

# How can winegrowers adapt to climate change? A participatory modeling approach in southern France

Audrey Naulleau, Christian Gary, Laurent Prevot, Fabrice Vinatier, Laure

Hossard

# ▶ To cite this version:

Audrey Naulleau, Christian Gary, Laurent Prevot, Fabrice Vinatier, Laure Hossard. How can winegrowers adapt to climate change? A participatory modeling approach in southern France. Agricultural Systems, 2022, 203, pp.103514. 10.1016/j.agsy.2022.103514. hal-03782229

# HAL Id: hal-03782229 https://hal.science/hal-03782229

Submitted on 4 May 2023  $\,$ 

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	How can winegrowers adapt to climate change? A participatory modeling								
2	approach in southern France.								
3	Audrey Naulleau <sup>1,3,4*</sup> , Christian Gary <sup>1</sup> , Laurent Prévot <sup>2</sup> , Fabrice Vinatier <sup>2</sup> , Laure Hossard <sup>3</sup>								
4 5	<sup>1</sup> ABSys, Univ Montpellier, INRAE, CIRAD, Institut Agro Montpellier, Ciheam-IAMM, 2 place Viala 34060, Montpellier, France								
6 7	<sup>2</sup> LISAH, Univ Montpellier, INRAE, IRD, Institut Agro Montpellier, 2 place Viala 34060, Mont- pellier, France								
8 9	<sup>3</sup> Innovation, Univ Montpellier, INRAE, CIRAD, Institut Agro Montpellier, 2 place Viala 34060, Montpellier, France								
10	<sup>4</sup> CIRAD, UMR INNOVATION, F-34398 Montpellier, France								
11 12	*corresponding author: audrey.naulleau@cirad.fr								
13 14 15	Keywords: adaptation strategy, grapevine, landscape model, participatory design, water- saving practices								

#### 16 1 Introduction

17 Mediterranean wine-growers have already faced rapid climate change as seen in the observed 18 increase in air temperature of 0.19-0.25°C per decade over the 1960-2005 period (Mariotti et 19 al., 2015). Their challenges will only increase with projections indicating a rise of annual 20 temperatures (+1.6°C by 2050) and a decrease in annual rainfall (-10% by 2050), especially 21 during spring and summer (Ferrise et al., 2016). The higher temperatures have already 22 advanced berry ripening and harvest dates by 2 weeks over the past 35 years, and the increase 23 in water stress alters yield and berry attributes (van Leeuwen and Darriet, 2016). There is an 24 urgent need for effective and localized adaptation measures in response to climate change 25 (Cradock-Henry and Frame, 2021).

26 Adaptation in this case is defined as "the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate 27 and its effects. In human systems, adaptation seeks to moderate or avoid harm, or exploit 28 beneficial opportunities" (IPCC, 2015, p. 76). From a biophysical perspective, many adaptation 29 measures are possible (Haasnoot et al., 2020). In viticulture for example, irrigation and water 30 saving techniques, varietal selection, and even vineyard relocation can contribute to the 31 adaptation to climate change (Santos et al., 2020). However, the potential of those adaptation 32 measures, alone or in combination, has not been fully investigated (Naulleau et al., 2021). Moreover, the spatial diversity of viticultural landscapes has been integrated into adaptation 33 34 studies mainly through biophysical spatial factors such as soil and climate (Daccache et al., 35 2015; Liles and Verdon-Kidd, 2020), but only rare studies, Terribile et al. (2017) for example, 36 has considered multiple socio-technical factors such as variety diversity, planting density, PDO regulations, water access, or farm organization. These spatially complex factors affect 37 38 potential levers and barriers to the implementation of adaptations measures and their 39 performances at several scales (Neethling et al., 2019). There is a need to design and assess 40 adaptation strategies, here defined as combinations of adaptation measures fitted in time and 41 space to heterogeneous local conditions within a landscape.

In viticulture, adaptation strategies have already been proposed and assessed by researchers,
either alone, or interacting with stakeholders. In the first case, researchers have developed
and used dynamic crop models at national scales to explore strategies based on a single
adaptation, such as irrigation (Fraga et al., 2018) or mulching (Fraga and Santos, 2018). Other

46 strategies based on vineyard migration at European (Malheiro et al., 2010) and worldwide 47 scales (Hannah et al., 2013) have been designed and evaluated using probabilistic models. 48 While those strategies benefit from a quantitative evaluation, their main drawback is 49 insufficient consideration of local context and stakeholders' capacity to implement multi-50 measure adaptation strategies (van Leeuwen et al., 2013). In the second case, studies have 51 involved stakeholders in the design of adaptation strategies. The stakeholders have been 52 engaged through in-depth interviews (e.g., Lereboullet et al., 2013; Neethling et al., 2017; 53 Nicholas and Durham, 2012), online surveys (e.g., Dunn et al., 2015), and collective workshops 54 (e.g., Aigrain et al., 2016), where they share perceptions on climate change issues, adaptation 55 possibilities, and the constraints they face. Participatory approaches can embrace various 56 scales such as field, farm, and regional scales. Resulting strategies can combine short and long-57 term adaptations, also called tactical or strategic options (e.g., Dunn et al., 2015; Lereboullet 58 et al., 2013), and reactive or anticipatory options (e.g., Neethling et al., 2017; Nicholas and 59 Durham, 2012). Although those co-designed adaptation strategies benefit from shared 60 knowledge among stakeholders, further work is needed to numerically evaluate their 61 potential, and thus help decision making at different scales (Mosedale et al., 2016; Nicholas 62 and Durham, 2012). No previous study has developed approaches that combine participatory 63 design of strategies with a crop model-based evaluation, in a context of climate change 64 (Naulleau et al., 2021).

65 Participatory modeling offers a wide range of tools and methods to engage stakeholders in 66 the modeling processes (Voinov et al., 2018). Among them, process-based models are 67 particularly suitable to visualize and analyze complex systems that are confronted with a 68 combination of climatic factors (e.g., temperature, evaporative demand, rainfall) and 69 management options (e.g., variety, canopy management, water management) (Knowling et 70 al., 2021). However, the use of process-based models in participatory approaches remains difficult because of model complexity that makes it difficult to perform realistic 71 72 parameterization (data requirement), describe the model (assumptions, simplifications), and 73 transmit its results (large number of variables and data) (Passioura, 1996). Nevertheless, 74 finding the balance between complexity and communication of information about climate 75 change is crucial to reach a shared understanding of its local impacts and the potential of 76 adaptation strategies.

77 In this study, we worked together with stakeholders to design and numerically evaluate 78 climate change adaptation strategies at field, farm, and watershed scales. We hypothesized 79 that the involvement of stakeholders to explore spatial and temporal combinations of 80 adaptation measures would help determine their viability in grapevine systems under future climatic conditions. The case study was located in the Rieutort watershed, a typical 81 82 Mediterranean vineyard watershed of 45 km<sup>2</sup>, for which a spatially-explicit numerical model 83 was previously developed with local and regional stakeholders (Naulleau et al., 2022). In this 84 paper, we used this model with the same stakeholders to (i) design adaptation strategies that 85 could be modeled, (ii) discuss simulation results, and (iii) expand the discussion to other potential adaptations. 86

# 87 2 Material and methods

#### 88 2.1 A participatory modeling process in a viticultural watershed

The Rieutort watershed (45 km<sup>2</sup>) is representative of the Languedoc vineyard region. The 89 90 watershed encompasses 1,400 ha of heterogeneous vineyards grown in alluvial, clay-91 limestone and shale soils. Its Mediterranean climate is characterized by a gradient from the 92 northern mountainous areas (705 mm mean annual rainfall, data Cabrerolles weather station 93 2000–2019) to the southern coastal plain (581 mm mean annual rainfall, data Puisserguier 94 weather station 2000–2019). The northern area is dedicated to traditional farming under the 95 guidelines for Protected Denomination of Origin (PDO) certification and the southern area 96 under Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) conditions, which are more similar to "New 97 World type viticulture". Ten percent of vineyard surfaces are irrigated. At least 59 98 winegrowers have one or more vineyard plots in the watershed and are registered in the French Land Parcel identification system (RPG 2017). They are grouped either in cooperative 99 100 cellars or in PDO syndicates with various environmental labels such as high environmental 101 value, organic, or biodynamic. In a previous participatory mapping exercise with local 102 stakeholders, the watershed was divided into eight production sectors (Fig. 1A) according to 103 climate, soils, production modes (i.e., low yield objective in Protected Designation of Origin 104 (PDO) areas, high yield objective in Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) areas), and 105 irrigation use (Naulleau et al., 2022).



- Figure 1. Description of the Rieutort watershed with a numerical model (A) and a summary of
  the workflow (B) of stakeholders designing and assessing climate change adaptation
  strategies. \*For eight selected farms. The eight production sectors are described in Supp Table
  PDO: Protected Designation of Origin. PGI: Protected Geographical Indication. RCP:
  Representative Concentration Pathways.
- 112

113 To design and assess adaptation strategies, we organized two sets of participatory workshops 114 (4 hours each) in January and July 2021. The two sets were separated by a 6-month modeling 115 phase performed by researchers (Fig. 1B). Participants were selected after a preliminary series 116 of individual interviews organized to assemble a representation of the different types of 117 production in the watershed (Naulleau et al., 2022). Each set of workshops included two 118 workshops, one with 15 invited local stakeholders (eight winegrowers, one representative 119 from the cooperative winery, two representatives from PDO syndicates, two technical 120 advisors, one local policy maker, and one agri-environmental coordinator) and one with 5 121 invited regional stakeholders (three representatives from extension and advisory services, one agri-environmental coordinator and one regional policy maker) (Supp Table 2). Workshop 122 123 agendas were planned with the participants to maximize participation and to ensure at least

124 one representative for each type of stakeholder (more details in Supp Table 2). We 125 hypothesized that regional stakeholders might propose bolder strategies, while local 126 stakeholders would gravitate towards more restrictive but locally adapted strategies that 127 account for the diversity of local conditions and constraints, as argued in March et al. (2012). 128 Five regional stakeholders participated in both of the regional workshops. Nine, and then six, 129 local stakeholders participated in the two local workshops. The first set of workshops (WS1) 130 was aimed at designing the adaptation strategies, including the spatial distribution of 131 adaptation measures in the watershed. Intermediary meetings and interviews with 132 participants were held during the modeling step to refine modelers' choices and share 133 information. The second set of workshops (WS2) consisted in the presentation and discussion 134 of simulation results.

