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Abstract

The aim of this chapter is to present the first results of interdisciplinary research that aims at understanding whether Turin has the assets and skills to build and manage a local food system, following a territorial approach. This analysis goes beyond a previous step of deconstructing the relationships between the “smart city” discourse and food policies and practices, which were presented in 2013 at the Fifth AESOP Conference on Sustainable Food Planning, in Montpellier, France (Dansero, Barbera, and Toldo 2013).

In the first step of the research, presented here, ongoing food-related practices and processes in the Turin metropolitan area are interpreted through the conceptual framework of resilience.

Introduction

Urban food planning (Morgan 2009, 2013) has a very different meaning in Italy than in other countries such as the USA or the U.K., where it plays an important role within urban policies. This derives partly from a delay in policy makers’ attention to food policies, partly from the peculiarities of food systems in Italy, based on strict relationships between food, culture, and territories, which—even if currently weakened—still have not been totally broken by globalization and the de-territorialization of food.
In this background, only a few cities (Pisa and Palermo, for example) have so far produced food plans or structured sets of food policies (Di Iacovo, Brunori, and Innocenti 2013). In the last few years, however, awareness has increased among policy makers and experts of the need to develop food policies that are integrated in urban planning and strategies. Among Italian cities, in Turin this awareness seems to be greater than elsewhere, as demonstrated by several projects and practices concerning the chain of food production and consumption.

The aim of this chapter is to present the first results of the work of our interdisciplinary research group from the University of Turin, working in co-operation with other universities and with local and national policy makers on various issues related to food and its relationships with the city.

The first objective of the research is to map the food system of Turin on a metropolitan scale. Even if the newly established “città metropolitana” of Turin has inherited its boundaries from the former “provincia”, we are aware that predetermining the scale of the food system would be a methodological mistake. In fact it will presumably emerge, by the process of mapping itself, as a complex topological networked and discontinuous space, rather than as an “institutional” scale. This mapping, which involves various stakeholders from local authorities to experts to the local university students with projects of participatory cartography, is considered the first step toward the development of a knowledge and methodological framework useful to address the development of food policies for the metropolitan area.

The approach of the research is a territorial one, based on the idea that eating is a territorial act—re-interpreting Wendell Berry’s famous aphorism “eating is an agricultural act” (Berry 1990)—which could be considered particularly apt for explaining and analyzing the new geographies of food (Wiskerke 2009)—characterized by a re-territorialization of food practices (Morgan, Marsden, and Murdoch 2006).

The first step of the mapping, presented in this chapter, concerns those spontaneous and institutional projects and practices relating food and the city in its territorial dimension. The mapped practices are then interpreted and evaluated through the conceptual tool of resilience, often evoked in the discourse on food planning as one of the fundamental features of “good” food systems (Burton et al. 2013).
The first section of this chapter explains how food systems can be studied and planned, moving from a territorial approach based on the analytical categories of space, resources, relations and scale. The second section relates this approach to the notion of resilience, applying it to urban food systems. In the last section, then, we present the results of the first step of the mapping of the food practices described above, interpreted through the theoretical framework of resilience.

**A Territorial Approach to Food Systems**

A famous aphorism of the American novelist and environmental activist Wendell Berry states, “Eating is an agricultural act” (Berry 1990). We could easily add, “Eating is a territorial act.” Talking about food and food systems is actually talking about territorialities and territories. Food production is one of the most dominant factors that shape landscapes (most cultural landscapes are foodscape) and relationships between people and environment. Many scholars identify the ability of ancient societies to produce a food surplus as the key to their political power, up until the present day (Diamond 1997).

One of the most common and clear descriptions of what transformed food chains in the last few decades is that the agro-industrial globalized food system progressively de-territorialized food production, which then became part of the international commodities networks (Morgan, Marsden, and Murdoch 2006). This new food geography has its spatial organization, territoriality, and landscape, but it broke the traditional relationship between local food production and local food consumption. We still have “local food systems”, but they are no longer systems of (mainly) local food. The trends that brought us to the so-called New Food Equation (Morgan and Sonnino 2010)—food price surges, food insecurity at various scales, climate change, urban sprawl, land grabbing, and so on—disclosed the unsustainability (and un-resilience) of the contemporary global food system, from the agro-industrial production chains to the consumption practices that they induce.

