

**BUILDING
MOVEMENT**

**ACHIEVING
TRANSFORMATION**

**11TH
AESOP
SUSTAINABLE
FOOD
PLANNING
CONFERENCE**

**19-22.06.2024
BRUSSELS
& GHENT**

**CONFERENCE
PROCEEDINGS**

with the support of FWO and AESOP4Food

Organization Team

Michiel Dehaene	Ghent University, Belgium
Elke Vanempten	ILVO-Flanders Research Institute for agriculture, fisheries and food & VUB-Cosmopolis Centre for Urban Research, Belgium
Alessandra Manganelli	HafenCity Universität Hamburg, Germany
Hans Vandermaelen	ILVO-Flanders Research Institute for agriculture, fisheries and food, Ghent University, Belgium & co-curator expo 'Gentse Gronden' at STAM, Ghent
Emma Bierens	Ghent University, Belgium
Glenn Willems	ILVO-Flanders Research Institute for agriculture, fisheries and food

Graphic design by Emma Bierens

11TH CONFERENCE

AESOP SUSTAINABLE

FOOD PLANNING

Conference Proceedings of the 11th AESOP Sustainable Food Planning Conference — 19-22 June, 2024 — Brussels & Ghent

This document is the collection of the papers as they have been submitted by the authors. All intellectual rights remain with the authors.

Papers are organized according to the paper session in which the paper was presented during the Conference.

This is the edition published online, after the conference took place. It can be accessed online via the DOI [10.5281/zenodo.12938367](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12938367)

— 28th of June, 2024

CONTENT TABLE

page **PAPER SESSION ROUND 1 — Title — Author(s)**

9 PAPER SESSION 1.A — PRODUCTIVE LANDSCAPES

10 Milan's agricultural districts: food landscape laboratories?

— Branduini Paola

20 Circular food initiatives and Continuous Productive Urban Landscapes - a critical reflection on the potential of circular initiatives for systemic change in city regions

— Viljoen Andre — Thapa Karki Shova

27 New Agricultural Parks regenerating city-region landscapes

— Lepkowski Maciej — Fanfani David — Nowysz Aleksandra — Simón Rojo Marian — Storie Joanna — Triboi Roxana — de Vries Jeroen

37 PAPER SESSION 1.B — AGROECOLOGICAL URBANISM

38 Urban rooftop farming in Brussels: an analysis from an agroecological point of view

— Dávila Francisco — De Brabandere Léna — Visser Marjolein

47 Agroecologies: Reassess Urbanization Through Agri-Urban Design

— Weichold Ivonne

56 Unlocking the agroecological potential of Lucanian farming and food practices

— Boniburini Ilaria — Romano Miriam — Gesualdi Ilaria — Mininni Mariavaleria

65 PAPER SESSION 1.C — URBAN AGRICULTURE PRACTICES

66 Agricultural practices in French prisons : towards better agro-ecological environments

— Sias Daniela — Giacchè Giulia — Aubry Christine

74 Towards a European Urban Agriculture Policy and Governance Framework. Sharing the Roman experience

— Hernandez Lelli Patricia — Luzzi Elisabetta — Bordi Claudio — De Grazia Giusy

81 The City's Low Hanging Fruits

— Vardi Neta Levran — Orenstein Daniel Eli

91 PAPER SESSION 1.D — FOOD MAPPING INITIATIVES

92 The University as a Critical Player of the Urban Food Policies. Towards a Food Atlas for the City of Trieste

— Rodani Valentina — Venturini Camilla

101 PAPER SESSION 1.E — INTERSECTIONALITY AND FOOD JUSTICE

102 Urban food governance's potential for a gender-just food transition: preliminary results from fieldwork in Milan and Barcelona

— Bergonzini Chiara

110 Intersectional Exploration for Food Justice Initiatives in France

— Lalliot Manon

119 Narratives of Change: more than individual intentions in the path to a sustainable and socially just food future

— Abrantes Patrícia — Zorell Carolin — Moreno Luís

131 PAPER SESSION 2.A — CITY REGION FOOD SYSTEMS

- 132 Global city goes local: State ambitions and societal undercurrents of food localization in Singapore**
— Soh Emily

- 141 Territories of urban-rural hybridisation in the agro-ecological transition. A spatial exploration of agro-ecology initiatives in Veneto plain**
— Marcon Alessandra — Tosi Maria Chiara

- 149 Strategizing regional food systems as pathways towards sustainability transitions: The case of Lisbon's Metropolitan Area**
— Oliveira Rosário — Mourato João — Truninger Monica — Garcia Távora Gabriel — Linares Ceballo Fernanda

- 157 The role of participative foresight in creating a sustainable food supply for the Brussels-Capital Region**
— De Schaepmeester Hannelore — Mathijs Erik

169 PAPER SESSION 2.B — MOVEMENT BUILDING ACROSS THE FOOD SYSTEM

- 170 Addressing the role and policy needs of Agroecology-Oriented Farmers Groups in transforming food systems**
— López-García Daniel — Carrascosa-García María

- 178 Tackling food poverty! Towards healthy, sustainable and socially just food environments through inclusive participation**
— Markoni Evelyn — Smaal Sara — Aeschlimann Lukas — Götze Franziska — Sefu Yassir — Veen Esther

187 PAPER SESSION 2.C — COMMUNITY GARDENING

- 188 Uneven Recognition: Community Gardens or Allotments?**
— Hasson Alban

- 196 Community gardens as a response to the contradictions of sustainable urban policy: Insights from the Swiss cities of Zurich and Lausanne**
— Jahrl Ingrid — Ejderyan Olivier — Salomon Cavin Joëlle

203 PAPER SESSION 2.D — DESIGN STRATEGIES FOR SUSTAINABLE FOODSCAPES

- 204 The Architecture of Sustainable University Foodscape. Design Strategies and Practices for re-shaping the Food-City Nexus**
— Basso Sara — Rodani Valentina