#### 135 2.2 The design of adaptation strategies

136 In an earlier step of the participatory approach, the stakeholders listed potential adaptation 137 measures (Naulleau et al., 2022, p. 6). Among those adaptation measures, six could be 138 simulated (late ripening varieties, irrigation, reducing canopy size, adjusting cover cropping, 139 reducing density, and shading). Seven of the listed measures could not be integrated in the 140 model: drought-tolerant varieties, high quality rootstocks (according to drought tolerance and 141 grafting techniques), water-efficient training systems, soil quality improvement (in terms of water holding capacity, nutrient availability and sanitary conditions), east-west row 142 143 orientations, and the introduction of hedges).

144 Following the discussion of climate change impacts in the Rieutort watershed (see details in 145 Naulleau et al., 2022), a participatory mapping exercise was devoted to the design of 146 adaptation strategies (Caron and Cheylan, 2005). The first set of workshops (WS1) were 147 conducted in three steps to help define the adaptation strategies. First, stakeholders indicated 148 on a map where they would position adaptation measures—regardless of whether or not they 149 could be simulated—among the eight production sectors (Figure 1). Second, researchers 150 sought more precisions on the six simulated adaptations: (i) their possible combinations 151 within a production sector, (ii) their location (e.g., percent of surface, which variety), and (iii) 152 their exact modalities (i.e., extent of canopy reduction, timing of cover crop destruction, 153 surfaces with cover crop, shade time and effects). Third, researchers and stakeholders agreed 154 on the agenda for the following step: the simulation of adaptation strategies.

#### 155 1.1 The modelling phases

156 The model used to simulate the co-designed adaptation strategies was developed in 157 participation with the same stakeholders (Naulleau et al., 2022, Supp. Fig. 1). It combines a 158 phenological (Morales-Castilla et al., 2020), a water balance (WaLIS, Celette et al., 2010), a 159 yield formation (GrAY, Naulleau et al., 2022), and a hydrological module (Lagacherie et al., 160 2010) (Fig. 1A), and is implemented in the landscape modeling platform OpenFLUID (Fabre et 161 al., 2013). It simulates the daily spatiotemporal dynamics of water fluxes and grapevine 162 production at field scale within the landscape while considering (i) the spatial variability of 163 soils and climate and (ii) the diversity of cropping systems (i.e., grapevine varieties, planting 164 density, bud load, etc.). The model is able to simulate the impacts of six adaptation measures: 165 irrigation, reduced canopy, late ripening varieties, reduced density, cover crop management, 166 and shading.

After the first set of workshops (WS1), researchers started by conducting simulations at field scale (Section 2.3.1) in order to explore a large range of options proposed by stakeholders. They then combined adaptation measures to design several plausible strategies at the watershed scale (Section 2.3.2), selecting only options leading to efficient adaptation. The model provided output indicators at field and watershed scales that were co-designed with stakeholders (see Naulleau et al., 2022 for more details). The indicator at farm scale was codesigned with stakeholders and based on model outputs (Section 2.3.3).

174 1.1.1 Simulations of adaptation measures at field scale

The simulations at field scale consisted in exploring the performance of simulated adaptation measures on phenology, water balance, and yield under different options (shade time and effects, intensity of canopy reduction, timing of cover crop destruction, surfaces with cover crop). The evaluation indicators were harvest dates, air temperature during berry ripening (proxy for berry quality), irrigation requirements, and yield.

We created a typical case sampling of fields in the watershed for the simulations at field scale. We used a criterion-based sampling (Ritchie et al., 2003) to select one representative field per production sector (Fig 1). Each adaptation was simulated individually for each considered field according to the rules presented in Table 1 (location, value ranges). Some of these rules were fully described by stakeholders (e.g., reduced density), other were partially described and had to be supplemented by information from scientific and grey literature (e.g., shading, cover 186 crop management). Stakeholders identified the watershed's seven major varieties as 187 belonging to three phenological groups characterized by their budburst precocity, according 188 to Pl@ntGrape (2020): early (merlot), mid-late (syrah, grenache), and late varieties (carignan, 189 cinsault, cabernet sauvignon and mourvedre). In the model, we used available parameters for 190 merlot, syrah, and cabernet sauvignon to represent each category respectively (Morales-191 Castilla et al., 2020). For each field, simulations were conducted for the three types of varieties 192 (early, mid, and late), and the results were expressed as their weighted average, using the 193 proportions of the varieties observed in the corresponding production sector (Supp Table 1).

194 Results were expressed as the difference in harvest date, temperature during ripening, 195 irrigation supply, and yield, when compared to the reference situation of the historical period 196 (1981-2010). We also evaluated the level of confidence in the model's results by estimating 197 their similarities and divergences with scientific and grey literature. A low level of confidence 198 was attributed when we did not find literature that corroborated the model's results. A 199 medium level was attributed when the model's results were consistent with the literature but 200 at a different magnitude. A high level of confidence meant that the model's results were 201 similar to those in the literature.

Table 1. Detailed simulations of adaptation measures at field scale, followed by information sources. If parameters existed in the reference situation, the value is indicated by an asterisk

Adaptation measures	Parameters changed	Production sectors	Values	Sources
Irrigation	Irrigation dose	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7	10 mm (20 mm first volume applied)	Stakeholders
	Soil water content	1, 2, 4 (PGI)	21% between budburst and flowering	Ojeda, 2007
	thresholds		12% between flowering and mid-flowering-veraison,	
			7% between mid-flowering-veraison and veraison	
			4% between veraison and maturity	
		5, 6, 7 (PDO)	12% between budburst and flowering	Ojeda, 2007
			7% between flowering and mid-flowering-veraison,	
			4% between mid-flowering-veraison and veraison	
			3% between veraison and maturity	
	Maximum annual volume	1, 2 (Current irrigation	Unlimited	Stakeholders
	of irrigation	network)		
		4,5 (Collective network extension)	80 mm	
		6,7 (Hill reservoir creation)	50 mm	
Late ripening variety	Chilling and forcing units	All the sectors	Supp Table 3	Morales-Castilla et al., 2020; Parker
Late ripening composite <sup>1</sup>	requirement	All the sectors		et al., 2013, 2020, 2011
Reduced canopy	Crop coefficient	All the sectors	-10 cm height: 0.36 to 0.58	Riou et al., 1989
	(* between 0.40 to 0.62)		-20 cm height: 0.33 to 0.53	
Reduced density	Plant density	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	4000 plants.ha <sup>-1</sup>	Stakeholders + van Leeuwen et al.,
		(* 4500 plants.ha⁻¹)		2019
		7,8 (* 4000 plants.ha <sup>-1</sup> )	3300 plants.ha <sup>-1</sup>	
Shading	Shading time	All the sectors	From veraison to maturity	Stakeholders + Caravia et al., 2016
	ET₀	All the sectors	- 60% global radiation	
			<ul> <li>- 2°C on daily maximal temperature superior to 35°C</li> </ul>	
Cover crop management	Destruction date	All the sectors	at budburst	Stakeholders + Celette et al., 2008;
	(* fixed date between 15 <sup>th</sup>		at flowering	Fernández-Mena et al., 2021
	February to 15 <sup>th</sup> March)			
	Surface covered during	All the sectors	1 inter-row out of 4	
	summer		1 inter-row out of 2	
			All inter-rows	
			All rows and inter-rows	

<sup>1</sup> hypothetical extremely late variety, built by combining information on several late ripening varieties (Morales-Castilla et al., 2020)

#### 204 1.1.2 Simulations of adaptation strategies at watershed scale

205 The simulations at watershed scale consisted in testing co-designed spatial and temporal 206 combinations of adaptation measures within the watershed. For each of these strategies, we 207 simulated the impacts of one or several combinations of adaptations measures on the 208 spatially-explicit irrigation supplies and grape production in the watershed. The adaptation 209 measures requiring high investment costs (irrigation, shading nets) or replantation (late 210 variety, density reduction) were applied to a limited surface of the production sectors. 211 Irrigation was limited to the planned irrigated areas, shading nets were introduced to the 212 early-ripening varieties (considered as more vulnerable), and reduced density was applied to 213 the late ripening varieties (considered as more adapted to traditional low-density systems). 214 Changes in land use was also considered as another adaptation measure at watershed scale. 215 The relocation of vineyards was based on the examination of agricultural areas depicted in 216 earlier (1974) black-and-white images. These images were taken from the IGN database and 217 processed to obtain orthophotos at sub-meter resolution following Vinatier and Arnaiz (2018). 218 Homogeneous areas visible on orthophotos were then classified as arable lands, orchards, 219 vineyards, forests, or moors. This was accomplished with a deep learning algorithm trained on 220 a sample covering approximately 600 fields, with an accuracy of 0.8 (Kappa Index).

#### **221** 1.1.3 Post-simulation calculation at farm scale

In WS1, some stakeholders felt that the consideration of the farm scale was critical, even though difficult to model due to the high diversity of farms in the watershed. They focused on the economic valuation of the adaptation measures. We therefore included these stakeholders (one PDO representative and one agro-environmental coordinator) in the process of identifying representative farms and developing a farm-scale indicator that could be calculated from the modeling results, mainly in terms of production gains and losses.

First, we selected farms whose vineyards were primarily located in the watershed. Among the 59 farms registered in the French Land Parcel identification system (RPG 2017) with at least one field in the watershed, we selected an initial sample of 18 farms with more than 85% of their surface in the watershed. We verified that the distribution of farm size in this sample was similar to that of the 59 registered farms (Supp Fig. 2). Within this sample, we selected eight farms to represent farm diversity in the watershed. 234 Stakeholders designed an indicator (NecPrice) representing the market price for wine that 235 would compensate for climate change impacts on yield and adaptation costs (i.e., maintain 236 the historical gross profit—GP<sub>historical</sub>). As suggested by the stakeholders, we used an 237 operation-based costing approach, which allowed us to limit consideration to the changing 238 operations between initial and adaptation strategy at plot scale. Note that Georgopoulou et 239 al. (2017) also used an operation-based costing approach in their cost-benefit analysis of 240 adaptation in Greek vineyard. We assumed that production costs were fixed over time. The 241 2020 average bulk market price was proposed by the stakeholders as a pertinent reference, 242 to which each winegrower could adapt (P<sub>historical</sub> – communicated by the joint trade council of 243 Languedoc wines).

