



Photo Credit: Philip Price / Scotland The Big Picture

Long-term Management Plan for Beavers in England – Survey

Survey closes: Monday 23rd February 2026, 12 noon

Survey Introduction

Defra's approach to the wild release and management of beavers in England was published on 28 February 2025. One of the policy's main objectives was to develop a long-term management plan for beavers in England to ensure that people can continue to meet the opportunities and challenges posed by an expanding beaver population.

Natural England have asked Dialogue Matters to design and run the process of co-creating content to shape and influence the Long-term Management Plan (LTMP) for beavers in England. We are a neutral third party and make sure that those taking part can be heard and express their views regardless of background or interest.

We have run 2 national workshops already. This initial work has been analysed and collated into a draft vision for the future of beavers in England, as well as priority ideas for inclusion in the LTMP. **This survey is a chance to have your say on what has emerged - whether you have been involved so far or not.**

Participants at the national workshops discussed 17 different topics. Topics are divided into 3 overarching sections:

- Focus on policy, licensing, guidance, funding and adaptive planning/measures (6 topics, approx. 30 minutes to complete)
- Focus on landscapes, beavers and infrastructure (6 topics, approx. 30 minutes to complete)
- Focus on the people side: collaboration and ongoing learning (5 topics, approx. 25 minutes to complete)

You can respond to all or some of these topics. We realise some people are interested in the whole picture and others in a particular aspect, and we welcome all responses. You can save your responses and return and edit at a later time.

What you say in this survey will be analysed and summarised to inform participants' discussions at the third national workshop in March.

Please note: the topics in this survey come from the ideas of people who took part in the national workshops, which included a broad mix of perspectives. At this stage, the 17 topics are not plans nor guaranteed to form part of the LTMP, but suggestions of what could happen. The contents of our final report to NE depend on: responses to this survey and the deliberations at national workshop 3 in March.

If you have any technical issues with the survey, please get in touch with Dialogue Matters at enquiries@dialoguematters.co.uk

Agreement to participate:

Participation is based on voluntary, informed consent. You are free to withdraw the information you have provided at any time, without having to give justification. If you wish to withdraw your responses please email enquiries@dialoguematters.co.uk telling us the date you submitted and the approximate time so that we can identify it.

Your responses will be analysed by Dialogue Matters. Data and information will be used in reporting to Natural England which will inform the Long-term Management Plan for beavers in England. Data and information will not be attributed.

All information gathered from this survey is held in secure file storage with two-factor authentication on password protected devices. Data will be stored for a maximum of 12 months after the completion of the project and will then be destroyed. Dialogue Matters will have access to the raw data during this time. Natural England will have access to anonymised raw data.

You can view Dialogue Matters' privacy notice here: https://dialoguematters.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Data-Protection-and-Privacy-Notice_vFeb24.docx

Contents

Draft Narrative Vision	5
Focus on policy, licensing, guidance, funding and adaptive planning/measures	7
A. Integration and streamlining of policy	8
B. Optimise licensing	9
C. Funding management and mitigation	10
D. Mitigation guidance	11
E. Adaptive management	12
F. Long-term funding for beaver reintroductions	13
Focus on landscapes, beavers and infrastructure	14
G. Landscape character and heritage	15
H. Getting rivers and floodplains beaver ready	16
I. Making space for water, river restoration and beavers at scale	17
J. Infrastructure impacts and solutions	18
K. Beaver sourcing and genetic diversity	19
L. Beaver welfare	20
Focus on the people side: collaboration and ongoing learning	22
M. Collaboration at local/catchment scale	23
N. Resolving tension and conflicts	24
O. Effective wider engagement	25
P. Community of interest	26
Q. Evidence including monitoring and research questions	27
End of Survey	28
Is something important missing?	28
Staying updated	28

Draft Narrative Vision

The following is a draft narrative vision for the future of co-existing with beavers in England, created from participants' responses to the question: *"Imagine it's 2035 and you are at an event celebrating progress since 2025 on sustainably co-existing with wild beavers. The two things that please you most are..."*

The narrative vision is intended to be ambitious, broad, encompassing of different perspectives, and to inspire people about the future. It is not intended to be a short, snappy tagline.

