

IPSI Case Study Summary Sheet

Basic Information

Title of case study <i>(should be concise and within approximately 25 words)</i>			
Governance-mix for resilient socio-ecological production landscapes in Austria – an example of the terraced riverine landscape Wachau			
Submitting IPSI member organization(s)			
University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU)			
Other contributing organization(s) <i>(IPSI members and/or non-members)</i>			
University of Groningen			
Author(s) and affiliation(s)			
Dr. Pia Kieninger, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU); Dr. Katharina Gugerell, University of Groningen; Prof. Marianne Penker, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU)			
Format of case study <i>(manuscript or audiovisual)</i>	Manuscript	Language	English
Keywords <i>(3-5 key concepts included in the case study)</i>			
Cultural landscape; Landscape governance; Terraced viticulture; UNESCO World Heritage Site Wachau (Austria), Resilience; Protected designation of origin			
Date of submission <i>(or update, if this is an update of an existing case study)</i>		1 November 2016	
Web link <i>(of the case study or lead organization if available for more information)</i>			

Geographical Information

Country <i>(where site(s) or activities described in the case study are located – can be multiple, or even “global”)</i>									
Austria									
Location(s) <i>(within the country or countries – leave blank if specific location(s) cannot be identified)</i>									
Wachau Region									
Longitude/latitude or Google Maps link <i>(if location is identified)</i>									
https://www.google.com/maps/@48.3896081,15.4048518,12z?hl=en									
Ecosystem(s) <i>(please place an “x” in all appropriate boxes)</i>									
Forest		Grassland	x	Agricultural	x	In-land water		Coastal	
Dryland		Mountain		Urban/peri-urban		Other (Please specify)			
Socioeconomic and environmental characteristics of the area <i>(within 50 words)</i>									
The Wachau is characterised by very high bio-cultural diversity, which results from different habitat and land use types (e.g. alluvial and semi-natural forests, dry grasslands, orchards, vineyards, stone terraces) as well as rich variety in local conditions (e.g. geological and edaphic underground, geographic direction, inclination, relief, climate).									
Description of human-nature interactions in the area <i>(land-use, traditional resource management practices etc. – within 50 words)</i>									
The landscape is characterised by small-scale vineyards and orchards of mainly apricots. Grasslands occur in the tributary valleys and on softer slopes with less solar radiation. Meadows and pastures are increasingly abandoned since most farmers have given up animal husbandry, and grasslands are overgrown or are replaced by other land uses such as Christmas tree plantations.									

Contents

Status (“ongoing” or “completed”)	Ongoing	Period (MM/YY to MM/YY)	2006 -
Rationale (<i>why activities or policies described, or information shared in the case study are needed – within 50 words</i>)			
SEPLs have to adapt to changing conditions along with globalisation processes in the food and energy sector, demographic and climate change and shifting expectations of food consumers and landscape users. How can different governance approaches contribute to the resilience of a SEPL? This question will be answered for the Austrian case study Wachau, a famous bio-culturally rich terraced wine-growing region along the Danube.			
Objectives (<i>goals of activities or policies described, or of producing the case study – within 50 words</i>)			
This paper illustrates different governance approaches on multiple scales and discusses if and how they contribute to SEPL resilience. The data are outcomes of several studies on land use change, landscape rurality, amenities and governance.			
Activities and/or practices employed (<i>within 50 words</i>)			
This article is based on the results of three different research studies, conducted between 2006 and 2014 on landscape governance and landscape change. The interdisciplinary mixed method approaches of these studies involved analyses of historical maps and aerial photos, land use mapping, vegetation surveys and documentation of landscape structure elements, as well as semi-structured interviews and document analysis.			
Results (<i>within 50 words</i>)			
A resilient SEPL needs market-driven land use, civil society and state-based governance. In contrast to alpine agriculture where farmers do not have strong bargaining power in marketing, and in milk or beef commodity markets, the Wachau benefits from place-based food and tourism associated with well-recognised quality and origin labels. These landscape-based market approaches, supported by a mix of policy and civil society instruments, can ensure the long-term resilience of an authentic SEPL.			
Lessons learned (<i>factors in success or failure, challenges and opportunities – within 40 words</i>)			
In the Wachau, different public policies, market instruments and civil society have created a multi-level, multi-actor hybrid governance structure. There is a complementarity between the three domains. Particularly as market-based mechanisms such as geographical labelling and regional branding work very well. Policy and civil society need to ensure ecological and social resilience.			
Key messages (<i>within 40 words</i>)			
The case study shows that the mix of different push (i.e. market forces, public incentives and civil society engagement) and pull (i.e. regulations and civic control) mechanisms open up an action space to navigate between multiple important goals of SEPLs. The multilevel and multi-actor governance network ensures adaptive learning and innovation processes based on multiple sources of ideas and capacities			
Relationship to other IPSI activities (<i>if the case study is related to any other IPSI collaborative activities, case studies, etc.</i>)			
This case study originally appeared in the Satoyama Initiative Thematic Review v. 2.			
Funding (<i>any relevant information about funding of activities or projects described in the case study</i>)			

Contributions to Global Agendas

CBD Aichi Biodiversity Targets (<https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/>)

The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the “direct” or “indirect” contributions to the CBD’s Aichi Biodiversity Targets respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

Strategic Goal A				Strategic Goal B					
■	■	■				●		●	
Strategic Goal C			Strategic Goal D			Strategic Goal E			
●			■			●	●	■	

UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>)

The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the “direct” or “indirect” contributions to the SDGs respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

	■						■	
1 NO POVERTY 	2 ZERO HUNGER 	3 GOOD HEALTH AND WELL-BEING 	4 QUALITY EDUCATION 	5 GENDER EQUALITY 	6 CLEAN WATER AND SANITATION 	7 AFFORDABLE AND CLEAN ENERGY 	8 DECENT WORK AND ECONOMIC GROWTH 	9 INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE 
		●			■			
10 REDUCED INEQUALITIES 	11 SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES 	12 RESPONSIBLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION 	13 CLIMATE ACTION 	14 LIFE BELOW WATER 	15 LIFE ON LAND 	16 PEACE, JUSTICE AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS 	17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE GOALS 	