different old-fashioned groups who have different interests in the upland. And actually, in the main they more or less all seem to be on the same page, everybody seems to have fairly similar goals in what they wanted to see come out of the uplands and all working together, so I was quite heartened by everybody views.’* *Business 4: ‘It's very good to have that opportunity to hear and see and meet other people over what is, essentially, the same aims and objectives but coming at it from a different perspective.’*  | *We should work together to achieve our shared goals.* |
| **Issue frames:** |  |  |
| Environmental frame: focus on environmental concerns | *Conservationist 5: ‘If this is about securing the environment going forward, then my concern would be that if you moved towards that model, that will not necessarily be good for biodiversity.’* *Conservationist 7: ‘Is there a possibility of giving a payment for keeping a lower level of grouse, a lower density of grouse, managed on the Uplands and the peatlands. Because that could potentially have biodiversity benefits, and it could potentially have carbon storage benefits. … And from a restoration point of view it makes sense to me if there’s somewhere AONB could actually contribute into that as well.’* *Farmer 1: ‘You’ve got to have your dry heath, acid grassland, some limestone grassland, some grassland has [0:04:40] on it, you need all those different habitats to maintain the full diversity of species. So each of them needs to be valuable in its own right because we will end up going the wrong route if we work everything towards blanket bog even if its sequestration of carbon is greater than the other types of habitats.’* * *Conservationist 1: ‘So, yeah, grazing is important for the biodiversity.’*
 | *This model (scenario) is undesirable because it does not support biodiversity.**We must consider the biodiversity and carbon storage effects of grouse numbers and density.**Mosaic habitat is desirable because it supports biodiversity.* |
| Economic frame: focus on economic and financial concerns | *Conservationist 8: ‘The big question is, how the heck do we do that, how do we resource it, how do we get the money coming in to make sure that we can protect what we’ve got and make it even better.’* *Farmer 2: ‘It’s got to then encourage people to go into it because if they look at it and think, “Well, it’s barely worth the money for the hassle and management.**Conservationist 8: ‘We’re lacking that kind of economic analysis as far as I’m aware. I know Defra have put out a piece of work recently, they’ve gone to tender to invite people to do a lot more of this economic analysis that’s needed to try and put those natural capital values onto some of these things. … it’s more a reflection of true cost of management and benefit to society. So it’s that blend of actual natural capital ecosystem services accounting plus real life management costs.’* | *Financial funds are a major concern for restoration.**We need financial incentives for peatland management.**We need a thorough economic analysis of peatland management.* |
| Localisation frame: zooming in, emphasising the need to take into account local differences and knowledge and to find local solutions | *Estate 1: ‘I’ve circled a bit on your plan here which says high intensity grazing, little change in vegetation composition, I think that’s probably not quite right. … it’s very site-specific. You know, there’s areas that have gone to zero grazing, there’s been zero grazing for ten years and it’s not any better than it was ten years ago. In fact, it’s probably a lot, lot worse. And there’s other areas that probably have been overgrazed in the past that are recovering and there’s everything in between. … So I don’t think there’s a one-size-fits-all in terms of sheep per hectare.’* *Conservationist 1: ‘There’s got to be some areas where grazing can be removed and it won’t impact biodiversity, but there’s also a lot of areas where it certainly would.’**Farmer 3: ‘It’s getting away from the prescriptive, because things like cutting dates that apply to the North Pennines, this one’s a national scheme so it applies to the whole of the country. We need it localised so that we can have a different cutting date and times. And more flexibility. There’s nothing worse than a farm when you can't cut before, it’s either July the 15th is the earliest, or later in some cases, and you’ve got a really good spell of weather. You need some sort of flexibility where in the circumstances for one years you can cut that field early**…it’s that local input, even each field’s different, that’s why you want to work with local people that come onto the farm.’* | *Particular peatland areas do not fit into the general grazing scheme.**Grazing supports biodiversity only in certain areas.**Cutting dates and times need to be flexible to meet local conditions.* |
