



HAL
open science

Perennial transitions from market gardening towards mixed fruit tree - vegetable systems

Alice de Lapparent, Rodolphe Sabatier, Raphaël Paut, Sophie Martin

► To cite this version:

Alice de Lapparent, Rodolphe Sabatier, Raphaël Paut, Sophie Martin. Perennial transitions from market gardening towards mixed fruit tree - vegetable systems. *Agricultural Systems*, 2023, 207, pp.103635. 10.1016/j.agry.2023.103635 . hal-04083754

HAL Id: hal-04083754

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04083754>

Submitted on 8 Dec 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 **Perennial transitions from market gardening towards mixed fruit tree - vegetable systems**

2

3 **Authors: Alice DE LAPPARENT ^{*a}, Rodolphe SABATIER ^a, Raphaël PAUT ^b, Sophie MARTIN ^c**

4 **Affiliations:**

5 ^a INRAE, UR 767 Ecodéveloppement, 84000 Avignon, France

6 ^b INRAE, UMR Agronomie, 91123 Palaiseau, France

7 ^c INRAE, UR LISC, Laboratoire d'ingénierie des Systèmes Complexes, 63178 Aubière, France

8 e-mail addresses: alice.de-lapparent@inrae.fr; rodolphe.sabatier@inrae.fr; raphael.paut@inrae.fr;
9 sophie.martin@inrae.fr

10 * Corresponding author. E-mail address: alice.de-lapparent@inrae.fr

11

12

13 **ABSTRACT**

14 *CONTEXT*

15 Planting fruit trees in a market gardening system creates a mixed fruit tree – vegetable system with
16 the potential to address certain environmental issues. However, it results in a complex system where
17 labor has to be allocated between the two activities.

18

19 *OBJECTIVE*

20 Our objective is to simulate possible trajectories for a perennial transition from market gardening to
21 mixed fruit tree – vegetable systems, in order to study the required trade-offs.

22

23 *METHODS*

24 We modeled the transition using viability theory, a framework with states, controls and constraints
25 that guarantees sustainability along a transition trajectory. It was used in two iterations, the first step
26 computing a target to be reached during the second step. Trajectory samples were computed from the
27 sets of viable states at each time step.

28

29 *RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS*

30 In order to guarantee sustainability, at the end of the transition process the farm must not only respect
 31 the constraints but belong to a subset of the domain they define. The study of viable trajectories shows
 32 a trade-off between capital and working hours, and thus different suitable strategies for the timing of
 33 orchard planting and the choice of crop rotations. Some strategies present bottlenecks where the
 34 flexibility of the farm is greatly reduced.

35


36 *SIGNIFICANCE*

37 The variety of resulting viable trajectories means that choosing between them can call upon criteria
 38 that are not implemented in the model, such as personal preferences. The establishment of a target
 39 through viability computation and the study of trajectory sets avoids the imposition of an *a priori*
 40 normativity.

41

42

43 **GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT**



44

45

46

47

48 **Keywords:** viability theory; crop diversification; perennial transition; mixed horticultural farm;
 49 agroforestry

50

51

52 **Highlights:**

- 53 • The transition from market gardening to a mixed fruit tree – vegetable system increases both
54 the functional diversity and the complexity of a farming system.
- 55 • Using viability theory, we modeled possible trajectories for a perennial transition from
56 market gardening to mixed fruit tree – vegetable systems.
- 57 • We show a trade-off between capital and working hours.
- 58 • This trade-off is driven by the timing of fruit tree planting and the choice of crop rotations.
- 59 • The sets of viable trajectories give a wide range of possibilities that can be made compatible
60 with individual values and priorities.

61

62

63

64 **1. INTRODUCTION**

65 In order to meet current environmental and social concerns, new farming systems based on
66 agroecological paradigms are becoming increasingly common in the agricultural landscape (Wezel et
67 al., 2014). In particular, more diversified systems make it possible to improve adaptability and thus to
68 face global changes (Dardonville et al., 2020; Darnhofer et al., 2010; Rigolot et al., 2019). Highly
69 diversified Market Gardening (MG) systems are thus a growing trend in agriculture. They produce a
70 wide range of vegetables (generally over 25 varieties) on small areas, mostly directed towards direct
71 selling (Morel, 2016; Pépin et al., 2021). These farms are generally run by farmers with strong social
72 and environmental aspirations, but who are confronted with pragmatic considerations (Morel and
73 Léger, 2016).

74 One way to effect a change in these systems while remaining coherent with ecological aspirations is to
75 plant fruit trees in addition to vegetable crops, in order to create a Mixed Fruit tree – Vegetable (MFV)
76 system. Mixing these two types of production results in increased functional diversity. Given their size
77 and their perennial development, trees present morphological characteristics and functional traits
78 very different from annual vegetable crops. They can buffer the microclimate, possibly benefiting
79 lower-growing crops, through a modification of light penetration, air temperature and humidity, soil
80 temperature and moisture, and wind movement. They also provide a wide range of ecosystem
81 services: carbon sequestration, soil structure enhancement, relocation of soil nutrients, erosion

82 control, food and habitat for pest predators and parasitoids, water quality enhancement and reduction
83 in nutrient leaching, etc. (Beillouin et al., 2021; Chittapur and Patil, 2017; Sollen-Norrlin et al., 2020).
84 The resulting system is also very well adapted to direct selling, providing complementary, high-added-
85 value products. Fruit can be considered as an attractive product that will make the consumer more
86 willing to come to the sales point (Léger et al., 2019). Their high efficiency on small areas makes these
87 systems interesting in a context of competition for land use. However, despite all their potential
88 advantages, such systems are also very complex to manage.

89 Indeed, fruit trees and vegetables have distinct physiological requirements and characteristics that
90 must be considered in their management. They must be spatially arranged in order to minimize
91 competition between crops. Their temporalities differ: most vegetables are annuals whereas fruit trees
92 are perennial crops requiring several years to reach their full potential yield. Fruit tree planting can
93 thus be considered as a long-term investment compared to annual vegetable cropping. When working
94 hours are limited, prioritizing of tasks can favor one type of crop over another. The choices made can
95 provide short-term benefits during the current year (*e.g.* harvesting vegetables) or be long-term
96 investments with benefits over the next few years (*e.g.* pruning trees). Failing to make this investment,
97 by neglecting fruit tree care during the first stages of development, can heavily impact their production
98 for many years. It is therefore crucial for a farmer to pay particular attention to the initial stage of tree
99 development when shifting from MG to MFV. Finding the right balance between long- and short-term
100 objectives is particularly difficult as it requires the ability to project the consequences of short-term
101 decisions onto the system's long-term dynamics.

102

103 In this study, we developed a dynamic model of an MFV farm to explore the long-term consequences
104 of crop and workload allocation choices for the dynamics of a farming system during perennial
105 transition from an MG farm to an MFV system. More specifically, we addressed two issues: the paths
106 enabling transition to occur and the conditions under which the targeted MFV system can become
107 perennial. In order to find the set of management options that would make it possible to perform the
108 transition, we used the Viability Theory mathematical framework (Aubin, 1991).

109

110

111

112

113 **2. METHODS**

114

115 **2.1. Viability theory:**

116 Viability theory is a mathematical framework that applies to the dynamics of state-control systems. It
117 seeks the set of situations and management options that make it possible to maintain the system
118 within a set of constraints over time (Aubin et al., 2011).

119 A given trajectory is defined by a series of states adopted over time. Changes in state are determined
120 by the choice of controls at each time step. A trajectory is considered as viable if it satisfies the
121 constraints at any time. The set of all initial states from which at least one viable trajectory starts is
122 called the viability kernel.

123 In the absence of any objective to be optimized, the main objects studied through viability theory are
124 sets of states and sets of trajectories. Therefore, it is particularly well-adapted to studying sustainability
125 issues, as it avoids the contentious issue of weighting different facets of sustainability (environmental,
126 economic and social) in order to provide a single solution. It also avoids trade-offs between short- and
127 long-term considerations through the choice of an intertemporal objective. However, this type of
128 model has rarely been used in relation to agriculture, and where it has, this has mostly been in relation
129 to herd- and grazing-management systems. Few viability studies deal with cropping (Oubraham and
130 Zaccour, 2018).