244 
$$NecPrice = \frac{GP_{historical}}{GP} * P_{historical}$$

245 Where 
$$GP = \sum_f [(Y_f * S_f - C_f) * P_f]$$

NecPrice: necessary market price for wine in order to compensate for climate change impactson yield and the costs of adaptation (in €/hl)

- 248 GP: gross profit (in €)
- 249 With for each field of the farm f,

250  $Y_f$ : yield (in hl/ha),

251  $S_f$ : surfaces (in ha),

252  $C_f$ : sum of adaptation costs for the field f (in €/ha),

- 253  $P_f$  : prices (in €/hl) varying according to production type.
- 254

Adaptation costs (Table 2) include material and labor for annual operations (trimming, tillage, 255 256 irrigation maintenance) and investment costs (irrigation infrastructure and material, shade 257 nets). We also considered cost savings from density reduction. We did not look at costs linked 258 to the planting of new vines, because we considered this to be a normal farm operating 259 expense not specifically linked to the adaptation. Adaptation costs for material and labor were 260 taken from Roby et al. (2008) and increased by 15 % to account for inflation over the 2008-261 2019 period, as proposed by Van Leeuwen et al. (2019). Infrastructure costs were 262 communicated by the regional stakeholders. The total costs of adaptation over the 30-year 263 simulation periods were divided by 30 to obtain an annualized cost per hectare. All costs were 264 presented and validated by the stakeholders.

265 Adaptation benefits were calculated by multiplying yield gains by the production prices (Table

266 2). Three values of bulk market prices were used for the different production sectors.

Table 2. Adaptation costs and benefits per hectare and per year. Benefits are indicated for three different bulk market prices. The range of costs and benefits for each adaptation measure corresponds to the eight different production sectors (see Fig 1 and Supp table 1).

				Ben	efit (€ .ha⁻¹ .ye	ear⁻¹)
	Infrastructure			Sector 1 to	Sector 5	Sector 8
Adaptation	life time	Cost (€ .ha⁻¹		4	to 7	(190 €/hl)
measures	(years)	.year-1)	Source	(90 €/hl)	(159 €/hl)	
Irrigation – Actual	30	350	Regional	920 to		
network			stakeholders	1200	-	-
Irrigation – Network extension	30	500 to 600	Regional stakeholders	1473	-	-
Irrigation – Hill reservoir	30	600 to 850	Regional stakeholders	-	960 to 1600	-
Shading nets	10	500 to 700	Regional stakeholders	270 to 550	440 to 860	180
Reduced density	-	-700 to – 1000	(Roby et al., 2008)	1000 to 2000	1200 to 3000	830
Tillage cost (cover crop management)	-	50 to 60	(Roby et al., 2008)	- 1000 to -1200	-	-
Trimming cost (reduced canopy)	-	50 to 70	(Roby et al., 2008)	900 to 1000	-	-
Late ripening variety	-	0		-	-	-

270 2.3 The discussions of the adaptation strategies with stakeholders

The study ended with a second set of workshops conducted with local and regional stakeholders. The aim was to present and discuss the numerical evaluation of adaptation strategies at field, watershed, and farm scales. After a brief review of climate change impacts and the model's ability to simulate adaptations measures, researchers presented model outputs at field scale for the 2031-2060 and 2071-2100 periods.

Stakeholders were then asked to complete the evaluation by estimating separately the feasibility and desirability of the six simulated adaptation measures and the non-simulated measures mentioned earlier (Naulleau et al., 2022). The latter included drought-tolerant varieties, high quality rootstocks (according to drought tolerance and grafting techniques), water-efficient training systems, soil quality and water holding capacity improvement (organic fertilization, mulching, fallow length, decompaction by deep rooting crop species, decompacting by soil ripping), east-west row orientations, and the introduction of hedges. Stakeholders had seven green stickers to designate the most feasible or desirable measures, and seven red stickers to designate the least feasible or undesirable measures. There was no obligation to use all the stickers. Stakeholders were asked to explain their choice during a recorded collective discussion. After the workshops, we calculated a score (S) for each adaptation (a) and group of stakeholders (g). For each criteria c (feasible/unfeasible, desirable/undesirable):

292

$$S_{c,g,a} = \frac{N_{i=c,j=g,k=a}}{\max_{\substack{i=c\\j=g}} * \max_{j=g}} (N_{i,j,k})$$

where N<sub>i,j,k</sub> is the number of stickers for the criteria c, the group g and the adaptation a. max<sub>i=g</sub>(N<sub>i,j,k</sub>) was 5 in both groups.

The researchers then presented the designed adaptation strategies at watershed scale and the simulation results under the RCP 8.5 climate scenario for the periods 2031-2060 and 2071-2100. Finally, the researchers presented the range of evolution in *NecPrice* indicators by the mid-century time horizon at farm scale. At each stage of the presentation, stakeholders were asked to share their perception of the simulations and suggest other strategies they could further imagine.

#### 299 **3** Results

#### 300 3.1 Adaptation measures at field scale

#### 301 3.1.1 Model-based evaluation and discussion with stakeholders

302 Among the 13 adaptation measures mentioned during the first set of workshops, six could be 303 simulated and were presented to stakeholders during WS2 (Table 3). Irrigation compensated 304 for yield losses due to climate change in most of the cases, with a high level of confidence in 305 model results. The yield losses in irrigated PGI production were probably overestimated due 306 to the presence of a shallow water table that was not considered in the model but could 307 provide water to grapevine roots. The historical average volume of irrigation water applied 308 (21 mm/year) to PGI vineyards was multiplied by 1.85 for the mid-century horizon and by 2.33 for the end-century horizon (38 mm/year at mid-century to 49 mm/year at end-century). 309 310 Currently, PDO vineyards are not irrigated in the studied areas, but the model estimation

suggests that 27 mm/year would enable the yield objective to be reached. The level of irrigation remained relatively stable under future climatic conditions (reaching 34 mm/year at end-century). Regional stakeholders confirmed that there is currently a deficit in the water balance in PDO vineyards, and they noted that the "*positive effect of irrigation in reducing mortality in superficial soils*" was not modeled. Local stakeholders noted that the volume of irrigation required is particularly important during dry years when the water reservoirs are difficult to replenish.

318 The use of late ripening varieties would limit the delay of harvest dates to one week, which is 319 only a modest improvement compared to the three-week advancement expected from 320 climate change by the end of the century. Furthermore, limiting the delay of the harvest date 321 had little impact on the mean temperature during ripening (decreasing 0.4°C for the 1971-322 2100 period). Adversely, it delayed the flowering period, pushing it towards warmer and dryer 323 conditions that could reduce yield. The simulations with the hypothetical late ripening 324 composite variety did compensate for the three-week delay of harvest, even though 325 temperatures during ripening remained higher than those of the historical period. This variety 326 corresponds to a non-existing variety whose budburst would occur at end of April and reach 327 maturity in October (under historical climate conditions). Local stakeholders were skeptical 328 about the consequences: "That would mean that we would need to prune the whole vineyard 329 from mid-March to mid-April, which would be impossible to schedule in that short period." 330 Regional stakeholders were more motivated to seek similar characteristics among ancient or 331 foreign varieties.

332 The three water-saving adaptation measures (shading, reduced canopy, and reduced density) 333 showed positive effects on yield and irrigation levels (Table 3). The reduction of canopy height 334 and plant density compensated for the effects of climate change, limiting water stress by 335 reducing surface transpiration rates. However, regional stakeholders were concerned that it 336 could lead to an unbalance between vegetative and generative growth. The results on shading 337 systems seemed realistic to the regional stakeholders and offered a slight offset of climate 338 change impacts on yield. Local stakeholders recognized the positive effects of those three 339 adaptation measures on yield and irrigation supplies but emphasized that they would also 340 have impacts on berry attributes at harvest (alcohol degree, acidity) that should be estimated.

- They also mentioned that density reduction and shading nets would require changes in thePDO specifications.
- The model only considered the effects of cover crops in terms of water budget (soil infiltration 343 344 and competition for water). Simulations showed that, on average, keeping soil cover during 345 summer decreased yield. However, the yield losses remained low (<5%) for sectors 1 and 2 346 which have the highest available soil water capacity (data not shown). Local stakeholders 347 noticed that grapevine systems would benefit from other services provided by cover crops 348 (e.g., physical soil properties, microclimate) that were not evaluated in this study. Both groups promoted the "development of a more flexible date for cover crop destruction" in order to 349 350 maximize beneficial effects of a cover crop while minimizing its impacts on yield.
- Table 3: Simulated effects of adaptation measures on harvest dates, mean temperature during ripening, irrigation supplies and yields, as compared to historical values. Results were averaged for the 8 representative fields of the Rieutort watershed for RCP 8.5 and two time periods: 2031-2060 and 2071-2100. Colors indicate the magnitude of the effects. Bullets indicate the level of confidence in model results (•: low, ••: medium and •••: high). PDO: Protected designation of Origin, PGI: Protected geographical indication production.

