

Grew up in Beaune in 1975. Family had no vineyards. Studied at wine school in Beaune in 1990 at age 15 when did apprenticeship at Domaine du Comte Armand. Pascal Marchand knew older brother and set up a job at the winery for me. Pascal is from Quebec arriving in Burgundy 1995, met the wife and stayed as the head winemaker of Domaine du Comte Armand, whom I succeeded. Pascal had no background in wine, free mind, self-taught, every idea is all fresh and new. He's part of the new generation - Christ Romier, Lafon, Grivot, the first ones to transform Burgundy and to travel elsewhere. Pascal wanted to go biodynamic straight from chemical in 90s, always on his mind. My parents were flower merchants - the aroma lives with me. It's all about aroma to me with wine.

First time I made Griotte Chambertin was 2011, lost at first, took me three years to understand the place. Part of the reason why I love working the negociant side of the business - you learn the places. It multiplies when it comes to the number of cuvee I am making - usually just one-two barrels per plot but such a joy from all the different places.

Travelled extensively during the period between first working for Pascal Marchand and back, South Africa, Bordeaux, Oregon, New Zealand, then Jadot, 1990-1993 apprenticeships. Best experiences was an experimental section on new techniques of organic growing: working with a spider XXX when people started to realize the eco system could work naturally. There were times when issues like yellow/red spiders were in the vineyards and people had to use pesticides not the best one not right. One guy said in fact if you let one spider eat the other spiders it'd be fine. In 1992 it was the early beginning. Now no one uses pesticides and everyone knows how to protect that spiders. That was right. I started to see insights - biodynamic teaches you how to observe.

Veronique Drouhin set me up in Oregon in 1994. Such a great vintage so continued with a second vintage 1995. Then I wanted to work outside Burgundy not Pinot Noir and Chardonnay, so she set up with Bordeaux contacts/cousins. Great experience in Bordeaux too. Very different philosophy: different variety, blending: enlarged my aroma spectrum and changed my way of seeing things. In Burgundy: single vineyards, no blending. But some time when you have a large plot eg Pommard 1er Cru Clos des Epeneaux, it did bring a lot my blending experience. Came back in 1998 to become the head winemaker at Comte Armand in Pommard. Pascal called to inform he'd pursue another opportunity at Jadot and asked if I'd take over Comte Armand. Then Comte Armand called me on 14 July 1999. First harvest 1999, by then Comte Armand also purchased Volnay and Auxey Duresses parcels. Around 10 hectares by then. A bit of white: Meursault, Meursault Meix Chavaux and Auxey Duresses. A bit of Bourgogne Aligote. My issue then was not enough space for all the fruit. Comte Armand's winery was built only for Clos des Epeneaux, and we had a large crop in 1999 so really tight then. The great thing with that estate: beautiful building dating back 18th century, a walled lot - taught me how to deal with limited space. 2000 part of the vineyards went back to owner as some were rented. Suddenly I had no more whites to do. I've always loved doing both and missed making whites then. So after 6 months, Comte Armand agreed to find more vineyards for whites. Didn't pan out so we started micro negociant - just to buy in fruit and try to decide if fruit is good enough to sell as Comte Armand. So then reds are estate fruit, negociant is bought in fruit for whites. So we started - in 2001 we had 3 bottles of Auxey Duresses. In 2002 increased the volume as it was working. By and by I wanted to go elsewhere and touch Cote de Nuits fruit. So in 2006 I was hunted by a famous estate in Burgundy, at age 31, but it was hard to leave a job I started at 15, with biodynamic trials still ongoing. I told Comte Armand I am not leaving but can I have more freedom to do things on the side - my own negociant as it's limited at Comte Armand, happy to stay another 5 years. He said yes and stay another 10 years. In the end I stayed another 7 years 1999-2014 while building own negociant Benjamin Leroux, started in 2007.

Clos des Epeneaux: 250m walls around, built in 1805 during French Revolution, for aristocrat's family. Preserved all the belongings and it went to the Comte Armand family as a wedding gift. 5.25 hectares, between 0.5 hectares Grand and the rest Petit Epeneaux. It's a Lieu-dit. Clos des Epeneaux is an appellation, if we want to declassify we could call it Grand Epeneaux and Petit Epeneaux. Four main blocks, two on top, two at the bottom. Different vine ages. First 4.2 hectares put in the same tank, then we've done a good replanting it part by part. At the beginning the domaine has just one vineyard. At some point it became interesting to divide. Pascal was working with 5 divisions I decided to divide even more. Some people argue the top parts are better than the bottom parts but across many blind tastings, the blended wines always come out best. Geological analysis on both sides of the walls - the walled parts are the best. I like a bit of everything from all the parts old and young vines: expression of terroir in great balance. I am replicating that a lot in my wines eg Gevrey village: each parcel treated differently - eg whole cluster more on one vineyard than another and blend together. Different clonal materials, vine ages, etc. Volnay village at first I was able to produce a great vintage every one out of five vintages. It was only after we started to purchase vineyards after selecting, can we produce 4 out of 5 great vintages. At first there was some hail, as a negociant I was able to purchase some fruit to make it big enough to the ferment and I purposefully chose the other side of Volnay - probably the best Volnay we've ever made - more diversity, better balance.