131

132

133 **2.2. Farm description:**

134 The model created is a discrete time (annual time step) dynamic model representing an MG or MFV
135 farming system, enabling simulation of changes over time of the farm's financial capital and the
136 condition of its orchard. It is based on Paut et al. (2021). It considers a one-hectare farm comprising
137 four equivalent plots. On this farm, one or two plots can be planted with trees, either apple (Royal Gala
138 variety) or peach (Big Top variety). Crop rotation can be modified each year. On each vegetable plot,
139 two crops are grown each year (winter and summer crops). They are selected from one of six choices,
140 three winter crops (lamb's lettuce *Valerianella locusta* var. *trophy*, cabbage *Brassica oleracea* var.
141 *capitate* and squash *Cucurbita moschata* var. *musquée de Provence*) and three summer crops (pepper
142 *Capsicum annuum* L., zucchini *Cucurbita pepo* var. *cylindrica* and bean *Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). These
143 crops were selected for their contrasting annual gross margin, labor requirements, workload allocation

144 throughout the year and, for the fruit trees, growth dynamics. In order to guarantee rotation among
145 the crops on each plot, the same crop cannot be planted on more than 50% of the farm area (Appendix
146 A). Monocultures and their long-term consequences on soils and biodiversity are thus excluded from
147 the model. Crops are considered to be cultivated on distinct plots; no interactions are therefore
148 considered between crops (vegetables or trees).

149

150

151 **2.3. Transition description:**

152 The system begins as an MG farm, with no trees. The transition to an MFV system can happen any time
153 between the first year and the time horizon ($T = 10$ years).

154 Transition from one system to another is always a long-term projection. The new system must remain
155 viable after the time horizon T at which the transition is considered to be complete. Furthermore, we
156 consider that farmers may be willing to put in a major effort for a few years in order to reach a more
157 convenient situation that will be easier to sustain over the long term. We thus translated an easing of
158 labor conditions after T by an increase in salaries and a decrease in working hours.

159 Management of such a farm requires the handling of several different tasks beside crop production,
160 such as marketing and administration. Therefore, labor time devoted to crops is lower than the total
161 working hours invested by the farmer. In the current situation and based on farmers' feedback, we
162 consider crop-related labor to account for around 70% of the total. The farm being conceived as being
163 managed by one full-time farmer, and according to what has been observed on highly diversified small
164 farms (Joyeux, 2017), labor time available is around 50h/week. Labor time devoted to crops is thus
165 limited to 140h/month (35h/week), for the first ten years. The farmer's wage is fixed at €1,500/month,
166 which is slightly under the French minimum wage (€1645.58 in 2022). Fixed costs are set at €8,000/year
167 (Declercq and Clerc, 2011). After T , salaries are raised to €2,000/month whereas working hours
168 devoted to crops are reduced to 120h/month (30h/week), reflecting better working conditions after
169 the transition phase.

170

171

172 **2.4. States and controls:**

173 Following the viability theory formalism, the model is characterized by states, controls, and
174 constraints. States and controls have been chosen to assess common viability criteria for such farms

175 (Morel and Léger, 2016), while considering conflicts that can appear between orchard and vegetable
176 management.

177 States are system features that change over time. In our model, the states considered are the farm's
178 economic capital (continuous), three discrete variables describing orchards, once fruit trees have been
179 planted, and one accounting for elapsed time (discrete):

- 180 • x_1 : Farm's economic capital, in euros (€). Even though money-making is not always a priority
181 for these farmers, we considered that most people have financial constraints, thus making it
182 mandatory to use an economic indicator to assess viability.
- 183 • x_2 : Tree age in years. A value equal to zero means that no trees are present.
- 184 • x_3 : Fruit tree composition, *i.e.* fruit tree species already present on each orchard plot. The
185 possibilities are apple once (meaning that only one plot is planted with apple trees), peach
186 once, apple twice, peach twice and an apple-peach combination. In the absence of fruit trees,
187 this state takes the value *none*.
- 188 • x_4 : Potential fruit production coefficient, which gives the relative production potential of fruit
189 trees given past management. It translates the effects of a lack of labor devoted to fruit trees
190 which can decrease future yields.
- 191 • τ : Time since the beginning of the computation, in years.


192

193 Controls correspond to the ways in which farmers can act on states between t and $t+1$. Here, choices
194 can be made about:

- 195 • crop rotation (u_1), *i.e.* the list of four vegetables and trees grown during the current year on
196 the four plots (Appendix A). This control makes it possible to simultaneously decide on the
197 vegetable portfolio, fruit tree species, and the proportion of the farm devoted to each. In
198 addition, the planting and/or removal of the orchard can be deduced from a comparison with
199 the previous fruit tree composition, given by x_3 .
- 200 • workload allocation (u_2), which refers to the farmer's prioritization of labor between orchard
201 and market gardening, when insufficient labor is available to meet the needs of both. It varies
202 between 0 (maximum priority is given to vegetables) and 1 (maximum priority is given to fruit
203 trees).

204

205



207

208 *Figure 1: Conceptual representation of the model. Rectangular blue boxes represent states, ellipses are controls. Yellow*
 209 *diamonds are parameters (fixed throughout the simulation). Rounded grey boxes are intermediate variables and dashed*
 210 *green boxes are subsystems. Controls can have immediate effects (solid arrows) on dynamics or long-lasting effects (dashed*
 211 *arrows) on states.*

212

213 2.5.1 Overall dynamics:

214 The overall model dynamics can be formally written as follows:

$$(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)(t + 1) = f((x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), \tau)$$

$$\tau(t + 1) = \tau(t) + 1$$

with

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, u_1, u_2, \tau) := (f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, u_1, u_2, \tau), f_2(x_2, x_3, u_1), f_3(u_1), f_4(x_2, x_4, u_1, u_2))$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, u_1, u_2, \tau) = x_1 + GMv(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) + GMf(x_2, x_3, u_1, u_2, \tau) - S(\tau) - C \\ f_2(x_2, x_3, u_1) = \begin{cases} x_2 + 1 & \text{if } h(u_1) = x_3 \\ 0 & \text{if } h(u_1) = \text{none} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ f_3(u_1) = h(u_1) \\ f_4(x_2, x_4, u_1, u_2) = \begin{cases} x_4 - \delta(x_2, u_1, u_2) & \text{if } h(u_1) = x_3 \\ 1 & \text{if } h(u_1) = \text{none} \\ 1 - \delta(x_2, u_1, u_2) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

215

216 Indeed, yearly variation f_1 in capital x_1 increases with annual gross margin for vegetables GM_v and for
217 fruit trees GM_f , whereas it decreases with farmer's salary S and fixed costs C . Costs C remain constant
218 throughout the simulation, whereas the salary S is revised at T , time at which the transition is
219 considered to be over. It therefore depends on time since the start of computation τ .

220 x_2 , x_3 and x_4 vary between t and $t+1$ only if $u_1(t)$ gives a tree present. Let h be the function extracting
221 tree composition from rotation choice u_1 . If $h(u_1) = \text{none}$, the variable x_2 corresponding to tree age is
222 set equal to 0. Otherwise, when $h(u_1) = x_3$, the planted trees remain and their age increases by one
223 each year. Finally, when $h(u_1) \neq x_3$, all old trees are removed, new ones are planted and then all tree
224 ages equal 1 (hence we only need a one-dimensional variable to describe tree age, which is crucial to
225 minimize computation complexity). x_3 takes the value corresponding to u_1 's tree composition (f_3). x_4
226 decreases proportionally to the lack of care of fruit trees (f_4 , with δ a function controlling the change
227 in potential yield coefficient). Its value is reset to 1 when trees are newly planted.