- 213 Gaps in urban food systems in Portugal: Lessons learned from 91 projects funded by national authorities**
— Archer Pratas João — Delgado Cecilia

221 PAPER SESSION 2.E — URBAN FOOD IN TIMES OF CRISIS

- 222 Transforming Food Systems in Lebanon: A Tale of Two Alternative Food Models in the Time of Crisis**
— Assaf Sherin — Farah Jihad — Yengue Jean Louis

231 PAPER SESSION 2.F — EXPERIMENTING WITH URBAN FOOD GOVERNANCE

- 232 The role of evaluation and learning in innovative food governance**
— Adlerova Barbora — Pitt Hannah

- 239 Navigating Governance Dynamics in Alternative Food Networks: A Case Study of 'La Ceinture Aliment-Terre Liégeoise' in Liège, Belgium**
— Longton Louise — Scholl Christian

- 248 The role of food movements in catalyzing Urban Food Policies. The Punto al Cibo network in Torino**
— Allegretti Veronica — Bruno Riccardo Giovanni — Dansero Egidio

255 PAPER SESSION 3.A — PUBLIC FARMLAND AND PUBLIC POLICY

256 Public urban agriculture equipment for sustainable food systems: the necessary mobilization of multiple public policies
— Saint-Ges Véronique — Jacobsohn Antoine

263 Roles of Local Governments in the Governance of Agricultural Land in France
— Perrin Coline — Leger-Bosch Christine — Martin-Prevel Alice — Dif Roxane

271 PAPER SESSION 3.B — STRATEGIES OF MOVEMENT BUILDING 242

272 Thinking through landscape frictions: unlocking the transformative power of permaculture projects
— Chakroun Leila

279 PAPER SESSION 3.D — URBAN FOOD ENVIRONMENTS

280 Food desert of alternative consumption spaces in European cities
— Karakaya Ayalp Emel — Fernández Casal Laura — Öztürk Sevim Pelin — Pinedo Gil Julia — Geçer Sargın Feral

287 PAPER SESSION 3.E — FOOD PROCUREMENT, REDISTRIBUTION AND WELFARE

288 Re-imagining foodspaces-welfare nexus across scales: building proximity networks
— Venturini Camilla — Basso Sara

296 Greening school meals: towards a public food system? Case studies from Normandy (France)
— Esnault Morgane

305 PAPER SESSION 3.F — ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

306 Navigating Urban Food Governance: Insights from Food Policy Councils in the United States
— Owen Maureen

315 Food system transformation pathways on hold. Why can local food policies get stuck?
— Vasile Maria — De Conno Arianna — Arcuri Sabrina

322 The Thematic Partnership on Food from Urban Agenda for the EU: Catalyzing Local Food System Transformation
— Triboi Roxana — Rotaru Irini — Păsărel Adina

331 PAPER SESSION 4.A — PERI-URBAN DYNAMICS

332 Proximity Agriculture in Underdeveloped Urban Areas: A Case Study in Matosinhos, Northern Portugal

— Antunes Heloisa Amaral — Martinho da Silva Isabel — Costa Sandra

341 PAPER SESSION 4.B — MOVING WITH THE FARMERS

342 Building food self-sufficiency from a territory of conflict

— Miglio Alessandra

349 Promoting Farmers' Innovation for Food Security and Agrobiodiversity

— Ghimire Saurav

358 How Farmers Disentangle from Convention and Develop Social and Ecological Objectives in Lincolnshire, UK

— Weinberg Yonatan

367 PAPER SESSION 4.C — FROM INFORMAL TO FORMAL URBAN AGRICULTURE

368 Reviving the educational garden – unfolding an ambiguous pathway for political recognition

— Carstensen Trine Agervig

377 Grey areas and green spaces: revealing the conflicts and gaps in the formalisation process of urban agriculture in Bogotá

— Manente Valentina — Caputo Silvio

387 PAPER SESSION 4.D — TRAINING AND POLICY LEARNING

388 New Actors in Food Governance. The Potential role of Museums and Ecomuseums

— Borrelli Nunzia — Koch Pamela — Azzarito Laura — Mura Giulia — Addis Ginevra

396 Raising urban planners' awareness for integration better food and agriculture-related measures into Climate Strategies and Plans – Lessons learned from the Portuguese campaign

— Delgado Cecília

403 PAPER SESSION 4.F — EXPERIMENTING FOR FOOD EQUITY

404 Traditional public markets: inclusive hubs for a just food systems

— Gonzalez Sara — Bridge Gemma

412 Urban Agriculture, Land, and Environmental Justice in San Diego, California

— Joassart-Marcelli Pascale

420 Post-Growth Metabolism: Rethinking Urban Planning and the role of Open Municipal Markets

— Carrasco Bonet Marta — Fava Nadia

LIST OF AUTHORS

A

Abrantes Patrícia 119
Addis Ginevra 388
Adlerova Barbora 232
Aeschlimann Lukas 178
Allegretti Veronica 248
Antunes Heloisa Amaral 332
Archer Pratas João 213
Arcuri Sabrina 315
Assaf Sherin 222
Aubry Christine 66
Azzarito Laura 388

B

Basso Sara 204, 288
Bergonzini Chiara 102
Boniburini Ilaria 56
Bordi Claudio 74
Borrelli Nunzia 388
Branduini Paola 10
Bridge Gemma 413
Bruno Riccardo Giovanni 248

C

Caputo Silvio 377
Carrasco Bonet Marta 429
Carrascosa-García María 170
Carstensen Trine Agervig 368
Chakroun Leila 272
Costa Sandra 332

D

Dansero Egidio 248
Dávila Francisco 38
De Brabandere Léna 38
De Conno Arianna 315
De Grazia Giusy 74
Delgado Cecilia 213
Delgado Cecília 396
De Schaepmeester Hannelore 157
de Vries Jeroen 27
Dif Roxane 263