Pinot Beirout (Blanc): higher density, 12000 vines per hectare - brave/clever at the time. Planted together, easy

on a sorting table. One of the traditions. Old school plantation - Chardonnay and Aligote too. If we don't restrict ourselves, co-planting Chard and Aligote, co-fermenting or blending into Chardonnay a bit of Aligote could be the answer for the future of climate change.

How to replant becomes even more important with climate change: in 50 years warmer and drier we need to plant now what's gonna be the best then. Temperature not much of a problem but water is. Irrigation is not possible for the future. Need to adapt. Clay soils retain water. Signs of droughts in 2018, first since 2003 when not very warm overall but heat waves. 2018 was 1.6C on average warmer than 2003. 2018 the warmest year recorded in Burgundy, second warmest 2017, third warmest 2015. We needed to do everything: ? tractors, better sprayers, don't take the weeds out, new tech. Need to adapt and start now. Viticulture and vilification. My winery is warmer, ~0.5 degrees warmer. Should I put a cooling system to keep it as it was, or see how wine ages and learn to adapt? I'm leaning towards the latter.

Moved to organic/biodynamic, any changes in pH? Not in soil, small variations but changes in the wine. Higher acidity after moving to organic. Not always sig but on perception it is sig. Brighter definitely. If through fertilization too much nitrogen was added to the soil which could affect vines/wines. When the vines are not stressed, then not much concentration around seeds/pips then you lose complexity. Same with stems/whole cluster: if too much nitrogen, greener stems, greener wines. All about balance, vine has to be in balance, also stress before ripening the fruit.

Trimming later or hedging later sometimes after flowering, sometimes folding: not hedging or trimming. A big question now, not sure how to take the warmer weather. True in the past: tried to trim as late as possible, done a few non-trimming, no wire, single post, like in Cote Rotie, to prepare go with much higher density like 20000 vines per hectare with full plantation, net?? in row. In Burgundy it's a tradition - 10000 vines per hectare, 1m between rows. It worked well, suitable for fighting phylloxera - grafting better than chemicals in soil. But is it the right way forward? We've been getting the secondary effects today, its only been ~one century since the replanting in 1930s. I have been wondering if it's time to plant like it before in full. I am not the only one: Lala mize?? Lalou Bize Leroy always keeping an eye on her vineyard. One problem we have today is rising sugar, we don't get 12, 12.5 like we used to but I'm not keen on making wine of 15%. Not sure more time on lees is the right move either. Questioning myself now. I'm not saying trimming lower is the right way. Not trimming too high is one way. We gain from more experience but we don't have answers.

If you don't trim then in cold years you have more exposure to mildew because of less air flow, but in warm years you can have too quick sugars because more leaves, more motor of ripening. We planted two young vines 2 years ago, hoping them to perform in 50 years. Hopefully we planted the ripe clones - they are more likely to ripen, not ideal now but hopefully will work in 50 years.

Warmer, precipitation about the same but not rain not falling at the same time. Need to start experimenting. Keep eyes on wood diseases, how pruning methods come in. Think long term. (pruning method) Nola Tyde Purcell?? is one of the ways to fight wood diseases: respect sap flow, no creating any necrosis on sap flow where fungus develop. New ways of grafting in the nurseries too, changes in every aspect of the profession. 30 years ago some rootstocks were the best but 25 years later vines are dying. Trimming or not could provide shadow or not and how sunlight vs heat means differently to grapes. Vines doesn't not necessarily need heat. Heat waves lead to dehydration which concentrates the grapes. We need juice because too much skin on Pinot is problematic. Light is more important because each plant has its own natural internal clock with respect to light. Earlier budbreaks in warmer years, risking early frost. In Beaune/Burgundy, flowering happens usually on 10 June - mid June, just before equinox: all the classic ripening cycles - ?hontre? Days: from flowering to picking - true always worked, is a matter of light. When flowering happens in mid May or late May, then vines get the big part of ripening cycle on longer days - 100 days, could work if bad days in August but not the case. In 2003, first week of August berries were dark and black, when picked in mid August it was ~weird. I called the institute with my ripeness sample. Then in Burgundy it's regulated the earliest day of picking - vendage - not any more. We were in panic, Michele Lafarge said they've already harvested and had only harvested once in August the entire life. We did it in 2003, started 17 August. Careful to work the fruit with the change of balance. Not the same as 3.3pH Pinot Noir. In 2018, 3.7-3.8 pH was picked, more like New World Pinot Noir I saw. But the balance was gorgeous. If the fruit ripens for Pinot then phenolics are not ripe. Physiological ripeness vs phenolic ripeness - usually the issue with young vines, those for Pommard village, easy to achieve sugar ripeness but the phenolic ripeness are not at good ripeness at picking - with old vines, its the opposite, phenolic ripeness before sugar/physiological ripeness. This balance is super important. Non-trimming and high canopy were started because I saw in cooler years I get sugar ripeness but not phenolic ripeness. 2018 was interesting as I took the challenge - lab analysis (Brix?? at 13, sugar ripeness was there) is one thing, you always need to taste to decide when to pick (phenolic ripeness not there despite lab results of sugar ripeness). So for a couple of vineyards we picked later, with high sugar but phenolic ripeness is there so wines are not showing alcohol. I'm not into 2015. We learnt a lot with this vintage. What's happening - climate change - is much faster than the viticultural cycle, than our understanding, and we need to react fast. Don't know which direction to take - probably many, and try to find a path. 2018 - hot vintage - reminds me of what I saw in the new world.

