0.1 Member State	IT
0.2.1 Species code	1358
0.2.2 Species name	Mustela putorius
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	N/A

1. National Level

1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map
Yes
1.1.1a Sensitive species
No
1.1.2 Method used - map
Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)
1.1.3 Year or period
1.1.4 Additional map
No
1.1.5 Range map
Yes

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

2.2 Published sources

Mediterranean (MED)

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Daniele Paoloni, Cristiano Spilinga (Associazione Teriologica Italiana - ATIt) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Marco Apollonio, Luigi Boitani, Paolo Ciucci, Luca Lapini, Anna Loy, Andrea Sforzi (ATIt).

Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. Http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN

Boitani L., Lovari S., Vigna Taglianti A., 2003. Carnivora – Artiodactyla. Fauna d'Italia, vol. XXXVIII, Mammalia III. Ed. Calderini de Il Sole 24 ore Edagricole, Bologna.

Capizzi et al., 2012. Progetto atlante dei Mammiferi del Lazio - Regione Lazio - ARP.

Parco Regionale Gallipoli Cognato Piccole Dolomiti Lucane. Banca dati faunistica.

Ragni B., 2002. Atlante dei mammiferi dell'Umbria. Petruzzi Editore.

Regione Liguria, 2008, Carta della Biodiversità, www.ambienteinliguria.it.

Regione piemonte. Banche dati Naturalistiche + Banca dati IPLA

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)2.3.2 Method - Range surface area

57500

Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 1 of 9

ii, iv and v species (An	nex B)			
2.3.3 Short-term trend period2.3.4 Short-term trend direction2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude2.3.6 Long-term trend period	2001-2012 unknown (x min	-	max	
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A			
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min		max	
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km²)			
	operator unkown		N/A	
	method		Yes Evpert i	judgment
2.3.10 Reason for change				accurate dataUse of different method
2.5.10 Reason for Change	iiiipioved ki	iowieuge/	more ac	accurate datable of different method
2.4 Population				
2.4.1 Population size	Unit N/A	4		
(individuals or agreed exception)	min	ı	max	
2.4.2 Population size	Unit nur	mber of m	ap 10x1	10 km grid cells (grids10x10)
(other than individuals)	min 166		max	166
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of	locality		
	Conversion r	•		
	Problems	nethod	Imno	ossible to convert grids to individuals
2.4.4 Year or period	1985-2012			ossible to convert blinds to marriadals
2.4.5 Method – population size		sed on exp	ert opin	inion with no or minimal sampling (1)
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012	, ca c c., p		
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	unknown (x)		
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude2.4.9 Short-term trend method2.4.10 Long-term trend period	min Absent data		max	confidence interval
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	N/A			
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	min		max	confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	N/A			
2.4.14 Favourable reference	number			
population	operator	N/A		
	unknown	Yes		
2.4.15 Reason for change	method	Expert jud	agemen	nt
2.5 Habitat for the Species				
2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)				

2.5.2 Year or period 2.5.3 Method used - habitat Absent data (0) 2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat Moderate 2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method Expert based 2.5.5 Short term trend period 2001-2012 2.5.6 Short term trend direction stable (0) 2.5.7 Long-term trend period 2.5.8 Long term trend direction N/A 2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²) 106397

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 2 of 9

2.5.10 Reason for change	Use of different me	thod	
2.6 Main Pressures			
Pressure		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
roads, motorways (D01.02)		medium importance (M)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat co	nnectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic c	conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A
2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on expe	rt judgements (1)	
2.7 Main Threats			
Threat		ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
roads, motorways (D01.02)		medium importance (M)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat co	nnectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic c	conditions (J02)	high importance (H)	N/A
2.7.1 Method used – threats	expert opinion (1)		
2.8 Complementary Information			
2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for			
trends 2.8.2 Other relevant Information			
2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment			
2.9 Conclusions (assessment of co			
2.9.1 Range	assessment Unkno qualifiers N/A	wn (XX)	
2.9.2. Population	assessment Unkno	wn (XX)	
·	qualifiers N/A		
2.9.3. Habitat	assessment Favour	rable (FV)	
2.9.4. Future prospects	qualifiers N/A assessment Favour	rahle (FV)	
2.5.4. Future prospects	qualifiers N/A	able (1 v)	
2.9.5 Overall assessment of	Unknown (XX)		
Conservation Status			
2.9.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status	N/A		
Conscivation states			

