

Accessory Publication: *Wildlife Research*, 2009, **36**(7), 553–564.

Mapping wildlife: integrating stockholder knowledge with modeled patterns of deer abundance by using participatory GIS

*Z. Austin, S. Cinderby, J. C. R. Smart, D. Raffaelli and P. C. L. White*

**Accessory Publication**

**Interview question sheet**

Part A: General information

1. Name of interviewee:
2. Organisation and position:
3. Date and time:

Part B: Model interpretation

Please take some time to familiarise yourself with the maps of the East of England provided, if you have not already done so. This includes maps displaying predicted relative landscape densities of five deer species present in this region and one plain map.

4. Using the matrix below, please rate the predicted relative landscape densities for each deer species, looking at the region as a whole. Please tick one box in each column representing a species. This rating should be based on how accurately the modelled patterns represent current relative landscape deer densities in this region according to your knowledge.

<b>Rating</b>		<b>Roe deer</b>	<b>Red deer</b>	<b>Fallow deer</b>	<b>Muntjac deer</b>	<b>Sika deer</b>	<b>Chinese water deer</b>
Extremely close fit	5						
Very good	4						
Good	3						
Reasonable	2						
Weak	1						
Not related	0						

5. Given your answers for part 4, please could you rate the model in terms of your overall impression of its ability to predict landscape deer densities. Please indicate your preference by ticking a box below.

Extremely close fit	Very good	Good	Reasonable	Weak	Not related
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Are there any general geographical areas or landscape types where you think that the model is particularly weak in its predictions for certain deer species, and is it over-predicting or under-predicting densities in these areas? Please indicate these areas on the plain map and list in the table below.

---

Region or landscape types	Over- or under- prediction	Comments
------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------

---

---

### Part C: Area identification

7. Please indicate on the plain map the areas that you are familiar with in terms of estimated deer densities. This can be done by shading the 10 km squares to which you feel you have adequate knowledge regarding deer populations and management at a landscape scale.

8. Please use the table below to list these areas in terms of county, square grid references and any specific sites – although the majority of these questions will require your landscape-level knowledge and does not refer to specific sites. Please bear this in mind when answering the remaining questions.

---

County	10 km squares	Specific sites
--------	---------------	----------------

---

---

### Part D: Model refinement

When looking again at the maps for each deer species, you will notice in the legend that each relative density has an associated number from 0 to 5 representing each density class.

9. Bearing in mind that the relative density classes reflect variations in deer density across the whole of the East of England, for each species map, can you please examine the landscape squares with which you are familiar (in which you identified in part C) and decide whether you agree with the density class for each square. Remember that these density classes represent relative landscape densities of deer and are therefore not associated with any particular site within the square but represent the average density over the whole square.

If you disagree with the density class allocated to a particular landscape square, could you please alter the square in question by writing your preferred density number in that square. For example, if there is a 10 km square which is shaded with a colour representing the density class of 0 but your opinion is that it should have a density class of 3, please place a 3 in that square on the map. Please feel free to alter any square in which you do not agree with on each species map, either by increasing or decreasing the deer density class.

Part E: Conservation impacts at the landscape scale

10. Are you aware of any specific sites or areas in which deer are having a significant negative or positive impact on biodiversity conservation?

11. If possible, could you please specify in which way deer are having a significant negative or positive impact on biodiversity conservation.

---

<b><i>Site or landscape square</i></b>	Positive impacts	Negative impacts
--	------------------	------------------

---

---

Part F: Management conflict and coordination

12. Are you aware of any specific sites or areas that you know to suffer from conflicts between stakeholders regarding the management of deer? Also, please list on the table below the site, square and stakeholders involved in such conflict.

---

Site	10 km squares	Stakeholders and comments
------	---------------	---------------------------

---

---

13. Are there any specific sites or areas, to your knowledge, where there has been any attempt to co-ordinate deer management across sites with different ownerships at a landscape scale? Please list these sites or squares in the table below, and also indicate the stakeholders involved, the mechanism by which the co-ordinated management takes place, and the extent to which this approach to management has been successful in reducing conflicts between stakeholders using a 1-6 scale, where 1 is extremely unsuccessful and 6 is extremely successful.

---

Site	10 km squares	Stakeholders	Mechanisms	Success rating
------	---------------	--------------	------------	----------------

---