228

229

230 **2.5.2 Work allocation:**

231 With limited workload available, workload requirements for fruit trees and vegetables can conflict. In
232 this case, management decisions are taken monthly using the workload allocation control u_2 . If $u_2 = 1$,
233 working time is first allocated to trees and the remaining time is allocated to vegetables. If $u_2 = 0$,
234 working time is first allocated to vegetables and the remaining time is allocated to trees. If $0 < u_2 < 1$,
235 working time allocation to both crops is proportional to u_2 . Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{v_month}(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) &= \min\left((1 - u_2)W(\tau) + \max(u_2 * W(\tau) - W_{n_f}(x_2, u_1), 0), W_{n_v}(u_1)\right) \\ W_{f_month}(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) &= \min\left(u_2 * W(\tau) + \max((1 - u_2)W(\tau) - W_{n_v}(u_1), 0), W_{n_f}(x_2, u_1)\right) \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

236 with $W_{v_month}(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau)$ monthly working hours devoted to vegetables, $W_{f_month}(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau)$
237 monthly working hours devoted to fruit trees, $W(\tau)$ available working hours per month when the time
238 since the beginning of computation is τ , $W_{n_f}(x_2, u_1)$ and $W_{n_v}(u_1)$ monthly working hours required
239 for an optimal harvest of fruit and vegetables respectively.

240 The result is then summed over the year and compared to cumulative work requirements, to create
241 relative working hours devoted to vegetables (W_v) and to fruit trees (W_f):

$$\begin{aligned}
W_v(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) &= \frac{\sum_{month} W_{v_month}(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau)}{\sum_{month} W_{n_v}(u_1)} \\
W_f(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) &= \frac{\sum_{month} W_{f_month}(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau)}{\sum_{month} W_{n_f}(x_2, u_1)}
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

242

243

244

2.5.3 Change in potential fruit production coefficient:

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

In accordance with Paut et al. (2021), based on a collective experts' knowledge-sharing workshop, we developed the hypothesis that a lack of work on trees during their growth phase has long-term effects, decreasing future yields, whereas once maturity is reached, this same negligence has only short-term effects. Moreover, we noted that production from both of the chosen tree species (apple and peach) is null if they are completely neglected. In this model we thus used a potential fruit production coefficient (x_4) which can take values between 0 (no production) and 1 (ideal production). The coefficient value is highest when the tree is planted, and it can only decrease, as a consequence of a lack of work on growing fruit trees. We translated these dynamics with the function δ controlling changes in the potential fruit production coefficient x_4 (Eq. (1)) using the equation:

$$\delta: (x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{1 - W_f(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau)}{g_{tree}(h(u_1))} & \text{if } x_2 \in [1, g_{tree}(h(u_1))] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

2.5.4 Potential yield coefficient:

261

262

263

264

265

266

Actual fruit yield is a function of potential yield and working hours devoted to fruit trees. Potential yield can be deducted from the age of the trees (x_2) and previous workload investment (x_4). According to Paut et al. (2021), potential yield trajectories of apple and peach trees as a function of their age (x_2) would follow a sigmoidal dynamic, with fixed parameters k_1 and k_2 for the tree species. The asymptote's value of the sigmoid is governed by x_4 , and constant neglect throughout the growth period would lead to zero production. It can therefore be written as:

$$\alpha_{a \text{ or } p}(x_2, x_4) = \frac{x_4}{1 + e^{-k_{1a \text{ or } p}(x_2 - k_{2a \text{ or } p})}} \quad (5)$$

267

268 The parameter values were taken from Paut et al. (2021).

269

270

271 **2.5.5 Gross margins:**

272 For vegetables, gross margin GM_v depends on the choice of crops in a given year (with no memory)

273 and on the workload W_v devoted to them (Eq.(3)):

$$GM_v(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) = VGM(u_1) \cdot W_v(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) \quad (6)$$

274 where VGM is a function which associates the crop rotation choice u_1 with the theoretical gross margin
275 of vegetables.

276

277 For fruit trees, gross margin GM_f also depends on the current state of the orchard, reflected by the

278 potential yield coefficient α (Eq. (5)):

$$GM_f(x_2, x_3, x_4, u_1, u_2, \tau) = [FGM_a(u_1) \cdot \alpha_a(x_2, x_4) + FGM_p(u_1) \cdot \alpha_p(x_2, x_4)] \cdot W_f(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) - \mathbb{1}_{\{h(u_1) \neq x_3 \ \& \ x_2 \geq 1\}}(x) \cdot rmv \quad (7)$$

279 where $FGM_a(u_1)$ and $FGM_p(u_1)$ are the theoretical gross margin for apple and peach trees respectively.

280 rmv defines the cost of removing previously planted trees, if need be: $\mathbb{1}_{\{h(u_1) \neq x_3 \ \& \ x_2 \geq 1\}}$ is the indicator

281 function that takes the value 1 if an orchard has to be removed, 0 otherwise.

282

283

284 **2.6. Constraints:**

285 We define a set of constraints to reflect the farmer's set of objectives. They relate to a minimal capital

286 to be maintained through time and temporal objectives related to tree planting.

287 For the farm to be able to perform even in the case of unpredicted events, a minimum amount of

288 money must be kept available. In our viability model, this is translated by a threshold applied to x_1 , set

289 at $x_{1min} = \text{€}10,000$ (Eq. (8)).

290 In order to model a transition from an MG to an MFV system, at least one plot must be planted with
 291 trees from the end of the ten-year transition period. This feature can be represented by x_2 (age of fruit
 292 trees), a value of 0 for this state meaning an absence of fruit trees (Eq. (8)).

293 Furthermore, at any given time, it is not possible to own trees planted before the beginning of the
 294 simulation. In other words, tree age x_2 cannot exceed the time elapsed since the beginning of
 295 computation τ (Eq. (8)).

296 Trajectories (combinations of states and controls) respecting all these constraints at any time are called
 297 viable trajectories. The subset of state space respecting these constraints is denoted K and can be
 298 written as:

$$K := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \tau) \mid \begin{array}{l} x_1 \geq x_{1\min} \\ x_2 \geq 1 \text{ when } \tau \geq T \\ x_2 \leq \tau \end{array}\} \quad (8)$$

299

300

301

302 **2.7. Two-step viability algorithm:**

303 The viability kernel is the set of states acting as the start of at least one trajectory that respects the
 304 constraints over time. Let V be the viability kernel of dynamics (Eq. (1)) facing constraints (Eq. (8)).

305 Denoting as $Q(X)$ the set of all trajectories governed by the controlled dynamic system and starting
 306 from $X := (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \tau)$, the viability kernel is defined by the equation:

$$V := \{X \in K \mid \exists x(\cdot) \in Q(X), \forall t \geq 0, x(t) \in K\} \quad (10)$$

307

308 To compute V , we take advantage of the particular dynamics of state τ . We use an algorithm (De Lara
 309 and Doyen, 2008) which employs a backward method to compute V_{τ^*} from V_{τ^*+1} where V_{τ^*} is the
 310 section of V :


$$V_{\tau^*} := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \tau) \mid (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \tau) \in V \ \& \ \tau = \tau^*\} \quad (11)$$

311

312 In our particular case, K is not upper bounded in the τ direction which makes the initialization of the
 313 algorithm impossible. However, as constraints and dynamics do not change after time T , being
 314 permanently viable at any time after T requires the same conditions as at T : $V_{\tau^*} = V_T$ for $\tau^* \geq T$.

315 Moreover, the same target could be computed in finite time, provided that this time would be long

316 enough: $V_T = V'_T$ where V' is the viability kernel of the same dynamics as Eq. (1) except for τ dynamics:
 317 $\tau(t + 1) = \tau(t) + 1$ if $\tau < T'$, $\tau(t + 1) = T'$ otherwise; and facing the bounded constraint set: K'
 318 $:= K \cap \{\tau \leq T'\}$ for a value of T' that is large enough. K' is upper bounded in the τ direction so we can
 319 use the backward algorithm to compute V' with the initialization $V'_{T'} =$
 320 $\{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \tau) \mid (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \tau) \in K' \ \& \ \tau = T'\}$.



