



Why climate change will not dramatically decrease viticultural suitability in main wine-producing areas by 2050

Hannah et al. (1) recently published a comprehensive study showing substantial impacts of climate change on viticultural suitability, leading to potential ecological issues. We agree that expansion of viticulture into new areas can lead to a decrease in biodiversity and that an increase in water use for irrigation might lead to major freshwater conservation impacts. However, we disagree with the alarming statement that suitability for winegrowing of main wine-producing areas worldwide will dramatically decrease over the next 40 y. We point out major methodological flaws in ref. 1, mostly linked to (i) the misuse of bibliographical data to compute suitability index, (ii) underestimation of adaptations of viticulture to warmer conditions, and (iii) the inadequacy of the monthly time step in the suitability approach.

The suitability index in ref. 1 is mainly compiled from grapevine maturity groupings as defined by Jones (ref. 2 is a wrong citation; this classification is given in ref. 3) and Gladstones [(4), not peer-reviewed]. In refs. 3 and 4, groupings were constructed from empirical observations collected in premium winegrowing areas and not based on grapevine physiological modeling. We argue that it is very difficult to establish precise upper limits by variety for growing high-quality wines and that those given in ref. 3 are underestimated. To illustrate this aspect, we compared average growing season temperature (AvGST) from 1971 to 1999 and from 2000 to 2012 for three major wine-growing regions (Fig. 1): Rheingau (Germany), Burgundy (France), and Rhone Valley (France). Burgundy continues to produce great wines with Pinot noir since 2000, although AvGST is already above the upper temperature limit cited in ref. 3. The same is true for Rheingau with Pinot gris and the Rhone Valley with Syrah. High-quality viticulture is sustained in these regions despite increased temperatures and dry farming, because of both the evolution

of consumer's preferences and implementation of adaptive strategies by growers.

A major flaw in ref. 1 is that noncapped growing degree days (GDDs) are computed and subsequently compared with varietal maturity groupings from ref. 4, wherein GDDs are capped at 19 °C [called biologically effective degree days (BEDDs)]. As the climate becomes warmer, the seasonal difference between BEDDs and noncapped GDDs increases up to several hundreds of DDs. Hence, projected ripeness in ref. 1 is weeks ahead when compared with ripeness properly estimated using ref. 4. This subsequently results in much higher temperatures during the projected last month before ripeness, which was the main criterion used in ref. 1 to consider a region suitable for viticulture or not.

A monthly time step was used in ref. 1. One month accounts for up to 270 BEDDs. When varieties are compared in maturity groupings that are 50 DDs apart, this resolution is too crude to yield reliable maturity predictions.

Hannah et al. make an interesting point in predicting which regions worldwide may become suitable for viticulture by 2050 as a consequence of climate change, and in estimating related potential ecological impact. However, their conclusion that most of the present wine-growing regions will become unsuitable for viticulture is erroneous.

Cornelis van Leeuwen^{a,b,1}, Hans R. Schultz^c, Iñaki Garcia de Cortazar-Atauri^d, Eric Duchêne^e, Nathalie Ollat^{a,f}, Philippe Pieri^{a,f}, Benjamin Bois^g, Jean-Pascal Goutouly^{a,f}, Hervé Quéno^h, Jean-Marc Touzardⁱ, Aureliano C. Malheiro^j, Luigi Bavaresco^k, and Serge Delrot^{a,b,f}

^aUnité Mixte de Recherche 1287, and

^bBordeaux Sciences Agro, Institut des Sciences de la Vigne et du Vin, University Bordeaux, F-331410 Villenave d'Ornon, France;

^cHochschule Geisenheim University, D-65366 Geisenheim, Germany; ^dUnité de service 1116 Agroclim, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), F-84914 Avignon, France; ^eUnité Mixte de Recherches 1131, INRA, F-68000 Colmar, France; ^fUnité Mixte de Recherche 1287, Institut des Sciences de la Vigne et du Vin, INRA, F-33140 Villenave d'Ornon, France; ^gUnité Mixte de Recherche 6282 Biogeosciences, Centre de Recherche de Climatologie, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Université de Bourgogne, F-21000 Dijon, France; ^hUnité Mixte de Recherche 6554 Littoral Environnement Télédétection Géomatique, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Université de Haute Bretagne, F-35043 Rennes, France; ⁱUnité Mixte de Recherche 0951, INRA, F-34060 Montpellier, France; ^jCentre for Research and Technology of Agro-Environmental and Biological Sciences, University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, 5001-801 Vila Real, Portugal; and ^kResearch Centre for Viticulture, Consiglio per la Ricerca e la sperimentazione in Agricoltura, I-31015 Conegliano, Italy

1 Hannah L, et al. (2013) Climate change, wine, and conservation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 110(17):6907–6912.

2 Jones G, White M, Cooper O, Storchman K (2005) Climate change and global wine quality. *Clim Change* 73(3):319–343.

3 Jones G (2006) Climate and terroir: Impacts of climate variability and change on wine. *Fine Wine and Terroir—The Geoscience Perspective*. *Geoscience Canada*, eds Macqueen RW, Meinert LD (Geological Association of Canada, St John's, Newfoundland), pp 1–14.

4 Gladstones J (1992) *Viticulture and Environment* (WineTitles, Adelaide, Australia).

Author contributions: C.v.L., H.R.S., I.G.d.C.-A., E.D., N.O., P.P., B.B., J.-P.G., H.Q., J.-M.T., A.C.M., L.B., and S.D. performed research; C.v.L., I.G.d.C.-A., E.D., P.P., and B.B. analyzed data; and C.v.L. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: vanleeuwen@agro-bordeaux.fr.