3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size	Unit	N/A	
	min		max
3.1.2 Method used	N/A		
3.1.3 Trend of population size within	N/A		

3.2 Conversation Measures

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 3 of 9

2.1 Biogeographical Region

2.2 Published sources

Continental (CON)

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Daniele Paoloni, Cristiano Spilinga (Associazione Teriologica Italiana - ATIt) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Marco Apollonio, Luigi Boitani, Paolo Ciucci, Luca Lapini, Anna Loy, Andrea Sforzi (ATIt).

Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. Http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN

Boitani L., Lovari S., Vigna Taglianti A., 2003. Carnivora – Artiodactyla. Fauna d'Italia, vol. XXXVIII, Mammalia III. Ed. Calderini de II Sole 24 ore Edagricole, Bologna.

Museo Friulano di Storia Naturale (Udine), Novembre 2011. Lo stato di conoscenza e di conservazione di alcune specie animali di interesse comunitario in Friuli Venezia Giulia.

Ragni B., 2002. Atlante dei mammiferi dell'Umbria. Petruzzi Editore.

Seglie D., Sindaco R., 2011. Segnalazioni Faunistiche Piemostesi e Valdostane, IV. Rivista piemontese di Storia naturale, 32: 419-438.

Seglie D., Sindaco R., 2012. Segnalazioni Faunistiche Piemostesi e Valdostane, V. Rivista piemontese di Storia naturale, 33: 457-472.

Sindaco, R., Carpegna F., 2012. . Segnalazioni Faunistiche Piemostesi, III. Rivista piemontese di Storia naturale, 31: 397-422.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)

2.3.2 Method - Range surface area

2.3.3 Short-term trend period

2.3.4 Short-term trend direction

2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude

2.3.6 Long-term trend period

2.3.7 Long-term trend direction

2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude

2.3.9 Favourable reference range

71600

Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)

2001-2012 increase (+)

min max

N/A

min max

area (km²)

operator approximately equal to (≈)

unkown No

method Expert judgment

Genuine Improved knowledge/more accurate dataUse of different method

2.3.10 Reason for change

2.4 Population

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 4 of 9

2.4.1 Population size Unit N/A (individuals or agreed exception) min max 2.4.2 Population size Unit number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10) (other than individuals) 276 276 min 2.4.3 Additional information **Definition of locality** Conversion method **Problems** Impossible to convert grids into individuals 2.4.4 Year or period 1985-2012 2.4.5 Method – population size Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1) 2.4.6 Short-term trend period 2001-2012 2.4.7 Short term trend direction stable (0) 2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude min confidence interval max 2.4.9 Short-term trend method Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1) 2.4.10 Long-term trend period 2.4.11 Long term trend direction N/A 2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude confidence interval min max 2.4.13 Long-term trend method N/A number 2.4.14 Favourable reference population operator approximately equal to (≈) unknown No method Expert judgement 2.4.15 Reason for change 2.5 Habitat for the Species 2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²) 2.5.2 Year or period 2.5.3 Method used - habitat Absent data (0) 2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat Good 2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method **Expert based** 2.5.5 Short term trend period 2001-2012

2.6 Main Pressures

2.5.10 Reason for change

2.5.6 Short term trend direction

2.5.8 Long term trend direction2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

2.5.7 Long-term trend period

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
roads, motorways (D01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
continuous urbanisation (E01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures based only on expert judgements (1)

stable (0)