E

Ejderyan Olivier 196
Esnaault Morgane 296

F

Fanfani David 27
Farah Jihad 222
Fava Nadia 429
Fernández Casal Laura 280

G

Garcia Távora Gabriel 149
Geçer Sargın Feral 280
Gesualdi Ilaria 56
Ghimire Saurav 349
Giacchè Giulia 66
Gonzalez Sara 413
Götze Franziska 178

H

Hasson Alban 188
Hernandez Lelli Patricia 74

J

Jacobsohn Antoine 256
Jahrl Ingrid 196
Joassart-Marcelli Pascale 421

K

Karakaya Ayalp Emel 280
Koch Pamela 388

L

Lalliot Manon 110
Leger-Bosch Christine 263
Łepkowski Maciej 27
Linares Ceballo Fernanda 149
Longton Louise 239
López-García Daniel 170
Luzzi Elisabetta 74

M

Manente Valentina 377
Marcon Alessandra 141
Markoni Evelyn 178
Martinho da Silva Isabel 332
Martin-Prevel Alice 263
Mathijs Erik 157
Miglio Alessandra 342
Mininni Mariavaleria 56
Moreno Luís 119
Mourato João 149
Mura Giulia 388

N

Nowysz Aleksandra 27

O

Oliveira Rosário 149
Orenstein Daniel Eli 81
Owen Maureen 306
Öztürk Sevim Pelin 280

P

Păsărel Adina 322
Perrin Coline 263
Pinedo Gil Julia 280
Pitt Hannah 232

R

Rodani Valentina 92, 204
Romano Miriam 56
Rotaru Irini 322

S

Saint-Ges Véronique 256
Salomon Cavin Joëlle 196
Scholl Christian 239
Sefu Yassir 178
Sias Daniela 66
Simón Rojo Marian 27
Smaal Sara 178
Soh Emily 132
Storie Joanna 27

T

Thapa Karki Shova 20
Tosi Maria Chiara 141
Triboi Roxana 27, 322
Truninger Monica 149

V

Vardi Neta Levran 81
Vasile Maria 315
Veen Esther 178
Venturini Camilla 92, 288
Viljoen Andre 20
Visser Marjolein 38

W

Weichold Ivonne 47
Weinberg Yonatan 358

Y

Yengue Jean Louis 222

Z

Zorell Carolin 119

Unlocking the agroecological potential of Lucanian farming and food practices

- **BONIBURINI Ilaria**
- **ROMANO Miriam**
- **GESUALDI Ilaria**
- **MININNI Mariavaleria**

Unlocking the agroecological potential of Lucanian farming and food practices

*Ilaria Boniburini**, *Miriam Romano***, *Ilaria Gesualdi**, *Mariavaleria Mininni**

*Università degli Studi della Basilicata, **Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro

ilaria.boniburini@unibas.it, miriam.romano@uniba.it, ilaria.gesualdi@unibas.it, mariavaleria.mininni@unibas.it

Our ongoing research involves the study, through a spatial, social and ethnographic approach, of selected local food production practices, which promote diverse alternatives to dominant food chains. It qualitatively assesses how these practices modify the physical territory and social relations, also analysing how the actors' behaviours and choices are induced by cultural factors. It aims to document and analyse these practices and identifies what enables or hampers transformations towards full agroecological and sustainable food systems in Basilicata. In return this analysis can enrich the intersection between agroecology and agroecology urbanism, towards an agroecology territorialism. This paper briefly outlines the reflections that led us to want to extend the visions of an agroecology urbanism to rural, inner and mountain areas. Being the research at an early stage, we focus on the methodology for mapping the agri-food practices and we close with some openings and ongoing research questions emerging from initial activities (exploratory interviews, visits and context analysis).

Keywords: agroecology, agroecology urbanism, territorialism, farm practices

Introduction

The sustainability of today's food systems, due to an increasingly well-documented series of interconnected negative impacts, is increasingly called into question. Industrial agriculture is one of the key drivers of the current crisis, but as Gliessman (2015, 1) says "it is also an arena of potential solutions". Agroecology emerges as an alternative paradigm to the corporate agri-food regime, to radically transform the structures that govern it - from food production systems to the socio-political and cultural systems through which humans conceive food and organise the way they eat in order to build a sustainable food system without increasing social or territorial inequality (Gliessman, 2015; de Molina, 2020). The evolution of agroecology and its application increasingly reveals its transdisciplinary nature by combining a science that emphasises the co-creation of knowledge; a set of practices that focus on the development of operational models using natural systems and processes; and a social movement that supports rural communities, food sovereignty, social justice and the preservation of local knowledge and culture (Wezel et al., 2020).

By bringing together political agroecology and urban food planning, Tornaghi and Dehaene (2021) argue for an alternative form of urbanisation and urban planning, non-extractive and regenerative, called "agroecology urbanism" which deeply embrace equitable sustainable food production. A radical reconfiguration through which a post-capitalist imaginary can emerge, capable of transforming the spatial relations, economic values, and planning processes of capitalist urbanisms (Dehaene and Tornaghi, 2021). Based on these assumptions, we have embarked on a research project that starts by mapping and reflecting on a series of agri-food production practices in various settlement areas in Basilicata, which promote alternative forms of food production, processing, and distribution, operating mainly outside the logic of large-scale distribution. These practices are based on organic agriculture, traditional cultivars, social ethics, environmental sustainability, and animal welfare representing either old practices resisting transformations (i.e. transhumance), traditional farming with a contemporary twist or new endeavours, generally by young farmers. Although the peasant production model (van der Ploeg, 2008) has not been completely overtaken by capitalist agriculture, the agricultural landscape of lowlands has been nevertheless transformed by intensive production.