Besides the globalization and de-territorialization of the food system, however, practices of local food chains endured, sometimes due to the strength of the traditional way of life on a local scale, sometimes to the explicit strategies of resistance by those who consider food production and consumption as crucial parts of a political view, based on environmental protection, community empowerment, and spatial justice. In the Italian
debate, for example, food chains are often considered to be one of the main fields of a “territorialist” approach to spatial planning, based on the increasing responsibilities of local communities for the care of land, environment, and heritage (Magnagni 2012). More generally, in the last few years new geographies of food are widely seen (Gatrell, Reid, and Ross 2011), often concerning the re-territorialization of food systems, as both the result of spontaneous practices and as the objective of food strategies aimed at facing the emerging uncertainty, injustice, and unsustainability of a system where food is only considered as a global commodity (Morgan, Marsden, and Murdoch 2006), as well as the consequence of a shift in consumers’ attention to the quality of food (Ilbery and Kneafsey 1998). Some authors talk about a re-localization of the system (Feagan 2007), as though it could be read as a simple shrinking of the food chain, while re-territorialization is something wider, which could involve a cultural or value proximity as well as a spatial one.

The city is probably the place where the evolution of food geographies is seen most clearly. The post-Fordist city, based on the service industry, became the place of consumption, where the other phases of the food chain almost disappeared. Most urban dwellers are ignorant of where their food comes from, how it is produced, and where their food waste goes and is processed. Until a decade ago, the food system had a very low visibility for urban policy makers and residents (Pothukuchi and Kaufman 2000); however, it has always been a key factor in the city’s metabolic flows.

From this short overview, the double nature of the concept of territorialization applied to food systems is clear. On the one hand, it has an analytical meaning related to the understanding of how the system can be territorialized; on the other hand, the meaning is prescriptive, considering a territorialized system as a good thing, for which to aim. In order to outline the conceptual framework we move in, it could be useful to recall some key concepts related to the notion of territory and territorialization, crucial for the geographical debate in countries like France and Italy, but only recently considered in the Anglo-Saxon debate (Klauser 2012).

The territorial approach may be used as the background for considering, understanding, and analyzing the connections between the multiple dimensions of food networks, their spatiality, embeddedness, and social relations. According to this approach, territory is not just a spatial extension, but also an ensemble of complex material and immaterial relations involving spatial dimension, relations among actors (at different
scales), and between the latter and local resources; in other words, a crossroads of complex social, economic, cultural, and environmental relations organized in superimposed but not coincidental scales.

One of the most important theorizations of the notion of territory comes from the French geographer Claude Raffestin, who defines territoriality as:

the ensemble of relations that humans maintain with exteriority and alterity, with the assistance of mediators, for the satisfaction of their needs, towards the end of attaining the greatest possible autonomy—that is, the capacity to have aleatory relations with their physical and social environment—taking into account the resources of the system (Raffestin and Butler 2012, p. 139).

Related to the concept of territory is the notion of territoriality, which the Italian geographer Dematteis (2007) defines as the ensemble of relations between actors and territory. These relations can be conceived on three complementary levels (Dansero and Puttilli 2014):

- the spatial dimension of the relations, that is the organization of the relations between the actors in space and the various geographical scales (from local to global);

- the dimension of the material and immaterial resources mobilized through the action of the actors, that is the resources present in the territory that are functional for achieving the strategic objectives of the actors;

- the dimension of the social relations among the actors, the way in which the actors reciprocally enter into the relationship to enhance the resources of the territory and pursue their own strategic objectives.

According to the preceding definitions, an interpretive framework based on the notions of territory and territoriality for the analysis and interpretation of (urban) food systems can rely on the following three key concepts, to which it necessary to add a fourth one: scale. From each of them a number of questions helping to understand a food system in a territorial approach can be posed.

- Space: What is the spatial organization of the food system? Where does the food come from? Where it is consumed? Where does the
waste go? How are spaces physically and symbolically transformed due to the processes related to the food system?

- Resources: Which material and immaterial elements are recognized as resources and used in the system? Are these resources highly specific, traditional, embedded, embodying the cultural values and meanings of a specific locality and not available or reproducible elsewhere (such as products with a certificate of origin or, in Italy, in the Slow Food outlets, where a specific cultural value expressed by the territory is associated with the product)? Could they be found elsewhere, as commodities of the global agro-food system?

- Relations: What spatial and social relations exist among the actors of the system? Are they based mainly on physical proximity? On economic convenience and efficiency? Or are they based on other factors such as a shared culture, common values, or other kinds of interests and aims? What are the explicit and implicit power relations between the actors of the system? Which places and spaces are related within the food system?