321
 322 *Figure 2: Two-step method to determine viable transition trajectories. Non-viable states are in grey, viable states are within*
 323 *the black frame. The dark green area corresponds to the target: viable states at T from which it is possible to remain viable*
 324 *after the change of parameters. The light green area is the capture basin, i.e. states at $t=0$ from which it is possible to reach*
 325 *$V_T(K)$ at T . Black arrows correspond to instances of trajectories with different starting points.*

326
 327 The computation of the viability kernel can be divided into two distinct steps, before and after horizon
 328 T ($\tau \leq T$ and $\tau \geq T$) (Figure 2).

329 The first step of the computation was to apply the viability algorithm between T and T' , to compute
 330 V'_T . As T' increases, V'_T decreases and then remains constant. Therefore, T' was taken as the minimal
 331 value from which there are no more modifications to V'_T . Consequently, any time horizon above T'
 332 would result in the same section of the viability kernel at T meaning that $V'_T = V_T$. This situation was
 333 reached in 5 years, meaning that $T' = 15$ years is suitable.

334 In the second step, the computed V_T was then used as the target to reach during transition. The
 335 viability algorithm was thus applied for a second time between 0 and T , to compute viable trajectories
 336 reaching this target at T . We thus looked for the capture basin of the horizon viability kernel V_T . The

337 capture basin is the set of all initial states from which at least one trajectory ending in the target starts.
338 It can be formally defined as:

$$C(K, V_T) = \{X \in K \mid \exists x(\cdot) \in Q(X), \exists t^* \geq 0, x(t^*) \in V_T \text{ \& \forall } t \in [0, t^*], x(t) \in K\} \quad (12)$$

339
340 In order to compute viability algorithms, each state and control was discretized on a regular grid. As
341 fruit tree gross margins remain essentially unchanged once maturity is reached, a mature tree category
342 was considered for all trees over 11 years. So x_2 ranges from 0 to 12 with a step of 1. Similarly, the
343 linearity of the dynamics enabled us to ascertain that if a state is viable with $x_1 = x_1^*$, it remains viable
344 with any greater value. We find that x_1 ranging from €8,000 to €50,000 is satisfactory with a step of
345 €2,000. x_4 ranges from 0 to 1 with a step of 0.1. u_1 belongs to a finite set available in Appendix A. u_2
346 ranges from 0 to 1 with a step of 0.2.

347

348

349 **2.8. Trajectory computation:**

350 As a preliminary step, a static comparison of the potential of the different crop portfolios was realized
351 for the different values of orchard age (x_2) with a maximal production coefficient ($x_4 = 1$). Dynamics
352 were computed and analyzed in terms of annual workload ($W_v(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau) + W_f(x_2, u_1, u_2, \tau)$) and
353 capital variation between two successive years ($x_1(t+1) - x_1(t)$). To compute capital, the value of
354 the workload allocation control (u_2) used was that giving the highest capital value. Salaries and fixed
355 costs have been included in the computation.

356 In a second step, we conducted a dynamic analysis of the system within the Viability framework. Two
357 scenarios were considered: one without any specific constraint about the age of orchards at T (they
358 must simply exist: $x_2(T) \geq 1$) and one imposing an age of 8 ($x_2(T) = 8$). Once viability kernels were found,
359 a random sample of 10,000 viable forward-looking trajectories was computed from each kernel. All
360 trajectories start with the lowest viable capital value, *i.e.* $x_1(0) = x_{1min} = €10,000$. Controls were drawn
361 randomly at each time step from among the viable ones. These trajectories (*i.e.* viable temporal
362 successions of crop portfolios) were then compared in terms of workload, capital and crop rotations
363 used.

364

365

366 **2.9. Computation:**

367 All viability kernels and trajectory computations used Python 3.9.7 (www.python.org/). Statistical
368 analyses used R software 4.1.2 (<https://cran.r-project.org>). Economic data were obtained from the
369 Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur Regional Chamber of Agriculture (Roblin and Bouvard, 2017).

370

371

372

373 **3. RESULTS**


374

375 **3.1. Working hours:**

376 Working hours are mainly occupied by vegetables. This is consistent with previous studies: tree care
377 activity does not demand much time in most months (Boury-Esnault et al., 2018; Léger et al., 2019).
378 Tree-related activity is likely to compete with vegetables only during pruning and harvesting periods,
379 when farmers may have to make a choice over workload allocation.

380 A static analysis of the workload associated with the different portfolios shows that working hours for
381 portfolios with vegetables only are significantly higher than working hours for portfolios including an
382 orchard, no matter its age (Welch's two sample t-test, $p = 4.6e^{-12}$; Figure 3). Workload marginally
383 increases with tree age but remains much lower than workload with vegetables only.

384



385


386 *Figure 3: Potential annual working hours for crop portfolios for various ages of fruit trees. The green box ($x = 0$) corresponds*
 387 *to the set of portfolios with vegetables only. Orange boxes ($x > 0$) correspond to portfolios with at least one fruit tree species,*
 388 *for different age values of this orchard. For each box, lower and upper limits correspond to the first and third quartiles.*
 389 *Whiskers extend to at most 1.5 times the interquartile range. Red circles correspond to the mean of each dataset.*

390

391

392 **3.2. Capital:**

393 Static analysis of changes in capital associated with each portfolio shows that high values of income
 394 can be reached with vegetables only, in particular when using certain portfolios with high-value crops
 395 such as pepper and lamb's lettuce. Tree planting (year 1) is costly and has a strong impact on capital.
 396 During the first years of tree growth, trees do not produce anything but occupy land and therefore the
 397 farm loses money. Tree planting can thus be viable only if previous capital is high enough to absorb
 398 this loss. Revenues exceed costs only after five or six years, with a reduced difference in income
 399 compared to portfolios with vegetables only (Welch's two-sample t-test, $p = 0.11$; Figure 4).



400

401 *Figure 4: Potential change in capital associated with crop portfolios, for different ages of fruit trees. The green box ($x = 0$)*
 402 *corresponds to the set of portfolios with vegetables only. Orange boxes ($x > 0$) correspond to portfolios with at least one fruit*
 403 *tree species, for different age values of this orchard. The best-case scenario was adopted for each point, i.e. the value of*
 404 *workload allocation enabling the highest growth in capital. For each box, lower and upper limits correspond to the first and*
 405 *third quartiles. Whiskers extend to at most 1.5 times interquartile range, outliers are represented as black dots. Red circles*
 406 *correspond to the mean of each dataset.*

407

408


409

410 **3.3. Trade-off between capital and working hours:**

411 Since planting fruit trees makes it possible to reduce working hours but affects capital by decreasing
 412 income for a few years, different strategies can emerge depending on the way fruit tree plantations
 413 are managed. These strategies were examined by studying a sample of random viable trajectories over
 414 the 10-year transition period, starting at $x_1(0) = x_{1min}$.

415 The sum of working hours during the period is positively correlated with final capital (linear regression,
 416 correlation coefficient = 0.02, $p < e^{-16}$; Figure 5). In other words, it is hard to improve both capital and
 417 labor conditions at the same time, leading to the search for a trade-off between these two variables.

418



419

420 *Figure 5: Sum of working hours throughout the simulation depending on final capital, for a sample composed of 10,000*
 421 *random viable trajectories. Each point is the result of a 10-year trajectory. The blue line corresponds to a linear regression of*
 422 *the whole sample.*

423

424 In the great majority (93%) of these trajectories, the decision is made to plant trees at $t = 9$ years,
 425 resulting in one-year-old trees at T . Indeed, even if there are almost the same number of rotations
 426 with and without trees, the cost of planting fruit trees makes the latter much less frequently viable.
 427 Consequently, in most cases, this event happens only when it becomes mandatory. In this case, $x_1(t)$
 428 must be superior to €36,000 to remain viable, which explains the sharp left-side limit of the yellow
 429 cloud in Figure 5. Trajectories resulting in older trees can remain viable with a lower capital value.