N/A

85748

2.7 Main Threats

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 5 of 9

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
roads, motorways (D01.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
continuous urbanisation (E01.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.7.1 Method used – threats

expert opinion (1)

2.8 Complementary Information

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends 2.8.2 Other relevant Information

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.9.1 Range assessment Favourable (FV) qualifiers N/A

2.9.2. Population assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

Favourable (FV)

N/A

2.9.3. Habitat

2.9.5 Overall assessment of

2.9.4. Future prospects

Conservation Status 2.9.5 Overall trend in **Conservation Status**

3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size Unit N/A

min max

3.1.2 Method used N/A

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

3.2 Conversation Measures

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

2.2 Published sources

Alpine (ALP)

The present species assessment (fields 0.1-2.9) has been compiled by Daniele Paoloni, Cristiano Spilinga (Associazione Teriologica Italiana - ATIt) and Anna Alonzi, Piero Genovesi, Francesca Ronchi (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research - ISPRA). Information, unpublished data and experts' judgments have been provided by Marco Apollonio, Luigi Boitani, Paolo Ciucci, Luca Lapini, Anna Loy, Andrea Sforzi (ATIt).

Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 6 of 9

A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. Http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN

Boitani L., Lovari S., Vigna Taglianti A., 2003. Carnivora – Artiodactyla. Fauna d'Italia, vol. XXXVIII, Mammalia III. Ed. Calderini de Il Sole 24 ore Edagricole, Bologna.

Museo Friulano di Storia Naturale (Udine), Novembre 2011. Lo stato di conoscenza e di conservazione di alcune specie animali di interesse comunitario in Friuli Venezia Giulia.

Regione Liguria, 2008. Carta della Biodiversità, www.ambienteinliguria.it.

Regione Piemonte. Banche dati Naturalistiche + Banca dati IPLA.

Seglie D., Sindaco R., 2011. Segnalazioni Faunistiche Piemostesi e Valdostane, IV. Rivista piemontese di Storia naturale, 32: 419-438.

Seglie D., Sindaco R., 2012. Segnalazioni Faunistiche Piemostesi e Valdostane, V. Rivista piemontese di Storia naturale, 33: 457-472.

Sindaco, R., Carpegna F., 2012. . Segnalazioni Faunistiche Piemostesi, III. Rivista piemontese di Storia naturale, 31: 397-422.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km²)

2.3.2 Method - Range surface area

2.3.3 Short-term trend period

2.3.4 Short-term trend direction

2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude

2.3.6 Long-term trend period

2.3.7 Long-term trend direction

2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude

2.3.9 Favourable reference range

14900

Estimate based on expert opinion with no or minimal sampling (1)

2001-2012 stable (0)

min max

N/A

min max

area (km²)

operator approximately equal to (\approx)

unkown No

method Expert judgment

Use of different method

2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size

2.3.10 Reason for change

(individuals or agreed exception)

Unit N/A

min max

2.4.2 Population size

(other than individuals)

Unit number of map 10x10 km grid cells (grids10x10)

min 48 max 48

2.4.3 Additional information **Definition of locality**

Conversion method

Problems Impossible to convert grids into individuals

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 7 of 9

 2.4.4 Year or period 2.4.5 Method – population size 2.4.6 Short-term trend period 2.4.7 Short term trend direction 	1985-2012 Estimate ba 2001-2012 unknown (ased on expert opinion with	no or minimal sampling (1)
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude 2.4.9 Short-term trend method 2.4.10 Long-term trend period	min Absent dat	max	confidence interval
2.4.11 Long term trend direction 2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude 2.4.13 Long-term trend method	N/A min N/A number	max	confidence interval
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	operator unknown method	approximately equal to (≈ No Expert judgement)
2 4.15 Reason for change			

4.15 Reason for change

2.5 Habitat for the Species

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km²)