| Global frame: zooming out to take a national or international perspective  | *Conservationist 8: ‘People are obviously always going to want the higher payments, but then that’s going to have to be offset against, okay, if we applied that at a regional, national level, it’s going to cost the country this much money. Can the Exchequer afford it?’* *Conservationist 6: ‘From the global climate change perspective and the fact that we’re trying to protect the carbon resource: you know there is an argument that I can see potentially happening at a national level, for a change of policy as far as wind farms are concerned, and other renewable energy, in these areas, particularly if they’re not being supported for farming.’**Estate 2: ‘I’m not in favour of reintroducing Lynx … and all this sort of thing. I think you know there’s a reason why they’re not there now, you know it won’t work. It didn’t work in Germany, now Germany has a big issue. They had a huge march in Berlin recently and all the farmers went in and complained about the wolves, you know, moving on to their sheep. And you can see what’s going to happen, it’s going to happen here if we do the same thing.’*  | *We need to consider what peatland management would cost at a national level.**Due to national climate change policies, wind farms may in the future be allowed in the Pennines.**The example of wolves in Germany should teach us not to reintroduce predators.* |
| Holistic frame: focus on the need to take into account a broad range of interacting issues | *Estate 2: ‘It goes back to the holistic approach though, if you’re only looking at one factor, … you say: well, if you stop burning completely … the peat’s going to start quicker. Or if you take sheep off completely, this little bit’s going to improve. But you forget about all the other stuff that affects it, whether it’s biodiversity, whether it’s the economics of the site and you have to look at it as a whole and find the balance between all the different interests.’* *Conservationist 5: ‘Any threat to that farming community potentially threatens the rich environment, so it’s how do we actually secure the farming community and enable them to carry on doing the stuff that they do which will benefit the environment whilst recognising that from an economic perspective they’re in a very challenging place?’* *Farmer 1: ‘They all interact with each other. You can’t consider any vegetation habitat type or area of farm in isolation. The whole lot inter-reacts and if you tinker with that, it affects the others. … their production of food produce, you know, the sheep enterprise and the cattle enterprise on the hill farm, the production of the environmental public goods is equally important and none of them will stand up without the other. You know, they’re all interlinked.’* | *If you control only one factor, such as burning or grazing, you neglect other factors, such as economics and biodiversity.**Protecting the farming community supports environmental protection.**Vegetation habitats, food production, and environmental public goods are interlinked. Changing one affects the others.* |
| Framing to the public: perceived need to use the right language to justify policies to the public | *Conservationist 8: ‘And the public perception is: ‘All trees are good’. A lot of the public don’t understand some of these subtleties we’ve been talking about. Oh, if you’re planting a tree, it must fab for the environment mustn’t it, and so that’s where we’ve got to be quite careful. Some people view these upland areas as just wastelands, good for nothing, and put some trees on it, it must be fab.’* *Farm 1: ‘Public money has to be used well and transparently, but we won’t get it when we’re competing with the health service. So we’ve got to show, we’ve got to demonstrate and farmers have to change their language. Landowners have to change their language. We have no right for support but we produce something that they might actually want to support by buying it off us.’**Estate 2: ‘It’s going to matter massively what the public and the Treasury and politicians think about it, and whether they feel it’s good value for money. So it needs to be far more transparent what people are paying effectively, the taxes that they’re putting into this. If people can see if as more linked to certain positive things, rather than just moorlands, doesn’t mean a lot to a lot of people, then it’s potentially more powerful.’*  | *The public perceives trees to be more beneficial than peatlands.**You need to explain the benefits of peatland to the public.**The public benefits of peatlands taxes needs to be made transparent.*  |
| External opponents: antagonism to views and actions by external bodies  | *Farmer 3: ‘When we work with Natural England, they’ve just got one focus and there’s no sort of lateral thought about things, they’re just so focused on whatever, the theme of the time, whereas when you went with North Pennines, you’ve got people, the peat restoration, I mean working with [name of RSPB member], with RSPB … you can achieve a balance with the way this is set up now, which you don’t get from Natural England.’**Farmer 1: ‘It can cause huge amounts of losses and farmers struggle to see why Natural England should have [name of measure] as an indicator of success. …’**Conservationist 3: ‘I saw the impact on a couple of sheep the other day ... It took me by surprise.’**Farmer 1: ‘It should be a compulsory part of the diet in the canteen at Natural England.’ (laughter)**Farmer 1: ‘A lot of people were pushed into restoration on land that really couldn’t be improved, and it should have never been put that way. Natural England were dubious on some of the agreements on that. … If it wasn’t in an agreement and going to an agreement it automatically became favourable or moved into favourable and it was a performance target used for Natural England. …’** *Conservationist 1:’ I’m not saying I agree with it.’*
* *Facilitator: ‘I know, yeah, it is quite funny that one, isn’t it?’*
* *Conservationist 1: I’m not saying I agree with the approach, but that’s the approach that they used.’*
 | *Natural England are too focussed on their current themes.**Natural England has wrong indicators of success.**Natural England uses wrong indicators of peatland quality.* |