			2031-2	2060		2071-2100					
			Ripening temperatures	Irrigation needs	Yield	Harvest date	Ripening temperatures	Irrigation needs	Yield		
	Mean historical values (1981-2010)	11-sept	22.4 °C	-	10.5 t/ha	11-sept	22.4 °C	-	10.5 t/ha		
Ø	Mean climate change impacts	•••	•••	••	••			••	••		
c	Irrigation PGI (current network)	_	_	••	••	_	_	••	••		
atio	Irrigation PGI (network extension)	_	-		••	-	-	••	••		
rrig.	Irrigation PDO (network extension)	_	-			_	—	••			
_	Irrigation PDO (hill reservoir)	_	-	••		-	_	••	•••		
ate ning iety	Late ripening varieties	•••	•••	•	••			•			
ripe var	Late ripening composite	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
opy nag ent	10 cm height reduction	+	—	••	•	+	_	••	•		
Can ma em	20 cm height reduction	+	_	••	•	+	—	••	•		
Shade	Shading nets	+	••	••	••	+		••	••		
Density	Reduced density	_	—	••	••	_	_	••	••		
op st.	At budburst	_	_	••	••	_	_	••			
၀ှင် ခို	At flowering	_	-			-	_				
0	1 inter-row out of 4	_	_			_	_				
cro	1 inter-row out of 2	_	_			_	_	••			
over	All interows	_	_	••		_	_	••			
0	All rows and inter-rows	_	_	•	••	_	_	•	• •		

		Harvest date (days)	Mean temperature during ripening (°C)	Irrigation need (mm)	Mean yield (%)						
ts ble		+ 14 d	- 6 °C	- 60 mm	+ 25 %						
/ora ffect		+ 7 à 14 d	- 3 à - 6 °C	- 40 à - 60 mm	+ 15 à + 25 %						
Fav ef		+ 3 à 7 d	-1à-3°C	- 20 à - 40 mm	+ 5 à + 15 %						
le		- 3 à + 3 d	-1à+1°C	- 20 à + 20 mm	-5% à - 5%						
orak		-3 à - 7 d	+1à+3°C	+ 20 à + 40 mm	- 5 à -15 %						
effe		-7 à - 14 d	+3à+6°C	+ 40 à + 60 mm	- 15 à -25%						
- T		- 14 d	+ 6 °C	+ 60 mm	- 25 %						
	_		Not modeled								
	-/0/+	Unfavorable	/ neutral / favor	able effects (qua	litative data)						

Level of confidence

●●● High

Medium

Low

358

#### 359 3.1.2 Feasibility and desirability of adaptation measures

360 Among the 13 adaptation measures mentioned during the first workshops, the most desirable 361 (score > 4) according to local stakeholders were the reduced canopy and improved soil quality 362 (maximal score in Figure 2A). They also highlighted a large number of other desirable 363 measures (score between 2 and 3): water-efficient training systems, reduced density, and 364 drought tolerant varieties and rootstocks. In total, they identified ten measures as desirable 365 (score > 1). Regional stakeholders identified two desirable adaptation measures, among which 366 reduced canopy did not appear, but the adaptive management of cover crop was mentioned. 367 The desirability of some adaptation measures (shading nets, hedges, and irrigation) was 368 subject to significant debate, particularly among the local stakeholders.

369 The most feasible adaptation measures differed between the two groups (Figure 2B). Local 370 stakeholders identified reduced canopy as the most feasible adaptation, especially in the 371 southern portion of the watershed, while regional stakeholders identified the adaptive 372 management of cover crop as most feasible. Both groups detailed feasible adaptation 373 measures to improve soil quality (increase fallow length, avoid compacting, increase organic 374 fertilization) and to incorporate water-efficient training systems. Planting drought tolerant 375 varieties was considered as unfeasible by both groups because they have not yet been 376 developed.

377 The comparison between desirability and feasibility showed interesting results. Drought 378 tolerant varieties and rootstock were not considered feasible, but they were seen as desirable, 379 and both appeared as a priority for further research. Irrigation and late ripening varieties were 380 seen as feasible, but their desirability was questionable. Irrigation was feasible in some areas, 381 depending on economic investment, but it incurred a risk of dependence on water resources. 382 The limited ability of late ripening varieties to delay harvest, as well as the labor constraints 383 involved, reduced the desirability of this adaptation measure for both groups. Hedges and 384 shading nets appeared neither feasible nor desirable. Although stakeholders recognized their 385 beneficial effects, hedges were described as difficult to implement, and shading nets were 386 both expensive and detrimental to the appearance of the landscape. Finally, reduced canopy, 387 improved soil quality, row orientation, training systems, and reduced density were identified 388 as promising because they are both feasible and desirable.



391 Figure 2: (A) Desirability and undesirability scores and (B) feasibility and unfeasibility of 392 adaptation measures, according to local and regional stakeholders.

#### **393 3.2** Adaptation strategies at watershed scale

#### 394 3.2.1 Overview of the co-designed adaptation strategies

The *baseline strategy* reflected the current production systems, without management changes to adapt to climate change. The following list describes the measures that compose each adaptation strategy designed in the first workshops (Table 4) and their implementation in the model:

- Delayed harvest strategy: The whole surface of the watershed is replanted with late
   ripening variety to prevent berry ripening from occurring during the warmest period.
   No simulation at watershed scale was performed because the results at plot scale
   showed little impact on temperatures during ripening (see section 3.1.1).
- 403 Water stress limitation strategy (WSS): Water-saving practices are implemented with 404 the aim of maintaining production volume, while enhancing water use efficiency. In 405 the simulations, the strategy followed three gradual steps according to the adaptation 406 measures implemented (Table 4). The irrigated areas were extended as currently 407 planned in the watershed (WSS\_irri). Short term adaptation measures (reduced 408 canopy, and cover crop in one of every four inter-rows) were implemented in the 409 Southern sectors of the watershed (WSS ST) where local stakeholders pointed out 410 their relevance during WS1 (Table 5). Long-term adaptation measures were only 411 considered for limited surfaces (WSS\_LT) because they require replanting or high

412 investments (Table 5). Shading systems were simulated in all production sectors, and
413 primarily on early ripening variety, while density reduction was indicated for the late
414 ripening varieties of the northern areas.

- Soil improvement strategy: The combination of soil management practices with high quality rootstock are implemented in order to improve available water capacity in the
   soil and favor deep grapevine roots. The lack of knowledge about soil heterogeneity in
   the watershed along with the related physical and biological processes in the soil did
   not allow us to evaluate quantitatively the performance of this soil improvement
   strategy.
- *Relocation strategy (RelocS)*: The vineyards are relocated northward, given the aptitude of northern vine systems to withstand climate change (Naulleau et al., 2022).
   The main limitation in evaluating this strategy is the lack of data on soil characterization, especially for the northern shale soils. Therefore, we hypothesized that the northern areas where vines had been previously cultivated (1974) could be re-converted into vineyards to compensate production losses from climate change.

427 Table 4: Combination of adaptation measures in the four co-designed strategies (irri:

428 irrigation, ST: short-term, LT: long-term). X: simulated and •: non-simulated

	Adaptation strategies							
	Delayed	Water st	ress lin	nitation	Soil improvement	Relocation		
	harvest	S	trategy	/	strategy	strategy		
Adaptation measures	strategy	IRRI	ST	LT				
Late ripening variety	Х							
Irrigation		Х	Х	Х		Х		
Reduced canopy			Х	Х				
Summer cover crop			Х	Х				
Reduced density				Х				
Shading	•			Х				
Hedges	•							
East-west row orientation	•							
Drought tolerant variety				•				
High quality rootstock					•			
Water efficient training system				٠				
Improved soil quality*					•			
Relocation						Х		
100 ¥ 1 C 11 ·				1 1	· · · · · ·			

429 \* Longer fallow period, good soil preparation before planting, organic fertilization,
 430 mycorrhiza, and limiting irrigation in the first years after planting

431

Table 5: Percentage of the sector's surface area engaged in each adaptation measure for the

434 three options of the water stress limitation strategy (WSS): irrigation where it is possible

435	(irri), short term adaptation n	neasures (ST) and long-term	adaptation measures (	LT). * 1 inter
	_			

436	row out of 4
430	1000000004.

Sector	WSS_irri	W	SS_ST	WSS	S_LT
(vineyard	Irrigation	Reduced	Reduced Summer		Shading
surface)		canopy	cover crop*	density	nets
1 (94 ha)	100%	100%	100%		20%
2 (77 ha)	100%	100%	100%		11%
3 (108 ha)		100%	6%		17%
4 (400 ha)	8%	100%	2%		20%
5 (173 ha)	32%		1%		39%
6 (278 ha)	46%		6%		46 %
7 (205 ha)	30%			31%	40%
8 (84 ha)				61%	29%
Watershed	31%	48 %	14 %	8%	31%
(1418 ha)					

437

438 3.2.2 Impact of the water stress limitation strategy (WSS) to enhance water use efficiency 439 The water stress limitation strategy was applied to portions of four vineyard sectors (4,5,6,7) 440 that are not currently irrigated. The resulting mean irrigation levels in these newly irrigated 441 sectors were lower than for the two sectors (1,2) that are currently irrigated (Figure 3A). This 442 difference can be traced to a combination of the maximum annual irrigation allowed by the 443 collective management of water resources and the lower water requirement of PDO 444 production as compared to PGI production. In sector 6, where the limestone soils are 445 superficial and the planting density is 4,500 plants ha-1, the maximum volume of irrigation 446 water was required 1 year in 4 during the period 2071-2100, which implies frequent difficulty 447 in satisfying grapevine water demand. In the period 2031-2060, the irrigated surface 448 (WSS\_irri) was almost tripled, and the irrigation water requirement at watershed scale 449 doubled from 68,000 m<sup>3</sup> to 134,000 m<sup>3</sup> (Fig 3B). The short-term (WSS ST) and long-term 450 (WSS LT) measures did not significantly reduce the level of irrigation at field or watershed 451 scales.

The mean yields in the newly irrigated surfaces were maintained, and even increased compared to the historical period (Fig 4A). The short-term adaptation strategy (*WSS\_ST*) showed a positive effect on yield in the two non-irrigated sectors located in the southern part of the watershed (sector 3 and 4), allowing them to reach the objective of 12 t/ha. In both 456 future time periods, the long-term adaptation strategy (WSS\_LT) of shading nets and reduced 457 density restored the northern sector's yield to the historical level. Shading nets also limited 458 yield decrease in the central sectors, but this effect was visible only for the 2031-2060 period. 459 At watershed scale, compensation for yield loss due to climate change was only achieved 460 through the mobilization of irrigation in the short and long-term adaptation measures, and 461 this only at the near future horizon (Fig 4B). Production losses at the end of the century in the 462 WSS\_LT strategy were estimated at 6%, compared to 14% in the baseline. PGI production 463 suffered the highest yield loss. However, the mean yield in PGI production sectors (sectors 1 464 to 4) remained higher than the 12 t/ha authorized for PGI certification. By contrast, the mean 465 yield in sector 8 remained below the authorized 6 t/ha for PDO production.