It's 2035, and we are celebrating the progress made in learning how to live alongside wild beavers in England. Beavers are now a normal, culturally accepted part of our landscapes - valued as a native species and managed pragmatically, like other established wildlife.

Co-existence is working because practical support is in place. A clear, co-designed management framework is fully integrated into ELMs and has provided certainty and reassurance with incentives for making space for water and nature. Farming, fisheries and infrastructure interests increasingly celebrate the benefits of beavers, while accepting and managing challenges collaboratively. Clear best practice and support from national agencies enables land owners, managers and riparian users to be confident in taking swift and proportionate management actions, without unnecessary bureaucracy.

Lowland managed floodplains are adapted to changes brought by beavers and the climate. Water management infrastructure is well protected and not adversely impacted. Beaver reintroductions have been working in parallel and complimenting other species recovery efforts. There is also cross-border collaboration with Scottish and Welsh governments about beavers.

Beavers are fully integrated into catchment-based approaches and wider nature-based solutions, and we see the benefits clearly. There is more space for water in the landscape and thriving beaver-created riparian habitats. Catchments, rivers and wetlands are healthier, more resilient and richer in biodiversity from headwaters to estuaries. People recognise what a naturally functioning river system looks like and understand the role natural processes play in buffering ecosystems from climate extremes.

As a result of all the above, illegal beaver releases are a thing of the past and England now co-exists with a healthy, self-sustaining beaver population which is becoming more genetically diverse.

To what extent do you support this draft narrative vision?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Why did you select this option? Please keep your answer short and to the point (up to 500 characters)</p> <p>To date the interactions of the British Lichen Society (BLS) with beaver with introductions has been on of having our concerns down graded if not simply ignored. This vision gives us no idea of how the problem of potential negative threats of beavers to surviving irreplaceable biodiversity interest has been dealt with.</p>				
<p>What would need to happen to increase your support? Please keep your answer short and to the point (up to 500 characters)</p> <p>Evidence that potential negative threats of beavers to surviving irreplaceable biodiversity interest has been accommodated and has resulted in some of this interest surviving. Reassurance that by 2035, although species poor damaged floodplain habitats have improved, this has not been at the expense of degradation to existing species-rich landscape habitats would improve confidence in this. This will require monitoring and evaluation, with pratcal mitigations for vulnerable habitats.</p>				

Focus on policy, licensing, guidance, funding and adaptive planning/measures

Look at the following topics and decide how much you support the initial ideas suggested under each topic for inclusion in LTMP. If you want, please tell us what would add or change to improve this list. You may wish to read through all the topics first so that you know what is coming up and can share suggestions under the most relevant topic.

There are 6 different topics in this section:

- Integration and streamlining of policy
- Optimise licencing
- Funding management and mitigation
- Mitigation guidance
- Adaptive management
- Long-term funding for beaver reintroductions

When you are responding, feel free to answer all, one, or some of these questions. We realise some people are interested in the whole picture and others in a particular aspect. We welcome all responses.

A. Integration and streamlining of policy

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Strong vision of integration with other long-term goals and Defra policy, broadly. State how policy integration will be realised and adaptive to ongoing changes (e.g. around the Water Regulations)

Relevant policy, gaps in policy, including policy in development. Include a visual of how different policy areas relate strategically

Description and visual of how beaver management links with other activities and systems on the ground

International lessons learned and how the approach in this plan builds on them

Procedures for regular strategic review and how roles and responsibilities can be scaled back and integrated into existing bodies/organisations/partnerships as beavers become more familiar. E.g. some Beaver Management Group roles could be integrated as species is less 'new' and more familiar

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				
<p>All this would be very good assuming that real and serious problems with threats to irreplaceable biodiversity interest are recognised.</p>				

B. Optimise licensing

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Lessons learned from previous wild release approaches and how this approach builds on what works.

Ethos of maximising benefits and minimising risks

Wild release licence application becoming and remaining robust, clear, streamlined, and as accessible as possible. Signposting other existing guidance where relevant to avoid duplication.

