

17. The new ‘online’ alternative food networks as a socio-technical innovation in the local food economy: Two cases from Milan

Paolo Corvo and Raffaele Matacena

INTRODUCTION

The chain of food production, distribution and consumption is undergoing an intense process of innovation in the face of a generalized crisis that affects the whole world of food. Under the pressure of food scares—generated anxiety, nutritional concerns and environmental preoccupations – together with a fashionization of food as an aesthetic experience, consolidated by constantly increasing media coverage – consumers are becoming increasingly interested in knowing the peculiarities of the food they purchase, and judgements over food quality now take into account characteristics such as place of provenance, methods of farming, and values and stories attached to the products.

As a consequence, new and varied models of food provisioning are emerging in Western cities, in which food is produced, sold and distributed in the light of three basic principles: the chain is as short as possible; the food has a higher quality and environmental values; and a direct relation between producers and consumers is built and sustained. These models are known as ‘alternative’ or local food networks, and are run and operated by an original alliance of collective and individual stakeholders, ranging from firms and business operators to associations and volunteer-activist individuals. They use the Internet and digital technologies as the stepping stones of their organization and, interestingly, exercise their activities (at least partly) outside the mechanisms and infrastructure of the corporate-controlled dominant food distribution sector (supermarkets and wholesalers) (Corvo, 2015).

Drawing from extensive field research, in this chapter we will present Cortilia and L’Alveare che dice Sì!, two rapidly consolidating

business-oriented alternative food provisioning models from the city of Milan (Italy). By illustrating their characteristics, scrutinizing their social membership, examining the actors involved, and highlighting their differences we will try to frame the features of the socio-economic innovation these two cases represent. With a specific focus on the perspective of the food producers participating in these networks, we will also try to reflect on the implications of such renewed sales channels for the primary sector, the logics of action that are put in place to assure its functioning, and the obstacles that may undermine its development.

FOOD SYSTEM AND 'FOOD CRISIS'

From a systemic point of view, the contemporary agri-food supply chain has recently been put under serious scrutiny both in its operational and governance aspects by a conspicuous number of actors, ranging from academia and international as well as national and subnational institutions to non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations and individuals. Such efforts have unveiled power structures, distortions and disconnections that are generating concerns about the ability of the system to assure food security (Godfray et al., 2010), sustainability (Sage, 2011; Marsden and Morley, 2014), sovereignty (Lang and Heasman, 2004) and justice (Allen, 2010) in the provision, supply, allocation and consumption of food.

The agri-food system is defined as a set of activities and relationships that interact to determine what, how much, by what method and for whom food is produced, processed, distributed and consumed (Fine, 1998). It comprises an interconnected flow of operations and processes that starts with the preparation of agricultural inputs, passes through primary production (cultivation, rearing, capture), processing (refining, manufacturing), distribution (transportation), sale/retail, preparation, and ends with consumption of food and its disposal (waste, recycling). Such a depiction of the food system recognizes the complex relationships between different components, embracing a more holistic and dynamic understanding (Sage, 2013) of the power balances between its elements.

Many analysts (see, for example, Feenstra, 1997; Pimbert et al., 2001; Godfray et al., 2010; Pretty et al., 2010; Goodman, DuPuis and Goodman, 2012; Stock, Carolan and Rosin, 2015) agree that, although it has brought a number of benefits in feeding populations and sustaining massive urbanization processes, the evolutionary path that has led to current food system arrangements is responsible, to a varying yet significant extent, for causing most of the problems that the system now faces. These problems,

in turn, now threaten its reproduction and its capacity to deliver public goods and well-being.

OUR FOOD ECONOMY

The current characteristics of the food system result from a century-long transformation process that, led by Northern countries, has focused on incrementing productivity through continuous technological enhancement. The application of scientific methods and industrial technologies provoked major changes in the food we eat, as well as in the structure of its productive apparatus. Following the industrialization of the Global North, the requirement of feeding a larger and increasingly urbanized population called for the installation of an intensive regime of food production, set up within a *productivist* paradigm. The transformation of food into a cheap commodity bolstered intense processes of concentration in the sector, with big corporations accumulating enormous market power both in the upstream segments (seeds and other inputs of production) and in the downstream segments of the chain (food processors and retailers) (Marsden and Morley, 2014).