Malic acidity becomes due to malic bacteria in MLF and lactic bacteria becomes sediment which are lees. So if less malic acids, less lactic acids, less lees. Avg malic acidity at harvest is 4-5 grams. Fermentation takes 1-2 week sometimes more and real changes in pH, acidity, creaminess of lactic acid, tartaric higher too. In the last two vintages, no more malic acids - 1 gram or less, so no lactic, Malo is done right after sugar, sometimes with sugar, and aging id only with yeast lees, which is good because malo lees is not always the best lees that's why we were racking. Bacteria is heavier than lees, so usually at the bottom of the barrel, the dead yeasts are fine lees. The last few years we only age on fine lees, no racking sometimes just one/two. Sometimes racking is done after fermentations when the wine is not even in barrel. Not lactic acid/bateria around the tartaric, and the tartaric acid is slightly lower, the balance is good. This gives more expression of the tartaric acid which is more zesty. I like it a lot, never happened before. With white you can block the malo and have malic. Now for the first time we see acid balance without malic/lactic. One of positives. Five years ago if you asked me, I'd say the old growers said the later the malo the better which means in the past we were leaving the wine on fine lees for ~9 months then you have malo starting in Spring for a few weeks, you rack after a year then only six months on fine lees aging. In the last few vintages, we aged the wine only 16-17 months instead of 18 but only on fine lees. In fact 16 months plus malo, longer than ever. I love it for both colors. One of the things that amazed me with those warm vintages. With reds, I know it good if we have phenolic ripeness in warm years but with whites not in my capacity. But in 2017, great wine, great freshness, again in 2018, super juicy fruit, high concentration of skin in Pinot. Whites seem to do very well with what happened on the outside. Mystery to me.

With climate change (perhaps also my taste: elegance over power for both colors), I've used less extraction on reds, infusion rather than extraction. Destem and wholecluster are not the same as before. Today you can really destem or do whole berry cellular fermentation without stems: preserving spicy floral aroma without having greenness of the stem. I like it when you can't guess if it's destemmed or whole cluster. I have cuvees sometimes 80%-100% wholecluster or all destemmed. No rules: sometimes wholecluster on Bourgogne Rouge or all destem on grand cru - it's all on sorting table and we decide. Whole berry: whether it's wholecluster with stems or whole berry destemmed. It used to be that the destemmer broke the whole berry or didn't take all the stems out. So now can do intercellular which allows destemming and keeping the whole berries, which combined with less punching down at the beginning of the fermentation (used to punch down more at first) to keep the berry whole because if you work to preserve whole berries, you'd avoid plunging at the beginning, you let it start naturally slowly inside and the juice is there because bottom grapes are crushed naturally. We wait for the juice on the bottom to ferment and start plunging at half way when there's alcohol since extraction only starts with alcohol - won't extract with just sugar - so no need to plunge early. This is different than what was done in 1999 when Contamon? arrived and the destemmer then - demmonsee?? - all equipped with pressure, at speed 10 tons/hour, no sorting table - sorting in the vineyard so not clean. On the sorting table, despite best efforts sorting in the vineyard 2% is always rejected. Crushing was like mash?? Basically mashed fruit going into the tank - mashed fruit, on one side, skin and pips on the other side, not the same. That's why we were calling for destemming in 90s. In 2001 we bought our first proper destemmer, it was working well - much better, but we were using little conveyor belt to transfer to the tank - big difference of the tannins compared to 1999 due to equipment. Not happy with it so bought another one. Today I'm using my 6th one after 15 years I think I found the right one, love it, it's for Pinot Noir. Different destemmers out there, you don't destem Syrah or Cab the same way as Pinot. My new one destems cleanly, doesn't crush, max volume at 1 ton/hour, perfect at the sorting table where 600-800 kg/hour.