Regular and adaptive review of licensing procedures (CL50 licence to capture, transport and re-release beavers or modify or remove beaver dams, burrows and lodges): Programme in regular open review and updating of the process with flexibility and an easy mechanism for leaving behind aspects that become unnecessary and onerous. A regular Licensing Forum (e.g. National Beaver Forum) could support this and solve emerging licensing challenges in a timely and effective way.

Set of principles for licensing wild release in different contexts:

- genetic reinforcement
- new populations in small-medium sized catchment
- very large catchments

Fast track for expressions of interests that match national priorities

Commitment for NE/EA liaison officers and resources to guide applicants and administer licensing

Differentiate procedures for direct reintroductions, existing populations, and translocation as a mitigation action

Clear guidance on initial and ongoing engagement and participation around wild release license applications, and who to consult during the licensing process.

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)				

There is no mention of baseline biodiversity surveys in this as part of the licensing procedures, which leads to questions as to how responsive mitigation measures can be. These need to be comprehensive and carried out before the release (the latter would seem obvious but it is not the BLS's experience in Scotland where surveys have been commissioned in response to developing problems after release).

C. Funding management and mitigation

[Note: Compensation mechanisms were discussed in the workshops, including that they are not part of the governments' approach. Considering this, discussion focused on mitigation and incentives]

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Funding through adaptive agri-environment/ecosystem services schemes: incentive schemes need to work in the dynamic context of wild beavers (e.g. funding that is sustained, flexible, adaptive, responsive, and quick to access). Incentives for making space for water encompass small streams and floodplains, and are available to any land and water manager (i.e. expanded beyond farmers).

Funding based on positive ecosystem service benefits within a 'systems approach' to water.

Funding for beaver management groups and officers to provide practical advice and guidance

Funding for training and support for farmers, land managers, and infrastructure organisations

(For ideas about funding beaver reintroductions, see topic F in this section)

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)				
This sounds impressive but experience in Scotland suggests that mitigating impacts on nationally important biodiversity may be problematic as it may not be the land manager's priority. We have found that assumptions that there will be limited biodiversity impacts results in surveillance and monitoring to be under funded in grants to beaver release projects.				

D. Mitigation guidance

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Mitigation collaboration guidance: Acknowledge that mitigation and management require collaboration between landowning, infrastructure and nature interest. Provide guidance on how best to establish this at differing scales.

Mitigation roles and responsibilities: outline who is responsible for which aspects of adapting and mitigating the presence of wild beavers

Overview of practical mitigation information - with signposting to detailed guidance which is tailored to different sectors and contexts, and adaptive to changes (water, forestry, farming and infrastructure are sectors of particular relevance)

Proactive mitigation to foster forward thinking and pro-active preparation for areas beavers are moving into

Overview and detail about the 5-step management approach: As beavers are a protected species, the long-term plan should set out Natural England's 5-step management approach: *managers should first seek expert advice and make space for beavers, then use lawful non-licensed mitigation where possible; if issues persist, apply for licences for lower-impact actions, and only as a last resort consider licensed higher-impact interventions.* Explain what these steps are and the options if things go wrong.

Enhancing understanding of the behaviour and motivation of beavers before mitigating

Programme of updating other government guidance to factor in beavers. E.g. Protecting trees from mammal damage: technical guidance.

Mitigation factors in inter-species interactions and effects: species and habitat dynamics and the resulting need for dynamic mitigation and management. E.g. beavers and deer interacting with the natural regeneration of hazel and other trees and shrubs.

Live inventory of sites where beavers can be relocated to in the event of overpopulation or conflict in an area

To what extent do you support this?