While these developments significantly expanded profit opportunities for the upstream and downstream operators of the chain, the farming segment bore the most negative consequences. It found itself stretched in between two highly concentrated and powerful ends of the supply chain, capable of setting the standards and governing the development of the system. Heffernan, Hendrickson and Gronski (2002) describe the shape of the food system, employing the metaphor of the 'hour-glass', whereby a huge number of farmers feed a larger number of consumers through an increasingly corporate-controlled system that involves nets of interconnected input suppliers, food processors and retailers, earning a profit from every transaction. The position of agriculture, then, is one of weakness, and many small-to-medium-sized farmers have been (and continue to be) pushed out of the market, lacking the capacity to withstand a trend of lowering returns.

In such a setting, the system endangers farmers' livelihood opportunities, and thus contributes to emigration from rural areas and to the subsequent urbanization of the world's population. This new economic and spatial arrangement also created the conditions for the rise of national and global corporatism in the retail sector, whose operators have progressively acquired more power and are currently considered to hold the lead in the food system (Vorley, 2001; Hendrickson and Heffernan, 2002; Fuchs, Kalfagianni and Havinga, 2011; Havinga, 2012). Supermarkets and other

retail outlet chains have in fact reached gigantic dimensions (to cite a widely known example, Walmart is the world's largest food retailer *and* the world's biggest company by revenue) and adopted the role of restructurers and directors of the whole food supply chain, dictating terms to food manufacturers who then force changes back through the food system (Konefal, Mascarenhas and Hatanaka, 2005).

From a market sociology perspective, the rise of corporate retailers can be explained as a matter of *resource dependence* (Fligstein and Dauter, 2007), which exists when 'power in markets is unequally distributed [and] one side of the exchange is more dependent on what is being exchanged than the other party' (ibid., p.114). In the contemporary food system, producers' and manufacturers' sales heavily rely on the main retail players, whose revenues, conversely, come from a very ample base of differentiated sources. The data collected in Britain by Martin (1990, quoted in Goodman et al., 2012) illustrate how, already in the late 1980s, the top four supermarkets accounted for 50–80 per cent of most major food manufacturers' sales, whereas no single food manufacturer represented more than 1 per cent of Sainsbury's or Tesco's (the leading UK retailers) turnover – an outstanding purchasing power then, which derives from an asymmetric situation of oligopsony (Pimbert et al., 2001), defined as a market in which a small number of buyers exert power over a large number of sellers.

ALTERNATIVE FOOD NETWORKS (AFNS)

The emergence of new consumers' desires and attitudes, combined with the current state of advanced commodification of the food economy, brought the development and consolidation of AFNs. Even if they show wide variability in operational and organizational mechanisms, AFNs are generally organized to 're-socialize' (Kneafsey et al., 2008; Sage, 2011; Goodman et al., 2012) and 're-localize' food (Hinrichs, 2003; Mount, 2012). Re-socialization rests upon bringing food out of the highly individualized fashion in which consumers make personal choices within the wide range offered by supermarkets and other corporate retailers, and more fully into the civic arena where public goods issues are given weight and consideration (Sage, 2011). It operates by building relations and promoting stronger connections among a whole set of food-related actors, not limited to producers and consumers but also extending to restaurateurs, food writers, grassroots food movements, civil society organizations, consumer co-ops, social entrepreneurs, and other businesses, all to some degree engaged in finding a way out of the more standardized patterns of conventional food supply.