Back in 1999 at Comte Arnaud was doing one week of cold soak, don't do it any more now. I let the yeast starts itself now. If you pick in August then it's warmer, we let the fruit outside to cool itself in the night or in a cold room, just to cool down to 14-15C not colder. Now fermentation starts in 1-2 days instead of one week naturally and it's fine. I don't want to inoculate. I'm more worried about maceration after fermentation.

There's a big change, before: after fermentation is done, you are on your way to press because you are losing CO2 as you have no way to protect the skin with a wooden open tank. As soon as you press, mixing press wine and free run, you put them straight into barrel with all the sediment. Today we seal the tank, with all natural the CO2 inside, we start infusion. We see when it's ready. Some maceration takes onlu 2 weeks from picking to pressing, some 2.5 weeks, all depends on how it goes, how it tastes.

Vertical pressing for reds, horizontal pneumatic pressing for whites: quality of vertical press is fantastic. It's a single press, no need to rotate the skins or mixing or mashing up. The piston will go gently on top for one single time, you only extract the best part of the skin. The cake makes a natural screen of filtration, making the juice super clean. I bought it immediately after trying it. Then for the white too, the old way, you have to take your time as with extraction you have to remove the fruit many times - "odesh??" For ?? we did trials one vertical one horizontal and saw after a few years one is aging better than the other one which was oxidized. I am happy with pneumatic press with whites - a question of learning how to use it. It brought a lot of issues esp when it first arrived in 90s. If you use it without adapting yourself to the fruit, you'd be producing the same thing every year, then you could face issues. If you learn how to use it, you won't go back to the same thing. We can create sediments with pneumatic press, to me it's not the issue but rather how we are using it.

Racking is important but has to be done at the right time. Nothing should be a set recipe: if low malic level, lees/reductive, then no need to rack, I've learnt when we rack with 20L² of lees at the bottom of the barrel heavy and reductive, when close to bottling we get eggs from the farm to use two egg whites per barrel for filtering. That was the way to do it. We were experimenting before: one/1.5/etc. now it's two eggs per barrel. Sometimes it works sometimes not. Today we are always experimenting.

During the last few years we did not put wine straight into barrels because with drier summers not much rain to clean the fruit, so more retention of sulphur and copper - plus dust and dirt - on fruit. We do light sedimentation on whites leaving the sediments at the bottom of the tank which you don't want to retain - brown and earthy. For reds we are doing the same thing now, let them stay in tank for a few weeks or one month in tank. In a way it's like racking then we can get the finest lees to barrel, it's our adaptation to weather condition, somehow forced to do but I like it very much, it works well and ever since we've racked much less. Resulting wines show greater definition of aromatics too. That said, with Nuits Saint Georges, Auxey Duresses we rack in the middle and sometimes only one barrel sometimes two. It depends, each village has its own tradition, no recipe at all.

CO₂ retention: as we don't rack much we retain high level of CO₂, so with our wine you can feel some fizziness when young as we tend to bottle with high CO₂, 100mg above what we used to have. I like bottling it at the edge of being perceived. Lifting aromatics, I love it - it's not at all re-fermentation, all natural, done on purpose, to avoid using too much sulphur. But to preserve the wine against microbial spoilage (which caused by oxygen on top of microbial bacteria) as an anti-oxidant and anti-septic. CO₂ is a way to lower sulphur level. For whites we use screw cap and DIAM, for which you need much less sulphur.

In early 80/90s, people were using much less sulphur and premox happened so more sulphur to try to salvage. Now it went back down again - which is good. Cork production industry reacted to the premox issue and it's not over. In 80s techniques to measuring sulphur were different, so were methods to add sulphur into barrels. I don't add much sulphur into my barrels because most of the time they are full, and I don't want to change my wine for the closure. I'm fed up with 35/40 parts of free sulphur, which would change the identity of the wine totally. If the cork is only okay - losing part of sulphur then it'd be fine. But as we are always looking for the best cork, if perfect seal, you retain too much. I don't see myself gambling with a lesser cork, nor going to high sulphur to insure against lesser cork. Cork variation is large - not great and it's difficult to make a decision.