| **Value frames:** |  |  |
| Social justice, fairness | *Farmer 1: ‘We’re producing all these things, they are seen as public goods and a public benefit, the public would miss them if we didn’t produce them. They make a big contribution towards the health of the nation just as much – you know, the NHS is moving on to preventative medicine. Clean water, clean air, quality [0:39:32] food and a green gym to enjoy all add up to contributing towards national health.’**Conservationist 3: … If you have a farm next door that just has dry heath on the top and then it has some, you know, different stuff, and stuff that isn’t capable of restoring to that level, under the same benefit system that farm then may not be profitable. So what’s the end goal for that? Does that mean that farm’s just unprofitable and it does then get re-wilded or—?’** *Facilitator: ‘Well, this is an important outcome of the results of this approach. We’re not all created equal, so [laughter] you’re—'*
* *Farmer 2: ‘… Yeah, and you’ll create a two-tier system, that’s unfortunate.*’

*Estate 2: ‘… that’s fine if every farm in the dale has an equal amount of everything and so they all get a bit of the top, a little bit less as it goes down, but unfortunately it doesn’t work like that.’*  | *It should be acknowledged that farmers in the Pennines provide public goods that contribute towards national health.**The benefit system disadvantages farms that do not have restorable peatlands, this creates a two-tier system.**The benefit system does not create equal chances for all farms, as they do not have equal types of land.* |
| Respect for tradition | *Farmer 1: ‘I’m very passionate about people understanding how fragile it is and how important it is to maintain those people with the skills and knowledge to look after and manage that landscape as a by-product of producing other things like cattle and sheep … to actually preserve the knowledge and experience, understanding of the landscape, that people have been working in it for years, actually have. And it needs to be passed on … there’s a real risk of losing that, that tradition and knowledge and skills ...’* *Business 3: ‘There’s no textbook to learn a hill farmer technique which is individual to each farm. That is not there, it’s to father and son handed down over a period of twenty years.’**Estate 1: ‘Does it actually feel bad that we have to change, no, I sometimes ask that question, to me, why are we actually wanting to change these things that have been going on for so long, and it’s acknowledged, by being a beautiful place by everybody place, it’s wonderful, why is it so necessary to force these changes on a landowner?’* | *We need to avoid losing the tradition, knowledge, and skills of looking after the landscape which has developed over years.**The hill farmer technique cannot be textbook-taught but needs to be related between generations on particular farms.**The traditional practices have created a beautiful place, we do not need to change them.* |
| Place identity | *Conservationist 5: ‘When I reflect on that, the reason I’m prepared to do that, get up at half five in the morning and get back at ten o’clock at night, is I have a burning passion within me to do better things with some of our special wild places. I was brought up in the far north of Scotland, was almost born on a peat bog.**Other 1: ‘I feel that peat bogs, the moorlands with peat bogs have an intrinsic value of their own. And they don’t need to be justified by the agricultural and economic practices that tend to happen in those areas. Simply because they are an important carbon sink, I understand that there’s more than twice as much carbon locked up in the peat bogs of the world as in the forests of the world for example. And that to me seems enormously important. Because peat bogs take so much longer to form than trees, one millimetre per year. So I see that the peat bogs in – around where I live, the North Pennines, as enormous, intrinsic value for that reason.**Business 3: ‘We are very lucky in this location that we haven't got that. But, you know, the South Pennines, Derbyshire, and the Lake District, what have you, yeah it’s fairly well over-used really from the nature point of view.’* | *I want to improve our special wild places.**Peatland have intrinsic value regardless of their agricultural or economic value.**Different to many popular destinations, the North Pennines are not over-used.* |
| Responsibility | *Estate 1: ‘I’m maybe feeling responsible for it being the way it is, after forty years. Not alone, but with the farming community.’* * *Facilitator: ‘Is there that sense of pride, is it a sense of fear, tell me more about that sense of responsibility?*
* *Estate 1: It’s a hard one because, you know, you get up every day; my life, and my work, and my passions, so when I go every single day, I get up in the morning, I’m not thinking, oh god, nine to five, I’m sure farmers are the same, you just think, oh the weather’s not very nice today, that’s a pity. You know, you know what you’ve got to do, it’s ever-changing, so you feel a responsibility to keep it as it is or improve it.’*

*Conservationist 2: ‘[I gained] more understanding of how responsible the tenants feel for using the money that's available in a sensible sort of way. I mean it's obvious that they do care about this, as much as I do, and they take care with spending their money wisely and sensibly.’* | *We do our work feeling that we need to maintain and improve the peatlands.**Tenants want to use the subsidies wisely and sensibly.* |