Re-rooting food in a specific place is the strategy employed in pursuing such alternative provision models. Food re-localization is practised through production, processing, retailing and consumption, all taking place within a prescribed area (as in the case of short chains, farmers' markets, community-supported agriculture, box schemes, solidarity-based purchasing groups, food hubs, urban agriculture, community gardens), and/or through the exchange of products that embody the natural and/or cultural characteristics of a particular area, even if retailed or consumed far outside the production area (for example, organic agriculture, *terroir* and speciality products, craft products, products with denomination of origin, fair trade products) (Tregear, 2011). In both cases, these traits of embeddedness of food products in peculiar places and ecologies act to contrast the perceived rootless nature characterizing the conventional system and its outputs.

AFNs are gaining vibrancy, membership and participation, as well as sparking academic interest, for they are seen as creating, in a varied and multifaceted way, new spatial and social connections that can pave the way for the construction of a real sustainable food paradigm, founded on the renewal of linkages in and across urban and rural spaces, and on the capsize of our established spatial theories and supply chain models (Feagan, 2007; Allen, 2010; Marsden and Morley, 2014). In a context framed by food security and sustainability crises, these networks' response is directed to ultimately empower both the 'urban food consumer' to become a more knowledgeable producer of his or her own and his or her family's health and well-being (Roberts, 2008), and the 'rural producer' to become a multifunctional provider of sustainable goods and services for rural and urban groups (Franklin and Morgan, 2014).

AFNs represent an innovation in the food supply chain that creates a prospect for generating an array of beneficial outcomes. These frequently relate to (often overlapping) elements of (positive) local anchorage, economic viability, ecological sustainability, and social justice. Moving towards a localized food system helps primarily to avoid the appropriation of value by distant or transnational companies, revitalizing primary production sectors, especially in peripheral areas (Ilbery et al., 2004). It also offers the potential basis for more collective solutions for community development, enhancing trust and social capital that can spill over into other collective and community initiatives, and providing opportunities for building synergies with other sectors, such as tourism (Sage, 2011).

Such an innovation process can assume different characteristics and lead to different outcomes, yet for its realization it leverages on the confluence of two factors: the diffusion of digital communication technologies and the establishment of a collaboration between different food stakeholders.

At the root of the phenomenon lies a pact between consumers and primary producers, but lately this two-sided collaboration has begun to involve (at least) a third actor, with new firms emerging to act as business intermediaries in an innovative fashion: instead of representing middle-step players battling the others for value appropriation within the chain, they are engaged in facilitating the direct relationship between producers and consumers. The examples from the Italian city of Milan presented in the next section will testify and exemplify such phenomena.

AFNS IN ITALY

In Italy, the alternative food procurement scene has been long dominated by two distinct types of initiatives: the farmers' markets and the Gruppi di Acquisto Solidale (solidarity-based purchasing groups) commonly known as GAS, which are groups of citizens that organize and manage informal systems to buy fresh wholesome food directly from producers.

Unlike some other countries, in Italy, local and neighbourhood food markets (whether open-air or indoor) have never disappeared, and for consumers they have always represented the soundest alternative to supermarkets. They were the places to find local produce, and in many cases they were also to some extent detached from the conventional chain (though this is not the case for those markets where stall-holders re-sell produce bought from the general wholesale market). Once the discourses on food re-connection and local food systems started to diffuse, consumers immediately became interested in the opportunity to buy directly from farmers, and a growing number of GAS groups and farmers' markets were quickly put in place, both in big cities and smaller towns. To give a sense of the dimension of the phenomenon, in 2014, in the urban core of Milan there were 94 street food markets, 15 farmers' markets, and more than 80 GAS groups. (Demaldè, 2014).

Many new initiatives are on the rise. They are based on past (i.e., traditional) AFN experiences, but they are innovating their model by adding, essentially, two new features: they make a smarter and more professionally architected use of the Internet and online communication resources; and they are run and operated by a firm – sometimes more market oriented, at times more socio-ethically oriented, as we will see – which acts as a facilitator in the relationship between producers and consumers, while implementing corporate-level process management and providing a system of incentives that liberates volunteerism from the burden of managing all operations. For these reasons, they hold the potential to overcome scaling-up barriers and position themselves as structured and viable alternatives,

capable of making a dent in the food system in the long run. Conversely, though, they are exposed to the risk of not being able to perpetuate those ideological traits of horizontality, mutual respect and communitarianism that inspired the first wave of alternative food schemes.