Barrel ferments with different sizes for whites, foudre - large oval format - typical old traditional maconnaise way to do Chardonnay in foudre, now also experimenting with whites in steel tank like in Chablis, not typical in Cote d'Or. Stainless steel is largely found in Chablis but it's not their tradition - Chablis used to be barrels all around. When a lot of growers became winemakers the easiest vessels to get are stainless steel so it became the style. But that happened in the last 50 years. Foudre is found in Macon, they kept the tradition. But it's also seen in Cote d'Or. Only issue was that phylloxera, WWI, economic collapse, WWII, the skills were lost and big negociants were ruling the system. When we talk about tradition - its 228L piece. Best volume for Pinot and Chardonnay. Historical reason is that it's practical, easy to move for one person, to get out of the cellar for the ??, all business was done in barrels. Most of the time at Comte Armand, lots of elevage was done in foudre. Piece was only used to ship the wine to London, etc. and empty back. We were just going back to tradition. With higher alcohol thus higher extraction, better definition of flavors, why add additional layers of wood which don't belong to the wine? You don't need new oak, there was a time when there was definitely too much new oak. But there was also a time when it's definitely needed in Burgundy to clean out the cellars and change up barrels as you can't keep them forever due to contamination of eg Brett. What happened in 90s was not all bad as it cleaned out a lot of dirty things in the cellar. But then there was a bit of loss of identity tasting the same thing. When you are negoc, you can see the identity of each village, mostly because of one cooper working with almost all growers, or nurseries with the same materials. Somehow the barrel makers started to be part of the identity of the taste of the village. I want wood for micro-oxydation, not importing flavors to my wine. Most of the time, we mix up cooperage as much as we can and vary the level of content with less wood contact between the volume wine. Grand cru suits well with normal barrels, I'd love to make Batard(-Montrachet) with foudre but I'm not producing them anyway. Another thing to experiment with is the shape: oval or round, to see the movement of lees and the effect on wine. We don't stir the lees - lees stirring fattens up the wine - we do lees stirring to encourage the yeast to finish the fermentation at the end. With natural active yeast, we can't have quick fermentation, we'd rather it take 2 months or less than 6 months. It helps to stir the lees to introduce more oxygen at the end to make it finish faster. We noticed that with the round shape the sedimentation happens fast, we won't touch the lees and at the end there will be some movement depending on the atmosphere pressure; in oval shaped vessels, there's constant movement of lees like natural lees stirring, preserving more CO₂ and it'd be interesting some years. These days I mix both - round and oval, mostly for village and Bourgogne level wines. The mix is interesting for preserving the freshness. It'd be fine for 3 years of aging, developing a lot of primary flavor. Oval oak could be too much in years lacking malic acidity, but interesting with good acidity and high alcohol overall. If we could choose from one year to another it'd be ideal but we can't leave the barrels empty so we usually mix.

Pick the fruit when it's ripe. Imagine a year not for foudre I can still buy wine that would not sell but just to preserve the fruit for one year. Did it in 2016, with frosts I could only fill 1/3 of my barrels. Instead of losing my barrels - when I first started I bought second hand barrels to avoid using too much new oak - even if you buy from good friends from top estates, they never let you taste, there's yeast outside... Today everything I taste everything we buy. In 2016 we bought a truck of Macon, we filled the barrels with them and I was happy with that. If the vintage is not good enough for foudre I won't use them.

Different lees contact/treatment in ovals and foudre on reduction? So far, never suffered from reduction in foudre - 100L like more than 5 barrels - theoretically we should have it. I think reduction is due to the quality/kind of fermentation. Nitrogen is an important part of the quality of fermentation as the yeast does live through the same cycle, they don't necessarily eat sugar and produce alcohol, they can do other things. Naturally they produce sulphur but it depends on what molecules they produce. Reduction is usually linked to nitrogen and lack of sulphur. Same with oxidation. Sulphur shouldn't be high protection against oxygen but sometimes you need some - sometimes wine can be slightly oxidative its fine as long as it's in balance. If the type of sulphur molecule you produce is fixed, you have bad reduction: bad eggs smell.

Good reduction linked to lacking nitrogen in must? NO usually good reduction is more linked with lees - lees sedimentation and the presence of lees. Using native yeast, a 2-month vs 2-week fermentation is very different. 2 weeks could lead to good aromatics but it also means you don't have enough generations of yeasts, therefore your sediment will be lower. Longer fermentation means many more generations of yeasts available then you have more fine lees, leading to nice reduction.

Fermentation in steel? Had to do it in 2018 because we didn't have enough barrels. Two things: we have been purchasing?? barrels since Feb, since reduction was going great??. We've been to Chablis, have friends in Chablis, we talk a lot about what to do, not to do, as when you are using closed tank like Denis?? you have to be careful with the quality of lees, so one tank was not good but the other one was brilliant. It suited the vintage so well. So I wanted to trial with stainless. It's not our style but we shouldn't not experiment esp for warmer vintages. In the end, for Bourgogne it's used for 10% of the cuvee. It's a matter of learning. Bigger volumes appear to work better. Temperature variations are not as much as in barrel.

Generally, for whites, whole bunch, no crushing. No recipe either. The question of crushing, destemming, etc. depends on the grapes. Today for 2019 we will have a crusher, based on the maturity I think we need to use the skin a bit more. But not everywhere, not a systematic thing but useful for some grapes of certain maturity. **Benefit of keeping stems: more for the drainage** as the must goes through the press. With pneumatic press, we are able to do programs without spinning the press and we need the stems to get more sediments and thus more phenolic compounds in wine. I've never tried whites with stems, I love white wines from destemmed fruit.

