

The reintroduction of Castor fiber in Piedmont (Italy): An integrated SWOT-spatial multicriteria based approach for the analysis of suitability scenarios

Original

The reintroduction of Castor fiber in Piedmont (Italy): An integrated SWOT-spatial multicriteria based approach for the analysis of suitability scenarios / Treves, A.; Bottero, M.; Caprioli, C.; Comino, E.. - In: ECOLOGICAL INDICATORS. - ISSN 1470-160X. - 118:(2020), p. 106748. [10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106748]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2842714 since: 2020-09-09T12:46:45Z

Publisher:

Elsevier B.V.

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106748

Terms of use:

openAccess

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

The reintroduction of *Castor fiber* in Piedmont (Italy): an integrated SWOT-Spatial multicriteria based approach for the analysis of suitability scenarios.

Anna Treves¹, Marta Bottero², Caterina Caprioli², Elena Comino^{1,*}

¹Politecnico di Torino, Department of Environment, Land and Infrastructure Engineering (DIATI), Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy; anna.treves@yahoo.com; elena.comino@polito.it

²Politecnico di Torino, Interuniversity Department of Regional and Urban Studies and Planning (DIST), Viale Mattioli 39, 10125, Torino, Italy; marta.bottero@polito.it; caterina.caprioli@polito.it

*Corresponding author: elena.comino@polito.it

Abstract:

The *Castor fiber* or Eurasian beaver can change its habitat by building dams and creating ponds. For this reason, *Castor fiber* is known as an "ecosystem engineer" for aquatic and riparian environments. Despite its ecological importance, at the beginning of the 20th century the population was reduced to only 1200 beavers in Europe and Asia, due to uncontrolled hunting. Recently, some reintroductions and translocations have partly re-established the population. In Italy, however, the beaver disappeared in the 16th century and no action has been taken despite the recommendation of the Council of Europe to perform a feasibility study. This research evaluates beaver reintroduction and identifies suitable areas in Italy and, in particular, in the Piedmont region. In order to achieve this, a SWOT analysis combined with a Spatial Multicriteria Analysis was performed. Firstly, the zoological and ethological aspects concerning this rodent were studied, as well as the historical reasons that led to its disappearance in Italy and near extinction in Eurasia. Secondly, Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) of the territory were identified for beaver reintroduction. The SWOT analysis was implemented, as the starting point for the spatial multicriteria analysis. Thirdly, the Multicriteria Spatial Decision Support System (MC-SDSS) was structured into two criteria, i.e. Potentials and Criticalities, representing the spatialization of strengths and weaknesses. The final result of the MC-SDSS is a map showing suitable areas for beaver reintroduction in Piedmont. This map is the weighted sum of the maps of criticalities and potentialities, performed through a set of GIS operations and weighted through a pairwise comparison of criteria by experts.

The analysis was conducted for the Piedmont region, but the integrated approach and the set of criteria can also be applied in other regions. Moreover, this mixed-method approach takes into account the characteristics necessary for the choice of suitable beaver habitats and also includes economic and social aspects. Therefore, it is an improvement on the Habitat Suitability Index (HIS), generally used in reintroductions. The aspects considered in the analysis are fundamental for the future development of a shared action plan, which considers both technical and social motivations and acts for the long-term on a wide area.

Keywords: Eurasian beaver, Re-establishment, Environmental management, Habitat Suitability analysis, Multicriteria Analysis, Analytic Hierarchic Process


1. Introduction

The beaver is a rodent mammal belonging to the *Castoridae* family, *Castor* genus. It is classified in two species: the Eurasian beaver (*Castor fiber*), widespread in Siberia, Mongolia and almost all of Europe except

49 for the Mediterranean areas, and the North American beaver (*Castor canadensis*), common in Canada,
50 Alaska and most of the United States, as well as in Chile (Graells et al., 2015) and Argentina. *Castor fiber*
51 and *canadensis* are very similar in appearance and behaviour, but they have a different number of
52 chromosomes (Nolet and Rosell, 1998). Beavers live in freshwater habitats surrounded by woods but can
53 also be found along agricultural canals or in suburban and urban areas (Taylor et al., 2017). Their diet is
54 strictly vegetative and consist mainly of herbaceous plants, bark and branches of arboreal plants (willow, ash
55 and alder). (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018). Beavers are one of the few species of mammals which
56 intentionally transform their habitat to adapt to their needs through their life activities: cutting trees, building
57 dams and lodges, digging dens and channels (Rosell et al., 2005; Stringer et al., 2015; Rozhkova-Timina et
58 al., 2018). Their activities constitute a powerful environmental factor affecting the entire area (water-coastal
59 complex) occupied by these rodents and, for this reason, they are known as “ecosystem engineers” (Rosell et
60 al., 2005; Stringer et al., 2015; Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018). The positive impact of beavers has wide
61 consequences on the territory, including that of increasing the heterogeneity of the habitat, promoting
62 biodiversity (Stringer et al, 2015), improving water quality (Puttock et al., 2017), lowering discharge peak in
63 downstream river during floods (Nyssen et al., 2011), contributing significantly to the resilience of the
64 landscape during extremely drought periods (Hood et al., 2008) and generating socio-economic benefits
65 through hunting, nature tourism (Campbell-Palmer and Rosell, 2010) and the improvement of ecosystem
66 services (Campbell et al., 2007). Nowadays in Europe, beaver populations are stable in number with a
67 minimum of one million beavers in at least 25 European countries (Halley et al. 2012). But in Asia they are
68 considered small and need specific conservation measures (Batbold et al., 2016). At the beginning of the
69 20th century, however the trend was very different. At that time, in Europe and Asia only eight small
70 populations were left with a total of 1200 individuals (Nolet and Rosell, 1998; Batbold et al., 2016).
71 Conservation programs, numerous reintroductions and translocations were carried out in order to conserve
72 the beaver population, protecting the remaining individuals and re-establishing the species. The measures
73 were successful and now *Castor fiber* is classified by IUCN as “Least Concern” (Batbold et al., 2016).The
74 main cause of the near disappearance was due to uncontrolled hunting for meat, fur and *castoreum*, chemical
75 substances secreted by castor sacs and once used in medicine for the presence of salicin, the basis of aspirin’s
76 synthetical production (acetylsalicylic acid) (Mertin, 2003).
77 In the past, even in Italy, beavers could be seen along the placid waterways bordered by deciduous forests
78 (Pratesi, 2001). However, the existence of this animal in this country, until the 16th century (Nolet et al,
79 1996), is only testified by fossil remains and by authors in the literature. To explore the potential of the
80 Italian territory for the reintroduction of the beaver, the present paper proposes an application of the Spatial
81 Multicriteria Analysis. Decision making, especially in nature conservation, requires the consideration of
82 different and conflicting objectives, such as habitat protection, social needs and economic development (Orsi
83 et al., 2011). The use of multicriteria analysis is firmly appropriate to take into account this complexity.
84 Moreover, the analysis of geographical patterns of the different elements is fundamental in this context, since
85 an assessment of the quality and quantity of available beaver habitats is essential in order to evaluate
86 reintroduction, to predict population development and to avoid any beaver-human conflict. In the domain of
87 complex spatial problems, like those in this research, the use of integrated evaluation approaches, such as
88 Multicriteria Spatial Decision Support System (MC-SDSS), is particularly useful due to the integration of
89 GIS and Multicriteria Decision Aiding (MCDA).
90 In order to support the definition of the spatial multicriteria analysis in a more structural way, a set of
91 preliminary analysis was conducted. The Section 2 (Methods Section) of this paper illustrates the different
92 stages of the analysis from a methodological perspective. Section 3 is devoted to the description of the
93 application in the selected case study area. Section 4 describes the results of the MC-SDSS for the
94 reintroduction of the *Castor fiber*. Finally, a Conclusions Section underlines the pros and cons of the applied
95 model and future perspectives of the research.

100 2. Methods

101 For the purpose of the present research, the analysis was developed as follows (Errore. L'origine riferimento
102 non è stata trovata.). Firstly, a thorough literature review of beaver habitats, its characteristics and its
103 historical distribution was carried out, as well as an analysis of territorial impacts and benefits of the beaver
104 presence on the territory. Secondly, knowledge of this species was enriched through discussions and
105 meetings with experts and a number of site inspections in Switzerland. Thirdly, a SWOT analysis was
106 performed to systematise all the information acquired in the previous steps and to create a clear starting
107 framework for the spatial multicriteria analysis. Following the results of the SWOT analysis the Spatial
108 MCDA was performed. A set of spatial criteria was defined for evaluation from the strengths and
109 weaknesses identified. This was then clustered into a set of potentials and criticalities of the territory
110 connected to the re-introduction of the beavers. These criteria represent the spatial indicators to perform the
111 spatial multicriteria analysis and to obtain the final results of the evaluation of beaver reintroduction.
112



113 **Fig. 1.** Structure of the evaluation approach. Starting from the topic of the research, the different steps are illustrated: preliminary
114 analysis (literature review and site inspection), SWOT analysis and MC-SDSS.
115

116
117 The methodological background of the two aforementioned approaches, SWOT and Spatial MCDA, is
118 described in the remaining part of the present section, whereas the specific steps of the application are
119 detailed in Section 3.