430 In this sample, final capital values are very tightly grouped around the mean and median (respectively
 431 €39,930 and €39,174), with a standard deviation of $\sigma = €4,918$ (12%). However, the range of values it
 432 can take is much wider and can go as high as €72,379. Mean cumulative working hours is 10,744h
 433 (median: 10,752h), which gives an annual mean of 1,070h/year (Figure 8).

434

435 However, these trajectories do not reflect the whole range of possibilities. Therefore, we computed a
 436 subset of the viability kernels by modifying the target, requiring 8-year-old orchards to be present at
 437 T . Another sample of 10,000 random viable trajectories was drawn out using this kernel (Figure 7). It
 438 was compared with the trajectories from the first sample presenting a one-year-old orchard at T . To

439 illustrate what happens in each sample, one trajectory has been randomly drawn from both of them.
440 They are presented on Figure 6.

441



442 *Figure 6: Illustration of trajectories from each of the two samples: random sample in blue and sample aiming at 8-year-old*
443 *orchards in orange. Stars correspond to fruit tree planting, with a color depending on the type of fruit tree chosen (x_3). Colors*
444 *of circle dots correspond to the value of the potential production coefficient (x_4).*

445

446 The cost of tree planting (Figure 4) can be seen on these trajectories. The one with the earliest
447 transition (orange curve) has the opportunity to make profits again five years after planting. This cost
448 has to be anticipated by more or less intense capital accumulation depending on the time provided
449 before tree planting and the amount of money necessary to remain viable with the resulting trees.


450

451

452

453


3.4. Comparison of two strategies:



454

455 *Figure 7: Sum of working hours throughout the simulation depending on final capital, for two samples of random viable*
 456 *trajectories: one requiring 1-year-old orchards (red circles) and the other requiring 8-year-old orchards (blue triangles). Each*
 457 *point is the result of a 10-year trajectory.*

458



459

460 *Figure 8: Distribution of capital, cumulative working hours and working hours deficit among the trajectories for the two*
 461 *samples: targeting 1-year-old orchards (late planting) and targeting 8-year-old orchards (early planting). Each sample is*
 462 *composed of 10,000 random trajectories. Red circles correspond to the means of each dataset.*


463

464

465 Aiming at 8-year-old trees results in both lower capital values and lower working hours. It corresponds
466 to a long-term investment made as early as possible. However, there is a limited number of vegetable
467 rotations in the first years that make it possible to accumulate enough money for such an investment
468 (Figure 9). In almost half of the cases (41%), a single plot of peach trees is planted. This choice is a way
469 to cope with less money being available at the time of tree planting, but it is not the most efficient in
470 the long-term. When starting with $x_i(0) = x_{1min}$, no crop rotation is lucrative enough to enable tree
471 planting after less than two years of market gardening.

472

473



474 *Figure 9: Frequency of use of the different crop rotations through time, for the two samples: aiming at 1-year-old trees (late*
475 *planting) and aiming at 8-year-old trees (early planting). Portfolios up to 35 are entirely composed of vegetables. Portfolios*
476 *36 and 37 include one orchard plot. Portfolios 38 and over include two orchard plots. See Appendix A for the composition of*
477 *each crop portfolio.*

478

479

480


3.5. Working hours deficit:

481 Problematic situations relating to workload appear when not enough working hours are available to
482 meet either vegetable or fruit production requirements. To study these situations, we defined working
483 hours deficit as the accumulated difference between effective workload and required working hours.

484 Among the random sample, trajectories with a lower working hours deficit seem more interesting in
485 terms of the trade-off between capital and labor (Figure 10). Thus, choosing crops with workload
486 requirements corresponding to available workload can be a means of avoiding the less efficient
487 trajectories.

488 Furthermore, working hours deficit is significantly lower when trees have been planted early (Figure
489 8). In other words, crop rotations with fruit trees tend to present work requirements closer to available
490 working hours.

491



492

493 *Figure 10: Sum of working hours depending on capital, for a sample of 10,000 random viable trajectories. Colors correspond*
494 *to working hours deficit values.*

495

496

497

498

499

500 4. DISCUSSION

501

502 4.1. Multiplicity of farmers' decision-making criteria

503 In this study we focused on the re-design of farming systems to explore the scope for sustainable
504 transitions from MG to MFV farms. Our findings showed that fruit tree planting makes it possible to
505 reach satisfactory income levels while limiting workload, but establishment is costly during the first
506 few years. Therefore, a choice has to be made between different strategies to sustain this cost. We
507 computed a set of viable trajectories based on aspects that can be quantitatively modeled, leaving
508 room for qualitative discussions about the relevance of the different trajectories.

509 Even though they are all viable, computed trajectories are not all equivalent. Some trajectories seem
510 riskier than others, as they present a reduction in possible choices at certain steps. Being in the viability
511 kernel means that at least one set of controls makes it possible to stay within bounds defined by the
512 constraints and to reach the target, but the number of possible paths can vary a lot. For instance, even
513 though aiming for particularly young or old trees at the time horizon makes it possible to reach higher
514 capital or lower workload values (respectively), it requires a limited set of vegetable rotations to be
515 chosen at some key moments (Figure 9). Risk aversion being an important factor in decisions to change
516 (Menapace et al., 2013; Norton, 1976), an alternative strategy could be to stay far from boundary
517 states in order to maintain a wider range of possibilities at each time step even though that trajectory
518 may be sub-optimal. Indeed, maintaining flexibility in management requires that not all resources be
519 used efficiently at any one point in time, providing trade-offs between efficiency criteria and
520 redundancy in the different resources (Darnhofer et al., 2010; Sabatier and Mouysset, 2018). This is an
521 insurance against uncertainty and surprise and allows for reorganization and renewal.

522 Market gardening and orchard cultivation are both knowledge-intensive activities, and the choice of a
523 strategy may also depend on knowledge and skills already possessed by the farmer. An effect of
524 diversification is to increase the number of interacting elements and the variety of tasks necessary to
525 manage them (Paut, 2020) and therefore the complexity of the system management. The model shows
526 that various timings of tree planting are viable, making it possible to choose among them according to
527 individual knowledge and learning skills. Delaying fruit tree planting and focusing on well-understood
528 vegetable growing can be a strategy enabling the farmer to devote some time to acquiring knowledge
529 about fruit tree management.

530 In addition to personal criteria such as risk aversion and learning, farmer's choices are constrained by
531 external structures such as social norms, technologies and the natural environment (Darnhofer et al.,

532 2010), that are particularly difficult to include in such a model. For instance, some tree species can be
533 more or less well-adapted to a given soil and climate, or possess specific cultural significance. Some of
534 these decision-making parameters can be included in models, e.g. land heterogeneity in Dogliotti et al.
535 (2005). However, choices have to be made about what to include or not in each model in order to
536 achieve a balance between accurate representation of reality and genericity. Here, a detailed land
537 description would have been inconsistent with the level of abstraction of the model dynamics.

538 Moreover, such alternative farming systems are often conceived by their author as life projects, and
539 priority is not systematically given to economic performance. Strategies adopted can also address
540 other concerns such as workload, risk (peaches' sensitivity to cold makes them liable to high variations
541 in yield), commercialization (apples are easier than peaches to store and sell), integration into local
542 communities, etc. These considerations can hardly be included in a digital model, as they can refer to
543 values such as beauty, intellectual interest or ecological concerns (Morel and Léger, 2016). They are
544 usually ignored in the modeling process, actors being considered as rational individuals making
545 decisions based on economic criteria.