Whites typically spend in barrels for 18 months on average. We don't bottle everything at the same time, we bottle as they are ready. No set rules. But in general, we bottle whites before reds, but in 2017, we finished our bottling with the whites. Usually we started bottling with Bourgogne, then village, then 1er cru, then grand cru. In 2017 one of the last bottlings was with village wines. I don't question myself for bottling after 12 or 18 months. There's maybe a couple of 18s that could be bottled half this time. They are tasting great now after malo but let's see what will happen in Sep.

Climate change: besides the deep topics above - malo, closure, etc., there are simple things to change in Burgundy: picking dates - if you have a team sometimes you have to start harvesting when not ready. 100 days after flowering is changing a bit: you can't decide your picking date in June. You know roughly when it's going to be but then you really decide at the last minute - for me the hardest part: when and which vine, etc., and you only know if you are right 3 months later. I think we need to manage things differently. I like to pick when its ready, not because you have your team ready. Same with bottling, you shouldn't bottle your wine just because next harvest is coming you need to free up the cellar and you shouldn't bottle everything at the same time. Wait for the right time. Simple rule but matters a lot to wine quality.

I usually put the white in the stainless steel before bottling but not every year. In 2015 when we picked I looked at the acidity level I figure because of the higher alcohol, there's no way we are aging this wine for 18 months in barrel. So I ordered 16 stainless steel tanks straightaway and right before the next harvest all to 15 stainless steel tanks for the last 6/7/8 months. Big investment but worth it. With stainless tank, some reduction which suits the wine, added some freshness. In 2016, we didn't need use the stainless steel tank so we only used them for bottling. In 2017 we used them again: for some wines only one year in barrel then stainless steel.

Young white Burgundy more approachable today than in 1990s? Yes, but we are not looking for young wine. With greater control over winemaking now, there's definitely greater purity in wine. I don't make wines to be drunk young, I'm sure they age well but a great wine tastes good all the time, young and old - 40, 50 years time. My first vintage was 1999, bought a lot early 90s, I think a wine hard in youth stays hard forever because the tannins will never ripen over time. What I love now is that if you work very well in understated appellation like Auxey Duresses or St Romain you could make beautiful wine approachable in youth. And you have higher appellations like Meursault, Puligny where you makes wines to keep.

Volnay Cailleret: top 1er cru of Volnay. The adage of Volnay says: whoever never drank Cailleret, doesn't know Volnay. "Qui n'a des vignes en Cailleret, ne sait ce que vaut le Volnay." If you don't have vines in Cailleret then you don't know what Volnay is', in rough translation. True. It's the king of Volnay. I make 4 different 1er crus in Volnay. I made more 1er crus in the past I think I know the area well but Cailleret wowed me. Big difference, like the first time you work a grand cru in Cote de Nuits. Much easier to make wine in those areas, the wine makes itself whatever the vintage is. We had too many blind tastings with grand crus in Cote de Nuits, top 3 always includes a Volnay, and it's a Cailleret every time, or the plot right next door (Champans? Clos des Chenes? Taille Pieds?). Cailleret means limestone and you can really feel it in the wine.

Pommard Haut Rugiens. When I left Comte Armand in 2014 just before harvest: I've done 15 vintages of Clos de Epeneaux but never made Pommard any more and I wanted to turn the page. And the parcel in Pommard I want to work in Rugien. The only vintage I haven't done Pommard is 2014. In 2015 by chance, Pommard Rugien was offered to me as part of the package of fruits. The parcel was just above Rugiens Bas, we call it Rugiens de Millieu. But yea it's Rugiens Haut, at the bottom of the vineyard it's a bit like Rugiens Bas, then you have more soil on the top which is Rugiens Haut. Less soil on the mid slope of Rugiens. Good diversity of vine age. It was the first time we used whole cluster on Pommard - I've always hated whole cluster on Clos des Epeneaux and I did not want to bring another layer. You have very different styles there, much smoother in terms of tannin extraction, a bit like Cailleret. Here a real different. Clos des Epeneaux (CdE) is a great 1er cru, can reach grand cru in some vintages, but in some other vintages it's just a good 1er cru. The major difference between grand cru and 1er cru: whatever the vintage grand crus are always consistently at the top, then just beneath, some top 1er crus like CdE. But compared to CdE, Rugiens is more like a grand cru esp Bas (more than Haut): power and elegance. I'm not sure it reaches the level of Volnay Cailleret though.

I think in the end it's not very important if Pommard gets grand crus or not, because in the village it motivates all the growers, which is important as it brings the village all together.