121 2.1 SWOT Analysis

122 The acronym SWOT stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. This analysis is based on
123 a logical procedure that allows the collection of data and information about the specific problem under
124 investigation in order to organize the decision-making process (Humphrey, 2005).

125 In the context of territorial projects, the SWOT analysis is a useful tool for the definition of possible
126 development scenarios of a given area. These scenarios can be created based on the valorization of strengths
127 and the mitigation of weaknesses, and in light of potential opportunities and threats. The analysis
128 distinguishes between endogenous factors of the process, that represent the internal variables, such as
129 strengths and weaknesses, and exogenous factors, that are external from the system, such as opportunities
130 and threats (Comino and Ferretti, 2016). It has been recognized that the SWOT analysis offers the possibility
131 of developing an in-depth knowledge of the territorial and socio-economic context under investigation that
132 can be useful to address design strategies (Bottero et al. 2019).

133 The implementation of SWOT analysis is normally performed in two steps. In a desktop phase, SWOT
134 components are identified neutrally and objectively. This is due to a data acquisition based on literature
135 consultation or consolidated information on the topic under analysis. In a focus group phase, experts and
136 stakeholders are consulted for adding elements to the SWOT components. The present research follows these

137 two stages of the SWOT development, starting from an in-depth literature review and, then, adding new
138 elements obtained from the consultation of beaver experts.

139
140

141 **2.2 Spatial Multicriteria Analysis**

142 The availability of analytical frameworks able to support spatial planning and decision-making processes is
143 becoming increasingly relevant. Within this context, fundamental support may be provided by spatial
144 Multicriteria Analysis (Malczewski, 1999). This type of analysis combines Geographic Information Systems
145 (GIS) and Multicriteria Decision Aiding (MCDA) in order to provide a collection of methods and tools to
146 transform and integrate geographic data (map criteria), and Decision Makers' preferences and uncertainties
147 (value judgments) to obtain information for decision-making and an overall assessment of the decision
148 alternatives.

149 This integrated approach is able to generate alternatives during the strategic planning phase and to compare
150 them during the evaluation phase, and it is applicable across many scientific fields to solve different decision
151 problem typologies (Ferretti, 2012). Spatial Multicriteria Analysis is particularly applied to land suitability
152 analysis in the urban/regional planning, in the hydrology and water management and in the
153 environment/ecology fields (Ferretti et al., 2015).

154 From the methodological point of view, the steps needed for the development of a Spatial Multicriteria
155 Analysis, that specifically support planning and decision-making processes, can be summarized as follows.
156 Firstly, the intelligence phase refers to the examination of the context in order to identify problems or
157 opportunities and to structure the decision process. In this phase, the system under consideration is defined
158 and the objectives are explored. One or more criteria, or attributes, are selected to describe the degree of
159 achievement of each objective. Secondly, the design phase involves the development and analysis of possible
160 courses of action. Thirdly, during the choice phase, alternatives are evaluated and a set of specific courses of
161 action is considered. Furthermore, detailed analyses, such as the sensitivity analysis, are developed in order
162 to obtain useful recommendations. Finally, the complete set of data, information and knowledge becomes
163 available evidence for planners, decision-makers and analysts.

164

165 **3. Application**

166 **3.1 Description of the context of the research**

167 In Italy, no action was actively performed after the beaver disappearance (Nolet, 1997). For this reason, this
168 project considers and evaluates the reintroduction of beavers in Italy and in particular, in the region of
169 Piedmont (**Fig. 2**).




170
 171 **Fig. 2.** Case study area. The study area, i.e. Piedmont region (black), is an Italian region located in the northwest of Italy. The
 172 coordinates in the box are relative to the centroid of Piedmont region.

173 The existence of this animal in Italy from the Mesolithic to the Contemporary Era, was reconstructed through
 174 a literature review and historical bibliographic research. The timeline reported in **Figure 3** summarize the
 175 literary or historical quotes of beavers in Italy.

176 Before the 16th century, the presence of the beaver is confirmed by various authors via the use of allegorical
 177 figures, but the identification of its distribution is more difficult. Only a few authors clearly refer to beaver
 178 location. Varrone (47-45 BC), in Roman times, and Fazio degli Uberti (1368), in the Middle Ages,
 179 respectively place the beaver in the Lazio region and in the surroundings of Ferrara. Thus, it is possible to
 180 assume that the beaver was present in the wooded marshes of Northern and Central Italy and that its
 181 distribution area gradually decreased over the centuries. Uncontrolled hunting and fragmentation of beaver
 182 habitat by human activity, such as land reclamations, led to its disappearance (Pratesi, 2001).

183 Nolet and Rosell (1998) dated the disappearance of the beaver to 1541, although there is not a certainty as to
 184 when the beaver really disappeared (Aldovrandi, 1637). Nevertheless, it is relevant to evidence that, at the
 185 end of October 2018, a hunter noticed some signs in Tarvisio, which could be attributable to the presence of
 186 beavers. This hypothesis was confirmed at the end of November 2018 by the presence of a specimen of
 187 *Castor fiber* captured by photographic traps (Pontarini et al., 2018). This beaver probably came from Austria
 188 and does not have conservative importance. However, it gives hope for a natural recolonization of the Italian
 189 territory.



190
191
192
193
194
195

Fig. 3. Timeline of beaver presence in Italy from Mesolithic to Contemporary Era. Each Box represents a literary or historical quote that refers to Italian beaver; from left to right: Mesolithic (10000-8000 BC) and Neolithic (8000-3000 BC) included in Prehistory (2 million years ago – 3000 BC), Roman Times (1st century BC-5th century AD) included in Ancient history (3000 BC – 476 AD), Middle Ages or Post-classical history (476 – 1492), Modern Era (1492 – 1789) and Contemporary Era (1789 - Nowadays). The *Castor fiber* photo is taken from Pontarini et al. (2018).

196

3.2 SWOT development

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222


223

The SWOT analysis was carried out in order to highlight habitat characteristics and the effects of beavers on the territory. Different sources were consulted, including several literature references on methods, indexes and models applied in the context of beavers, such as Habitat Suitability Indexes (Allen, 1982), GIS-based habitat suitability models (Maringer and Slotta-Bachmayr, 2006; Anderson & Bonner, 2014; Stringer et al., 2018), beaver habitat classification systems (Howard & Larson, 1985; McComb et al., 1990) and Beaver Intrinsic Potential model (Dittbrenner et al., 2018). These models generally consider only habitat variables needed for beaver life, such as vegetation composition and distribution, stream gradient and substrate, valley width, flow rate, water level and minimum habitat area. However, they disregard variables strictly connected to the anthroposphere with which this animal could interact, such as agricultural channels, road network and protected landscapes. These variables were explored through a bibliographic review of the effects of beavers on the ecosystem (Cazzolla Gatti et al., 2018; Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018, Stringer et al., 2015; Ruys et al., 2011; Rosell et al., 2005), on the hydraulics and the hydrology of the area (Gorczyca et al., 2018; Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018; Klimenko and Eponchintseva, 2014; Nyssen et al, 2011; Butler and Malason, 2005), on climate (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018; Whitfield et al., 2015; Hood and Bayley, 2008) and on the socio-economic sphere (Taylor et al, 2017; Campbell-Palmer and Rosell, 2010; Campbell et al, 2007). Based on the data collected and on a direct analysis of the beaver habits in Switzerland, where this animal has been reintroduced, it was possible to develop the SWOT matrix. The two main questions at the basis of the SWOT structuring were:

1. What are the aspects of the territory that can be a strength or weakness in the reintroduction of the beaver?
2. What opportunities and threats does reintroduction offer to the territorial context?

These two questions allow the comprehension of the internal factors, i.e. the intrinsic territorial characteristics, which can help or prevent to achieve the goal, and of the external factors, able to support or threaten the project, i.e. benefits or impacts on the territory caused by the reintroduction of the beaver.

Figure 4 shows the summary scheme of the SWOT analysis: the upper part of the matrix reports the internal factors, i.e. strengths and weaknesses, instead, the lower part, the external factors, i.e. opportunities and threats.