- Regarding the territorial approach, a fourth field should be added to the three fields of investigation just presented; this fourth relates to the notion of scale, which is very important in order to study and plan food systems.

Trying to understand the scale of a food system means, first of all, exploring the various dimensions of this concept, which is at the same time fundamental for geography and discussed within the disciplinary debate (Swyngedouw 2004).

When referring to a food system, we can evoke three interpretations of scale:

- Scale as the extension of a phenomenon: How big is a food system? Which scales is it related to? On which scales do production, distribution, and consumption of food take place? How can events happening somewhere in the world affect the food system in other places, and at other scales?

- Scale of jurisdiction: The roles of public institutions are limited by the extent of the territory they have jurisdiction over. However, we can also talk about a “scale of jurisdiction” with reference to other
types of actors contributing to the governance of a city or a region (such as associations, businesses, trade unions, interest groups, and city dwellers in general). The link between this meaning of scale and power is very clear: each actor is able to act only as far as its formal or informal power allows him/her/it to do. Therefore, analyzing the actors who participate in a food system also means understanding in which scales they move, and how their multi-scalar action affects the territoriality of the food system.

- Scale as produced by processes: This third meaning of scale is probably the most important for the approach presented in this chapter. Talking about urban food planning means understanding the “urban scale”, whatever it means, as a scale suitable for food policies.

The rise in Italy of the città metropolitana, as an institutional scale of government, could be the chance to finally merge the scales of jurisdiction and the scale of the extension of phenomenon. Before this, however, it is crucial to understand what kind of scale is produced by the food system. Each food system, in fact, produces a new scale, which goes beyond any administrative boundary or formal scale of jurisdiction, and which has to be fully understood, in its multi-scalarity and trans-scalarity, before moving from the analytical to the constructive dimension.

**Urban Food Strategies and Resilience**

The concept of resilience was developed in the field of ecology, where it is used to define the property of an ecosystem returning to a new equilibrium after stress (Colucci 2012). In the last few decades, this term has progressively been adopted by other fields of research and policy, such as psychology, organizational studies, and spatial planning. In the latter disciplines, the resilience idea is mostly considered in a broad sense, as the ability of a territorial or organizational system to react to changes and stresses in a dynamic way, absorbing them and considering the opportunities they present, rather than simply opposing them (Berkes, Colding, and Folke 2003). Very soon, resilience began to be presented as the panacea for all society’s problems and territories, becoming the new buzzword for political and scientific discourses, like other abused concepts such as sustainability (O’Hare and White 2013) or smartness. As Davoudi (2012, p. 299) notes: “Yet, it is not quite clear what resilience means, beyond the simple assumption that it is good to be resilient.”
The conceptual, methodological and practical shift of the notion of resilience from ecology and engineering to social and political discourse, and also to spatial planning, has rarely taken place with a true consideration of what it would actually mean in terms of a shift of meaning and perspective. The original idea of resilience—the ability of a system to react to a stress and find a new state of equilibrium (Holling 1973)—assumes that this equilibrium is a good and desirable condition.

In spatial planning and territorial studies, this interpretation led to what Davoudi (2012, p. 301) calls the “discourse of bounce-back-ability”. She states that when talking about nature and societies, it would better to embrace the idea of an evolutionary resilience, which brings into question the idea of the desirability of a previous state, moving to the aim of accepting and trying to absorb the potential benefits coming from changes and stresses. In this sense, resilience should not be considered as the return to the previous “normal” condition, rather as the ability of a socio-ecological complex system to change and adapt itself in reaction to disturbances of varying nature and degree (Carpenter, Westley, and Turner 2005).

Some of the best expressions of spatial planning followed this idea of resilience, proposing to overcome the traditional huge urban transformation projects, and replace them with a selection of actually possible transformations at a smaller scale and with rigorous but agile rules of land use, able to stimulate the regeneration and recycling of what already exists, without new sprawl or land appropriation (Gasparrini 2014). More than plans and projects concerning the material transformations of space, this idea of resilience has been used in recent years by strategic planning related to the flows and functioning of cities and regions. The case of urban and regional food planning is one of the best examples of this.

Resilience is one of the keywords of the discourse about food policies and the relationships between food and the city. In the last few years, political awareness is growing of the need to increase the resilience of local food systems (and the global food system in which they are embedded), in order to respond to the multi-faceted crises that cities are facing (economic, energy, social, cultural, environmental). In the international scientific literature, food planning and resilience are often related to urban food production, urban agriculture, and the re-territorialization of the food system, as a means of increasing urban food security and urban resilience in the face of stresses like climate change.
(Burton et al. 2013) or economic crisis (Barthel, Parker, and Ernstson 2015).