546

547

548 **4.2. Looking for satisfactory solutions**

549 Dynamic models make it possible to study long-term dynamics such as those at stake in transitions,
550 and to explore a wide range of trajectories with uncertain outcomes, whereas proceeding by trial and
551 error with real systems is a time-consuming and risky process (e.g. Corbeels et al., 2014; Delbridge and
552 King, 2016; Lescot et al., 2011; Žibert et al., 2022). Thanks to a high enough number of simulated
553 variables and interactions, and to calibration with empirical data, these models can be precise and
554 reliable enough to predict *ex ante* trajectories; for example crop performance in places or climates
555 where the crop of interest has never been grown. In order to discriminate among possible decisions,
556 the best one is generally selected based on a single criterion or a combination thereof, in order to get
557 as close as possible to a predefined target (Bergez et al., 2010). *Ad hoc* modeling tools are used to
558 assess farmers' interest (or lack thereof) in engaging in transition, and thus to explain factors
559 determining the adoption of agroecological practices. In addition to achieving a better understanding
560 of the mechanisms and processes at stake, these models can therefore also be used to provide farming
561 advice. Farmers can thus use the model's optimal trajectory as a benchmark against which to compare
562 their own farm and practices (e.g. Rodriguez et al., 2014; Ryschawy et al., 2014). However, with these
563 models, farmers are generally assumed to be rational profit-maximisers with perfect knowledge of the
564 production outputs. This is a crude approximation of farmers' behavior and optimization tools are

565 limited in their ability to include farmers' complex decision-making processes (McCown, 2001; Robert
566 et al., 2016; Sempore et al., 2015).

567 One main interest of viability theory is to give a set of viable solutions instead of a single 'optimal'
568 solution. The model we developed required very few hypotheses about farmer's behavior and avoided
569 the delicate step of defining decision rules to simulate crop management. It is a means of
570 acknowledging diversity in farmers' motivations, abilities (including knowledge and learning skills) and
571 strategies, as well as the existence of multiple pathways enabling sustainable transitions (Rosenbloom,
572 2017). It avoids imposing the researcher's normativity, thus increasing the model's legitimacy, defined
573 as the production of fair and unbiased information respecting stakeholders' values and beliefs (Cash
574 et al., 2003; Chang and Morel, 2018). Moreover, decision-making processes can be considered at both
575 strategic (long term) and tactical (short term) scales: the realization of strategic objectives (the
576 transition) depends on yearly choices of crop rotations and workload allocation (Robert et al., 2016).
577 Depending on farmer's individual priorities, one viable trajectory or another can be adopted, offering
578 flexibility in the search for sustainable solutions. When several controls are viable, the choice made for
579 one control or another can correspond to various strategies. Farmers with different objectives can find
580 various ways to create their own viable farm. For instance, an early decision to plant trees can be a
581 way to invest for future income and labor conditions, whereas planting vegetables to increase capital
582 can be another way to face forthcoming adversity. An alternative to computation of every possibility
583 could be to develop several alternative scenarios with farmers, in a participatory modeling approach
584 (Le Gal et al., 2022; Pisonnier et al., 2019).

585 The framework based upon the satisfaction of certain constraints rather than looking for optimal
586 solutions is also more in accordance with farmers' management. Real-life systems are complex and
587 limited information is available, so farmers often have only a vague idea of the probability distribution
588 of outcomes associated with various control strategies. Therefore, what is sought is the satisfaction of
589 some objectives and operational constraints, rather than the maximization of some utility function
590 (Norton, 1976). The system can then be pushed towards these objectives through a range of available
591 controls, without closely monitoring every dynamic and interaction.

592 The model does not capture all the complexity of these systems, but the number of computed
593 trajectories makes it possible to select them in hindsight, depending on individual concerns. The
594 predictive power of the model is not necessarily a priority for farmers, who may prefer qualitative
595 discussions (Chang and Morel, 2018). Nevertheless, the accuracy of this model could be increased by
596 including competitive and cooperative interactions between crops. Management of these interactions
597 is often considered to be the main issue of these systems (Wezel et al., 2014), but data is lacking about

598 the exact degree of their effects (Léger et al., 2019; Paut et al., 2020). Another improvement could be
599 to increase the number of available crops to increase the range of possibilities at each time step. This
600 would require computation time limitations to be dealt with. Finally, it could be interesting to include
601 uncertainties, such as climatic events or market instability. This could be achieved by applying
602 stochasticity to yields (see *e.g.* Baumgärtner and Quaas, 2009; Oubraham et al., 2020; Sabatier et al.,
603 2015) and assessing the resilience-related properties of the system (Sabatier et al., 2018). Resilience
604 can also be assessed without assumptions about the probabilities of such catastrophic events, as the
605 inverse of the minimal cost associated with the effort to restore and preserve some properties of the
606 system following disturbances (Martin, 2019). Furthermore, this model could be adapted to the case
607 of a different farm size, or a collective installation on the same farm, by simply changing the
608 parameters. Indeed, collective installation is often a lever for diversification. The combination of each
609 person's specialized skills and knowledge creates a diversified whole-farm system and overcomes the
610 knowledge acquisition issue.

611

612

613 **4.3. From a deterministic to an open-ended perspective of transition**

614 Agroecological transition is a wide notion covering a whole range of conceptual frameworks, focusing
615 on different objects at various organizational levels, over medium- to long-term time spans (Duru et
616 al., 2015; Ollivier et al., 2018; Prost et al., 2023). The process of change can be conceived as the
617 transformation of an initial state into a targeted final state, or as a continuous process of successive
618 adjustments between means and goals (Lamine et al., 2021). The transition represented here is farm-
619 centered and quite deterministic: a goal is set from the beginning about what the farm must look like
620 at a given time horizon. This goal is rooted in the way the model has been implemented: the possibility
621 of planting trees is part of the dynamics and determines one of the constraints.

622 However, even though the objective of obtaining a perennial MFV farm is set from the beginning, the
623 precise target required to meet this goal is not. It is computed through a complementary viability
624 analysis, so every solution consistent with this goal is considered, with as few assumptions as possible.
625 In July (2015), viability at final state is defined differently than for other steps, as there are no controls
626 enabling the assessment of usual viability constraints. Therefore, viability at final state was considered
627 as subsequent growth reaching stationary state. This phenomenon was in turn translated into
628 constraints. In our model, fewer hypotheses are required, as conditions at the time horizon for future
629 sustainability are not established at the outset.

630

631 The large number of trajectories computed, and the consistency of the approach compared to farmers'
632 management, could make this model relevant for discussions with stakeholders at participatory
633 workshops. The use would be different depending on participants' position relative to transition. If
634 they are already engaged in a transition process, it could provide a framework to guide the initial farm
635 diagnosis at the beginning of the support process, by comparing their position in the range of possible
636 to viable trajectories or in the viability kernel (Sabatier et al., 2017). Otherwise, it can help with *ex-ante*
637 assessments of the viability of a range of alternatives (Briot et al., 2011; Chang and Morel, 2018;
638 Sempore et al., 2015). An objective could be, for instance, to compare the feasibility of transition with
639 different amounts of time available (corresponding to their objectives or their possibilities), by
640 comparing viability kernels with imposed orchard planting at the corresponding time point. Given the
641 multiplicity of possible trajectories computed by the model, its use would be closer to that of a heuristic
642 tool, crystallizing reflections during discussions between farmers and mediators, than a prescriptive
643 norm to be respected. It could be coupled with other types of model, such as empirical modeling of
644 social–ecological systems, in order to better understand the values and norms behind management
645 decisions (Crane, 2010; Klapwijk et al., 2014). By redefining the target while the trajectory is ongoing
646 and considering elements that are not explored in the model, it would leave an opportunity for
647 creativity to be expressed in order to find innovative solutions adapted to a very complex and
648 unpredictable reality (Lamine et al., 2021).

649

650

651 **5. CONCLUSION**

652 In this study, we computed a range of viable trajectories leading to a transition towards a more
653 diversified agronomic system. In order to do this, we made an original use of the viability kernel
654 approach by separating our model into two successive parts, using the kernel of the first as an objective
655 for the second. We found that in order for the transition to be long-lasting, the final state must not
656 only be viable, but also belong to a given subset of the constraint domain.