466 Local stakeholders suggested going further in the long-term adaptation strategy, by simulating 467 an extreme strategy where all vineyard surfaces would be shaded and reduced in density. In 468 terms of the reduction of production losses presented in Figure 4B, the regional stakeholders 469 stressed that the water-saving strategy, based on conservative development of irrigation, 470 remained unequal among winegrowers. Indeed, although production was sometimes 471 maintained with few winegrowers having access to irrigation, especially in PDO sectors, for 472 the others, the lack of irrigation would still imply production and revenue losses due to climate 473 change.

#### A) Field scale





476 three water stress limitation strategies (WSS) in RCP 8.5. Boxplots correspond to the 30

477 years of simulation (mean indicated by a point). Barplots correspond to the mean irrigation

478 supplied and the percentage of difference when compared to the baseline of the historical

479 period. Sectors 3 and 8 had no plans for irrigation.



Figure 4: Evolution of grapevine production in RCP 8.5 for the period 2031-2060 and 20712100 in comparison to the historical period (1981-2010): (A) variation of mean yield by sector
and (B) mean annual volume of production according to type (PGI: Protected Geographical
Indication, PDO: Protected Designation of Origin).

#### 486 3.2.3 Relocation strategy to compensate for production losses





488

Figure 5: A) Map of the vineyard baseline (white) and relocation strategies (white + black); B)
Effects of the relocation strategy (RelocS) on the total production volume under the RCP 8.5.
PDO: Protected Designation of Origin. PGI: Protected Geographical Indication production.

493 During the timespan between the aerial images of 1974 and 2010, 330 ha of vineyard were 494 converted into forests (173 ha), fallows (61 ha), cereals (38 ha), pastures (37 ha) and other 495 crops (21 ha). Among those surfaces, 160 ha are located in PDO sectors, mainly in the northern 496 areas, and 170 ha in PGI sectors in the south (Fig 5A). The reconversion of those surfaces into 497 vineyard, without considering fallow time, compensated for or increased the volume of 498 watershed production compared to the historical period (+9% by the period 2031-2060, +5% 499 by the period 2071-2100) (Fig 5B). On average, the mean yield in these new areas reached 40 500 hl/ha for PDO production by the end of each time periods, and 70 hl/ha for PGI production by 501 2060 and 64 hl/ha by 2100. Local stakeholders confirmed the historical move southward. 502 Generally, vineyards were abandoned because of difficult terrains in the more mountainous 503 region and lower yields compared to other fields in the same sector. Local stakeholders 504 estimated that the reconversion of those fields could be feasible if winegrowers managed to 505 produce a quality wine, with historical varieties. But issues related to access, labor, and related 506 costs would remain. A detailed analysis of soil properties in these areas would be necessary507 to precisely identify areas suited to relocation.

#### 508 1.2 Cost-benefits analysis at farm scale

509 We calculated the bulk-wine price increase necessary to compensate for production losses 510 and adaptation costs for eight representative farms in the watershed and for the different 511 water-saving strategies (WSS\_irri, WSS\_ST, WSS\_LT) (Table 5). The studied farms differed in 512 their structure (cooperative winery or independent), type of production (PDO, PGI or mixed), 513 and location among the eight production sectors. Average bulk-wine price received by the 514 eight farms ranged from 90 €/hl to 190 €/hl in 2020. In the case where no adaptation measure 515 is taken (the *baseline*), the NecPrice must increase between 1 and 18 €/hl (excluding inflation). 516 The most impacted farms would be members of cooperative wineries producing more than 517 half of their production as PGI wine, without irrigation (Table 6).

518 The expansion of irrigation in the watershed (WSS irri) involved four farms, all with PDO 519 production and water supplies in hill reservoirs. The extent of the conversion to irrigation on 520 these farms varied from 18% to 75% of their cultivated surfaces (Table 6). The gain in yield 521 from irrigation would cover the irrigation costs, as seen in the lower necessary price increase 522 with the irrigation strategy compared to the baseline strategy. The regional stakeholders 523 agreed with this analysis with the understanding that the winegrowers would have to respect 524 the yield limitation set by the PDO syndicates (6 t/ha) in order to benefit from the higher price 525 of a PDO wine. They also noted that the adaptation costs of irrigation infrastructure for hill 526 reservoirs are highly variable and depend on factors such as location, water sources, and 527 topography. We might have underestimated the costs, but one stakeholder argued that 528 800€/ha/year is the "maximum acceptable cost." If costs rose above that amount, he believed 529 that the infrastructure would not be built. Local stakeholders believed that the investment 530 required would entail significant costs to local government agencies, and they raised the 531 question of the necessity of such spending. Moreover, the availability of the water supply is 532 not guaranteed, creating an additional risk that was not considered here (i.e., the evaluation 533 assumes that reservoirs are recharged each year).

534 Short term adaptations (WSS\_ST strategy) were primarily associated with the farm in the 535 southern part of the watershed. The additional costs related to reduced canopy (trimming) 536 were low, and the yield gain simulated in the model covered the adaptation costs. This balance 537 between cost and benefit was maintained even for the farm that also adopted the practice of 538 a cover crop on one inter-row in four during summer. Nevertheless, local stakeholders 539 suggested that the positive effect of severe trimming on yield, as well of its impact on wine 540 quality still need further verifications.

Long-term adaptations (WSS\_LT strategy) were chosen for the independent farms with vineyards in the northern part of the watershed. The costs of shading nets were covered by the yield gain. The reduced planting density resulted in economic benefits from reduced production costs, which supports the results of Van Leeuwen et al. (2019).

545 To sum up, no adaptation measure at watershed scale would cost more than the benefits in 546 yield. However, only two of them (irrigation and reduced density) resulted in benefits that 547 fully compensated for the effects of climate change, and these two only did that in particular 548 cases. These results reflect the sentiment that stakeholders often repeated: "There is no 549 miracle solution." The range of increase in the bulk-wine price (from 1€/hL to 18€/hL) needed 550 in order to compensate for climate change consequences, albeit uncertain, did not allow for 551 price variations between years. The local stakeholders concluded that "the market price itself 552 is a real lever" and may avoid investment in expensive infrastructures. A debate took place on 553 the ability of the PDO syndicate and PGI organizations to increase their prices to compensate 554 for yield losses.

555 Table 6: Evolution in the Necessary bulk-wine price (€/hl) according to farm characteristics 556 and water stress limitation strategies (WSS), for the RCP 8.5 during the period 2031-2060. Blue 557 bars represent the percentage of farm surfaces where the adaptation is implemented. The 558 evolution in the Necessary bulk-wine price is null (0) if the benefit of adaptation is equal to 559 the adaptation cost. That evolution is a decrease ( $\lor$ ) if the benefit of the adaptation strategy is superior to the adaptation cost, and it is a strong decrease  $(\forall \forall)$  if the benefit of the 560 adaptation strategy compensated for negative effects of climate change (in terms of necessary 561 562 price). Grey cases indicate the farm is not concerned by that strategy. PDO: Protected 563 Designation of Origin, PGI: Protected Geographical Indication (certified labelling).

Farm Description			Mean	Adaptation (% farm surfaces)				Necessary price evolution for the period					
	-	production	WSS irri WSS ST		WSS LT		2031-2060 (in €/hl)						
Winery	Production	Production	Surface	Reference	Irrigation	Cover	Canopy	Density	Shade	Baseline	WSS_irri	WSS_ST	WSS_LT
		sector	(ha)			crop	man.			strategy			
Independant	High premium PDO	7,8	26	190 €/hl						+1 €/h1			עע
_	PDO	7,8	17	158 €/hl						+6 €/h1	עע		עע
	PDO	5,6,7,8	17	158 €/hl				1		+12 €/h1	Ы		Ы
	PDO / PGI	5,6	30	107 €/hl						+14 €/h1		עע	
Cooperative	mostly PDO	5,6	30	144 €/h1						+13 €/hl	Ы		Ы
-	PDO / PGI	4,5,6	17	125 €/hl						+18 €/hl	0	N	Ы
	mostly PGI	3,4	30	103 €/h1						+17 €/h1		Ы	Ы
	Irrigated PGI	1.2	17	90 €/h1						+12 €/h1		0	

### 565 4 Discussion

#### 566 4.1 Co-designed adaptation strategies

The four co-designed adaptation strategies were defined according to specific concerns: harvest date, water efficiency, soil quality, and soil occupation. One strategy does not exclude another; so these strategies can be combined together in an operational perspective. The potential of these adaptation strategies, and the measures they involve, have been partially evaluated by a model and by local expertise; however, the relevance of these strategies can be debated with respect to the scientific literature.

573 Exploiting the genetic diversity among grapevine cultivars to limit the effects of climate change 574 on phenology was demonstrated by Morales-Castilla et al. (2020) as successful at a worldwide 575 scale but insufficient in some regions like southern Europe. Our results at the scale of a 576 medium-size watershed in Mediterranean vineyards confirmed only a limited effect from late 577 ripening varieties for reducing the temperature during berry ripening. Nevertheless, further 578 scenarios should be explored by (i) more precisely considering the diversity of existing 579 varieties in the watershed and (ii) running simulations with other very late ripening 580 Mediterranean varieties, such as those cultivated in Cyprus or Greece. The effectiveness of 581 the late harvest strategy would depend primarily on the global decisions taken to reduce 582 future emissions and minimize the rise in global temperature. In any case, varietal diversity is 583 crucial to manage labor during the year (winter pruning, harvest), to limit bioclimatic risks 584 (frost, drought, pest disease), and to contribute to the blending process during wine-making 585 (Nicholas and Durham, 2012).

586 Genetic diversity should also be explored according to the drought-tolerance of varieties and 587 rootstocks. Today 110 Richter is the most widely used rootstock in Languedoc, but the even 588 more drought tolerant 140 Ruggeri could be included in the adaptation strategies even though 589 its effect on water balance is difficult to evaluate quantitatively (Ollat et al., 2015). Similar 590 options do exist through the use of drought-tolerant varieties (Duchene, 2016).