I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				
<p>There is a need to determine and emphasise what works in mitigation drawing on expert knowledge. We note that the first recommendation for tree protection in the FE's "Protecting trees from mammal damage; technical guidance" for beavers is stand protection by fencing, but that lichenologists have repeatedly been told that this is not possible for internationally important lichen rich old growth woodlands by those involved in beaver introductions. Some joined up thinking required. The section on inter-species interactions is odd. The interaction between beavers and browsers in natural systems is a well known part of the dynamics of beaver ecology. In well wooded environments beavers promote biodiversity by causing cyclic deforestation.</p>				

E. Adaptive management

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Adaptive management at a national level with consideration of legal status and advice over time as the population increases

Taking a 'nested approach': Provide a broad view of adaptive management for beavers in England with national priorities and strategic objectives. Connect this to interpretation and application at more localised levels.

Recognising that adaptive management starts with preparedness and is then about adapting to natural processes. It must be open about outcomes and guided by principles, holistic thinking, multi-benefit objectives, collaboration and flexibility. An adaptive management cycle can be followed before scaling back over time.

All related and relevant guidance to be framed to enable dynamic processes and adaptation

Integrating and embedding adaptive management for beavers within river restoration and catchment management

Fostering the concept that adaptive management is community driven so there is more local collaboration and agency

Criteria and prediction of when management requires translocation, and advice on identifying recipient sites

A strategic hierarchy with some rivers and locations more important than others

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p> <p>Answer to E: This would be impressive if management can be adaptive, but would need baseline surveys and detail knowledge of potential problems if responses are not to be too late to be effective. Answer to F (box blocked): our experience in Scotland that introduction projects have been assuming there will be no biodiversity problems, so are under funded to cope with these when they arise. .</p>				

F. Long-term funding for beaver reintroductions

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Long term funding: recognising that funding will be needed for at least 25 years based on beaver population growth curves, population trends, and management needs. Even as reintroduction activity reduces, licensing for interventions will increase

Improving funding stability: recognising the availability of public funding may change with political priorities, explore how more stable, long-term funding could be supported through private markets, shared metrics, innovative and blended finance approaches

Taking a strategic approach to funding, relating to the geographic spread of beavers

Funding recognises that natural processes are at work so outcomes must be holistic and uncertain (with no fixed end point)

How existing funding opportunities can be accessed, aligned, and applied to beaver management (such as Environmental Land Management schemes) with clear routes for land managers and communities to access them

Using funds to unlock other funding such as private investment by landowners and other partners

Community ownership and multi-benefit investment, including support for communities acquiring land for nature

Integrating funding for beaver management with natural flood and drought management funding

Policy pressure and incentives for private investment to include beavers in nature recovery e.g. if insurance company in UK gives a percentage to climate resilience projects, beavers are included.

(For ideas about funding management and mitigation, see topic C in this section)

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				

Focus on landscapes, beavers and infrastructure

Look at the following topics and decide how much you support the initial ideas suggested under each topic for inclusion in LTMP. If you want, please tell us what would add or change to improve this list. You may wish to read through all the topics first so that you know what is coming up and can share suggestions under the most relevant topic.

There are 6 different topics in this section:

- Landscape character and heritage
- Getting rivers and floodplains beaver ready
- Making space for water, river restoration and beavers at scale
- Infrastructure impacts and solutions
- Beaver sourcing and genetic diversity
- Beaver welfare

When you are responding, feel free to answer all, one, or some of these questions. We realise some people are interested in the whole picture and others in a particular aspect. We welcome all responses.

G. Landscape character and heritage

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

The strategic framework of Landscape Character Areas (LCA) and how their intrinsic character will be affected by beavers. Provide some illustrative visuals and case examples and signpost to LCA and heritage resources.

People have different values and understandings around landscape and heritage, so will have different ideas, perspectives and tensions around the effects of beavers

Relevant regulations and protections related to landscape and heritage e.g. protected landscape, scheduled monuments, world heritage sites, water mills and Millers' Rights

Beaver reintroduction projects doing appropriate heritage and landscape impact assessments and consultation

Cultural and recreational activities can be an intrinsic part of local landscape character and culture, and will be affected by beaves. Include the need to understand the effects of beavers on current activities, the local economy, and related social, wellbeing. E.g. fishing is part of local culture and heritage, and socially and economically important.