224
 225 **Fig. 4.** Summary scheme of SWOT analysis. On the upper part of the matrix was reported and summed up the internal factors, i.e.
 226 strengths and weaknesses, instead, the lower
 227 part, the external factors, i.e. opportunities and threats.
 228

229 The SWOT Analysis was fundamental to obtain a complete view of the different aspects connected to the
 230 reintroduction project. In particular, the analysis was useful to identify the territorial characteristics necessary
 231 for reintroduction and the beavers' effects detectable on the territory. It also facilitated the identification of
 232 the variables to be considered in the spatial multicriteria analysis. The SWOT analysis can be used as a
 233 starting point for the creation of a reintroduction management plan able to reduce the negative impacts and
 234 increase the benefits. The result is the 4x4 matrix with all strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
 235 (**Table 1**).

Tab. 1. SWOT matrix to analyze beaver reintroduction effects on the territory and habit features for their relocation

References and Sources	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	References and Sources
Allen, 1982; Baker and Hill, 2003; Maringer and Slotta-Bachmayr, 2006; Taylor et al, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of tree species preferred by beavers (willow, aspen, alder) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of species protected by law that would be in danger with the presence of the beaver 	Deduction based on: Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018; Taylor et al, 2017
Allen, 1982; Nolet and Rosell, 1998; Stringer et al, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Band of riparian vegetation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of landscape constraints (UNESCO sites and Regional Landscape Plane) 	Deduction based on: Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018; Taylor et al, 2017
Allen, 1982	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constant seasonal variation of flow rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monumental trees 	Deduction based on: Stringer et al, 2015; Taylor et al, 2017
Derived from meetings with beaver experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary river branches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail and road network 	Deduction based on Taylor et al, 2017 and derived from meetings with beaver experts
Dittbrenner et al., 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimal valley width (extensive riparian areas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive presence/absence of predators (wolf, bear, lynx, fox) 	Deduction based on: Nolet and Rosell, 1998
Allen, 1982; Anderson & Bonner, 2014; Maringer and Slotta-Bachmayr, 2006; South et al, 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercourses with reduced slope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of bridges, embankments, bank defences, water intake/return structures, crossings 	Deduction based on Taylor et al, 2017 and derived from meetings with beaver experts
Allen, 1982; Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of wetlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of agricultural canals 	Deduction based on Taylor et al, 2017 and derived from meetings with beaver experts
Derived from meetings with beaver experts and Pollock et al, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of damaged landscapes (incised channels subject to constant erosion) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anthropization/urbanization 	Deduction based on Taylor et al, 2017
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crops and coppice wood 	Deduction based on Taylor et al, 2017 and derived from meetings with beaver experts
References and Sources	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS	References and Sources
Pollock et al, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beavers as an instrument for ecological restoration of damaged landscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on the landscape (felling of trees, plants and crops gnawed, construction of dams and consequent flooding of wooded areas, crops, roads) 	Taylor et al, 2017
Gorczyca et al, 2018; Stringer et al., 2015.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of basins and wet areas, branched river structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degradation and destabilization of banks due to the excavation of burrows (micro and nano variations of the morphology of the place) 	Gorczyca et al, 2018; Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018
Nyssen et al, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation of the water regime and flood mitigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncontrolled flooding (impact on the landscape/social and economic) 	Klimenko and Eponchintseva, 2014; Butler and Malanson, 2005; Butler et al, 1989.
Nummi et al, 2013; Hood and Bayley, 2008.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on the water balance of the area, droughts and forest fire risk reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damaged natural assets 	Taylor et al, 2017


Puttock et al, 2017; Martin et al, 2015; Stringer et al, 2015.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase sedimentation and nutrient accumulation (decrease in speed and erosion) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to crops, fruit trees and coppice (economical damage) 	Taylor et al, 2017
Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing of flora and fauna species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration of the dam not predictable (variable duration from 1 to 50 years) with following management of flood waves and material presence in the riverbed (timber, mud/sediments, stones) 	Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018; Butler and Malanson, 2005
Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase biodiversity of species living in or preferring conditions of humidity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Death of part of the vegetation present, depending on the type 	Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018; Thompson et al., 2016
Stringer et al., 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial change of forest structure (lighter at ground level and growth of species not commonly associated with riparian areas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease in species for which the habitat created by the beavers is not favourable 	Stringer et al., 2015
Stringer et al., 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiation in the age of the species preferred by beavers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of ecological continuity of species associated with old woods 	Stringer et al., 2015
Ruys et al, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cohabitation with nutria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial redistribution of reintroduced individuals 	Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018
Rosell et al, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversified and abundant bird species more than without beavers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease dissolved oxygen, slow flow and reduced circulation within the ponds. Possible death of some species of fish (degenerate case) 	Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018
Bouwes et al., 2016; Rosell et al, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased areas suitable for fish reproduction and deposition, constant maintenance of the ideal water temperature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dams as barriers for moving fish (influence on some types of fish) 	Rosell et al, 2005
Stringer et al., 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitation of some non-native invasive species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spread of non-native invasive species 	Stringer et al., 2015
Elliot et al, 2017; Puttock et al, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement of water quality, pollutants retained in the sediments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence on carbon cycle (accumulation of carbon in beaver meadows, releases of methane in the troposphere) 	Whitfield et al., 2015
Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence on the nitrogen cycle, allochthonous nitrogen fixation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible spread of diseases 	Taylor et al, 2017
Derived from meetings with beaver experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dams as an ecological corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible reduction of dissolved oxygen and creation of anaerobic conditions (degenerate case) 	Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018
Nolet and Rosell, 1998.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife tourism and hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible death of beavers invested or exhausted by the current of water taken for hydroelectric 	Derived from meetings with beaver experts
Derived from meetings with beaver experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural growth of local populations thanks to the implementation of awareness actions and training courses (reintroduction as an educational tool) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequent increase in beavers number, loss of diversity and increase of human-beaver conflicts 	Nolet and Rosell, 1998
Derived from meetings with beaver experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase ecological knowledge on the species thanks to monitoring activities 		

238 **3.3 MC-SDSS development**

239 Once the SWOT analysis was performed, the Piedmont area was analysed through a spatial multicriteria
 240 analysis to identify suitable areas for a possible beaver reintroduction.

241 The procedure can be divided into five different phases, according to the scheme shown in **Figure 5**.

242



243

244 **Fig. 5.** Spatial Multicriteria analysis scheme subdivided into five phases and reporting the outputs obtained during each step
 245 (elaborated from Malczewski (1999))

246 Phase 1 consists in the definition of the problem structure. The analysis starts from the definition of the
 247 objective of the evaluation, which in this case was the identification of one or more areas suitable for the
 248 reintroduction of beaver in Piedmont. Subsequently, a number of criteria and a set of related sub-criteria
 249 were chosen, taking into account the needs of the animal and the positive and negative effects that it could
 250 generate on the territory. In particular, the problem was broken down into two criteria, called Potentials and
 251 Criticalities, which respectively consider 7 and 8 sub-criteria. These sub-criteria derive from the strengths
 252 and weaknesses contained in the SWOT matrix and they were transformed in spatial indicators for the
 253 Spatial Multicriteria Analysis. In order to have a clearer view of the correlation between SWOT and Spatial
 254 Multicriteria Analysis, **Table 2** shows the link between strengths and potentials and between weaknesses and
 255 criticalities. As can be seen in **Table 2**, not all the strengths and the weaknesses of SWOT were considered
 256 for two main reasons. Firstly, the lack of data related to some aspects of the territory, such as the distribution
 257 of bears and foxes, and the presence of secondary river branches. Secondly, the complexity of spatializing

258 some of these aspects with the resolution used in this case study, such as the distribution of lynxes and
 259 wolves, the seasonal variation of flow rates, and the valley width.

260
 261 **Tab. 2.** List of indicators selected for the spatial multicriteria analysis. The indicators derive from the spatialization of strengths and
 262 weaknesses into potentials and criticalities.