This research, still in its early stages, is at the intersection of different paths, experiences (including practical and activist ones) and projects including the Matera Food Atlas. We decided to collaborate in documenting and systematically analysing the agri-food practices each of us is exploring. Additionally, we aim to examine the intersection of food planning and agroecological urbanism in a regional context classified as rural. The programmatic intent is to move beyond the city-countryside dichotomy and envision an agroecological re-

territorialization that views the settlement system as a cohesive whole. Contemporary rurality calls for complexity and settlements (understood as the set of physical artefacts, territorial endowments and human and inter-species relations that develop in a given place to allow human habitation) in Basilicata cannot be strictly divided into rural or urban. Involving farmers, with the valorisation of their empirical knowledge and social networks, can allow for a generative encounter of practices and knowledge, concretising the idea of a renewed relationship, both social and spatial, between city and countryside, between 'those who grow food' and those who 'consume food'.

We ask ourselves: What strategies are implemented by these practices to contribute to agroecology? What kinds of social and spatial relationships, networks, and identities emerge? What factors facilitate/hinder the adoption of an agroecological approach in Basilicata? What insights can we gain to guide agroecology urbanism and territorialism? [fig.1] Title_Arial 10 pt. Please notice that we're using "AESOP2024_caption" character style. Provide a caption, and short description if needed. Source: if the image is a personal drawing, use "elaborated by the author". If you used some data, add ", from" and write data sources you used.

Overview of the Basilicata region

Basilicata (also called Lucania), is a region in the South of Italy, it covers about 10,000 km² and is predominantly mountainous (46.8%) and hilly (45.2%), with modest flat areas (8%) in the river valleys and south-eastern coastal plain. The population density is about 55 in/km² and the region is predominantly rural. Its morphology makes it a land with an infrastructure deficit but with a great endowment of natural and environmental resources; a land with a dramatic demographic decrease and a weak urban framework made up of 80% mountain centres with fewer than 5,000 inhabitants and only two urban poles, Matera and Potenza.

The regional economy shows a marked specialisation in the agricultural sector which absorbs 10.1% of the workforce, compared to a national average of 3.6 per cent (2023). The contemporary structure of Lucania's agricultural landscape sees a prevalence of arable crops, followed by agrarian woody crops and permanent grassland. A significant fact is that organic farming accounts for about 22% of the Utilised Agricultural Area (2022). In recent years, the sector has been growing, especially thanks to the recognition of 19 PDO and PGI products and the emergence of forms of food and wine tourism.

The Lucanian agrarian landscape, formerly characterised by small peasant properties with promiscuous and diversified crops grafted between large feudal properties, underwent a radical transformation from the 19th century onwards, culminating in 1950 with the launch of the Agrarian Reform. It changed the land order in favour of small and medium-sized properties and restructured the territory by creating infrastructures, networks and different types of new rural settlements, with the aim of improving peasant living conditions and promoting regional economic development. This new territorial model placed Basilicata at the centre of numerous sociological, anthropological and urban studies, because it was a symbol of the peasant world with which modernity was unable to deal.

The analysis of statistical data reveals a fragile economic and agro-production system when compared to the national and European context. However, explorations of the territory reveal the existence of a complex heritage of knowledge and practices, which over the centuries have been perfected in relation to changes in the living environment.

Concerning agroecological experiences in Basilicata, three initiatives are of interest. The AgroforSyLL (Ciaccia et al., 2021), implemented in the Metapontino area - an interactive laboratory based on the introduction of diversified agroforestry systems, which involves organic farmers, research centres and other actors in an action-research process. The Agro-ecological District of Murge and Bradano, between Apulia and Basilicata - a recently established network of farms, organisations, and citizens that aims to define a new agro-ecological territorial management model, based on sustainability and participation. The Community of Food and Biodiversity of the Pollino Lagonegrese, the first of its kind in Italy, which aims to protect and enhance agri-food biodiversity, traditional local culture and the rural landscape and to halt depopulation trends.

Towards an agroecology territorialism

Agroecology urbanism advances an imaginary for a world that is not organised according to the urban-rural dichotomy, that is not the formal translation of the political economy of capitalist urbanisation, and that leads to decolonising the field of urbanism (Dehaene and Tornaghi 2021). These assumptions oblige us to extend these reflections to rural territories. The urban-rural divide has dominated for a long time and reflects the inability to conceive the two dimensions as part of the same issue. A crack in perspective arrived in the second half of the last century, with the decline of the factory-city model, which triggered processes of economic and spatial transformations that also involved the rural dimension. The advance of capitalism incorporates and transforms local production systems in a systemic logic that proceeds along two trajectories: re-agrarianisation and de-agrarianisation (Uleri et al., 2023).

The former mainly affects the fertile plains (in Basilicata the Metapontino area), introducing new production techniques, practices and technologies, sweeping away traditional agrarian systems and biodiversity. The aim was to stimulate the economy of scale, specialisation, and integration with the system of processing and large-scale agro-industrial distribution. It sees an increased flow of human and economic resources to agriculture, vertically controlled and unevenly accessed and distributed (ibid.). The latter mainly affects mountainous and inner areas, and is characterised by an outflow of resources towards non-agricultural activities and non-rural areas. This is the case of the abandonment of pastures, mountain agriculture, and small villages in the face of the growth of lowland industrial poles or the conversion of peri-urban agricultural land to support urban expansion. In the case of Basilicata, these dynamics translate into a progressive contraction of villages in favour of the two main cities.