In the following sub-sections, we will present two case studies from Milan that we reckon are – at least to a certain extent – explanatory of the types of innovation discussed. First, we will present L'Alveare che dice Sì!, a French company that recently entered the Italian market proposing a model that appears an attempt to standardize the functioning of GAS groups by leveraging on a company-controlled Internet platform. Then we will introduce Cortilia, a Milan-based company running a very successful and rapidly growing food delivery scheme (involving both fresh and preserved foodstuff). We will try to delineate the way they work, and to highlight their major strengths and weaknesses, as well as the criticisms put forth by both producers and consumers, collected during our fieldwork.

L'Alveare che dice Sì!

Born in France in 2011, with the name of La Ruche qui dit Oui! (The Beehive That Says Yes!), this alternative food procurement scheme is based on a centralized IT service that offers the possibility of creating a local Beehive – that is, a community marketplace where alongside market exchange, physical interaction between producers and consumers takes place – through the use of an Internet platform that connects consumers searching for fresh products with local producers, allowing local handling of offers, orders, sales, cash flows and billing.

A local Beehive can be formed on the initiative of a single individual, an association, or a business. An individual takes the role of the Beehive manager, and chooses where to install the Beehive, takes care of building up a local group of consumers, and selects producers. Producers must be carefully selected, respecting a set of norms that implies they must be located a maximum distance of 250 km from the Beehive, and that they comply with all norms ruling their respective activities. In addition, producers must aim for excellence – both regard to food quality and ecology – even though they are not required to possess any official certification. Beehives' rules are not particularly strict on agro-ecological practices: they only state that cultivation techniques must be organic or, at least, must strive to limit the use of chemicals. Nevertheless, producers are required to detail the characteristics of their products, their business, and their agricultural practices. Yet, they freely establish what they are selling, and advertise weekly on the website the list of available products, the minimum quantities they want to set to justify delivery, and the prices they require for their products.

Consumers, for their part, have no obligations but to subscribe to the closer Beehive(s): this way they are filed in the central server, but – contrary to what happens in traditional GAS groups – this does not imply any particular commitment towards producers, neither in terms of frequency, volume or periodicity of orders, nor to participate in collection rounds or other forms of volunteer activity. Being able to know the producers' locations and whether their products are organic or not, consumers freely choose the products and quantities they want and pay online via the platform. The local Beehive records all orders until the day before the collection, and if minimal quantities are reached, the Beehive manager confirms single consumers' orders via email (the Beehive says 'yes'). Consumers then can collect exactly what they ordered by going to the Beehive during collection hours (normally two to three evening hours, once a week). If minimum quantities are not reached, customers receive a refund for those single items they could not buy, on the same card they used for payment.

The website works as a social network. Besides forms of mutual help and exchange of recipes, consumers can publicly express their (dis)satisfaction and comments on the organization, on food quality, price and so on. Even producers engage in this communication, giving explanations and justifications of their products and their choices. As Regazzola comments (2015), this whole set of exchanges generates a form of social pressure that eventually ensures compliance with the rules, thanks to a sort of collective auto-control.

The Beehive manager is responsible for taking care of the Internet spaces made available to local producers and consumers, and must ensure the availability of a private physical space where producers and consumers can meet and exchange the products (to avoid paying a rent for the space, managers usually rely on associations or other commercial activities, such as bars and pubs, providing free support to the initiative). On collection days, the manager receives the products and packs them into individual boxes or crates, and supervises the collection activities and the interaction of producers and consumers. He or she is usually also engaged in organizing social activities, product tastings or other forms of promotion.

Transparency of value partition is a prominent element of the company's philosophy. Producers get 80 per cent of the price they set, while the rest is equally split between the Beehive manager and the mother company (whose share, they claim, is mostly used to cover VAT and financial transaction costs) (Regazzola, 2015).