Strengths (SWOT analysis)	Potentials (Spatial Multicriteria Analysis)
Presence of tree species preferred by beavers (willow, aspen, alder)	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species composition of woody vegetation • Function of woody vegetation
Band of riparian vegetation	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of vegetation within 20 m from the stream
Constant seasonal variation of flow rates	
Secondary river branches	
Optimal valley width (extensive riparian areas)	
Watercourses with reduced slope	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stream gradient • Stream substrate
Presence of wetlands	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of wetlands
Presence of damaged landscapes (incised channels subject to constant erosion)	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of naturalness of the territory
Weaknesses (SWOT analysis)	Criticalities (Spatial Multicriteria Analysis)
Presence of species protected by law that would be in danger with the presence of the beaver	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected natural areas
Presence of landscape constraints	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected landscapes
Monumental trees	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance from monumental trees
Rail and road network	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance from railways and highways • Distance from provincial, state, municipal roads
Excessive presence/absence of predators (wolf, bear, lynx, fox)	
Presence of bridges, embankments, bank defences, water intake/return structures, crossing	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density of hydraulic works
Presence of agricultural canals	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance from agricultural canals
Anthropization/urbanization	→ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of anthropization of the territory
Crops and coppice wood	

263
 264 In Phase 2, each sub-criterion was implemented in a geographic system through different steps. Firstly, the
 265 spatial data and information were collected from some regional open databases (SICOD, Geoportal of
 266 Piedmont Region and of ARPA Piedmont) or national databases (SINAnet and Web site of Ministry of
 267 Agricultural, Forestry and Tourism Policies) and then developed into sub-criterion maps. Depending on the
 268 specific data, some preliminary developments were implemented. A merge of some shapefiles were obtained

269 from different sources, as applied in agricultural canals. A reclassification was performed with respect to a
270 specific attribute (as applied in the level of anthropization or naturalness of the territory). Clipping was
271 carried out on a buffer zone, as applied in the presence of vegetation within 20 m from the stream. Secondly,
272 different spatial analyses were conducted on the first maps in order to obtain a raster map for each sub-
273 criterion, where each pixel represents a level of suitability. Three different types of spatial analysis were
274 performed: reclassification (used to assign a numerical value to the qualitative categories of some sub-
275 criteria, such as species composition of woody vegetation, presence of wetlands, protected natural areas,
276 protected landscapes), Euclidean distance (used to evaluate the distance from a certain factor, such as roads,
277 monumental trees or irrigation canals) and kernel density (only used to obtain the density of hydraulic works,
278 considering a 100 m radius). Thirdly, a standardization function was created for each sub-criterion,
279 converting the different units of measures and values of each sub-criterion on a common scale, from 0 to 1
280 (Sharifi and Rodriguez, 2002; Beinat, 1997; Eastman, 2006). The original values were converted to 0 when
281 the maps showed the minimum potentiality or criticality and 1 for the maximum. In the present study, the
282 standardization was performed based on the literature. **Table 3** describes the set of sub-criteria identified for
283 the analysis for each criterion, reporting a short description for each of them, the source map used, the spatial
284 analysis method and the bibliographic sources at the basis of standardization. To provide an illustrative
285 example, **Figure 6** shows the procedure for the creation of a sub-criterion map. The figure reports the initial
286 row map (**Fig. 6a**), the intermediary source map (**Fig. 6b**), the standardization function (**Fig. 6c**) and the
287 standardized map (**Fig. 6d**) for the sub-criterion related to the species composition of woody vegetation (one
288 of the Potentials sub-criteria).

Tab. 3. List of criteria and sub-criteria considered for the evaluation of beaver reintroduction. For each sub-criterion a short description, the source data and scale, the spatial analysis performed and the bibliographic sources for the standardization procedure are given.


Criteria	Sub criteria	Description	Source map	Spatial analysis	Bibliographic sources for standardization
Potentials	Species composition of woody vegetation	It subdivides tree species into deciduous trees preferred by beavers, broad-leaved trees, mixed deciduous and coniferous woods, conifers and other (all that is not woody vegetation).	Map of woodland, Geoportal of Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 2016 - scale 1:10000) and Corine Land Cover map, SINAnet (Shapefile, 2012 - Scale 1:100000)	Reclassification. Deciduous trees preferred by beavers have the highest score (100); broad-leaved trees (80); mixed deciduous and coniferous (60); conifers (40); the score is nil in the rest of the territory.	Beavers prefer to feed willow, poplar, alder and ash (Maringer and Slotta-Bachmayr, 2006). However, these varieties are not the only source of food. Different types of broad-leaved trees are regularly included in the feeding of this rodent when present in large quantities (Allen, 1982; Taylor et al., 2017). Also conifers are not excluded from the diet when deciduous trees are absent (Baker and Hill, 2003).
	Function of woody vegetation	It represents the role that forest plays, subdivided into productive, protective, tourist-recreational, naturalistic and environmental function.	Map of woodland, Geoportal of Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 2016 - scale 1:10000)	Reclassification. Naturalistic function has the highest score (100); protective (80); tourist-recreational (60); without specific function (50); productive and protective (40); productive (20); the score is nil in the rest of the territory.	Beavers prefer to live in freshwater habitats surrounded by woods (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018), so the optimal habitat for this animal will be given by wooded areas as natural as possible, where it can live undisturbed.
	Presence of vegetation within 20 m from the stream	It represents the strip of vegetation along the watercourse within 20 m from the banks.	Map of woodland, Geoportal of Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 2016 - scale 1:10000) and Map of riverbed types and flow rates, Geoportal of ARPA Piedmont (Shapefile, 2005 – scale 1:100000)	Reclassification. Riparian vegetation has the highest score (100); no riparian vegetation (10); the score is nil in the rest of the territory (outside of 20m buffer zone).	Beavers prefer to live in freshwater habitats surrounded by woods (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018). The distance traveled by the beaver to obtain food, however, seems to depend on various factors including topography of the place, distribution and type of woody vegetation, as well as the minimum area, intended as the minimum size that habitat must have to support beaver settlement. In this case, it was considered 20 m from the waterway, minimum distance from which beaver signs have been identified (Nolet and Rosell, 1998) and often associated with the minimum

					size of continuous habitats (Maringer and Slotta-Bachmayr, 2006).
Stream gradient	Inclination or degree of steepness of a watercourse or a stretch of it.	Map of riverbed types and flow rates, Geoportal of ARPA Piedmont (Shapefile, 2005 – scale 1:100000)	Reclassification. Lakes and gradient <6% have the highest score (100); >=6% (80); 1-16% (60); not identified gradient (50); >=16% (10); the score is nil in the rest of the territory.	Beaver prefer water bodies with a gradient <6% and the number of colonies decrease with the increase of gradient until to annul for gradient > 15% (Allen, 1982).	
Stream substrate	Material that constitutes watercourse's bed classified as rock, rock and/or loose materials, rock and/or alluvial deposits, alluvial deposits, unidentified.	Map of riverbed types and flow rates, Geoportal of ARPA Piedmont (Shapefile, 2005 – scale 1:100000)	Reclassification. Alluvial deposits have the highest score (100); rock and/or alluvial deposits (60); not identified substrate (50); rock and/or loose materials (10); the score is nil in the rest of the territory.	Beavers prefer water bodies characterized by soft substrates (South et al., 2000) where it can easily dig the den and building dams. Activities seem to reduce or even cancel out where there are rocky substrates or large boulders (McComb et al., 1990).	
Presence of wetlands	Presence of natural environments characterized by the presence of land and water, such as swamps and ponds, peat bogs, marshes and ponds, wet forests, lakes, riparian areas, running waters.	Map of wetlands, Geoportal of ARPA Piedmont (Lyr file, 2011 - scale 1:10000)	Reclassification. Wetlands have the highest score; the score is nil in the rest of the territory.	Beavers live in freshwater habitats surrounded by woods (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018) with a preference for habitats characterized by standing water (Stringer et al., 2015). Their damming activity change the environment creating unique lentic habitat (Stringer et al., 2015; Taylor et al, 2017).	
Level of naturalness of the territory	Relates natural areas, represented by wooded areas, semi-natural environments, wetlands and water bodies, and artificial/agricultural areas	Corine Land Cover map, SINAnet (Shapefile, 2012 - Scale 1:100000)	Reclassification. Natural areas have the highest score; the score is nil in artificial/agricultural areas.	Beavers live in freshwater habitats surrounded by woods, but it is possible to find them also along agricultural canals or in suburban and urban areas (Taylor et al., 2017). However, in order to identify an area suitable for reintroduction it is necessary to take into account what is the optimal habitat for the life of this animal, that meets its needs and without beaver-man conflicts that would put its safety at risk.	