These processes of marginalisation are only relatively dependent on absolute physical or territorial disadvantages, but rather on the effects of a development model centred on plains, growth, resource exploitation, industrialisation, specialisation, standardisation of the production process, and centralisation of functions and powers. Escobar (2002) recognises a fundamental role for planning, and more specifically town planning and the science of urbanism in bringing the Fordist order to fruition. Both the liberal-capitalist and anti-capitalist traditions have interpreted development in positive terms, questioning rather how to plan the economic and social growth of a given territory or community. Even in the reformist version of democratic urbanism, which has historically assumed the goal of rebalancing between the productive factors of capital and the reproductive factors of labour force by redistributing profit through services on the territory, the 'territory of the inhabitants' does not appear (Magnaghi, 2017). This planning model impacts on the material and immaterial deterritorialisation of places, and the expropriation of people from the possibility of controlling processes and resources fundamental to their lives, such as the allocation of food. As Escobar (2002, 146) argues that "the practice of planning inevitably requires the normalisation and standardisation of reality, which in turn entails injustice and the erasure of difference and diversity". In its most widespread manifestations, it has denied the integration of different functionalities, led to the separation of production and consumption, and obscured the possibility of alternative trajectories of emancipation.

The developed territories are thus contrasted with the underdeveloped ones, identified with the Global South, Southern Italy, rural areas, inner areas, and mountains not associated with winter tourism, which become the object of planning to bridge the gap. In Italy, this process of marginalisation, rediscovery and new development is well exemplified by both inner and mountain areas. These two 'categories' are not only two realities that do not coincide geographically, but are two concepts that come from different schools of thought (Dematteis, 2014). When referring to mountain areas, we exclude the Alps gentrified by winter sports, and the mountain-city. Hills and mountains have been the protagonists for centuries of a plural and variegated territorial evolution. While in pre-industrial times a relative self-sufficiency of these areas was accompanied by a certain dependence of the city on them (for mining, agro-forestry and energy resources), this relationship was later reversed. With the enlargement of markets (for materials, energy, labour), cities become increasingly independent from their hinterlands,

while the latter increase their dependence on cities, especially in terms of services, investments and employment (Dematteis, 2014).

In recent times, rural space, as well as inner and mountain areas, started to be perceived differently, beyond their capacity to satisfy the cities' demand for primary consumption, and become places for the production of sophisticated goods. They are praised for their specific resources (preserved more than in other contexts), their capacity to produce diversity, to offer agri-food assets, settlement structures, water quality, energy, biodiversity, culture and positive externalities. While looking with renewed interest at these areas, both the dominant economy and planning do so primarily in function of the city: as a place of entertainment and economic opportunity (celebrating the 'vocation' of tourism and local products); as an uncontaminated place and reserve of resources to be preserved for the consumption of an impoverished urban territory (exalting its ecosystem services); as a counterbalance to the urban and the loss of a rural tradition (glorifying abandoned villages, making them museums or places of entertainment), struggling instead to recognise a political and cultural value to the human presence on highlands (Varotto, 2020). Recently, Another need has emerged, that of energy, which involves both agricultural production and rural areas: from biomass directed to the production of biofuels or biogas, to the presence of wind turbines and ground-based photovoltaics. Beyond the economic benefits, these structures influence the land use and modify agrarian settings which in turn can generate forms of socio-environmental injustice with respect to the agricultural world and rural contexts (Scotti, 2024).

Nevertheless, in this panorama, emerge approaches that recognise the need to recover the heritage of traditional agronomic techniques, the peasant wisdom and local cultural legacies. The multifunctional approach of the primary sector becomes the new frontier of rural development, referring to the intention to broaden the range of goods and services offered, including non-agricultural activities, in order to vary income sources. The Italian strategy of farm diversification (especially with agritourism) seems not only to have anticipated the new European Green Deal strategy, but by integrating agricultural practices with ethical and social aspects through the involvement of farmers and local communities, it seems to act as a precursor to agroecology (Gargano et al., 2021). The district approach for planning local agri-food systems is also emerging, responding to the need for place-based development policies, based on establishing strong cooperative relationships among geographically close areas, involving different actors in order to retain and expand local added values.

For our reflection, appears useful to explore the 'ecoterritorialist' approach, which contrasts hierarchical centre-periphery relationships by proposing bioregional models capable of respecting and regenerating the ecological ecosystem and hydro-geo-morphological balances of settlements; physically, functionally and symbolically reconnecting urban spaces to the surrounding environmental systems and agro-forestry territories; defining a new idea of solidarity-based and non-hierarchical urbanity, promoting local communities and forms of self-government of production based on the care and reproduction of territorial heritages (Magnaghi and Marzocca, 2023). The complexity of the concept of the (urban) bioregion, as proposed by the territorialist school in relation to food systems that is still in evolution, appears more inclusive than the reductive ways in which it has been considered by City-Region Food System theorists, and by the many processes of building local and urban food policies (Dansero and Dematteis, 2023). What emerges from the intersection of food planning and ecoterritorialism is the identification of the agri-food basin scale (foodshed) as the most appropriate, defined not so much by administrative boundaries as by bioregional ones. New concepts are thus emerging, such as that of agro-ecological territorial systems based on new principles. The farms and the farmers become the territorial garrisons of the principles of care and regeneration of patrimonial resources and the privileged sphere of profound ecological innovation (Bocchi, 2023) in tune with van der Ploeg's (2008) rural development approach.

Research design for mapping/documenting farming practices

The perspective of farmers and farming communities, who choose to include or reject new standards of practice within their farming system, plays a crucial role in achieving the goals of

agroecological transition (de Molina et al., 2020; Barnes, Thompson and Toma, 2022) This is why we choose to give farmers a central role and use the interview and participant observation as point of departure. Starting from the principles of agroecology (Gliessman, 2015; FAO; HLPE, 2019), we have developed an analytical framework to explore agricultural practices, understood as one of the main manifestations of agroecology (Wezel et al., 2020), which “aims to analyse the full picture of an agricultural system, with all its complexity and interactions, and to do so in a way that does not alienate the farmer's own knowledge system” (Peeters, 2021). In order to carry out this type of analysis, it is important to recognise the heterogeneity of practices and the groups of farmers who implement them, and to ask how personal choices and attitudes, as well as current institutional factors, direct the adoption or non-adoption of ecological practices (Barnes et al., 2022). Simplifying, we can say that farming practices depend on the interaction between internal and external factors.