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)

It is concerning to the BLS that this section appears to concentrate on human heritage and does not include irreplaceable biodiversity interest as part of wider landscapes. From the BLS point of view a major concern is habitats with frequent veteran trees in humid and grazed floodplain environments with associated internationally important lichen assemblages. Examples such as The New Forest and the Barle valley, Exmoor are at the forefront of our concerns. Both are in National Parks and are in SACs for their old woodlands.

H. Getting rivers and floodplains beaver ready

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Assessing all rivers and floodplains for beaver opportunities and effects to prioritise the optimum rivers for beaver reintroductions. Assessment could include: mapping historic river features (ponds and paleo-channel analysis); sediment issues; water quality and pollution sources; cultural, and heritage designations and features; vulnerable features such as flood banks; infrastructure; locations at risk to canal and river breaches; drainage infrastructure; and new builds

Taking pre-emptive action to protect vulnerable features identified during mapping and assessment

Incentivising and encouraging a wider and richer riparian zone for beavers: This includes making space for water and enhancing riparian areas with tree planting or favourable vegetation for beavers, helping deflect from forestry. Upstream, this has the benefit of slowing the flow of rivers and holding it higher in rivers systems, reducing peak floods

Framework for rapid assessment and mapping where beavers have constructed barriers to fish passage, and a hierarchy of interventions to optimise the river for fish and beavers

Guidance related to sediment problems – whether this needs to be addressed before beaver introductions or whether we introduce beavers to trap and improve sediment issues

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p> <p>We note with interest that this section includes "help deflection from forestry" but says little about conserving existing irreplaceable biodiversity interest. As well as veteran trees and their lichens of concern to the BLS, these could include rare grassland and mire vegetation or clean water ponds at risk from contamination by diverted more polluted river water, which are also of concern to other groups.</p>				

I. Making space for water, river restoration and beavers at scale

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Introduction with a broad overview of ‘making space for water’ including the multiple benefits and outcomes, so the presence and activity of beavers sit in this broader context.

Allowing more space upstream to realise the benefits of beavers in relation to flooding

Beavers having different spatial needs. Different behaviour in different environments, and how this is dynamic as they alter their surroundings. If specific measurements are given, e.g. 10 metres from river edge, explain why and what features to consider.

Maps or illustrations to help the concept of ‘making space for water’ be more tangible. Also, to illustrate the opportunities and challenges in different landscapes, and to help visualise possible changes before beavers arrive, and when they are present

Signpost other relevant information and strategies around working at catchment scale

Signpost the Biodiversity Net Gain metric for ‘making space for water’ so that the value of beavers who arrive in an area can be assessed.

(For ideas about being open to uncertainty and adaptive to outcomes when enabling natural processes, see section 'Focus on policy...' topic E: Adaptive Management)

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p> <p>This reads as if all rivers need restoration, a contra example would be the New Forest rivers and wetlands, which are already largely restored and dynamic but set in a historic landscape that evolved in the absence of beavers and is poorly suited to them. The arrival of beavers here is likely only to cause problems.</p>				

J. Infrastructure impacts and solutions

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Understanding and acknowledging opportunities and risks – beavers can provide benefit to some infrastructure providers as well as risks, e.g. flood storage, water purification, Biodiversity Net Gain

Funding sources for proactively protecting infrastructure, whilst also factoring in related benefits or savings from beaver activity

Assessing the impacts of beavers on infrastructure e.g. take a heat mapping approach to modelling, with reference to Beaver Foraging Index, beaver dam models.

Guidance for different types of infrastructure – e.g. Design Manual Roads & Bridges, for road signage, and by connecting and working with e.g. the Institute of Civil Engineers

Guidance on operational procedures and requirements where beavers are present, e.g. around testing reservoirs or dams (could be included in EA processes); making non-operational land more appealing to beavers; and upskilling personnel.

Clear responsibility within infrastructure organisations - one point of contact

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				

K. Beaver sourcing and genetic diversity

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Identifying the current genetic diversity of beaver populations, including a mapping element or spatial analysis, and checking in on status periodically.

Identifying pathways to increase genetic diversity and the key principles of movement of animals in relation to genetic diversity

Preventing genetic inbreeding. Advice and transition timeframes for the current approach of beaver breeding in enclosures.