591 The water stress limitation strategy encompasses a large range of adaptation measures. In our 592 study, the development of irrigation systems corresponds to the current local policy measures, which plan to increase irrigated vineyard surfaces from 16% to 30% by 2030 593 594 (Département Hérault, 2019). However, this policy does not guarantee the economic 595 investment necessary for the infrastructure. Moreover, the irrigation systems' sustainability 596 is debated among stakeholders and scientists (Grantham et al., 2010). Our participatory design 597 showed that winegrowers producing PGI wine in areas with water constraints were more likely 598 to adopt tactical adaptations, while winegrowers producing PDO wine in dryer or drought-599 prone areas, were more likely to adopt strategic adaptations. The model's results showed that 600 the tactical adaptations proposed in PGI production systems are insufficient in the long term 601 to counterbalance the effects of climate change. Thus, winegrowers in these areas would 602 eventually need to engage in more disruptive adaptations (planting density, market 603 positioning, etc.). The traditional Mediterranean goblet training system, which can still be 604 found in some of the drought-prone areas (Deloire et al., 2022), could be an interesting 605 adaptation but needs more documentation in the literature. For PDO production systems, it 606 is worth noting that the proposed strategic adaptations could appear unrealistic under current 607 regulations (i.e., reduced planting density) and local customs (i.e., shading nets).

608 The soil improvement strategy is an important lever to promote deep rooting and soil water 609 storage. A recent review by Marín et al. (2020) recognized the complexity of root-soil 610 interactions, as well as the importance of understanding that complexity in climate change 611 adaptations. But the current state of knowledge on rootstocks and root/soil processes did not 612 allow us to introduce this complexity into our simple process-based model. We can 613 hypothesize that an increase of either rooting depth or soil porosity would lead to an increase 614 of Total Transpirable Soil Water (TTSW). This would have a positive effect on the water balance 615 and thus increase drought resilience (Gaudin and Gary, 2012). The difficulty is how to measure 616 the extent that different types of soil management (fallow length, decompacting by soil 617 ripping, organic fertilization, biochar, mulching, cover crop, etc.) would increase the TTSW. 618 Regional stakeholders suggested using the model to evaluate the available soil water capacity

619 needed to maintain historical yield. The goal would be to evaluate the ability of changes in soil
620 management to fill the gap between the current and future soil water capacity needed.

The vineyard relocation strategy has often been studied at large scales (e.g., de C. Teixeira et al., 2014; Hannah et al., 2013; Malheiro et al., 2010), and our results confirm the advantages of moving to higher altitudes to adapt to climate change. But the limitations of such studies, including ours, is the lack of attention to conservationist conflicts over land use (Hannah et al., 2013), the low resolution of the input data (soil, climate, practices, etc.), and the technical feasibility of cultivating those areas. Further research could focus on this strategy and expand knowledge about the choices to buy or rent (or not) new land, as studied in Delay et al. (2015).

#### 628 4.2 An original method to design and assess adaptation strategies

629 The method proposed here is original in that it combines tools used independently in previous 630 studies: the participatory design of adaptation strategies and process-based model 631 simulations under future climatic conditions. We had some difficulty involving stakeholders in 632 a complex design process, so the resulting adaptation strategies included some choices made 633 by the modelers. This could be due to several reasons. First, we dedicated only one set of 634 workshops to strategy design. The first strategies could reflect a hesitancy on the part of 635 stakeholders testing the model approach, as previously experienced in Hossard et al. (2013). 636 Second, the design framework was constrained by the modeling tools. Our simulations 637 considered a limited number of typical cropping systems in the watershed, a unique driver of 638 change (climate change), and only six field scale technical changes to define adaptation 639 strategies. The issue might have been avoided by using narrative scenarios to encourage 640 creativity and consistency (e.g., Delmotte et al., 2017). However, as the timeline extends, the 641 number of possible values of the variables explodes, and the narratives would become more 642 difficult to translate into quantitative scenarios (Alcamo, 2009; Leenhardt et al., 2012).

The economic evaluation of the adaptation strategy was crucial for the two types of stakeholders. However, the co-designed economic indicator showed some limitations: (i) costs and benefits poorly consider plots and farms diversity, (ii) variable costs and benefits are not considered, (iii) costs are fixed and annualized over time. Concerning the first point, we had only two available levels of costs and benefits according to the type of production (PDO or PGI), intrinsically linked with vineyard design. However, the diversity of plots (soil, slope, etc.) and farms (material, spatial distribution of plots, labor force, etc.) imply a wider range of 650 operation costs. The marketing strategies (e.g. bulk vs. bottled, direct sales vs. cooperatives, 651 environmental labelling) may also affect the selling price and therefore the benefits of the 652 adaptation. Therefore, further and updated data collection on the economic performances of 653 the different types of farms are needed to proceed to a monetary assessment of adaptations 654 measures. National database can be used such as census (e.g. Bernetti et al. 2012), farm 655 accounting (e.g. Sacchelli et al., 2017) or data available at the ministry of Agriculture (e.g. 656 Georgopoulou et al., 2017) for estimating the operation costs and benefits in the vineyard. 657 While these databases may have some limitations, the complexity and the high territorial 658 differentiation of vineyard systems often lead the authors to use complementary sources of 659 information like consultation of farmers (e.g. Georgopoulou et al., 2017) or experts (e.g. 660 Sacchelli et al., 2017). On the second point, we suggest to introduce variable costs, such as the 661 irrigation water price, and variables benefits depending on wine quality and market variability, 662 to better compute costs and benefits. This would allow the exploration of economic 663 adaptation scenarios such as the creation of climate-smart agriculture labels, or an increase 664 in the cost of irrigation water. On the third point, the United Nations Framework Convention 665 on Climate Change reviewed a large panel of approaches to assess the costs and benefits of 666 adaptation options (UNFCCC, 2011). Among them, the approach proposed by stakeholders 667 has similarities with the cost-benefit analysis (CBA). However, unlike our method, a discount 668 rate is used in CBA to determine the present value of future benefit and cost flows. The IPCC 669 reminds that discount rate is a core question but opinions vary sharply on its value 670 (Chambwera et al., 2014). This value can vary between 0.1 to 2.5% among studies (Chambwera 671 et al., 2014), while in the Greek vineyard, Georgopoulou et al. (2017) took on a rate of 6%. The 672 discount rate parameter, that could appear subjective, is not easy to implement in a 673 participatory approach. A solution could be to test various values of discount rate, with the 674 challenge to keep results clear enough with the stakeholders.

#### 675 4.3 Enriching interactions within and between groups of stakeholders

The choice of the territory and the co-design approach had some consequences on the size of the participant sample. First, the territory had a small size (45 km<sup>2</sup>). Therefore, the diversity of systems, stakeholders, and their opinions could be represented by a limited number of participants, including farmers. Second, co-design approaches require a constant and organized dialogue between participants and researchers (Jeuffroy et al., 2022); keeping an 681 active and stable participation is thus necessary to build a fruitful dialogue. However, recent 682 works often cite the difficulties of maintaining actor's involvement during workshops (Della 683 Rossa et al., 2022). In our case, the collective planning and the dialogue established between 684 participants helped ensuring a constant number of participants to preserve the diversity of 685 stakeholders (localization, types of production, professions and ways of actions). There is no 686 consensus in literature on the right number of participants for participatory design workshop. 687 While Alcamo (2009) suggests a number between 15 and 25 for World Scenario Exercise (p. 688 137), design workshops of the 12 case studies analyzed by Jeuffroy et al. (2022) included 689 between 7 and 25 participants, which is similar to the participation observed in our study. Our 690 workshops gathered, in addition to other stakeholders, 8 farmers, who represented all 691 production sectors. Although this number is relatively low, it corresponds to what was 692 observed on the case studies of design workshops, which included between 0 and 8 farmers 693 (Jeuffroy et al., 2022). Nevertheless, a larger number of farmers would have been beneficial 694 to (i) limit the risk to neglect some adaptation measures and to (ii) represent a wider range of 695 different interests and experiences.

696 The two separated groups of stakeholders produced and discussed complementary but 697 sometimes contradictory information. The local stakeholders appreciated the concrete and 698 local information they acquired on climate change and its potential consequences on their 699 vineyards. Many ideas were mentioned during the workshop, such as the wish to innovate 700 within their farm, the importance of sharing experiences, and the need to combine multiple 701 adaptations. Local stakeholders tended to look at traditional practices to find solutions, but 702 they complained about the prohibition of some of those practices decided at regional or 703 national level (e.g., restrictions on planting density, varieties). Regional stakeholders were 704 more interested in sharing information on adaptation measures, for which they are most often 705 solicited. They highlighted the need of information on goblet systems (training the vines 706 upright and planting in a grid pattern without use of a trellis), historical varieties, and foreign 707 varieties. As further step, a final meeting could be organized to inform a broader audience 708 about the results of our study, as well as to engage them in discussion (Voinov and Bousquet, 709 2010).

The interactions between researchers and the two groups of stakeholders did not differ significantly. However, each group helped develop analyses outside of the model's limits. For 712 example, regional stakeholders helped compare model results with different experiences in 713 other areas. Local stakeholders were more likely to identify possible feedback loops in their 714 production systems. For example, water ponds would increase the available irrigation water, 715 but a particularly dry winter could jeopardize the replenishment of the water ponds, and 716 consequently decrease the available irrigation water. Thus, the cost-benefits ratio of the water 717 source infrastructure would be adversely affected. They also proposed to account for extreme 718 climate events (frost, hail, heat waves) by introducing particularly low production years, for 719 which the probability could vary among climate scenarios. The relevance of stakeholder's 720 knowledge about local conditions, constraints and feedback loops was demonstrated by 721 Schaap et al. (2013) in their study evaluating the impacts of extreme events on Dutch farms. The next stage of the study should focus on deepening the participatory approach to include 722 723 qualitative information on feedback effects into a (semi-) quantitative evaluation.

# 724 5 Conclusion

725 Most of the design and evaluation of adaptation strategies rely on either crop models that 726 take little account of local diversity or participatory approaches that are not designed to meet 727 quantitative information needs. In those cases, it can be difficult for stakeholders 728 (winegrowers, technical advisors, policy makers) to fully understand the adaptation potential 729 in a given context. In this study, we combined a participatory approach with the use of 730 process-based models, thus making it possible to include local knowledge in the model-based 731 exploration of adaptation strategies. This approach yielded insight into the heterogeneity of 732 vulnerability and adaptive capacity of vineyards in a Mediterranean watershed. Although 733 estimates of the potential and cost-effectiveness of adaptations are not absolute or definitive, 734 our work with stakeholders identified effective combinations of adaptation measures that can 735 be implemented in different grapevine systems.