Shifting from the academic debate to practices at the local scale, the need of a “resilient turn” of food systems has been diffusely understood. Worldwide, several cities have developed food policies and food plans, which often consider the resilience of the system as one of their essential targets. Even if sometimes the concept of resilience is declared within food city plans without an adequate operational plan of actions, they offer a good review of how resilience is understood by food planners at the urban and regional scales.

Interesting exceptions are the food plans of cities like Bristol, in the U.K., whose Sustainable Food Strategy states:

The aim of the strategy is to develop a sustainable and resilient food economy for Bristol based on mutually supportive collaboration between Bristol communities and producers, processors, suppliers in and around Bristol that supports the health and wellbeing of communities and the environment now and in the future. (Bristol Food Network 2009, p. 1)

and follows the aim statement with specific and detailed work programs and actions. (See Carey (2011) for further information.)

According to ICLEI (2013), a resilient urban food system should have the following characteristics:

- to be diverse: in biodiversity, agricultural models, spaces of production and consumption [in a multicultural urban area such as Turin’s, we would add “cultural diversity” as well];

- to be distributed: through the interconnection of places of production and consumption, centrally and peripherally, vertically and horizontally;

- to be natural: a resilient system should have a minimal environmental footprint and contribute to a better management of natural resources;

- to be innovative: social and technological innovation are fundamental for the resilience of the food system and its flows and networks;
to be social: a food system cannot be resilient without being just;

to be inclusive: with the active involvement of public and private actors.

Once this characterization of the concept of resilience as applied to urban food systems has been accepted, the next step is to wonder why it is a good thing for a food system to be resilient, going beyond the abused political declarations and narrative constructions. Figure 42-1 shows how the four dimensions of resilience (as identified by the international research group Resilience Alliance) can be connected to most of the policies and practices developed within the framework of Urban Food Planning by many cities, at different scales, worldwide. Even with the frequent abuses and misunderstandings described above, and with the difficulty of defining it in an operational way, using resilience as a component of a conceptual framework useful to map and then to plan an urban/regional food system seems to be appropriate in the uncertainty that characterizes contemporary society and space. Within urban, regional, and territorial studies, this concept is especially suitable for describing how to imagine, follow through, and plan the re-territorialization of (already existing) food systems as a necessary condition for creating not only resilient, but also just and efficient cities.

Ultimately, the recent surge of interest in re-building community-based food systems is not just about resilience – it is about just resilience, planning and preparing for a fast-changing world in ways that leave no one
behind. … Adopting a just-resilience approach involves embracing the uncertain, the unknown, and the stranger who is actually a neighbor. It also requires us to step out, beyond the realms of comfort and certainty, and into more distant communities—not simply to find answers, but also to create them, together. (Ackerman-Leist 2013, p. 278)

Resilience in the Food System of Turin

In the northwest of Italy, between Milan and the French borders, with a population of 900,000 (almost 2.3 million if we consider the former provincia, now città metropolitana), Turin is the fourth biggest Italian city by population. After centuries as capital of the Duchy and then the Kingdom of Savoy, and a few years (1861–1865) as the first capital of the united Italy, in the twentieth century the city grew as a company town, around the huge FIAT automobile plants in the southern neighborhoods of Lingotto and Mirafiori, and the smaller plants of the flourishing satellite activities. In the last decades, the city has been the location of a dramatic transformation, both physical and symbolic. Many factories closed and were replaced by brand new portions of the city. This material change accompanied a remarkable process of re-invention of the city’s image, whose turning point was the 2006 Winter Olympic Games (Dansero and Puttilli 2009). In about fifteen years, the city shifted in the collective imagination of Italians from a grey city where cars were built to a vibrant city and a tourist destination, based on creativity, cultural heritage, cinema, museums, innovation—and food (Vanolo 2008).

Turin belongs to a territorial system where food is a mature economic, social, and cultural asset, which contributes to a regional development increasingly based on high-quality food production (wine, chocolate, nuts, cheese, and so on) and food and wine tourism, which, as mentioned above, are gradually taking the place of heavy industries in the economic system and in the discursive representations of the area. The acknowledgment of these assets, stimulated by some strong and very active stakeholders (Slow Food and Eataly, for example), led to the organization of several initiatives and events aiming at promoting and safeguarding typical food products (such as the Salone del Gusto, Terra Madre, Cioccolatò, and others), which made Turin one of the recognized national “capitals of food” (Associazione Torino Internazionale 2013).