Criticalities	Protected natural areas	Consisting of natural areas protected at regional, national or community level such as Parks, Sites of Regional Interest (SIR) and Sites Natura 2000 (Sites of Community Interest – SCI and Special Protection Areas – SPA)	Map of natural protected areas, Piedmont Region’s web site (Shapefile, 2017 - Scale 1:10000)	Reclassification. Natural protected areas have the highest score; the score is nil in the rest of the territory.	Beavers are able to change the environment, creating a unique habitat (Stringer et al., 2015; Taylor et al., 2017). However the transformation imposed by the beaver, with the construction of dams and the consequent flooding of the adjacent areas, leads to the death of part of the vegetation due to the lack of oxygen in the soil and a change in the species of flora and fauna (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018). For this reason, it is good to protect those natural areas of regional, national or international importance which could otherwise be damaged by the presence of this rodent.
	Protected landscapes	Criterion consisting of the "Sites included in the UNESCO World Heritage list" and the "Rural areas of specific landscape interest"	Regional landscape plan, Geoportal of Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 2017 - Scale 1:25000)	Reclassification. Protected landscapes have the highest score; the score is nil in the rest of the territory.	Beavers are able to change the environment, creating a unique habitat and landscape (Taylor et al., 2017). For this reason, it is good to protect those areas of specific landscape and cultural interest which could otherwise be damaged by the presence of this rodent.
	Distance from monumental trees	Criterion constituted by “Sites It represents the distances from monumental trees, a common good with a naturalistic, landscape and historical-cultural value.	National list of monumental trees, Web site of Ministry of Agricultural, Forestry and Tourism Policies (Excel File, 2018)	Euclidean distance. Monotonically decreasing function that assigns the higher score to areas which are less than 20 m away from monumental trees and the lower score to areas more than 100 m away.	Beavers prefer to feed soft woody vegetation with diameter <10 cm or at the most of 20 cm. But also, trees with diameter >100 cm are been used by beavers (Stringer et al., 2015). The distance traveled by the beaver to obtain food seems to depend on various factors including topography of the place, distribution and type of woody vegetation, as well as the minimum area, intended as the minimum size that habitat must have to support beaver settlement. In this case, it was considered a minimum distance of 20 m from the tree - i.e. the minimum distance from which beaver signs have been identified (Nolet and Rosell, 1998) and often associated with the minimum size of continuous habitats (Maringer and Slotta-

					Bachmayr, 2006) - and a maximum distance of 100 m (Allen, 1982).
Distance from railways and highways	Represents distances from railways and highways.	Map of transport infrastructures, Geoportal of Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 2004 – scale 1:100000)	Euclidean distance. Monotonically decreasing function that assigns the higher score to areas which are less than 20 m away from highway/railways and the lower score to areas more than 30 m away.		The minimum distance from which beaver signs have been identified (Nolet and Rosell, 1998) is equal to 20 m from watercourse.
Distance from provincial, state, municipal roads	Represents distances from provincial, state and municipal roads.	Map of transport infrastructures, Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 2004 – scale 1:100000)	Euclidean distance. Monotonically decreasing function that assigns the higher score to areas which are less than 5 m away from highway/railways and the lower score to areas more than 20 m away.		Beavers could degrade and destabilize riverbanks through burrowing (Taylor et al., 2017). The burrows have a maximum length of 4 m (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018). At the same time the minimum distance from which beaver signs have been identified (Nolet and Rosell, 1998) is equal to 20 m from watercourse.
Density of hydraulic works	Density of embankments, crossings fords, bank defences, spillways, bridles, collection and restitution work.	Maps of hydraulic works, SICOD Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 2009 – scale 1:10000)	Kernel density. Monotonically increasing function that assigns the higher score to areas with less density of hydraulic works and the lower score to areas with high density.		Beavers are able to obstruct pipes and bridles with wood material and dig tunnels in the banks damaging hydraulic works and bank defenses and limiting or cancelling out their function. (Taylor et al., 2017)
Level of anthropization of the territory	It highlights the presence of artificial, agricultural and natural surfaces (wooded, semi-natural areas, wetlands and water bodies).	Corine Land Cover map, SINAnet (Shapefile, 2012 - Scale 1:100000)	Reclassification. Artificial surfaces have the highest score (100); agricultural (60); the score is nil in natural areas.		Beavers live in freshwater habitats surrounded by woods, but it is possible to find them also along agricultural canals or in suburban and urban areas (Taylor et al., 2017). However, more an area is anthropized, more beaver-human conflicts will arise.
Distance from agricultural channels	It represents distance from agricultural channels.	Maps of channel and conduits SIBI (Shapefile, 2016 - Scale 1:10000), Geoportal and web site of	Euclidean distance. Monotonically decreasing function that assigns the higher score to areas which are less than 20 m away		Beavers live in freshwater habitats surrounded by woods, but it is possible to find them also along agricultural canals or in suburban and urban areas (Taylor et al., 2017). Minimum distance from which beaver signs have been

			Piedmont Region (Shapefile, 1993 - Scale 1:100000)	from highway/railways and the lower score to areas more than 30 m away.	identified (Nolet and Rosell, 1998) and often associated with the minimum size of continuous habitats (Maringer and Slotta-Bachmayr, 2006) is 20 m from watercourse. While the minimum buffer zone to guarantee fluvial functionality is equal to 30 m (Manuale APAT, 2007).
--	--	--	--	---	---



292
293
294

Fig. 6 Exemplary procedure for the creation of a sub-criterion map (Species composition of woody vegetation). Initial map (a), the spatial analyzed map (b), the standardization function (c) and the standardized map (d).


295 Phase 3 is devoted to the identification of the importance of each sub-criterion to the achievement of
 296 evaluation goal. To define this importance, a variety of points of view are considered, involving different
 297 stakeholders to participate at a questionnaire. In this study, the stakeholders chosen were beaver experts,
 298 biologists, hydraulic engineers, farmers, architects and local inhabitants. In particular, each of them was
 299 asked to assign the level of importance of each sub-criterion in achieving the evaluation objective through a
 300 pairwise comparison. A ratio scale from 1 to 9 was used (the so-called Saaty fundamental scale (Saaty,
 301 1980)), where 1 means an equal influence of the two sub-criteria and 9 an extremely importance of one sub-
 302 criteria with respect to the other. This weighting approach is used in the Analytic Hierarchic Process (AHP)
 303 methodology, one of the most common multicriteria analysis, to obtain the eigenvector of the pairwise
 304 comparison matrix which represents the synthesis of the numerical judgements established at each level of
 305 the network (Saaty, 2005). As an example, **Figure 7** and **Table 4** respectively provide an exemplary
 306 questionnaire submitted to one expert and the corresponding pairwise comparison matrix with the priorities
 307 obtained for to the evaluation of Potentials.
 308

POTENTIALS

The Potentials criterion represents the aspects of the territory that can be considered a strength point for a possible reintroduction of the beaver. With respect to this criterion, which of the two sub-criteria do you consider having the greater influence on the choice of the most suitable area for reintroduction? And to what extent?

Assign a value from 1 to 9 for each pair.

1 = equal influence 3 = moderate influence 5 = strong influence 7 = very strong influence 9 = extreme influence
 2, 4, 6, 8 = intermediate values



309 **Fig. 7.** Exemplary of the questionnaire taken by one stakeholder. The sub-criterion related to the species composition of woody
 310 vegetation is compared to other six potential sub-criteria. The blackened boxes return the value assigned by the expert.
 311

312 **Tab. 4.** Pair comparison matrix and its corresponding priorities obtained from expert judgments for Potentials. (A=Species
 313 composition of woody vegetation; B= Function of woody vegetation; C = Presence of vegetation within 20 m from the
 314 stream; D = Stream gradient; E= Stream substrate; F=Presence of wetlands; G=Level of naturalness of the territory;)

Sub criteria	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Priorities
A	1	7	3	4	3	1	6	0.322
B	1/7	1	1/6	1/5	1/4	1/5	1/5	0.025
C	1/3	6	1	1	4	2	4	0.182
D	1/4	5	1	1	4	3	4	0.195

E	1/3	4	1/4	1/4	1	3	2	0.057
F	1	5	1/2	1/3	1/3	1	5	0.158
G	1/6	5	1/4	1/4	1/2	1/5	1	0.061

Inconsistency	0.1
----------------------	-----


315 All judgments were processed using the Expert Choice software¹ which automatically elaborated the square
316 matrices of the pairwise comparison. The software returned as outputs the priorities (**Tab. 5**), i.e. the
317 weights, which represent the level of importance of each sub-criteria. The standardized maps, obtained
318 during Phase 2 were aggregated to obtain the maps of Potentials and Criticalities (**Fig. 8**) through the
319 weighted sum of each sub-criterion map.

320 **Tab. 5.** Priorities of Potentials and Criticalities, obtained by Expert Choice, based on the collected stakeholders' judgements.
321 Reported in descending order.