Guidance on minimal numbers of beavers to release for optimal diversity and health, within constraints of catchment size.

Using the national Eurasian beaver studbook (held by the Beaver Trust) when sourcing and releasing

Proposed beaver imports with regulation to reduce the risk of the parasite *Echinococcus multilocularis* entering the UK

<p>To what extent do you support this?</p>

I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				

L. Beaver welfare

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Definition and justification for beaver welfare, including what ‘genetically healthy’ looks like

Distinction about when a released beaver becomes a ‘wild animal’ and its welfare is no longer the responsibility of the people who released it

Clear flow chart or decision-making tree of rescue protocol including for beavers trapped somewhere or stuck at sea. Understanding what beavers can tolerate/when to intervene.

Best practice translocation release protocol (ref: the Scottish Animal Welfare Commission)

Guidance for reinforcing a beaver population: reassess any mortalities and see if the habitat location is suitable for either existing beavers or as beaver territory

Recommendations, support and training about the ‘healthiest beavers’ for the wildlife rehabilitators. Possibly a national helpline (e.g. like for bats)

Reviewing the Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) of beavers and adding an updated definition of their FCS to the plan

Advice for the public about how to interact with beavers

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				

Focus on the people side: collaboration and ongoing learning

Look at the following topics and decide how much you support the initial ideas suggested under each topic for inclusion in LTMP. If you want, please tell us what would add or change to improve this list. You may wish to read through all the topics first so that you know what is coming up and can share suggestions under the most relevant topic.

There are 5 different topics in this section:

- Collaboration at local/catchment scale - Resolving tension and conflicts
- Effective wider engagement
- Community of interest
- Evidence including monitoring and research questions

When you are responding, feel free to answer all, one, or some of these questions. We realise some people are interested in the whole picture and others in a particular aspect. We welcome all responses.

M. Collaboration at local/catchment scale

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Guidance and principles of best practice on how catchments partnerships and Beaver Management Groups work together. Recognising that innovation and what is needed differs between locations. Recognising farmers, nature conservationists and other interests are all working slightly differently so everyone will have to adapt and change.

Beaver Management Groups needed at the early stages when beavers move in or are introduced to a new catchment. Include an exit strategy to transfer responsibility and oversight to the catchment partnership with sustainable funding

Catchment partnerships being consulted on individual projects

How to access funding for catchment partnerships and beaver management groups to work together

What happens when beavers move in naturally without a project and with no Beaver Management Group.

A directory, kept up-to-date, of local and regional management groups so that people know who to talk to about challenges (no matter the scale). Include people who can respond quickly, so we don't lose the human connection for those facing challenges

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				
<p>Excellent if it can happen</p>				

N. Resolving tension and conflicts

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Signpost about benefits, challenges, and solutions using neutral language to build trust and mitigate the concern that people are only being told one side of the story. Be realistic about the challenges, rather than avoiding their existence

Being realistic and acknowledge that with varied perspectives, working towards co-existence with beavers will not be conflict free - and that issues are dependent on circumstance and multiple variables

Guiding principles for empathetic listening and wise handling of differences linked to case studies about successful conflict management and resolution

Blended financing to support beaver management groups' role in bringing different perspectives together

Live inventory of sites where beavers can be relocated in the event of overpopulation conflict in an area

The need for design of new infrastructure and development which factor in beavers to reduce future conflict

Negative impacts of 'beaver bombing' (*illegal, unlicensed release of beavers into the wild without landowner consent or ecological assessment*) which undermines licensed introductions and creates conflict

(For information about the 5-step management approach, see section 'Focus on policy...' topic D: mitigation guidance)

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p> <p>We are very much in support of resolving tension and conflicts, but this does involve all sides. "Being realistic about the challenges, rather than avoiding their existence" would not be a fully accurate description of the response the BLS has had from our experience of beaver introduction projects in Scotland.</p>				

O. Effective wider engagement

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Engagement advice for different scales (local, catchment, national)

Engagement advice for different groups (public, academic, infrastructure, practitioners). Including their interests, what they need from engagement, their concerns, appropriate methods, relevant messages, and accessible language