More infusion (vs extraction) could benefit Pommard as the wines can be rustic. Geologically there's more red soils in Pommard, iron oxide, so naturally high tannins. That's why it's important.... I think I made better wines since 2007 at Comte Armand when I started to work with growers on my negociant side, which made me understand the style of tannins we could get/extract. To me the key of my winemaking is in 2007. Pommard's already got a lot of tannins. When I was making CdP at the beginning you start the fermentation and you have 4-5% alcohol suddenly, big mass of tannins, then layer after layer, which you have to deal with. In most appellations you are building structure bit by bit, thus very different. With Pommard, no need to extract more, infusion is definitely one way to treat the harvest besides crusher, destemmer/wholebunch, etc. I think not all lieu-dits of Pommard can stand whole bunch, which adds another layer of tannins - it could work in some vintages but not always. To be smoother in extraction is interesting in Pommard. It's also ingrained in the traditions of winemaking in Pommard. Pommard's reputation was built because those wines travel so well. What we call rusticity today was quality in the past. It takes time to change.

Tend to destem Chambolle-Musigny because the vine materials in Chambolle village tends to be better when destemmed? NO... with **Chambolle** I'm using **whole bunch**. Maybe it's Cote de Bar?? village. Same thing after phylloxera today I would use nurseries often in northern parts of France because they are free of sans dorée?? the disease, which means they can produce vines without insecticides, so organic planting from the beginning in other regions. We can order from afar. After phylloxera, usually grafting. We have one nursery by village and the selections are made by village. For instance, Vosne-Romanee, beautiful materials from the same selection. Chambolle slightly different selection usually very nice. In Gevrey, different selection and different soil too. There's definitely a common side to all the oldest vines, planted right after phylloxera. Then clonal selection arrived, depending on village different types of clones. So the technique we use within a village can usually generalize by winemaking as the materials are the same. Usually the place where we use easily the most whole cluster is definitely Vosne-Romanee, due to geology, terrior, and vine material. The types of Pinot Noir there are crazy good. You also find them most often in the northern part of Nuits Saint George (Boudots) and in Chateau du Clos de Vougeot in Vougeot where usually a mix as you go north the bunches are usually bigger, generally speaking. You can certainly see Vosne growers planting in Gevrey but the old vines are usually local materials. [LD: stark contrast of Pinot Noir in new world - big berries whereas in Vosne the berries are tiny - stunning. You make a particularly good Vosne Romanee Malconsort des Sud] It's a nice place, so named since it's just above Malconsort, different geology though as here it's just on the bedrock, more minerality, but more compared with Beaux Petit Mont?? than Malconsort. We make 1-1.5 barrel, first time we tasted it wow - so much lift. I love hunting for lesser known lieu-dits, either because only one owner, too small, etc. I do the same with Goulots ("from an old word for running water, as 'gouléyant' to describe a wine today would imply that it slips down the throat so easily as to be on the point of dilution", lighter, hillside also from Domaines Fourrier, Gallois and Heresztyn) in Gevrey, Tete du Clos ("soil is white marl full of small stones, producing a mineral wine unlike the heavier offerings of more classic Morgeot", Vincent Dancer) in Chassagne, etc. A good deal. Being a negociant is a rich adventure of human relationships. Malconsort is higher up on the slope, same as Clos St Denis, close to the border of Clos de la Roche. We are

producing Chaffots from the same parcel. Chaffots is next to Clos St Denis but it's at the level of 1er cru. Clos St Denis is interesting as it's not always the grand cru we think of but if Morey St Denis took St Denis from its name, there's a reason. Such a lift from it. Elegance. Slightly higher, more mineral than Chaffots. I like Clos St Denis a lot: lift, aromatics. That's why I like where a part of Gevrey is from that side of Morey St Denis. Ethereal. Underrated.