In order to identify the agroecological potential, the internal factors within the farm itself (see Figure 1) - such as the farmer's choices and inclinations, background, and identity, are first investigated. Considering the farm as the result of the coexistence and interaction of multiple components, its Production and metabolic system, Economic structure and marketing behaviour, Space and territory, Cultural aspects, identity and lifestyle and Socio-political aspects are analysed as constituent parts of the farm itself.

Each of these components represents a set of various topics that may concern, for example, management, production, places and the actors that collaborate in the life of a company. For this, subgroups have been identified, each of them referring to a specific topic, into which the component is broken down. For example, the component of Socio-political aspects manifests itself through the topics of Cooperation & networking, Goods and activities outside market relations and working habits & conditions. Agroecology has a holistic approach for agricultural improvement in the sense of both food quality, territories, and the lives of people and animals. Not only crops practices, but also livestock plays a crucial role in food systems. This is reflected in the livestock' component, also for investigating transhumant breeding practices, which play an important role in Basilicata.

Each topic, in turn, groups a series of criteria that represent the concrete expression of the theoretical principles of agroecology and can be used as a yardstick to evaluate the strategies implemented by the farm analysed. For example, in the component of the Economic structure and marketing behaviour, regarding the topic of Economic activities and revenue, one of the criteria is the High level of diversification of products and activities, coinciding with the agro-ecological principle of ‘diversity’ or ‘economic diversification’ (HLPE, 2019). Based on this breakdown and reorganisation of the principles, it was possible to identify issues to be observed and submitted to farmers. The farm analysis is flanked by a deep context analysis, at different scales (macro, meso and micro), as it plays a fundamental role in determining the choices and the way farmers behave. The context is articulated in 4 topics: Territory and human settlements, socio-economic, historical and political, cultural and knowledge, and then further articulated into criteria.

The spatial dimension is a central field of investigation in our analysis for the way it produces and modifies territories and communities. This close link with spatial design is confirmed by the example of permaculture in which the space component is particularly prominent and can be examined to articulate the close connection between agroecology and territorialism.

Therefore, the Space & Territory component is included in the research framework with the aim of examining aspects relating to the relationship between landscape form, land use and present architecture. The criteria deriving from these topics will make it possible to evaluate how the configuration of the landscape itself influences agriculture and, vice versa; how land use characterises the landscape; how practices allow the preservation, modification or even cancellation of local landscape features; the position and reciprocal relationship between the farmer's house and agricultural structures; the choice of site-responsive architectural solutions, the use of local materials and construction techniques, as well as the use of ecological architecture solutions.

The selection of farming practices was based on the identification of organic or ecological practices in Basilicata as they resonate with agroecology. Subsequently it was decided to make

a selection by taking into consideration: i) the landscape of belonging, with specific geomorphologic and pedoclimatic characteristics, in order to analyse the variability of practices in relation to environmental and settlements characteristics; ii) the type of production, giving preference to farms with diversified production structures specialised in local crops (official plants, traditional cultivars, etc.), and farms that practise sustainable livestock breeding; iii) the type of farm/livestock management, including family farming, cooperative structures, young farmers and women farmers, who often introduce innovative and sustainable practices; iv) membership in alternative food networks, networks that promote responsible and sustainable consumption or that valorise local production and biodiversity (Food and Agroecological Districts and Communities) and in democratic and participatory innovation spaces (Living Labs).

In short, our selection of agricultural and livestock farming practices, guided by geographical, productive and social diversity, aims to build a mosaic of experiences that helps us understand the complexity and adaptability of agroecological production.

COMPONENTS	TOPICS	CRITERIA
PRODUCTION AND METABOLIC SYSTEM	Agriproduction - predominantly crops	Systemic and regenerative approach adopted; Use of local/adapted seeds & plants; Organic and/or certified practices; Use of regenerative cultivation techniques; Crop diversity; Cultivation of ancient, forgotten and local seeds; Conservative harvesting techniques; Seed harvesting and plant breeding; Integrated livestock farming system
	Agriproduction - predominantly livestock	Diversity of animal species and breeds; Reduction in the use of concentrated feed; Animal welfare; Good animal-person relations; Collaborative ethology; Variety of animal species and breeds; Local and semi-breeds; Maximum use of grazing resources - foraging chain; No use of concentrated feed and maximum use of proteins from fodder; Integrated pasture management (grazing plan, rotational grazing); Integrated forage; Fodder and forage management; Homogeneity and phytotherapy instead of conventional drugs; Animal welfare; Good animal-person relations; Conservative ethology; Recovery of marginal seeds and plants
	Natural resources conservation and waste management	Use of conservative soil work; On-farm composting methods and soil fertility practices; High level of addition of agrodiversity; Rainwater recovery; Fodder use optimisation practices; Use of renewable energy; Low waste production; Greater use of bio-based materials
ECONOMIC STRUCTURE AND MARKETING BEHAVIOUR	Economic activities and revenues	High level of diversification of products and activities; Short processing chain; Proportion of self-produced products; Maximisation of variable costs; Subsidies and incentives; Maximisation of on-farm income; Proportion of direct sales; Marketing others
	Advertising & certification	Product calculation practices; Contact with customers; Product certification
SPACE AND TERRITORY	Landscape	Landscape form and function; Agricultural ecosystems with diversified elements; Conservation of local landscape character
	Sites & buildings	Geographical location and proximity to farm; Ecological and social related architecture (housing and farm)
CULTURAL ASPECTS, IDENTITY & LIFESTYLE	Food and diet	Use of self-produced food; Sources of purchased food; Food harvest; Traditional recipes and methods
	Artisan practices	Selection of traditional food; Other self-products; Crafted products
	Ethical principles	Environmental; Consumption
	Experiences	Level and kind of education; Training courses
	Satisfaction and quality of life	On-farm working environment; Sufficient time for knowledge and new skills; Sufficient time for family friends; Satisfaction with economic benefits from farming activities; Other benefits compared to other occupations
SOCIO-POLITICAL ASPECTS	Cooperation & networking	Agricultural associations and consensus memberships; Involvement with food sovereignty; Local or environmental movements; Involvement with local non-profit associations activities (cultural or social); Organisation of non-profit socio-cultural and educational activities in the farm; Relationships with other farming communities; Relationships with the urban world
	Working habits & conditions	Family labour share; Available time labour share; Off-farm income; Provision of sustainable services; Human and safe working environment; Fair wages; Job stability and social protection
	Goods and activities outside market relations	Involvement of family members and friends in specific activities; Exchange of goods outside markets