The mother company, *La Ruche qui dit Oui!*, was founded in France in 2011 by two highly skilled individuals, experts in food marketing and website/digital management. It defines itself as a 'for-profit company', and its set-up was facilitated by various financing rounds involving equity

funds, banks and individual successful entrepreneurs. In less than six years it was able to follow a rapid consolidation trajectory in France, where (as by May 2017) the number of working Beehives has grown to 838,¹ and opened subsidiaries in eight other countries (Belgium, Netherlands, UK, Germany, Denmark, Switzerland, Spain and Italy). It entered the Italian market in late 2015, with the name *L'Alveare che dice Sì!* (a literal translation of its French name). It immediately gave signs of a successful development: to date, the Italian Beehives' count adds up to 168 (*ibid.*). They are mainly concentrated in bigger cities and towns in the north of the country, but evidence seems to testify that they are also spreading in the south and in other peripheral areas of the peninsula.

The results of our fieldwork, which focuses on the city of Milan, show that the Beehives are being appreciated by both producers and consumers for a host of reasons. Concurrently, a number of critical points have been raised, especially from producers and managers. The producers catering to Beehives that we had the opportunity to interview generally showed a sense of optimism toward this new form of organizing an alternative food network, which they conceived as an innovative form of sales that is worth following from the beginning, for it is thought to possibly be playing a major role in the future local food market. A dairy farmer and cheese manufacturer affirmed that despite weekly sales being as yet insufficient, he was happy to spend two hours a week meeting customers, presenting himself and speaking about the products, even if it meant overloading an already excessively busy workday. What producers also appeared to appreciate was the simplicity and effectiveness of the online ordering and paying methods provided by the platform. They knew that all the products they brought along were already sold, meaning there was no monetary transaction in place and no need for bargaining. Unlike farmers' markets they are not required to extend their efforts by managing offers or applying discounts to attract customers. Thus, they are able to focus solely on the product, and this is a relief for many.

Consumers, for their part, are able to buy local fresh food without having to engage in active participation and volunteer work within a sustained net of stronger interpersonal relationships, as happens in a GAS. This means that Beehive-style food purchasing is more in line with contemporary lifestyles: to be appreciated it doesn't require a peculiar activist or ideology-inspired attitude, nor a very strong sensitivity to food-related problematics; therefore it can spontaneously attract a higher number of customers.

Negative impressions spur from what can be considered the flipside of the coin of our analysis so far. For the frenzy life of contemporary primary producers, committing two hours of a workday only for the sake of

engaging in social relations with customers is an investment that many are not willing to realize, or simply are not able to afford. This prevents many producers to participate in the Beehives, or facilitates their way out as soon as commercial results start to falter or find difficulties in consolidating. For consumers, the same easiness which characterizes Beehives' approachability can lead to a high number of excessively dis-engaged and light-hearted consumer-community relations, ultimately hindering the construction of a critical mass of committed buyers which is essential for feeding the working mechanism of a nuclear food system like the Beehives'.

In conclusion, L'Alveare che dice Sì! can be conceptualized as a new service in the food economy, one that draws upon past experiences – ethically and (to some extent) politically connoted – and innovates them not only by implementing technological solutions, but also soaking them in a capitalistic profit-oriented resource pool, with all the advantages in terms of efficiency and the risks of losing identity and ideological strength it entails. A similar point, yet with all due specifications, can be made for the next case study, which will be presented next.

Cortilia

Cortilia is a successful start-up running a fresh food delivery scheme, allowing people to buy quality food directly from local small-scale producers, paying for it online and having it delivered to their doorstep within just a day from the purchase. It offers customers the possibility to make occasional single purchases, or to subscribe to a periodic customizable food box delivery, containing fresh vegetables and fruit, to which other foodstuffs (fresh and cured meats, dry and preserved foods, preserves, and so on) and cosmetic products can be added.