Make a range of grand crus in Gevrey Chambertin: Mazis-C, Griotte-C, Mazoyères-C, Charmes-C. Gevrey-Chambertin is one of the largest appellations, with Brochon, almost reaching 500 hectares. Easier to get in Gevrey than Chambolle-Musigny. We started in 2017 with villages only, on the Morey side, then little by little moving north. All the diversity of Gevrey. For me there's a real difference between Mazoyères-C and Charmes-C, geology/style. Mazoyères-C can be labelled as Charmes-C on the label (not the other way around) but I don't do it. Mazoyères-C & Charmes-C are about the same area, a bit more Mazoyères-C than Charmes-C, you see more labels of Mazoyères-C now, sometimes Charmes-C as Mazoyères-C. But when in French, Charmes-C is a better name - charming. But today in cellar I have both, different styles: Charmes-C is more generous, more approachable whereas Mazoyères-C deeper more complex, more spicy. I don't know which grand cru of the Gevrey is the best, it depends on the vintage. Most of the time, Chambertin is the biggest, always takes time to age. Not much to show in the cellar but reaching maturity at 18 months it's the most powerful - a silent king, not showing, but when it's at its best, wow. That said, Mazoyères-C is the same every year, not the biggest, not showing a lot but always at this level, consistent since youth. Then Griotte-C, we are on top and beneath because there's a depression/hole in the middle from an old quarry. These vines are growing on the old bedrock. Here you don't play with tannin, pure lift and aromatics. Very different style. Vineyards are so different. You can just smell it, drink the smell. Mazis-C is somewhere in between, we have Mazis-C Haut and Bas together. Gevrey has a large area of grand cru and there's no doubt about its quality. A lot of old vines in Gevrey, definitely bigger berries than Vosne, but definitely enough of them free of virus, aging well. If you don't have virus you don't have to pull out the vines and you can replace bit by bit. Grand cru whites are awesome, so are less heralded wines. St Aubin, Auxey Duresses, and Blagny. Part of my development, so much to discover. Great places, not grand cru level. If talking about grand cru, I'd love to make Chevalier-Montrachet one day but I've got so much excitement working with Auxey Duresses and St Aubin. So much easier to deal with growers in those appellations as there's much more freedom there. When it comes to grand cru, you only have one barrel of Mazis-C, you play it safe. Bigger appellation allows you to experiment eg vertical press for St Romain, viticultural trials in Meursault etc. it works well. Warmer weather is even better for these places. Blagny, part of our estate, where we have a single vineyard of 2.2 hectares, such a wonderful place. Blagny has a true identity. I don't understand why in the past whites are called Meursault or Puligny if on the Puligny side, reds are called Blagny. There are truly two geologies, one for Pinot, one Chardonnay. For years, many Pinots were pulled out to plant Chardonnay, reasonably so because mostly Blagny is owned by Meursault producers. When you only do one red, it's difficult to manage the equipment. Also Chardonnay sells for higher price [Meursault sells higher than Blagny red], with a shorter cycle, easier to plant. That said, we are pulling out Chardonnay to replant Pinot. [LD: you also make a red Blagny, near Les Malpoiriers, classic for red Pinot] Les Malpoiriers is one example, old vintages are always good. On top of that the bottom of the slope is definitely for Pinot. Chardonnay is there too but not doing as well as on Chardonnay geology. Whites can be called Blagny, or Meursault-Blagny, then you are losing the appellation. When I put my Meursault 1er cru Les Malpoiriers alongside my Meursault Genevrière or Charmes, I think it hasn't reach those but on its own it's great the saltiness no others have. I'd love to call my white Blagny if I have the choice. You can call your Puligny Blagny that's the right thing. Like St Aubin, it's not Puligny but today there's no doubt that it's great terrior, everybody recognizes this appellation but Blagny needs to be recognized. What I like in Blagny red since I made it since 2014: It's always good despite different vintages, adapting to any situations. I would fight for this appellation, I understand the market is ready but it's a question of education. In 20 years, we'd be wondering why all this time no one wanted Blagny, such a good place.

Meursault vs Chassagne-M vs Puligny-M from a negociant's perspective: I have most of my vineyards in Meursault - more of a grower there, it's a larger appellation of lots of excellent growers. Common things among growers most notably DAMY our cooperage, which suits Meursault well. Larger area, greater diversity of terrior, better for a negociant. Puligny-M historically has no cellars so always negociant. Smaller. Not much room to work since always with negociant in the past. I'm working a bit in Puligny, not an easy place to make room. Puligny has magic like Vosne Romanée, the acidity is magic. In Chassagne-M, I work with Batard-M. Chassagne as a village is where people are really working together. You can see it in the village like village parties, no fights at all.

Key to soil health is to plough the soil, not using herbicides. Terrior is the first thing. Estate label vs negociant label: vineyards I bought are usually not in good shape as those on sale usually are not from top estates. Vineyards I took 2 years ago used 30 years of herbicides and I left it free for 3 years. Amazing how fast it comes back. Faster when you have limestone less on the clay side, deeper clay like Bourgogne?? takes more time. But last 40 years in Burgundy of herbicides etc is reversible. Burgundy today you see Spring, unlike 5

years ago you see burnt grass herbicides. More people ploughing the soil, big improvement. Next step is going organic, bringing back life in the soil faster. Even if you don't do organic straightaway, it makes a big step-up if you stop using herbicides. Major impact on the wine. One of the rules: never plough the soil at least four weeks before harvest, to make sure to bring back some dirt, humidity, and Botrytis esp when grapes are closing down. Bringing back dirt inside the bunch, it's like inoculate the berry from inside.

[LD: learning vintages since 2007 you started your own negociant/estate?] Suffered so much in 2003 when picked with high temperature even if we were picking in the morning because the nights were not cooling down. Not equipped enough back then in the winery in Pommard. Could have done better with good equipment. Before harvesting the fruit I can't tell what wine I'm going to make the vintage. I have to see the fruit and know bit by bit. The best approach to a new situation like frost in 2016 when we had a vineyard with frost and another one without frost, you need two approaches for winemaking and that was not planned before. No preconception. Now we were talking about infusion but maybe in one year I need to extract more.