2.5.2 Year or period

2.5.3 Method used - habitat

2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat

2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method

2.5.5 Short term trend period

2.5.6 Short term trend direction

2.5.7 Long-term trend period

2.5.8 Long term trend direction

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km²)

2.5.10 Reason for change

Absent data (0)

Good

Expert based

2001-2012

stable (0)

N/A

37758

Use of different method

7 6 1	Mai	ın	Pressures	•
Z.U I	via		r i essui es	•

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
roads, motorways (D01.02)	low importance (L)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
human induced changes in hydraulic conditions (J02)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures	based only on expert judgements (1)
2.7 Main Threats	

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
roads, motorways (D01.02)	low importance (L)	N/A
anthropogenic reduction of habitat connectivity (J03.02)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Other ecosystem modifications (J03)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.7.1 Method used – threats expert opinion (1)

2.8 Complementary Information

2.6.1 Method used – pressures

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for

2.8.2 Other relevant Information

12.00.46 22/04/2014 Page 8 of 9

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

2.9 Conclusions (assessment of	conservation	status at end	of reporting	period)

2.9.1 Range assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.2. Population assessment Unknown (XX)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

assessment Favourable (FV)

qualifiers N/A

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Favourable (FV)

Conservation Status

2.9.4. Future prospects

2.9.3. Habitat

2.9.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status

N/A

3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size Unit N/A

min max

3.1.2 Method used N/A

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

3.2 Conversation Measures

22/04/2014 12.00.46 Page 9 of 9

Species name: Mustela putorius (1358) Region code: ALP

Field label Note User

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km2)

The area of suitable habitat (2.5.9) has been calculated by intersecting habitat suitability models with each biogeographical region in which the species is present. The habitat suitability models are those included in the Italian Ecological Network (Rete Ecologica Nazionale – REN; Boitani et al. 2002), and were developed at the national scale for all vertebrate species, based on species-environments relationships defined with inputs from leading species' experts. The models were created integrating into a Geographic Information System geographic and environmental data, such as Corine Land Cover, Digital Terrain Model, water and road networks.

ISPRA_ AUNA

ISPRA_A

Source: Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. Http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN

Species name: Mustela putorius (1358) Region code: CON

Field label Note User

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km2)

The area of suitable habitat (2.5.9) has been calculated by intersecting habitat suitability models with each biogeographical region in which the species is present. The habitat suitability models are those included in the Italian Ecological Network (Rete Ecologica Nazionale – REN; Boitani et al. 2002), and were developed at the national scale for all vertebrate species, based on species-environments relationships defined with inputs from leading species' experts. The models were created integrating into a Geographic Information System geographic and environmental data, such as Corine Land Cover, Digital Terrain Model, water and road networks.

Source: Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. Http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN

Species name: Mustela putorius (1358) Region code: MED

Field label Note User

22/04/2014 12.00.35 Page 1

2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km2)

The area of suitable habitat (2.5.9) has been calculated by intersecting habitat suitability models with each biogeographical region in which the species is present. The habitat suitability models are those included in the Italian Ecological Network (Rete Ecologica Nazionale – REN; Boitani et al. 2002), and were developed at the national scale for all vertebrate species, based on species-environments relationships defined with inputs from leading species' experts. The models were created integrating into a Geographic Information System geographic and environmental data, such as Corine Land Cover, Digital Terrain Model, water and road networks.

ISPRA

AUNA

Source: Boitani L., Corsi F., Falcucci A., Maiorano L., Marzetti I., Masi M., Montemaggiori A., Ottaviani D., Reggiani G., Rondinini C., 2002. Rete Ecologica Nazionale. Un approccio alla conservazione dei vertebrati italiani. Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo; Ministero dell'Ambiente, Direzione per la Conservazione della Natura; Istituto di Ecologia Applicata. Http://www.gisbau.uniroma1.it/REN

22/04/2014 12.00.35 Page 2