657 As the installation of an orchard decreases workload but is costly during the early years, computed
658 viable trajectories reflect different trade-offs in the balance between workload and capital. They result
659 from choices about the time of orchard planting and the fruit and vegetable species grown each year.
660 These choices can result from considerations that can be quantified by the model, such as flexibility or
661 working hours deficit, but also qualitative factors outside the scope of this model, such as farmers'

662 values. The range of viable trajectories acknowledges the importance of considering the variety of
663 possible means to achieve the same goal in a complex world. Because the conceptual framework is
664 relatively close to the way farmers manage their farms and the plurality of the outputs avoids the
665 imposition of an exclusive solution, it could become a good tool for starting a discussion with
666 stakeholders.

667

668

669

670 **Declaration of Competing Interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial
671 interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this
672 paper.

673

674 **Acknowledgements:** This work was supported by a doctoral fellowship from INRAE (ACT Department).

675

676

677

678 **6. REFERENCES**

679

680 Aubin, J.-P., 1991. *Viability Theory*. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4910-4)
681 4910-4

682 Aubin, J.-P., Bayen, A.M., Saint-Pierre, P., 2011. *Viability Theory: New Directions*. Springer Science &
683 Business Media.

684 Baumgärtner, S., Quaas, M.F., 2009. Ecological-economic viability as a criterion of strong sustainability
685 under uncertainty. *Ecol. Econ., Methodological Advancements in the Footprint Analysis* 68, 2008–
686 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.01.016>

687 Beillouin, D., Ben-Ari, T., Malézieux, E., Seufert, V., Makowski, D., 2021. Positive but variable effects of
688 crop diversification on biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Glob. Change Biol.* 27, 4697–4710.
689 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15747>

690 Bergez, J.E., Colbach, N., Crespo, O., Garcia, F., Jeuffroy, M.H., Justes, E., Loyce, C., Munier-Jolain, N.,
691 Sadok, W., 2010. Designing crop management systems by simulation. *Eur. J. Agron., Cropping Systems*
692 *Design: new methods for new challenges* 32, 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2009.06.001>

693 Boury-Esnault, A., Tchamitchian, M., Paut, R., 2018. L'organisation du travail dans un système
694 diversifié : cas des vergers-maraîchers.

695 Briot, J.-P., de Azevedo Irving, M., Mendes de Melo, G., Vasconcelos, J.E.F., Alvarez, I., Martin, S., Wei,
696 W., 2011. A Serious Game and Artificial Agents to Support Intercultural Participatory Management of
697 Protected Areas for Biodiversity Conservation and Social Inclusion, in: *2011 Second International*
698 *Conference on Culture and Computing*. Presented at the 2011 Second International Conference on
699 *Culture and Computing (Culture Computing)*, IEEE, Kyoto, Japan, pp. 15–20.
700 <https://doi.org/10.1109/Culture-Computing.2011.12>Cash, D.W., Clark, W.C., Alcock, F., Dickson, N.M.,
701 Eckley, N., Guston, D.H., Jäger, J., Mitchell, R.B., 2003. Knowledge systems for sustainable
702 development. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 100, 8086–8091. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1231332100>

703 Chang, M., Morel, K., 2018. Reconciling economic viability and socio-ecological aspirations in London
704 urban microfarms. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 38, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-018-0487-5>

705 Chittapur, B.M., Patil, D.K., 2017. Ecosystem services rendered by tree based land use systems. *Indian*
706 *J. Agric. Sci.* 87, 1419–1429.

707 Corbeels, M., de Graaff, J., Ndah, T.H., Penot, E., Baudron, F., Naudin, K., Andrieu, N., Chirat, G., Schuler,
708 J., Nyagumbo, I., Rusinamhodzi, L., Traore, K., Mzoba, H.D., Adolwa, I.S., 2014. Understanding the
709 impact and adoption of conservation agriculture in Africa: A multi-scale analysis. *Agric. Ecosyst.*
710 *Environ.* 187, 155–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.10.011>

711 Crane, T.A., 2010. Of Models and Meanings: Cultural Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems. *Ecol. Soc.*
712 15, art19. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03683-150419>

713 Dardonville, M., Urruty, N., Bockstaller, C., Therond, O., 2020. Influence of diversity and intensification
714 level on vulnerability, resilience and robustness of agricultural systems. *Agric. Syst.* 184, 102913.
715 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2020.102913>

716 Darnhofer, I., Bellon, S., Dedieu, B., Milestad, R., 2010. Adaptiveness to enhance the sustainability of
717 farming systems. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 30, 545–555. <https://doi.org/10.1051/agro/2009053>

- 718 De Lara, M., Doyen, L., 2008. Sustainable Management of Natural Resources: Mathematical Models
719 and Methods. Springer Science & Business Media.
- 720 Delbridge, T.A., King, R.P., 2016. Transitioning to Organic Crop Production: A Dynamic Programming
721 Approach. *J. Agric. Resour. Econ.* 41, 481–498.
- 722 Declercq, Y., Clerc, F., 2011. Référence technico-économique en maraîchage biologique.
- 723 Dogliotti, S., van Ittersum, M.K., Rossing, W.A.H., 2005. A method for exploring sustainable
724 development options at farm scale: a case study for vegetable farms in South Uruguay. *Agric. Syst.* 86,
725 29–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2004.08.002>
- 726 Duru, M., Therond, O., Fares, M., 2015. Designing agroecological transitions; A review. *Agron. Sustain.*
727 *Dev.* 35, 1237–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0318-x>
- 728 Joly, F., 2015. Dynamics of a pastoral system of the Mongolian Gobi exposed to climate hazards: a
729 resilience-based case study in a viability framework (PhD Thesis). AgroParisTech, Paris.
- 730 Joyeux, C., 2017. Données technico-économiques en maraîchage biologique en France - Etat des lieux
731 de la littérature actuelle et réflexion pour une méthodologie collégiale.
- 732 Klapwijk, C., van Wijk, M., Rosenstock, T., van Asten, P., Thornton, P., Giller, K., 2014. Analysis of trade-
733 offs in agricultural systems: current status and way forward. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 6, 110–115.
734 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.11.012>
- 735 Lamine, C., Magda, D., Rivera-Ferre, M., Marsden, T. (Eds.), 2021. Agroecological transitions, between
736 determinist and open-ended visions. Peter Lang International Academic Publishers.
- 737 Le Gal, P.-Y., Andrieu, N., Bruelle, G., Dugué, P., Monteil, C., Moulin, C.-H., Penot, E., Ryschawy, J., 2022.
738 Modelling mixed crop-livestock farms for supporting farmers' strategic reflections: The CLIFS
739 approach. *Comput. Electron. Agric.* 192, 106570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2021.106570>
- 740 Léger, F., Morel, K., Bellec-Gauche, A., Warlop, F., 2019. Agroforesterie maraîchère : un choix
741 stratégique pour garantir une durabilité en transition agroécologique ? Expériences issues du projet
742 SMART. *Innov. Agron.* 71, 259–273. <https://doi.org/10.15454/EK0390>
- 743 Lescot, J.-M., Rousset, S., Souville, G. (Eds.), 2011. Assessing Investment in Precision Farming for
744 Reducing Pesticide Use in French Viticulture. <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.114387>
- 745 Martin, S., 2019. Viability analysis as an approach for assessing the resilience of agroecosystems, in:
746 Gardner, S.M., Ramsden, S.J., Hails, R.S. (Eds.), *Agricultural Resilience*. Cambridge University Press, pp.
747 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107705555.014>
- 748 McCown, R.L., 2001. Learning to bridge the gap between science-based decision support and the
749 practice of farming: Evolution in paradigms of model-based research and intervention from design to
750 dialogue. *Aust. J. Agric. Res.* 52, 549–572. <https://doi.org/10.1071/ar00119>
- 751 Menapace, L., Colson, G., Raffaelli, R., 2013. Risk Aversion, Subjective Beliefs, and Farmer Risk
752 Management Strategies. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* 95, 384–389. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajae/aas107>
- 753 Moore, A.D., Holzworth, D.P., Herrmann, N.I., Brown, H.E., de Voil, P.G., Snow, V.O., Zurcher, E.J., Huth,
754 N.I., 2014. Modelling the manager: Representing rule-based management in farming systems
755 simulation models. *Environ. Model. Softw.* 62, 399–410.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.09.001>

757 Morel, K., 2016. Viabilité des microfermes maraîchères biologiques. Une étude inductive combinant
758 méthodes qualitatives et modélisation. (Sciences agricoles). Université Paris-Saclay.