Figure 1: Analytical framework (farms internal components)

Openings

The research, at its beginning, intends to open a perspective of investigation on an inner rural reality that has been looked in for too long with the risk of the rhetoric of peasant nobility or path dependence, indicating the constraint of a past socio-economic model that prevents and prejudices any subsequent and future choices. If on the one hand "history matters", and that we must look carefully at historical factors, on the other it is not certain that this path will perpetuate fatalistically without the possibility of changing course (Donolo, 2011). The critical study through the lenses of agro ecology of agricultural processes, farmers and the food production system could introduce destabilising factors of a hard-to-die stigma to think that the future depends only on us.

Bibliography

- Barnes, A.P., Thompson, B. and Toma, L. (2022) 'Finding the ecological farmer: A farmer typology to understand ecological practice adoption within Europe,' *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability*, 4, p. 100125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crsust.2022.100125>.
- Bocchi (2023) 'L'agro-ecologia come supporto fondativo dell'eco-territorialismo', In *Ecoterritorialismo*. Firenze University Press, pp. 75-86.
- Ciaccia, C. *et al.* (2021) 'Organic Agroforestry Long-Term Field Experiment Designing Trough Actors' Knowledge towards Food System Sustainability,' *Sustainability*, 13(10).
- Dansero, E. and Dematteis, G. (2023) 'Gli apporti della geografia alla definizione operativa dell'eco-territorialismo. Tra storie disciplinari e geografie indisciplinate del cibo,' in *Territori*, pp. 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.36253/979-12-215-0116-2.08>.
- De Molina, *et al.* (2020) *Political Agroecology: Advancing the Transition to Sustainable Food Systems*. CRC Press.
- Dematteis, G. (2014) 'Montagna, città e aree interne in Italia: una sfida per le politiche pubbliche 10.4458/4526-01,' *Documenti Geografici*, (2).
- Donolo, C. (2011) *Italia sperduta – La sindrome del declino e le chiavi per uscirne*, Donzelli.
- Escobar A. (2010) 'Planning', in Sachs, W. (Ed) *The Development Dictionary*. Second edition. Zed books, pp. 145-160.
- Gargano, G. *et al.* (2021) 'The Agroecological Approach as a Model for Multifunctional Agriculture and Farming towards the European Green Deal 2030—Some Evidence from the Italian Experience,' *Sustainability*, 13(4), p. 2215. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042215>.
- Gliessman, S. (2014). *Agroecology. The Ecology of Sustainable Food Systems* (Third edition). New York: CRC Press.
- HLPE (2019) *Agroecological and other innovative approaches for sustainable agriculture and food systems that enhance food security and nutrition*. A report by HLPE, Rome.
- Magnaghi A. (2017) 'Le fondamenta di un'utopia concreta', in *La coscienza di luogo nel recente pensiero di Giacomo Becattini*, Firenze University Press, pp. 1-15.
- Magnaghi, A., Marzocca, O., (2023) Una costellazione di saperi per l'autogoverno e la cura dei luoghi come beni comuni. In *Ecoterritorialismo*. Firenze University Press, pp. VIII-XIII.
- Peeters A., Škorjanc K., Wezel A. and Migliorini P. (2021) *OASIS, the Original Agroecological Survey Indicator System. A simple and comprehensive system for agroecological transition assessment*. Agroecology Europe, Brussels: 82 pages.
- van der Ploeg, JD (2009) *The New Peasantries, struggles for autonomy and sustainability in an era of empire and globalization*. Earthscan.
- Scotti I. (2024) 'Elettricità agricola: l'agrivoltaico nella prospettiva sociologica', in *Energia e mutamento sociale*. Franco Angeli.
- Tornaghi, C. and Dehaene, M. (2021) *Resourcing an agroecological urbanism: Political, Transformational and Territorial Dimensions*. Routledge. pp. 1-11.
- Uleri, F., Meloni, B., Piccoli, A., and Elsen, S. (2023). Aree Interne tra Deagrarizzazione e Riagrarizzazione: Giovani Agricoltori e Meccanismi di Ritorno all' "Osso" in Centro Sardegna. *Fuori Luogo Journal of Sociology of Territory, Tourism, Technology*, 17(4), 171-188.
- Varotto, M. (2020) *Montagne di mezzo*. Giulio Einaudi Editore.
- Wezel, A. *et al.* (2020) 'Agroecological principles and elements and their implications for transitioning to sustainable food systems. A review,' *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 40(6).

