- Welcome change in SG policy as through SNH and FCS.
  "Deer fencing can serve a useful purpose for controlling deer, helping to achieve environmental objectives and preventing deer causing a public hazard" – Joint Agency Statement and Guidance

- Also welcome the change of stance of SNH which recognises that sustainability is about people, communities and jobs, as well as the environment. That balance, which we often struggle to find, is correct and should be supported.

- The availability of fencing as a deer management tool in appropriate circumstances allows equally legitimate land management activities to coexist and avoids conflict.

- Acknowledge that it is costly, unsightly and can kill birds and a means of last resort.

- However lower cost alternatives – electric. Strategic fencing rather than piecemeal

- Relatively short term but must be maintained.

- Mitigate bird strike risks by positioning and marking.

- DMGs have the difficult job of reconciling potentially conflicting objectives.

- Many of those are to do with deer fencing or lack of it and some individuals and organisations will not currently consider fencing as an option which means reducing deer populations to a level which may allow regen but is insufficient to meet the objectives of neighbours.

- Conversely some landholdings refuse to consider population reductions which might reduce the case for fencing while still delivering a sustainable deer harvest.

- Neither position is sustainable when it comes to the sharing of a common resource. If your policies are detrimental to your neighbours they are not reasonable or fair.

- No man is an island when it comes to wild deer.

- Negotiation and compromise is often required and fencing can be the key aspect of this along with population adjustments within the limits of what allows all concerned to continue to achieve reasonable objectives.