759 Morel, K., Léger, F., 2016. A conceptual framework for alternative farmers' strategic choices: the case
760 of French organic market gardening microfarms. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* 40, 466–492.
761 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2016.1140695>

762 Norton, G.A., 1976. Analysis of decision making in crop protection. *Agro-Ecosyst.* 3, 27–44.
763 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3746\(76\)90098-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3746(76)90098-6)

764 Ollivier, G., Magda, D., Mazé, A., Plumecocq, G., Lamine, C., 2018. Agroecological transitions: What can
765 sustainability transition frameworks teach us? An ontological and empirical analysis. *Ecol. Soc.* 23, art5.
766 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09952-230205>

767 Oubraham, A., Saint-Pierre, P., Zaccour, G., 2020. Viability of Agroecological Systems under Climatic
768 Uncertainty. *Sustainability* 12, 5880. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155880>

769 Oubraham, A., Zaccour, G., 2018. A Survey of Applications of Viability Theory to the Sustainable
770 Exploitation of Renewable Resources. *Ecol. Econ.* 145, 346–367.
771 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.11.008>

772 Paut, R., 2020. Analyse des compromis entre diversité cultivée et complexité de gestion à travers le cas
773 d'étude du Verger-Maraîcher. Une approche combinant modélisation et méthodes qualitatives. INRAE.

774 Paut, R., Sabatier, R., Dufils, A., Tchamitchian, M., 2021. How to reconcile short-term and long-term
775 objectives in mixed farms? A dynamic model application to mixed fruit tree - vegetable systems. *Agric.*
776 *Syst.* 187, 103011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agry.2020.103011>

777 Paut, R., Sabatier, R., Tchamitchian, M., 2020. Modelling crop diversification and association effects in
778 agricultural systems. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 288, 106711.
779 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106711>

780 Pépin, A., Morel, K., van der Werf, H.M.G., 2021. Conventionalised vs. agroecological practices on
781 organic vegetable farms: Investigating the influence of farm structure in a bifurcation perspective.
782 *Agric. Syst.* 190, 103129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agry.2021.103129>

783 Pissonnier, S., Dufils, A., Le Gal, P.-Y., 2019. A methodology for redesigning agroecological radical
784 production systems at the farm level. *Agric. Syst.* 173, 161–171.
785 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agry.2019.02.018>

786 Prost, L., Martin, G., Ballot, R., Benoit, M., Bergez, J.-E., Bockstaller, C., Cerf, M., Deytieux, V., Hossard,
787 L., Jeuffroy, M.-H., Leclère, M., Le Bail, M., Le Gal, P.-Y., Loyce, C., Merot, A., Meynard, J.-M., Mignolet,
788 C., Munier-Jolain, N., Novak, S., Parnaudeau, V., Poux, X., Sabatier, R., Salembier, C., Scopel, E., Simon,
789 S., Tchamitchian, M., Toffolini, Q., van der Werf, H., 2023. Key research challenges to supporting farm
790 transitions to agroecology in advanced economies. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 43, 11.
791 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-022-00855-8>

792 Rigolot, C., Martin, G., Dedieu, B., 2019. Renforcer les capacités d'adaptation des systèmes d'élevage
793 de ruminants: Cadres théoriques, leviers d'action et démarche d'accompagnement. *INRA Prod. Anim.*
794 32, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.20870/productions-animales.2019.32.1.2414>

795 Robert, M., Thomas, A., Bergez, J.-E., 2016. Processes of adaptation in farm decision-making models.
796 A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 36, 64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-016-0402-x>

797 Roblin, C., Bouvard, F., 2017. Références Technico-Économiques 2017 en agriculture biologique.
798 Région Sud Provence Alpes Côte d'Azur.

799 Rodriguez, D., Cox, H., deVoil, P., Power, B., 2014. A participatory whole farm modelling approach to
800 understand impacts and increase preparedness to climate change in Australia. *Agric. Syst.* 126, 50–61.
801 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.04.003>

802 Rosenbloom, D., 2017. Pathways: An emerging concept for the theory and governance of low-carbon
803 transitions. *Glob. Environ. Change* 43, 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.12.011>

804 Ryschawy, J., Joannon, A., Choisis, J.P., Gibon, A., Le Gal, P.Y., 2014. Participative assessment of
805 innovative technical scenarios for enhancing sustainability of French mixed crop-livestock farms. *Agric.*
806 *Syst.* 129, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2014.05.004>

807 Sabatier, R., Joly, F., Hubert, B., 2017. Assessing both ecological and engineering resilience of a steppe
808 agroecosystem using the viability theory. *Agric. Syst.* 157, 146–156.
809 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.07.009>

810 Sabatier, R., Mouysset, L., 2018. A robustness-based viewpoint on the production-ecology trade-off in
811 agroecosystems. *Agric. Syst.* 167, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2018.08.001>

812 Sabatier, R., Oates, L.G., Jackson, R.D., 2015. Management flexibility of a grassland agroecosystem: A
813 modeling approach based on viability theory. *Agric. Syst.* 139, 76–81.
814 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2015.06.008>

815 Sempore, A.W., Andrieu, N., Nacro, H.B., Sedogo, M.P., Le Gal, P.-Y., 2015. Relevancy and role of whole-
816 farm models in supporting smallholder farmers in planning their agricultural season. *Environ. Model.*
817 *Softw.* 68, 147–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.02.015>

818 Sollen-Norrlin, M., Ghaley, B.B., Rintoul, N.L.J., 2020. Agroforestry Benefits and Challenges for
819 Adoption in Europe and Beyond. *Sustainability* 12, 7001. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12177001>

820 Wezel, A., Casagrande, M., Celette, F., Vian, J.-F., Ferrer, A., Peigné, J., 2014. Agroecological practices
821 for sustainable agriculture. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 34, 1–20. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0180-7)
822 [013-0180-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0180-7)

823 Žibert, M., Prevolšek, B., Pažek, K., Rozman, Č., Škraba, A., 2022. Developing a diversification strategy
824 of non-agricultural activities on farms using system dynamics modelling: a case study of Slovenia.
825 *Kybernetes* 51, 33–56. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-04-2021-0254>

826

827

828

829

48	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Beans greenhouse_Pongo			Apple_Royal Gala	Apple_Royal Gala
49	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Beans greenhouse_Pongo			Peach_Big Top	Peach_Big Top
50	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Beans greenhouse_Pongo			Apple_Royal Gala	Peach_Big Top
51	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Apple_Royal Gala
52	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Peach_Big Top	Peach_Big Top
53	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Peach_Big Top
54	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Beans greenhouse_Pongo	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Apple_Royal Gala
55	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Beans greenhouse_Pongo	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Peach_Big Top	Peach_Big Top
56	Cabbage_Impala	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Beans greenhouse_Pongo	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Peach_Big Top
57	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Beans greenhouse_Pongo			Apple_Royal Gala	Apple_Royal Gala
58	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Beans greenhouse_Pongo			Peach_Big Top	Peach_Big Top
59	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Beans greenhouse_Pongo			Apple_Royal Gala	Peach_Big Top
60	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Apple_Royal Gala
61	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Peach_Big Top	Peach_Big Top
62	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Zucchini_Zelia	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Peach_Big Top
63	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Beans greenhouse_Pongo	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Apple_Royal Gala
64	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Beans greenhouse_Pongo	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Peach_Big Top	Peach_Big Top
65	Squash_Musquee de Provence	Lamb's lettuce greenhouse_Trophy	Beans greenhouse_Pongo	Pepper greenhouse_Almuden			Apple_Royal Gala	Peach_Big Top

832

833

834 Appendix B. Source code.