Signpost engagement and participation good practice, step by step guides, 'how to' advice, funding, tools and mechanisms

Promote ethics of undertaking beaver reintroductions with those affected - a 'with others' not 'to others' ethic

Communicating aims and targets for future numbers and geographic range of beavers with strong messaging that guarantees long term protection

Communicating the weight and strength of current evidence

Communicating the benefits and challenges of wild beavers: Include description and acknowledgement of both beaver contributions and benefits (for example water management) and related challenges

Communicating using neutral language to convey realistic information and rounded evidence (not only natural science evidence, nor only positive stories and messages).

Engagement role of Beaver Management Groups and community ambassadors. Consider these over time - now, in 10 years, and long term – and evolving needs for appropriate training, funding and coordination

Success stories and case examples to show how people tackled and solved challenges

Ongoing programme of events for people to learn from each other, share challenges and solutions, and visit sites.

Measuring and evaluating engagement success to know which engagement is effective

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)

We would welcome this

P. Community of interest

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

Maintaining and strengthening a dynamic community of interest - to share learning and experience, with different self-organised subgroups, and with the ability to shift and evolve in response to changes across the life of the plan

Clear visually engaging information for practitioners which includes accessible decision tools and flowcharts

Clear and updated signposting to resources, success stories and case studies showing what worked in practice

Opportunities for cross-border collaboration and learning from the work in England, Wales and Scotland

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				

Q. Evidence including monitoring and research questions

Include in the Long-term Management Plan information, advice about, or a pathway to achieve the following list:

An introduction to this topic clearly explaining the difference between monitoring and research

National research priorities, identified and agreed collaboratively to help focus effort.

A ‘Balanced Evidence Appraisal Method’ (a structured, systematic process for evaluating the validity, reliability, and applicability of research evidence to inform decision-making).

To include guidance on how to appraise the weight and appropriate use of evidence for different topics (e.g. flooding, or salmonids), so that it informs and improves multi-benefit decision-making across interests.

Guidance for communicating science and information: in lay terms, distinguishing between evidence and beliefs or perceptions, and includes the need for everyone to disseminate it responsibly

Requirements, standards, potential barriers, and solutions for monitoring: both to identify where beavers are, and ongoing monitoring over the long term (could refer to existing approaches used for badgers?).

Establishing a citizen science monitoring programme or programmes. This could tie in with existing Catchment Partnerships and research.

Connecting and linking to existing and additional evidence reviews and monitoring frameworks. Including existing relevant and transferable evidence from other countries.

A mechanism for sharing information and knowledge with the ability to highlight dynamic change

To what extent do you support this?				
I have strong concerns	I have concerns	I can live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Is there something you would add or change to improve this list? Please note it here, keeping your answers short and to the point (up to 750 characters)</p>				
<p>We would welcome this, but would question if sufficient resources will be made available.</p>				

End of Survey

Is something important missing?

We are at an early stage in this process of co-creating content. Please tell us about any other important areas to consider for inclusion in the Long-term Management Plan for beavers in England (that have not already been covered in this survey). [up to 750 characters]

We do not disagree that beavers do increase biodiversity within damaged and impoverished river systems, damaged floodplain fen peatlands and the like, so are likely to be beneficial across wide areas of England. However, we consider it unrealistic to just assume that beavers will do no biodiversity harm when brought back into areas where they have been absent for many hundreds of years. This aspect appears missing from this survey. It is possible that beavers will do irrevocable damage to irreplaceable biodiversity interest. If recognised this may be able to be mitigated to a degree but the potential that unique features of high value may be lost to be replaced by more ordinary habitats should be recognised as a risk.

Staying updated

Please add your email address below if you would like to be kept updated about the progress of the Long-term Management Plan for beavers.

Note: Dialogue Matters will pass this list of email addresses to the Natural England team. By leaving your email, you give Natural England permission to email you with progress updates about this particular project (Long-term Management Plan for beavers) only.

Neil A Sanderson, BLS Conservation Officer conservationofficer@britishlichensociety.org.uk