It was founded in Milan by a food-passionate entrepreneur and expanded in a strikingly rapid fashion – also thanks to various financing rounds mounting up to 2.5 million euros, which involved venture capitalist funds and also Cassa Depositi e Prestiti, a government-controlled investment bank. It started operating in the Milan area, but then expanded to other cities in Lombardy – where in 2014 it had already obtained a customer base of more than 50 000 users² – and recently landed in two other Northern Italian regions (Piedmont and Emilia-Romagna). As for the year 2015, Cortilia was present in 11 Italian cities and towns, and realized a turnover of 3.1 million.³

Its strength appears to be two-fold. As per the consumer experience, this company makes a strong use of the short/direct chain narrative. On its functional and user-friendly website, the stories, faces, and features of the producers involved in the scheme are portrayed and highlighted. Users

can browse through maps of their city's surrounding countryside, look at beautiful food pictures, learn about food provenance, and discover the personal stories of food manufacturers. This is supposed to provide them with a sense of 'shopping in the countryside', as the website home page claims. The company is responsible for checking the quality of the products and the production techniques, its employees regularly visit its suppliers and engage in a direct relationship with them, thus offering an element of reassurance with regard to food quality and fairness in economic relationships. On the other side, the company is able to run a sophisticated logistical apparatus, completing the consumer's experience by providing them with the convenience of receiving their purchases at home, on the day and at the hour they prefer. For supplying the Milan area, they rely on a logistical hub located south of the city, where producers are requested to deliver their products. These are then handled and delivered by a third party – a workers' co-operative also working for the central wholesale market and many other supermarkets. Following Amazon's example, recently a just-in-time logic has been implemented, allowing customers to receive their orders the day after purchase.

Despite its undeniable success, some areas of criticism can be highlighted. One – shared with many other alternative food initiatives – deals with elitism: products bought through Cortilia are more expensive than any other direct food network. It is evident that the company's target audience is composed of middle- and upper-class urban families. Catering to the wealthy is not a flaw per se, yet it is only by involving ever larger strata of the population that routines can be reconfigured and a substantial change in the food system can be put forward (Matacena, 2016). From a producers' perspective, instead, Cortilia is criticized by farmers because, on a pragmatic note, they find it difficult to satisfy its logistical needs, especially after the introduction of the delivery-in-one-day service; while, from a more human point of view, producers feel that the enlargement of the company has been paralleled by a transformation in the kind of treatment they receive from it, which transformed from open, collaborative and sympathetic, to strict, demanding and business-oriented. This seems to suggest that Cortilia's corporate structure, its partaking in the financial world, and its scaling-up ambitions might undermine the upkeep of that values-imbued attitude which characterizes players in the alternative economy. The example of Cortilia can be understood as an innovation operating at the crossroads of the primary, the food manufacturing, and the service sectors. It hinges on the collaboration of different actors to try to transform a daily, basic activity (i.e., buying food) into a meaningful experience loaded with multiple semantic layers (reconnection with food and with countryside, health, well-being, and a fairer economy), made

possible by the use of Internet technologies. It fits within a framework of 'alternativeness' to the mainstream mode of production and consumption in the field, since mainstream actors of the food chain are excluded from its operational boundaries. Yet its corporate structure suggests that a high level of 'hybridity' is involved, for its model heavily relies on capitalistic market structures and conventional financing modes.

CONCLUSIONS

The experiences we have described and analysed helped to shed light on how (much-needed) innovations in the food economy meet the complexity of a movement, the alternative food networks, that does not exist in a separate sphere from the conventional food system, but rather it is deeply embedded in it, and depends on the capitalistic market for its social and material reproduction (Goodman et al., 2012).

Innovative schemes are not to be seen, as Goodman and his colleagues assert (*ibid.*), as 'oppositional' in the sense that they seek to overthrow the hegemonic capitalist system. Rather, they interact and co-evolve with the conventional food system and attempt to change it from within, challenging its productivity-driven socio-spatial arrangements by creating alternative economic spaces within which to develop different operational logics and value systems.