Like other Italian cities, then, Turin and its people have a close relationship with food, evidenced, for example, by the large numbers of food markets (45) held every day in the city. In most of them, producers
bring their fresh products daily from the countryside around Turin. In the Italian context, these markets can hardly be defined as “alternative food networks”, as they are not expressions of practices of explicit resistance against the globalized and de-territorialized food system; they are just a common way for people living in Turin to purchase their food.

This is a clue to the peculiarity of the Italian food system, where the issues are quite different from the ones faced by food plans in Northern American or British cities. This could suggest that there might be an “Italian way” to food planning, which will not be discussed in this chapter, but which would deserve a careful consideration.

In the most recent years, at least two important factors contributed to build momentum for issues that concern research and practice about food and food policies in Turin. The first is the process of institutionalization of the “metropolitan area” of Turin, which is going to take the place of the “province” in the institutional re-ordering of Italy. This new “territory of competence” is progressively becoming a “territory of project” (Raffestin 1980), which includes the city and its surroundings. Many of the projects developing in this area concern the relationships between food and the city. The topics of these projects are various: urban and peri-urban agriculture, with its social, environmental, and educational dimensions; public health; sustainable catering, food education; waste reduction; and so on.

The second factor is the spatial and temporal proximity of the 2015 Universal Exposition (Expo), which will be held in Milan (about 130 kilometers and fifty minutes by high-speed train from Turin), whose theme will be “Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life”. The Exposition is the frame in which several projects about food are being developed, not only in Milan, but in the whole of Northern Italy as well. The City and the Province of Turin and the Regione Piemonte are trying to attract within their boundaries some of the potential benefits of Expo 2015, with regard to both flows of tourists as well as projects and policies concerning the main topic of the international event: food.

In this potentially fertile context, several projects relating to food policies are underway in and around the city, both at the municipal and at the metropolitan scale. Even if Turin still does not have a food council and these projects are still not part of a food plan, local authorities are paying specific attention to food policies. The aim to transform Turin into a “capital of food” was one of the objectives of the second strategic plan of
the city (Associazione Torino Internazionale 2013), and section 7.10 of the third strategic plan describes a continued focus on the development of worldwide recognition of the food culture of Turin and its surrounding area (Associazione Torino Internazionale 2015).

In the following pages, there is a short presentation of the most important practices, projects, and policies (clustered into families of practices) that are related to food and currently underway in Turin. Each of them could be a part of a future “urban food plan”. As already mentioned, as a first step of the process of mapping and analyzing the food system of Turin in order to build the base of knowledge for future planning actions, we tried to read these projects and policies through the conceptual framework of resilience (Table 42-1).

**Food Governance**

Food is a central issue for several strategic programs developed in the Turin area. One of the most important, probably, was part of the second Strategic Plan of the city (Associazione Torino Internazionale 2013), which had as one of its main axes the aim to make Turin the Italian “capital of food”. Other interesting projects related to food are developed within the Torino SMILE projects, which apply to Turin the vision of the so-called “smart city” (Dansero, Testa, and Toldo 2013).

**Alternative Food Networks**

Besides the many traditional markets and neighborhood food retailers that are still lively in Turin, in the last few years several examples of alternative food networks have arisen within the metropolitan area (Dansero and Puttilli 2014). Among the most common there are the so-called gruppi di acquisto solidale (GAS), which could be translated to English as “Solidarity Purchasing Groups” (Graziano and Forno 2012); these are groups of people who collectively purchase food (and other goods), usually directly from producers. In the Turin metropolitan area, there are about eighty GAS, most of which belong to the Rete GAS national network. A variation of GAS is the gruppi di acquisto collettivo (GAC), supported by a project of the Provincia di Torino and mostly addressed to low-income consumers (Matteucci 2012).

Another very important typology of alternative food networks (AFNs) in Turin is the farmers market. As mentioned before, most of the
neighborhood daily markets in the city are hosted by producers who sell their products directly. Furthermore, the main Italian farmers’ federation, Coldiretti, as well as other organizations (such as Slow Food) regularly organize other farmers markets. In all, there are about sixty farmers markets in the former Provincia of Turin (now the città metropolitana), which must be added to the dozens of “regular” daily markets where producers are present.

A third typology of AFN that is widely present in the Turin area is the on-farm direct sale, practiced by 14 percent of farmers in the Piedmont region, most of whom are concentrated within the Turin metropolitan area or just outside it, especially in the hilly regions of Langhe, Roero, and Monferrato (Corsi, Novelli, and Pettenati 2014).