Potentials	Priorities
Presence of vegetation within 20 m from the stream	0.200
Presence of wetlands	0.199
Stream gradient	0.166
Species composition of woody vegetation	0.141
Level of naturalness of the territory	0.132
Function of woody vegetation	0.090
Stream substrate	0.072

Criticalities	Priorities
Protected landscapes	0.165
Distance from railways and highways	0.164
Density of hydraulic works	0.150
Distance from provincial, state, municipal roads	0.143
Distance from agricultural canals	0.110
Distance from monumental trees	0.105
Protected natural areas	0.090
Level of anthropization of the territory	0.074

¹ <https://www.expertchoice.com/2020>



322
323 **Fig. 8.** Maps of Potentials and Criticalities. The Potentials (a) presents everywhere, except for water bodies, areas characterized by
324 very low or low potentiality (red and orange range). The Criticalities (b) presents very low or low critical issues (green and light
325 green range), excluding some areas that present medium-high criticalities. There are no very high critical areas.

326
327 At this stage, a Sensitivity analysis was conducted (Phase 4) by varying the set of weights assigned in order
328 to verify the robustness of the analysis. First, the balanced scenario was developed, awarding equal
329 importance to all sub criteria. Then, an OAT (One-At-Time) approach was implemented, raising the
330 relevance of one criterion at a time and keeping all the other sub-criteria at the same weight. The sensitivity
331 analysis showed similar results in the scenarios developed. This means that the evaluation was stable since
332 the best and worst areas remained the same both for potentials and criticalities maps. As an example, the
333 comparison between the map of Potentials and the balanced scenario of the sensitivity analysis is reported in
334 the Appendix.

335 In Phase 5, the two maps of Potentials and Criticalities were intersected in order to obtain the map of the
336 suitable areas for the reintroduction of the *Castor fiber* in the Piedmont territory (**Fig. 9**). This result is
337 discussed in detail in the Results and Discussion section.

339 4. Results and Discussion

340 The previous section described in detail the application of the integrated approach performed, SWOT and
341 Spatial Multicriteria Analysis, to evaluate beaver reintroduction in Italy and to identify suitable areas in
342 Piedmont. This section describes the results of analysis base on the Map of suitable areas previously
343 obtained.

344 The Map of Suitable Areas (**Fig. 9**) is characterized by four suitability classes (**Tab. 6**) obtained through the
345 intersection of the two maps of Potentials and Criticalities criteria.

346
347 **Tab. 6.** Suitability classes obtained by intersecting Potentials and Criticalities.

Class	Suitability value	Potentials \cap Criticalities	Colour
1	Very High	Very High P. \cap Very Low C.	

2	High	High P. \cap Low C.	
3	Medium	Medium P. \cap Medium C.	
4	Low	Low P. \cap High C.	

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359


360

361

The highest class, identified with Very High, includes areas with typical features of beaver habitat, such as riparian vegetation within 20m from the stream, wetlands, low stream gradient, and very low criticalities, where human-beaver conflict is the lowest. By contrast, the suitability value class called Low includes areas with few beaver habitat characteristics and many critical elements, such as protected landscape, railways and streets or agricultural canals.

Overall, it is possible to highlight the presence of:


- numerous areas of very high suitability, interspersed with areas of medium-high suitability, distributed more or less continuously along the main waterways in foothill and in plane zones; these areas have maximum suitability (very high potential and very low criticality) for beaver reintroduction;
- most of the areas with very high suitability but very fragmented are in mountain zones;
- a limited number of areas (about ten) with low suitability for *Castor fiber* can be found throughout the territory.



362
363
364
365

Fig. 9. Map of the areas suitable for the reintroduction of the *Castor fiber* in the Piedmont territory obtained intersecting map of Potentials and Criticalities. (Dark green=Potentials very high and criticalities very low; Light green=Potentials high and criticalities low; Yellow= Potentials and criticalities medium; Orange=Potentials low and criticalities high).

366 Apart from the Map of Suitable Areas, which represents the final result of the analysis, two maps were
 367 created, Scenario Suitability 1 and 2 with a zoom on three different areas in **Figure 10**. In particular,
 368 Scenario 1 shows areas with very high potential and high criticality where beaver settling after a natural
 369 redistribution could create conflict with humans with great probability. Scenario 2 highlights a greater
 370 number of areas suitable for the reintroduction, i.e. those areas with a very high suitability surrounded by
 371 buffer areas. Buffer areas are those characterized by high potential and low or very low criticality, without
 372 any problems for beavers or humans.



373
 374 **Fig. 10.** Two scenarios of suitability (Scenario 1 and 2, respectively the images in the middle and below) compared with the final
 375 suitability map (images above) for three different areas.

376
 377 **5. Conclusions**

378 The present paper has illustrated the combination of SWOT analysis and Multicriteria Spatial Decision
 379 Support System (MC-SDSS) for the construction of a map of suitable areas for the reintroduction of the

380 beaver in Piedmont. These areas are characterized by typical features of beaver habitat, such as riparian
381 vegetation, wetlands, low stream gradient, and they present a very low level of criticality, since the risk of
382 beaver-human conflict is very limited. The results show that the most suitable areas are mostly located along
383 the main watercourses in foothill and in plane zones. At the same time, the model allows the identification of
384 a number of buffer zones, characterized by lower potential than optimal habitats and by low or very low
385 criticality. These zones further restrict human-beaver conflict in the event of a natural beaver redistribution.
386 Overall, the results obtained are significant and in agreement with expectations, and the innovative approach
387 proposed support the complex problem of localization, in line with national and international guidelines for
388 reintroduction. Findings identify the suitable areas in terms of potentials for the beaver habitat and avoid
389 conflicts with men and their settlements. These areas are usually determined using the Habitat Suitability
390 Index models, which estimate the ability of a given habitat to support a specific species based on species-
391 habitat relationships (United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 1981). The integrated procedure applied in
392 this research combines SWOT analysis and MC-SDSS. Therefore, it is able to take into account not only the
393 territorial characteristics necessary for the identification of a suitable habitat, but also economic and social
394 aspects, useful for the elaboration of a shared action plan. In this way, environmental and technical
395 characteristics, as well as socio-economic factors, can be considered simultaneously, and a long-term plan of
396 action can be proposed for a wider area of the territory under consideration.

397 Moreover, the methodology proposed in this paper can usefully support both an investigation of beaver
398 reintroduction in other territorial contexts or, more generally, the assessment and management of the
399 potentialities and criticalities of habitats where some species have been already reintroduced or located.
400 Regarding beaver reintroduction in other territories, the methodology and list of indicators could be used as a
401 whole since it is consistent with the main national and international studies on the beaver benefits and
402 impacts. However, to fit in with the specificities of a given territory, this list may need to be improved or
403 changed slightly. As an example, in Northern European countries, such as Norway, Sweden or Finland,
404 wood production is a leading sector of the economy, and the presence of beavers is often harmful because of
405 the serious tree damage they cause (Parker et al., 1999). The model presented partially considers the damage
406 to loggers in the sub-criterion level of anthropization. For Northern European countries, a higher level of
407 attention would be necessary to this damage, for example by using an additional sub-criterion – and therefore
408 a map – which would consider the presence of forests exploited for profit. On the contrary, some sub-criteria,
409 such as the distance from monumental trees or protected areas, would be eliminated. The specific socio-
410 economic and cultural policies of each country could be a reference to fix the list of relevant indicators.
411 For what concerns the maintenance of other species, the proposed methodology can be used both for guiding
412 their reintroduction and for the management of those already present (Ovenden et al., 2019; Tosi et al.,
413 2015). The present research could represent a valuable methodological framework where the indicators are
414 necessarily adapted to the specific characteristics of the species considered. Moreover, the management of
415 existing species is a relevant aspect both at a local and wider scale, and the methodology proposed can help
416 public administrations in the definition of a plan of action.

417 For the specific area analysed, some reflections could be proposed as a guide for future research on this field.
418 Firstly, it should be noted that this study did not consider the entire territory of Northern Italy, where this
419 animal could probably live. This is due to two main issues: (i) it is unfeasible to perform a single analysis on
420 such extensive area, since details would be lost in the wider scale; (ii) standardization of the data based on
421 the different regulations of each single regional body could cause an oversimplification of the final results.
422 However, the proposed process is completely reproducible for other regions using the same set of indicators,
423 which derives from a national and international research of suitable and unsuitable habitats for the beaver.
424 Secondly, the final map obtained, i.e. the Map of Suitable Areas, represents a good starting point for
425 choosing the best place in which to reintroduce the beaver. However, further studies should be performed, in
426 particular on the size, distribution and ecological continuity of the areas. In fact, due to the great adaptability
427 of this animal and its tendency to move (Rozhkova-Timina et al., 2018), it is essential to evaluate the surface
428 size and a buffer zone in order to avoid possible conflict generated by over-distribution.

429 Thirdly, the method performed to identify suitable areas for reintroduction should be coupled with an
430 adequate management plan able to structure all the steps of the intervention and to manage all its aspects.