As all economic geographies, AFNs are constrained by the requirements of materially effective circuits of consumption, exchange and production (Leyshon, Lee and Williams, 2003) and thus engage in a peculiar relationship with the consolidated food system, which is concurrently competitive and symbiotic. In building a moral and sustainable economy they compete with the dominant market structures, appropriating flows that would otherwise be channelled through corporate circuits of value creation. At the same time, for their exchange and reproduction needs they leverage on conventional market structures (Goodman et al., 2012).

A crucial point, raised by Mount (2012), relates to legitimacy. He suggests that innovation in local and alternative food systems should aim to preserve an alternative identity within a context of hybridity. If such a goal is not achieved, contrast and frictions like those between the producers and the schemes we have been commenting on are likely to occur.

Furthermore, the lights and shadows we have been analysing leave space for a series of open questions, ranging from the political (what kind of change do we want to see in the food system?), to the more pragmatic, like asking ourselves what other innovations are needed (for example, in the farming sector) to foster the equitable development of the food economy.

Thus, a deeper understanding of how innovation processes should be designed is needed, if we want different, less predatory food procurement mechanisms to scale up and out and deepen their impact on the wider food system. As the global financial and resources crises unfold, as Marsden and Franklin (2013) foresee, it is likely that more voids and spaces will begin to open up for new post-neoliberal institutional platforms to take hold, which can favour the convergence of alternative food movements and empower them to become 'major social and political vehicles for embedding and creating the means of transitions to the post-neoliberal eco-economy' (ibid., p. 640). To grow, however, and engage more consumers and producers, local and alternative food networks must develop the ability to undermine the inertial forces of the conventional food system and reconfigure routines, integrating new complexes of production–consumption into the practices of daily life (Goodman et al., 2012). While avoiding the risks of 'dis-embedding' and 'de-localization' that scaling-up processes imply, which may cause the loss of the distinctive local connection and 'regard' for the producers, such socio-ecological projects have to become assemblages of production–consumption practices, knowledge, routines and imaginaries, able to reconfigure the 'orderings' engendered by conventional agri-food.

NOTES

1. Source: Company website, accessed 4 June 2018 at <https://laruchequiditoui.fr/fr>.
2. Source: Startup Business website, accessed 2 June 2018 at www.startupbusiness.it.
3. Source: Diariodelweb website, accessed 2 June 2018 at www.diariodelweb.it/innovazione/.

REFERENCES

- Allen, P. (2010), 'Realizing justice in local food systems', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, **3**, 295–308.
- Corvo, P. (2015), *Food Culture, Consumption and Society*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Demaldè, C.A. (2014), 'Cibo e sostenibilità nei sistemi urbani. Il consumo alimentare sostenibile nella città di Milano' [Food and sustainability in urban systems. Sustainable food consumption in the city of Milan], doctoral thesis, University of Milan-Bicocca.
- Feagan, R. (2007), 'The place of food: Mapping out the "local" in local food systems', *Progress in Human Geography*, **31**(1), 23–42.
- Feenstra, G.W. (1997), 'Local food systems and sustainable communities', *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture*, **12**(01), 28–36.
- Fine, B. (1998), *The Political Economy of Diet, Health and Food Policy*, London: Routledge.