Finally, we designed and assessed adaptation strategies that limit potential production losses due to climate change in the Rieutort watershed. The most productive areas showed the least leeway to adapt to climate change, even though they appear to be the most affected by the future climatic conditions. The systems with low yield production were better at withstanding climate change and were also more likely to adopt innovative adaptations. However, our study did not consider the effects of extreme events, nor the effects of socio-economic drivers of change. Reduced canopy, soil quality improvement, water-efficient training systems, and
reduced density were identified as particularly promising adaptation measures and should be
further investigated.

# 745 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the LACCAVE 2.21 project funded by the meta-program Adaptation of Agriculture and Forests to Climate Change (AAFCC) of the French National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food, and Environment (INRAE). This work is part of a PhD project funded by the Occitanie Regional Council and the INRAE AgroEcoSystem division. Authors would like to thank all study participants, as well as the OpenFLUID team for modeling support. Authors would like to thank Ben Boswell for English reviewing. The authors would like to thank the three reviewers for their constructive feedbacks.

# 753 References

- 754 Aigrain, P., Brugière, F., Duchêne, E., Cortazar-Atauri, I.G. de, Gautier, J., Giraud-Héraud, E., 755 Hannin, H., Ollat, N., Touzard, J.-M., 2016. Work of prospective on the adaptation of 756 the viticulture to climate change: Which series of events could support various 757 adaptation strategies? / Travaux de prospective sur l'adaptation de la viticulture au 758 changement climatique : quelles séries d'événements pourraient favoriser différentes 759 stratégies d'adaptation? BIO Web Conf. 7, 03016. 760 https://doi.org/10.1051/bioconf/20160703016
- 761 Alcamo, J., 2009. Environmental Futures, Volume 2 1st Edition, Elsiever. ed.
- 762 Bernetti, I., Menghini, S., Marinelli, N., Sacchelli, S., Sottini, V.A., 2012. Assessment of climate 763 change impact on viticulture: Economic evaluations and adaptation strategies analysis 764 for the Tuscan wine sector. Wine Econ. Policy 1, 73-86. 765 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wep.2012.11.002
- Caravia, L., Collins, C., Petrie, P.R., Tyerman, S.D., 2016. Application of shade treatments during
   Shiraz berry ripening to reduce the impact of high temperature: Shade reduces impact
   of high temperature on Shiraz. Aust. J. Grape Wine Res. 22, 422–437.
   https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12248
- Celette, F., Gaudin, R., Gary, C.C., 2008. Spatial and temporal changes to the water regime of
   a Mediterranean vineyard due to the adoption of cover cropping. Eur. J. Agron. 29,
   153–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2008.04.007
- Celette, F., Ripoche, A., Gary, C., 2010. WaLIS—A simple model to simulate water partitioning
  in a crop association: The example of an intercropped vineyard. Agric. Water Manag.
  97, 1749–1759. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2010.06.008
- Chambwera, M., Heal, G., Dubeux, C., Hallegatte, S., Leclerc, L., Markandya, A., McCarl, B.A.,
   Mechler, R., Neumann, J.E., 2014. Economics of adaptation, in: Climate Change 2014:
   Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects.
   Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J.
  Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova,
  Cirrero, F.S. Kissel, A.N. Jourg, S. Mastrandrea, B.B. Mastrandrea, and J. J. White (Eds.)
- B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (Eds.)].
  Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 945–977.
- Cradock-Henry, N.A., Frame, B., 2021. Balancing scales: Enhancing local applications of
  adaptation pathways. Environ. Sci. Policy 121, 42–48.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.04.001
- Daccache, A., D'Agostino, D., Lamaddalena, N., El Chami, D., 2015. A decision tool for
   sustainable agricultural policies: The case of water saving scenarios for Apulia Region
   (Southern Italy). Water Policy wp2015050. https://doi.org/10.2166/wp.2015.050
- de C. Teixeira, A.H., Tonietto, J., Pereira, G.E., Hernandez, F.B.T., Angelotti, F., Lopes, H.L.,
  2014. AGRO-CLIMATIC SUITABILITY DELIMITATION FOR TABLE AND WINE GRAPE
  CROPS UNDER IRRIGATION CONDITIONS IN NORTHEASTERN BRAZIL. Acta Hortic. 277–
  286. https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2014.1038.33
- 794Delay, E., Piou, C., Quenol, H., 2015. The mountain environment, a driver for adaptation to795climatechange.LandUsePolicy48,51–62.796https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.05.008
- Della Rossa, P., Mottes, C., Cattan, P., Le Bail, M., 2022. A new method to co-design agricultural
   systems at the territorial scale Application to reduce herbicide pollution in
   Martinique. Agric. Syst. 196, 103337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103337
- Delmotte, S., Couderc, V., Mouret, J.-C., Lopez-Ridaura, S., Barbier, J.-M., Hossard, L., 2017.
   From stakeholders narratives to modelling plausible future agricultural systems.
   Integrated assessment of scenarios for Camargue, Southern France. Eur. J. Agron. 82, 292–307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2016.09.009
- Deloire, A., Rogiers, S., Trujillo, P.B., 2022. What could be the architectural forms of future
   vines adapted to climate change: a new challenge! Let's discuss the Gobelet (Bush
   Vine): Original language of the article: English. IVES Tech. Rev. Vine Wine.
   https://doi.org/10.20870/IVES-TR.2022.5384
- 808Département Hérault, 2019. Hérault Irrigation,Schéma départemental, 2018 2030.809https://fr.calameo.com/read/0017574769e5f76918e87, Montpellier.
- 810Duchene, E., 2016. How can grapevine genetics contribute to the adaptation to climate811change? OENO One 50, 113–124. https://doi.org/10.20870/oeno-one.2016.50.3.98
- Dunn, M.R., Lindesay, J.A., Howden, M., 2015. Spatial and temporal scales of future climate
  information for climate change adaptation in viticulture: a case study of User needs in
  the Australian winegrape sector. Aust. J. Grape Wine Res. 21, 226–239.
  https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12138
- Fabre, J.-C., Rabotin, M., Crevoisier, D., Libres, A., Dagès, C., Moussa, R., Lagacherie, P., Raclot,
   D., Voltz, M., 2013. OpenFLUID: an open-source software environment for modelling
   fluxes in landscapes, in: EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts.
- 819 Fernández-Mena, H., Frey, H., Celette, F., Garcia, L., Barkaoui, K., Hossard, L., Naulleau, A., 820 Métral, R., Gary, C., Metay, A., 2021. Spatial and temporal diversity of service plant 821 management strategies across vineyards in the south of France. Analysis through the 822 Coverage Index. Eur. J. Agron. 123, 126191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2020.126191 823
- Ferrise, R., Trombi, G., Moriondo, M., Bindi, M., 2016. Climate Change and Grapevines: A
  Simulation Study for the Mediterranean Basin. J. Wine Econ. 11, 88–104.
  https://doi.org/10.1017/jwe.2014.30

- Fraga, H., García de Cortázar Atauri, I., Santos, J.A., 2018. Viticultural irrigation demands under
  climate change scenarios in Portugal. Agric. Water Manag. 196, 66–74.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2017.10.023
- Fraga, H., Santos, J.A., 2018. Vineyard mulching as a climate change adaptation measure:
  Future simulations for Alentejo, Portugal. Agric. Syst. 164, 107–115.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2018.04.006
- Gaudin, R., Gary, C., 2012. Model-based evaluation of irrigation needs in Mediterranean
  vineyards. Irrig. Sci. 30, 449–459. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00271-012-0349-x
- Georgopoulou, E., Mirasgedis, S., Sarafidis, Y., Vitaliotou, M., Lalas, D.P., Theloudis, I.,
  Giannoulaki, K.-D., Dimopoulos, D., Zavras, V., 2017. Climate change impacts and
  adaptation options for the Greek agriculture in 2021–2050: A monetary assessment.
  Clim. Risk Manag. 16, 164–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2017.02.002
- Grantham, T.E., Merenlender, A.M., Resh, V.H., 2010. Climatic influences and anthropogenic
  stressors: an integrated framework for streamflow management in Mediterraneanclimate California, U.S.A. Freshw. Biol. 55, 188–204. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.13652427.2009.02379.x
- Haasnoot, M., Biesbroek, R., Lawrence, J., Muccione, V., Lempert, R., Glavovic, B., 2020.
  Defining the solution space to accelerate climate change adaptation. Reg. Environ.
  Change 20, 37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-020-01623-8
- Hannah, L., Roehrdanz, P.R., Ikegami, M., Shepard, A.V., Shaw, M.R., Tabor, G., Zhi, L.,
  Marquet, P.A., Hijmans, R.J., 2013. Climate change, wine, and conservation. Proc. Natl.
  Acad. Sci. 110, 6907–6912.
- Hossard, L., Jeuffroy, M.H., Pelzer, E., Pinochet, X., Souchere, V., 2013. A participatory
  approach to design spatial scenarios of cropping systems and assess their effects on
  phoma stem canker management at a regional scale. Environ. Model. Softw. 48, 17–
  26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.05.014
- 853 IPCC, 2015. Climate change 2014: synthesis report. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
   854 Change, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Jeuffroy, M.-H., Loyce, C., Lefeuvre, T., Valantin-Morison, M., Colnenne-David, C., Gauffreteau,
   A., Médiène, S., Pelzer, E., Reau, R., Salembier, C., Meynard, J.-M., 2022. Design
   workshops for innovative cropping systems and decision-support tools: Learning from
   12 case studies. Eur. J. Agron. 139, 126573. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2022.126573
- Knowling, M.J., Bennett, B., Ostendorf, B., Westra, S., Walker, R.R., Pellegrino, A., Edwards,
  E.J., Collins, C., Pagay, V., Grigg, D., 2021. Bridging the gap between data and decisions:
  A review of process-based models for viticulture. Agric. Syst. 193, 103209.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103209
- Lagacherie, P., Rabotin, M., Colin, F., Moussa, R., Voltz, M., 2010. Geo-MHYDAS: A landscape
   discretization tool for distributed hydrological modeling of cultivated areas. Comput.
   Geosci. 36, 1021–1032. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2009.12.005
- Leenhardt, D., Therond, O., Cordier, M.-O., Gascuel-Odoux, C., Reynaud, A., Durand, P.,
   Bergez, J.-E., Clavel, L., Masson, V., Moreau, P., 2012. A generic framework for scenario
   exercises using models applied to water-resource management. Environ. Model.
   Softw. 37, 125–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.03.010
- Lereboullet, A.-L., Beltrando, G., Bardsley, D.K., 2013. Socio-ecological adaptation to climate
  change: A comparative case study from the Mediterranean wine industry in France and
  Australia. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 164, 273–285.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2012.10.008