431 The result could be an instrument to analyse all aspects of this complex context but would not be a definitive
432 answer to the question "Reintroduction - yes or no?". In fact, even if the final maps show many suitable areas
433 in the Piedmont region with many benefits (Rozhkova-Timina, 2018), three fundamental aspects must be
434 taken into account:

- 435 1. The beaver, which disappeared more than 500 years ago from our territory, could be seen negatively
436 by the population as occurred with the natural return of wolf in the territories where it lived in the
437 past.
- 438 2. Once reintroduced, beavers will probably migrate and settle to other areas, including suboptimal
439 areas due to the great adaptability of this animal.
- 440 3. The probability of conflict between man and beaver is very high, so costs for the recovering should
441 be taken to account (Campbell et al, 2007; Taylor et al., 2017).

442 If reintroduction is chosen, an information and training campaign will be necessary to raise the population's
443 awareness of the benefits and impacts of the beaver in the territory. Moreover, a management program
444 should be defined in advance both for the reintroduction of animals and for management of the
445 damage/conflict. At the same time, it should be defined the rules at the basis of the reintroduction, such as
446 who will intervene and how, and possible monetary compensation where damages occur. Management costs
447 are not easy to estimate since they depend strictly on the studied area, the type of conflict, the solutions
448 adopted, the possible compensation measures for damage to different goods and whether these actions are
449 performed in the short or the long term. Nevertheless, an advance plan of actions would reduce costs to a
450 minimum; instead, if plans are made only after beaver colonies have been already established, management
451 could be more difficult and expensive (Taylor et al., 2017).

452 A future perspective of this research could consider the value of beaver reintroduction with respect to the
453 provision or reduction of ecosystem services. According to Campbell et al. (2007), the only attempt to assess
454 the role of beavers in the context of ecosystem services indicates that benefits are high. In fact, the wetlands
455 created by beaver activity can offer and improve a wide range of ecosystem services, in particular by
456 reducing erosion, improving water quality through the regulation of sediment retention, the level of nutrients
457 and dangerous chemical components, reducing flood peaks after intense rainfall and storing water in the
458 aquifer. The topic of ecosystem services and their evaluation has intensively increased in the last twenty
459 years. More recently, the study of the benefits and impacts of wildlife has begun, the role of bees in crop
460 production has been recognised, as well as the importance of the presence of a variety of species for
461 biodiversity (Dee et al., 2019; Leroy et al., 2018). However, there is still little awareness at the political level
462 on the role of animals in generating spin-off effects on a territory. The reintroduction of the beaver, as well
463 of many other species, can strongly contribute to the restoration of the ecological and natural balance of an
464 area. The present research could represent a first step in the direction of increasing consciousness of
465 decision-makers, by guiding them in the definition of a strategic plan for increasing a variety of ecosystem
466 services in their territory.

467

468

469 **Acknowledgements:** Part of this research was developed by the author (Anna Treves) into the Master Thesis
470 in Environmental and Territorial Engineering at Politecnico di Torino titled *Studies and methodologies for*
471 *the identification of areas suitable for the reintroduction of Castor fiber in the Piedmont region (Italy)*
472 supervised by Professor Comino, Professor Bottero and PhD student Caterina Caprioli.

473 The authors would like to thank Christof Angst, leading the Service Conseil Castor, for his collaboration,
474 help and passion shown during the visit of the Swiss beaver land.

475

476

477 **Funding:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial,
478 or not-for-profit sectors.

479 **References**

- 480
- 481 Aldrovandi, U. 1637. De quadrupedibus digitatis viviparis libri tres et de quadrupedibus digitatis oviparis
 482 libri duo. Bartholomaeus Ambrosinus collegit. A. Nicolaum Tebaldinum ed., Bononia: 1-716.
- 483 Allen, A.W., 1982. Habitat suitability index models: beaver. *U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv. FWS/OBS- 82/10.30*.
- 484 Anderson, J., Bonner, J., 2014. Modeling Habitat Suitability for Beaver (*Castor canadensis*) Using
 485 Geographic Information Systems. *International Conference on Future Environment and Energy*, Vol. 61,
 486 pp. 12-23.
- 487 Baker, B.W., Hill, E.P., 2003. Beaver (*Castor canadensis*), pp 288-310 in G. A. Feldhamer, B. C. Thompson,
 488 and J. A. Chapman, editors. *Wild Mammals of North America: Biology, Management, and Conservation*.
 489 Second Edition. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.
- 490 Batbold, J, Batsaikhan, N., Shar, S., Hutterer, R., Kryštufek, B., Yigit, N., Mitsain, G. Palomo, L. 2016.
 491 *Castor fiber*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T4007A115067136.
 492 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T4007A22188115.en>
- 493 Beinat, E., 1997. Value functions for environmental management. In *Value functions for environmental*
 494 *management* (pp. 77-106). Springer, Dordrecht.
- 495 Bottero, M., Comino, E., Dell'Anna, F., Dominici, L., Rosso, M., 2019. Strategic Assessment and Economic
 496 Evaluation: The Case Study of Yanzhou Island (China). *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1076. Bouwes, N., Weber,
 497 N., Jordan, C.E., Saunders, W.C., Tattam, I.A., Volk, C., Wheaton, J.M., Pollock, M.M., 2016.
 498 Ecosystem experiment reveals benefits of natural and simulated beaver dams to a threatened population
 499 of steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Scientific Reports*. 6:28581. DOI: 10.1038/srep28581
- 500 Butler, D.R., Malanson, G.P., 2005. The geomorphic influences of beaver dams and failure of beaver dams.
 501 *Geomorphology*. 71, 48-60
- 502 Butler, D.R., 1989. The Failure of Beaver Dams and Resulting Outburst Flooding: A geomorphic Hazard of
 503 the Southeastern Piedmont. *The Geographical Bulletin* 31(1), 29-38.
- 504 Campbell, R., Dutton, A., Hughes, J., 2007. Economic impacts of the beaver. Report for the Wild Britain
 505 Initiative. 28 pages
- 506 Campbell-Palmer, R., Rosell, F., 2010. Conservation of the Eurasian beaver *Castor fiber*: an olfactory
 507 perspective. *Mammal Rev.* 2010, Vol. 40, No. 4, 293-312
- 508 Cazzolla Gatti, R., Callaghan, T.V., Rozhkova-Timina, I., Dudko, A., Lim, A., Vorobyev, S.N., Kirpotin,
 509 S.N., Pokrovsky, O.S., 2018. The role of Eurasian beaver (*Castor fiber*) in the storage, emission and
 510 deposition of carbon in lakes and rivers of the River Ob flood plain, western Siberia. *Science of the Total*
 511 *Environment*. 644, 1371–1379.
- 512 Comino, E., Ferretti, V., 2016. Indicators-based spatial SWOT analysis: Supporting the strategic planning
 513 and management of complex territorial systems. *Ecological Indicators*, 60, 1104-1117.
- 514 Dee, L.E., Cowles, J., Isbell, F., Pau, S., Gaines, S.D., Reich, P.B., 2019. When Do Ecosystem Services
 515 Depend on Rare Species? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. Vol. 34, No. 8.
 516 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.03.010>
- 517 Dittbrenner, B.J., Pollock, M.M., Schilling, J.W., Olden, J.D., Lawler, J.J., Torgersen, C.E., 2018. Modeling
 518 intrinsic potential for beaver (*Castor canadensis*) habitat to inform restoration and climate change
 519 adaptation. *PLoS ONE* 13(2): e0192538.
- 520 Eastman, J. R., 2006. *IDRISI Andes guide to GIS and image processing*. Clark University, Worcester, 328.
- 521 Elliott, M., Blythe, C., Brazier, R.E., Burgess, P., King, S., Puttock, A., Turner, C., 2017. Beavers – Nature’s
 522 Water Engineers. Devon Wildlife Trust
- 523 Fazio degli Uberti, 1368. Dittamondo.
- 524 Ferretti, V., 2012. *Verso la valutazione integrata di scenari strategici in ambito spaziale. I modelli MC-*
 525 *SDSS*. CELID, Torino
- 526 Ferretti, V., Bottero, M., Mondini, G., 2015. A Spatial Decision Tool to Study Risks and Opportunities of
 527 Complex Environmental Systems, *Journal of Environmental Accounting and Management*, 3(2): 192-212
- 528 Gorczyca, E., Krzemień, K., Sobucki, M., Jarzyna K., 2018. Can beaver impact promoteriver
 529 renaturalization? The example of the Raba River, southern Poland. *Science of the Total Environment*.
 530 615, 1048-1060.