- Fligstein, N. and L. Dauter (2007), 'The sociology of markets', *Annual Review of Sociology*, **33**, 105–28.
- Franklin, A. and S. Morgan (2014), 'The new frontier? Urban strategies for food security and sustainability', in T. Marsden and A. Morley (eds) (2014), *Sustainable Food Systems: Building a New Paradigm*, London: Routledge, pp. 186–207.
- Fuchs, D., A. Kalfagianni and T. Havinga (2011), 'Actors in private food governance: The legitimacy of retail standards and multistakeholder initiatives with civil society participation', *Agriculture and Human Values*, **28**(3), 353–67.
- Godfray, H.C.J., J.R. Beddington and I.R. Crute et al. (2010), 'Food security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people', *Science*, **327**(5967), 812–18.
- Goodman, D., E.M. DuPuis and M.K. Goodman (2012), *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice, and Politics*, London: Routledge.
- Havinga, T. (2012), 'Transitions in food governance in Europe: From national towards EU and global regulation and from public towards hybrid and private forms of governance', *Nijmegen Sociology of Law Working Paper*, 2012/02.
- Heffernan, W., M. Hendrickson and R. Gronski (2002), 'Consolidation in the food and agricultural system', *Sociologia Ruralis*, **42**(4), 347–69.
- Hendrickson, M.K. and W.D. Heffernan (2002), 'Opening spaces through relocalization: Locating potential resistance in the weaknesses of the global food system', *Sociologia Ruralis*, **42**(4), 347–69.
- Hinrichs, C.C. (2003), 'The practice and politics of food system localization', *Journal of Rural Studies*, **19**(1), 33–45.
- Ilbery, B., D. Maye and M. Kneafsey et al. (2004), 'Forecasting food supply chain developments in lagging rural regions: Evidence from the UK', *Journal of Rural Studies*, **20**(3), 331–44.
- Kneafsey, M., R. Cox and L. Holloway et al. (2008), *Reconnecting Consumers, Producers and Food: Exploring Alternatives*, New York: Berg.
- Konefal, J., M. Mascarenhas and M. Hatanaka (2005), 'Governance in the global agro-food system: Backlighting the role of transnational supermarket chains', *Agriculture and Human Values*, **22**(3), 291–302.
- Lang, T. and M. Heasman (2004), *Food Wars: The Global Battle for Mouths, Minds and Markets*, London: Earthscan.
- Leyshon, A., R. Lee and C.C. Williams (eds) (2003), *Alternative Economic Spaces*, London: Sage.
- Marsden, T. and A. Franklin (2013), 'Replacing neoliberalism: Theoretical implications of the rise of local food movements', *Local Environment*, **18**(5), 636–41.
- Marsden, T. and A. Morley (eds) (2014), *Sustainable Food Systems: Building a New Paradigm*, London: Routledge.
- Martin, P. (1990), 'Trolley fodder', *Sunday Times Magazine*, 4 November.
- Matacena, R. (2016), 'Linking alternative food networks and urban food policy: A step forward in the transition towards a sustainable and equitable food system?', *International Review of Social Research*, **6**(1), 49–58.
- Mount, P. (2012), 'Growing local food: Scale and local food systems governance', *Agriculture and Human Values*, **29**(1), 107–21.
- Pimbert, M.P., J. Thompson and W.T. Vorley et al. (2001), *Global Restructuring, Agri-Food Systems and Livelihoods*, International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Pretty, J., W.J. Sutherland and J. Ashby et al. (2010), 'The top 100 questions of importance to the future of global agriculture', *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, **8**(4), 219–36.

- Regazzola, T. (2015), 'L'economia dell'alveare diventa un business', *Comune Info*, 2 March, accessed 31 May 2018 at <http://comune-info.net/2015/03/leconomia-dellalveare/>.
- Roberts, W. (2008), *The No-Nonsense Guide to World Food*, New Internationalist e-book.
- Sage, C. (2011), *Environment and Food*, London: Routledge.
- Sage, C. (2013), 'The interconnected challenges for food security from a food regimes perspective: Energy, climate and malconsumption', *Journal of Rural Studies*, **29**, 71–80.
- Stock, P.V., M. Carolan and C. Rosin (eds), (2015), *Food Utopias: Reimagining Citizenship, Ethics and Community*, London: Routledge.
- Tregear, A. (2011), 'Progressing knowledge in alternative and local food networks: Critical reflections and a research agenda', *Journal of Rural Studies*, **27**(4), 419–30.
- Vorley, B. (2001), 'The chains of agriculture: Sustainability and the restructuring of agri-food markets', *IIED Opinion*, accessed 31 May 2018 at pubs.iied.org/pdfs/11009IIED.pdf.