- Liles, C., Verdon-Kidd, D. c, 2020. Refining the growing season temperature parameter for use
  in winegrape suitability analysis. Aust. J. Grape Wine Res. 26, 343–357.
  https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12447
- Malheiro, A., Santos, J., Fraga, H., Pinto, J., 2010. Climate change scenarios applied to viticultural zoning in Europe. Clim. Res. 43, 163–177. https://doi.org/10.3354/cr00918
- March, H., Therond, O., Leenhardt, D., 2012. Water futures: Reviewing water-scenario
  analyses through an original interpretative framework. Ecol. Econ. 82, 126–137.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.07.006
- Marín, D., Armengol, J., Carbonell-Bejerano, P., Escalona, J.M., Gramaje, D., HernándezMontes, E., Intrigliolo, D.S., Martínez-Zapater, J.M., Medrano, H., Mirás-Avalos, J.M.,
  Palomares-Rius, J.E., Romero-Azorín, P., Savé, R., Santesteban, L.G., Herralde, F. de,
  2020. Challenges of viticulture adaptation to global change: tackling the issue from the
  roots. Aust. J. Grape Wine Res. n/a. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12463
- Mariotti, A., Pan, Y., Zeng, N., Alessandri, A., 2015. Long-term climate change in the
  Mediterranean region in the midst of decadal variability. Clim. Dyn. 44, 1437–1456.
  https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-015-2487-3
- Markanday, A., Galarraga, I., Markandya, A., 2019. A critical review of cost-benefit analysis for
   climate change adaptation in cities. Clim. Change Econ. 10, 1950014.
- Morales-Castilla, I., García de Cortázar-Atauri, I., Cook, B.I., Lacombe, T., Parker, A., van
  Leeuwen, C., Nicholas, K.A., Wolkovich, E.M., 2020. Diversity buffers winegrowing
  regions from climate change losses. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 201906731.
  https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906731117
- Mosedale, J.R., Abernethy, K.E., Smart, R.E., Wilson, R.J., Maclean, I.M.D., 2016. Climate
  change impacts and adaptive strategies: lessons from the grapevine. Glob. Change
  Biol. 22, 3814–3828. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13406
- Naulleau, A., Gary, C., Prévot, L., Berteloot, V., Fabre, J.-C., Crevoisier, D., Gaudin, R., Hossard,
   L., 2022. Participatory modeling to assess the impacts of climate change in a
   Mediterranean vineyard watershed. Environ. Model. Softw. 105342.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2022.105342
- Naulleau, A., Gary, C., Prévot, L., Hossard, L., 2021. Evaluating Strategies for Adaptation to
   Climate Change in Grapevine Production–A Systematic Review. Front. Plant Sci. 11, 21–
   54. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.607859
- Neethling, E., Barbeau, G., Coulon-Leroy, C., Quénol, H., 2019. Spatial complexity and
   temporal dynamics in viticulture: A review of climate-driven scales. Agric. For.
   Meteorol. 276–277, 107618. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2019.107618
- Neethling, E., Petitjean, T., Quénol, H., Barbeau, G., 2017. Assessing local climate vulnerability
   and winegrowers' adaptive processes in the context of climate change. Mitig. Adapt.
   Strateg. Glob. Change 22, 777–803. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-015-9698-0
- Nicholas, K.A., Durham, W.H., 2012. Farm-scale adaptation and vulnerability to environmental
   stresses: Insights from winegrowing in Northern California. Glob. Environ. Change 22,
   483–494. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.01.001
- 915 Ojeda, H., 2007. Irrigation qualitative de précision de la vigne. Prog. Agric. Vitic. 124, 133–141.
- Ollat, N., Peccoux, A., Papura, D., Esmenjaud, D., Marguerit, E., Tandonnet, J.-P., Bordenave,
  L., Cookson, S. j., Barrieu, F., Rossdeutsch, L., Lecourt, J., Lauvergeat, V., Vivin, P., Bert,
  P.-F., Delrot, S., 2015. Rootstocks as a component of adaptation to environment, in:
  Grapevine in a Changing Environment. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 68–108.
  https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118735985.ch4

- Parker, A., de Cortázar-Atauri, I.G., Chuine, I., Barbeau, G., Bois, B., Boursiquot, J.-M., Cahurel,
  J.-Y., Claverie, M., Dufourcq, T., Gény, L., Guimberteau, G., Hofmann, R.W., Jacquet, O.,
  Lacombe, T., Monamy, C., Ojeda, H., Panigai, L., Payan, J.-C., Lovelle, B.R., Rouchaud,
  E., Schneider, C., Spring, J.-L., Storchi, P., Tomasi, D., Trambouze, W., Trought, M., van
  Leeuwen, C., 2013. Classification of varieties for their timing of flowering and veraison
  using a modelling approach: A case study for the grapevine species Vitis vinifera L.
  Agric. For. Meteorol. 180, 249–264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2013.06.005
- Parker, A.K., Cortázar-Atauri, I.G.D., van Leeuwen, C., Chuine, I., 2011. General phenological
  model to characterise the timing of flowering and veraison of Vitis vinifera L. Aust. J.
  Grape Wine Res. 17, 206–216. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0238.2011.00140.x
- Parker, A.K., García de Cortázar-Atauri, I., Gény, L., Spring, J.-L., Destrac, A., Schultz, H.,
  Molitor, D., Lacombe, T., Graça, A., Monamy, C., Stoll, M., Storchi, P., Trought, M.C.T.,
  Hofmann, R.W., van Leeuwen, C., 2020. Temperature-based grapevine sugar ripeness
  modelling for a wide range of Vitis vinifera L. cultivars. Agric. For. Meteorol. 285–286,
  107902. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2020.107902
- Passioura, J.B., 1996. Simulation Models: Science, Snake Oil, Education, or Engineering? Agron.
  J. 88, 690. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1996.00021962008800050002x
- Pl@ntGrape, 2020. Catalogue of Vines Cultivated in France, IFV INRAE l'Institut Agro |
   Montpellier SupAgro, 2009-2020.
- Riou, C., Valancogne, C., Pieri, P., 1989. Un modèle simple d'interception du rayonnement
  solaire par la vigne vérification expérimentale. Agronomie 9, 441–450.
  https://doi.org/10.1051/agro:19890502
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Elam, G., 2003. Designing and selecting samples, in: Qualitative Research
   Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers. SAGE Publications, Inc.,
   London.
- Roby, J.-P., Marguerit, E., van Leeuwen, C., 2008. Références vigne: références technicoéconomiques de systèmes de conduite de la vigne, 2e éd. ed, Références. Synthèse
  agricole, Bordeaux.
- 949 Sacchelli, S., Fabbrizzi, S., Bertocci, M., Marone, E., Menghini, S., Bernetti, I., 2017. A mix-950 method model for adaptation to climate change in the agricultural sector: A case study 951 for Italian wine farms. J. Clean. Prod. 166, 891-900. 952 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.08.095
- Santos, J.A., Fraga, H., Malheiro, A.C., Moutinho-Pereira, J., Dinis, L.-T., Correia, C., Moriondo,
  M., Leolini, L., Dibari, C., Costafreda-Aumedes, S., Kartschall, T., Menz, C., Molitor, D.,
  Junk, J., Beyer, M., Schultz, H.R., 2020. A Review of the Potential Climate Change
  Impacts and Adaptation Options for European Viticulture. Appl. Sci. 10, 3092.
  https://doi.org/10.3390/app10093092
- Schaap, B.F., Reidsma, P., Verhagen, J., Wolf, J., van Ittersum, M.K., 2013. Participatory design
  of farm level adaptation to climate risks in an arable region in The Netherlands. Eur. J.
  Agron. 48, 30–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2013.02.004
- 961 UNFCCC, 2011. Assessing the costs and benefits of adaptation options. An overview of
   962 approaches, THE NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME ON IMPACTS, VULNERABILITY AND
   963 ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE.
- van Leeuwen, C., Darriet, P., 2016. The Impact of Climate Change on Viticulture and Wine
   Quality. J. Wine Econ. 11, 150–167. https://doi.org/10.1017/jwe.2015.21
- van Leeuwen, C., Pieri, P., Gowdy, M., Ollat, N., Roby, J.-P., 2019. Reduced density is an
   environmental friendly and cost effective solution to increase resilence to drought in

- 968vineyards in a contexte of climate change. OENO One 53, 129–146.969https://doi.org/10.20870/oeno-one.2019.53.2.2420
- van Leeuwen, C., Schultz, H.R., Garcia de Cortazar-Atauri, I., Duchene, E., Ollat, N., Pieri, P.,
  Bois, B., Goutouly, J.-P., Quenol, H., Touzard, J.-M., Malheiro, A.C., Bavaresco, L.,
  Delrot, S., 2013. Why climate change will not dramatically decrease viticultural
  suitability in main wine-producing areas by 2050. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 110, E3051–
  E3052. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1307927110
- Vinatier, F., Arnaiz, A.G., 2018. Using high-resolution multitemporal imagery to highlight
   severe land management changes in Mediterranean vineyards. Appl. Geogr. 90, 115–
   122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2017.12.003
- Voinov, A., Bousquet, F., 2010. Modelling with stakeholders. Environ. Model. Softw., Thematic
  Issue Modelling with Stakeholders 25, 1268–1281.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2010.03.007
- Voinov, A., Jenni, K., Gray, S., Kolagani, N., Glynn, P.D., Bommel, P., Prell, C., Zellner, M.,
  Paolisso, M., Jordan, R., Sterling, E., Schmitt Olabisi, L., Giabbanelli, P.J., Sun, Z., Le
  Page, C., Elsawah, S., BenDor, T.K., Hubacek, K., Laursen, B.K., Jetter, A., Basco-Carrera,
  L., Singer, A., Young, L., Brunacini, J., Smajgl, A., 2018. Tools and methods in
  participatory modeling: Selecting the right tool for the job. Environ. Model. Softw. 109,
  232–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.08.028

988