Appendix A

Food system actors	Label used in the papers	# papers
Pre-farming input supply	<i>Agrobusiness (input)</i>	1
Farming	<i>Farmer, urban farmer, organic farmer, grower, farmer-processing, farmer association, production</i>	8
Process	<i>Food processor, food business, farmer-processing</i>	7
Wholesale	<i>Wholesale supermarket</i>	1
Retail	<i>Retail, online grocery store, retail chain, farmer market, cooperative</i>	8
Food services & eateries	<i>Consumption, chef/bakery, kitchen/catering social enterprise</i>	2
Individual citizens (eaters)	<i>Citizen-consumer, community member, community gardeners, engaged citizens</i>	10
Waste	<i>Waste management, international waste management company</i>	2
Logistics	<i>Transportation authority, distribution, alternative distribution</i>	3
Natural environment	<i>Nature-based ecosystem services,</i>	1
Other	<i>Urban food initiatives, alternative food networks, farmer-consumer cooperative, online meeting platform</i>	10
Operational services	<i>Nutritionist, food consultancy, public health, mental health, design studio, landscape architect, product designer, housing corporation</i>	10
Education, training, awareness raising	<i>Education, vocational training, students, nature and environment education</i>	6
Business interests & professional corporations	<i>Business interests, entrepreneur, small and medium enterprises, local entrepreneur</i>	7
Non-profit, voluntary and community groups	<i>Community centres, social welfare organisation, civil society, not-for-profit enterprises, NGO, charity, community foundation, development agencies</i>	17
Research	<i>University, researcher, academia</i>	13
Governance and regulations	<i>Municipality, city official, local government, regional government, federal administration, government department, international agencies</i>	18
Finance, Investments and insurance	<i>Bank, trading corporation, resources for entrepreneurs</i>	2
Marketing and advertising		0
Media & culture	<i>Filmmaker, tourism, religious organisation, library employees, food writer, journalist</i>	5
Individual citizens (values)	<i>Citizen-consumer, community member, community gardeners, engaged citizens, local action group, activism</i>	11

Table A1: Overview of participating actors in the food system, according to Reckinger's (2022) classification (column 1), as described in the examined papers (column 2), along with the corresponding number of papers that include those participants (column 3). The gray shaded part encompasses the core food supply actors.

Appendix B

Papers	References in Harvard style
paper 1	Black, D. <i>et al.</i> (2023) 'Testing Food Waste Reduction Targets: Integrating Transition Scenarios with Macro-Valuation in an Urban Living Lab', <i>SUSTAINABILITY</i> , 15(7). Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/su15076004 .
paper 2	Heitlinger, S. <i>et al.</i> (2019) 'Co-creating "smart" sustainable food futures with urban food growers', in. <i>ACM International Conference Proceeding Series</i> , pp. 114–120. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1145/3328320.3328399 .
paper 3	Newell, R., Picketts, I. and Dale, A. (2020) 'Community systems models and development scenarios for integrated planning: Lessons learned from a participatory approach', <i>Community Development</i> , 51(3), pp. 261–282. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2020.1772334 .
paper 4	Arciniegas, G. <i>et al.</i> (2022) 'A participatory tool for assessing land footprint in city-region food systems-A case study from Metropolitan Copenhagen', <i>FRONTIERS IN SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS</i> , 6. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.846869 .
paper 5	Brons, A. <i>et al.</i> (2022) 'A tale of two labs: Rethinking urban living labs for advancing citizen engagement in food system transformations', <i>Cities</i> , 123. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103552 .
paper 6	Dankel, D.J. <i>et al.</i> (2020) 'The Melting Snowball Effect: A Heuristic for Sustainable Arctic Governance Under Climate Change', <i>Frontiers in Marine Science</i> , 7, p. 537. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00537 .
paper 7	Sellberg, M.M. <i>et al.</i> (2020) 'Using local initiatives to envision sustainable and resilient food systems in the Stockholm city-region', <i>Global Food Security</i> , 24, p. 100334. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.100334 .
paper 8	Adeosun, K.P., Greene, M. and Oosterveer, P. (2023) 'Practitioners' perspectives on improving ready-to-eat food vending in urban Nigeria: a practice-based visioning and back-casting approach', <i>Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems</i> , 7. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1160156 .
paper 9	Hodbod, J. <i>et al.</i> (2024) 'From Theory to Transdisciplinary Practice: Community-Based Resilience Visioning in Urban Agriculture', <i>Society and Natural Resources</i> , 37(1), pp. 143–167. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2023.2228264 .
paper 10	Stafseng, V.E., Nicolaysen, A.M. and Lieblein, G. (2024) 'Key Characteristics of Co-produced Urban Agriculture Visions in Oslo', in <i>GeoJournal Library</i> , pp. 175–198. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-41550-0_8 .
paper 11	Manderscheid, M. <i>et al.</i> (2022) 'Let's Do It Online?! Challenges and Lessons for Inclusive Virtual Participation', <i>Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems</i> , 6. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.732943 .
paper 12	Lardon, S. <i>et al.</i> (2016) 'Participative prospective in the Pisa urban area (Italy): Water and food production as issues for territorial development', <i>Cahiers de Geographie du Quebec</i> , 60(170), pp. 265–286. Available at: https://doi.org/10.7202/1040535ar .
paper 13	Dijkshoorn-Dekker, M. <i>et al.</i> (2020) 'Food secure metropolitan areas: The transition support system approach', <i>Sustainability (Switzerland)</i> , 12(13). Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135376 .
paper 14	Cox, V. <i>et al.</i> (2014) 'Beyond Design and Participation: The "Thought for Food" Project in Flanders, Belgium', <i>Journal of Urban Design</i> , 19(4), pp. 412–435. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2014.923742 .
paper 15	Wentworth, C. <i>et al.</i> (no date) 'SCENARIOS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE FLINT FOOD SYSTEM: VISIONS FOR 2042'.
paper 16	Sakai, P. <i>et al.</i> (2020) 'Growing a resilient food system in Leeds'. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5518/100/62 .

paper 17	Smith, K. (2022) 'Fair Food Futures. Future scenarios for Food Justice and Zero Hunger in Australia: A synthesis for policy action'.
paper 18	<i>Report Dhaka Systems project</i> . Wageningen: Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation. Available at: https://doi.org/10.18174/573275 .
paper 19	Fiala, V. and Jacob, K. (2024) 'Combining the multi-level perspective framework with participatory scenario development to explore the many facets of food system transitions in Germany', <i>Sustainability Science</i> [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-024-01505-6 .

Table B1: List of papers in corpus.