531 Graells, G., 2015. Invasion of North American beaver (*Castor canadensis*) in the province of Magallanes,
532 Southern Chile: comparison between dating sites through interviews with the local community and
533 dendrochronology. *Revista Chilena de Historia Natural*, 88:3. DOI 10.1186/s40693-015-0034-6

534 Hood, G. A., Bayley, S. E., 2008. Beaver (*Castor canadensis*) mitigate the effects of climate on the area of
535 open water in boreal wetlands in western Canada. *Biol. Conserv.*, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2007.12.003

536 Howard, R.J., Larson, J.S., 1985. A Stream Habitat Classification System for Beaver. *The Journal of Wildlife*
537 *Management*, Vol 49, n. 1, pp 19-25.

538 Humphrey, A., 2005. SWOT analysis for management consulting. *SRI alumni Newsletter*, 1, 7-8.

539 Klimenko, D.E., Eponchintseva, D.N., 2014. Experimental Hydrological Studies of Processes of Failure of
540 Beaver Dams and Pond Draining. *Povolzhskii Ekologicheskii Zhurnal*. 3, 351–363.

541 Leroy, G., Baumung, R., Boettcher, P., Besbes, B., From, T., Hoffmann, I., 2018. Animal genetic resources
542 diversity and ecosystem services. *Global Food Security*. 17, 84-91.
543 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.04.003>

544 Malczewski, J., 1999. *GIS and Multicriteria Decision Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, New York

545 Manuale APAT, 2007. IFF - Indici di Funzionalità Fluviale. Lineagrafica Bertelli Editori snc. Trento

546 Maringer, A., Slotta-Bachmayr, L., 2006. A GIS-based habitat-suitability model as a tool for the
547 management of beavers *Castor fiber*. *Acta Theriologica* 51 (4), 373-382.

548 Martin, S.L., Jasinski, B.L., Kendall, A.D., Dahl T.A., Hyndman, D.W., 2015. Quantifying beaver dam
549 dynamics and sediment retention using aerial imagery, habitat characteristics, and economic drivers.
550 *Landscape Ecol.* 30, 1129-1144.

551 McComb, W. C., Sedell, J. R., Buchholz, T. D., 1990. Dam-site selection by beavers in an eastern Oregon
552 basin. *Great Basin Naturalist*: Vol. 50, No. 3, Article 9.

553 Mertin, B., 2003. Castoreum – das Asprin del Mittelalters. Sieber J. (ed.), Biber-Die erfolgreiche Rückkehr.
554 47-51

555 Nyssen, J., Pontzele, J., Billi, P., 2011. Effect of beaver dams on the hydrology of small mountain streams:
556 Example from the Chevril in the Ourthe Orientale basin, Ardennes, Belgium. *Journal of Hydrology*. 402,
557 92-102

558 Nolet, B.A. 1996. Management of the beaver *Castor fiber*: towards restoration of its former distribution and
559 ecological function in Europe. Council of Europe/Convention on the Conservation of the European
560 Wildlife and Natural Habitats Bern Nature and Environment series 86. Council of Europe Publishing,
561 Strasbourg, France.

562 Nolet, B.A., 1997. Management of the Beaver (*Castor fiber*): toward restoration of its former distribution and
563 ecological function in Europe. Council of Europe.

564 Nolet, B.A., Rosell, F., 1998. Comeback of the beaver *Castor fiber*: an overview of old and new conservation
565 problems. *Biol. Conserv.* 83, 165-173.

566 Nummi, P., 1989. Simulated effects of the beaver on vegetation, invertebrates and ducks. *Ann. Zool. Fennici*.
567 26, 43-52.

568 Orsi, F., Geneletti, D., Newton, A.C., 2011. Towards a common set of criteria and indicators to identify
569 forest restoration priorities: An expert panel-based approach. *Ecological Indicators*, 11, 337-347
570 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2010.06.001

571 Ovenden, T.S., Palmer, S.C.F., Travis, J.M.J., Healey, J.R., 2019. Improving reintroduction success in large
572 carnivores through individual-based modelling: How to reintroduce Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*) to
573 Scotland. *Biological Conservation*. 234, 140-153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.03.035>

574 Parker, H., Haugen, A., Kristensen, Ø., Myrum, E., Kolsing, R., Rosell, F., 1999. Landscape use and
575 economic value of Eurasian beaver (*Castor fiber*) on large forest in southeast Norway. *Conf. Paper: 1st*
576 *Euro-American Beaver Congress*, Aug. 24-28, 1999. Kazan, Russia

577 Pollock, M.M., Beechie, T.J., Wheaton, J.M., Jordan, C.E., Bouwes, N., Weber, N., Volk, C., 2014. Using
578 Beaver Dams To Restore Incised Stream Ecosystems. *BioScience Advance Access*. Vol. XX No. X

579 Pontarini, R., Lapini, L., Molinari, P., 2019. A BEAVER FROM NORTH-EASTERN ITALY (CASTOR
580 FIBER: CASTORIDAE, RODENTIA). *GORTANIA Botanica, Zoologia*, 40 (2018), 115-118

581 Pratesi, F., 2001. Storia della natura d'Italia. Editori Riuniti. Roma.

582 Puttock, A., Graham, A.H., Cunliffe, A.M., Elliott, M., Brazier, R.E., 2017. Eurasian beaver activity
583 increases water storage attenuates flow and mitigates diffuse pollution from intensively managed
584 grasslands. *Science of the Total Environment*. 576, 430-443.

585 Rosell, F., Bozsér, O., Collen, P., Parker, H., 2005. Ecological impact of beavers *Castor fibre* and *Castor*
586 *canadensis* and their ability to modify ecosystems. *Mammal Rev.* Volume 35.

587 Rozhkova-Timina, I.O., Popkov, V.K., Mitchell, P.J., Kirpotin, S.N., 2018. Beavers as ecosystem engineers
588 – a review of their positive and negative effects. *IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 201.
589 Ruys, T., Lorvelec, O., Marre, A., Bernez, I., 2011. River management and habitat characteristics of three
590 sympatric aquatic rodents: common muskrat, coypu and European beaver. *European Journal of Wildlife*
591 *Research*, August 2011

592 Saaty, T.L., 1980. *The Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority Setting, Resource Allocation*,
593 McGraw-Hill, New York, NY

594 Saaty, T. L., 2005. *Theory and applications of the analytic network process: decision making with benefits,*
595 *opportunities, costs, and risks.* RWS publications

596 Sharifi, M. A., Rodriguez, E., 2002. Design and development of a planning support system for policy
597 formulation in water resources rehabilitation: the case of Alcazar De San Juan District in Aquifer 23, La
598 Mancha, Spain. *Journal of Hydroinformatics*, 4(3), 157-175.

599 South, A., Rushton, S., Macdonald, D., 2000. Simulating the proposed reintroduction of the European beaver
600 (*Castor fiber*) to Scotland. *Biological Conservation*. 93, 103-116.

601 Stringer, A.P., Blake, D., Gaywood, M.J., 2015. A review of beaver (*Castor spp.*) impacts on biodiversity,
602 and potential impacts following a reintroduction to Scotland. *Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned*
603 *Report No. 815.*

604 Stringer, A.P., Blake, D., Genney, D.R., Gaywood, M.J., 2018. A geospatial analysis of ecosystem engineer
605 activity and its use during species reintroduction. *European Journal of Wildlife Research* 64: 41.

606 Taylor, J.D., Yarrow, G.K., Miller, J.E., 2017. Beavers. Wildlife Damage Management Technical Series.
607 USDA, APHIS, WS National Wildlife Research Center. Ft. Collins, Colorado. 21p. United Nations, 1992.
608 Convention on biological diversity.

609 Thompson, S., Vehkaoja, M., Nummi, P., 2016. Beaver-created deadwood dynamics in the boreal forest.
610 *Forest Ecology and Management*. 360, 1–8

611 Tosi, G., Chirichella, R., Zibordi, F., Mustoni, A., Giovannini, R., Groff, C., Zanin, M., Apollonio, M., 2015.
612 Brown bear reintroduction in the Southern Alps: To what extent are expectations being met? *Journal for*
613 *Nature Conservation*. 26, 9-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2015.03.007>

614 United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 1981. Standards for the development of habitat suitability index
615 models. *United States Fish and Wildlife Service*, Release No. 1-81, 103 ESM.

616 Varrone, M.T., 47-45 a.C. De lingua latina.

617 Whitfield, C.J., Baulch, H.M., Chun, K.P., Westbrook, C.J., 2015. Beaver-mediated methane emission: The
618 effects of population growth in Eurasia and the Americas. *AMBIO*. 44, 7–15.