Urban Gardens

Several projects, mostly concentrated within the municipality of Turin, concern urban gardens, characterized more by social and educative aims than by strictly productive ones. Some of them are promoted by public institutions (examples are Miraorti, Orti collettivi Circoscrizione 8, and more), others by private actors like the Bunker association, which transformed a neglected industrial area into urban gardens and recreational spaces.

Urban Agriculture Projects

These are projects of urban agriculture that are more oriented to production. The most relevant one is the project TOCC—Torino Città da Coltivare (Città di Torino 2012), which aims at making a survey of unused areas of the city that could potentially be used for agriculture, in order to transform them into productive areas.

Social Agriculture and Teaching Farms

In the Turin metropolitan area there are about forty teaching farms, notably involving schools, oriented to production and education. A very important project in this field is the Orto dei Ragazzi, which merges the attention to socioeconomically disadvantaged people with education in food and sustainability (Orto dei Ragazzi 2016).
Schools, Hospitals, and Food Education

This category clusters the projects related to what can be called “public food”, served and consumed in schools, hospitals, university or company canteens, and so on. Some of them are related to green public procurement policies and to food education in schools.

Food Waste

Food waste is one of the most evident effects of inefficient urban food systems (Pothukuchi and Kaufman 2000). In Turin, like in many other cities, in recent years various projects have started to work toward a reduction of food waste, creating relations between sellers and disadvantaged consumers.

Food Transportation and Logistics

The metropolitan area of Turin and the region of Piedmont play a fundamental role in flows of food and other commodities to and from Italy. Some ongoing projects in this area aim at resolving some of the inefficiencies occurring in this part of the food chain. A very interesting one is Food Hub to Connect, which created a food hub associating producers, retailers, and consumers in a perspective of sustainability and smartness of the urban food system (Food Hub to Connect 2013).

Small Farms Networks, Typical Food and Quality Food Markets, Small Shops Networks, and Others

This last category contains projects based on food quality networks and brands, and the valorization of local products, both within international (Slow Food) and local networks.

Table 42-1. An overview of food-related projects in Turin, evaluated within the conceptual framework of resilience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies and Practices</th>
<th>Metabolic Flows</th>
<th>Governance Networks</th>
<th>Social Dynamics</th>
<th>Built Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Governance</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and Practices</td>
<td>Metabolic Flows</td>
<td>Governance Networks</td>
<td>Social Dynamics</td>
<td>Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative Food Networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC San Salvario, GAS Torino,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piattaforma Food Sharing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Markets, mercati tematici.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Gardens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area verde Tonolli, Bunker, Orti collettivi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circoscrizione 8, orti scolastici, Turin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orto, Miraorti, Orti dei centri sociali,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitato Agri Torino, Parco Agricolo del</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangone, Agricoltura sociale del Cottolengo,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orti generali.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Agriculture Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torino Città da Coltivare — TOCC, Progetto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona Verde.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Agriculture and Teaching Farms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orto dei Ragazzi, Cascine Bert, Piemonte,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellerina, Giaglione, Falchera, Bonafous,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roccafranca, Duc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools, Hospitals and Food Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitolato mense scolastiche, software per</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l’impronta ecologica dei cibi, capitolati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innovativi per i comuni in area periurbana,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progetto “La pietanza non avanza”, Progetto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Il menù l’ho fatto io”, abolizione delle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verdure a quarta gamma, Progetto formazione</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitori “Lotta all’obesità”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Waste</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progetto Buon Samaritano, Banco e Colletta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alimentare, collaborazione mense benefiche,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interventi a sostegno del servizio pasti a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domicilio, Last Minute Market, Asili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nottumi, Mensa festiva San Vincenzo.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Policies and Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies and Practices</th>
<th>Metabolic Flows</th>
<th>Governance Networks</th>
<th>Social Dynamics</th>
<th>Built Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Transportation and Logistics</strong>&lt;br&gt;Progetto mobilità sostenibile MIUR, Patto dei Sindaci, Progetto Food Hub TO Connect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Farms Networks, Typical Food and Quality Food Brands and Networks, Small Shops Networks, and so on</strong>&lt;br&gt;Presidi Slow Food e Terra Madre, Maestri del Gusto, Paniere dei prodotti tipici della Provincia di Torino, Strada Reale dei Vini Torinesi, Associazioni Via dei Commercianti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42-1 associates each category of project to the four spheres of urban and territorial resilience that constitute the theoretical tool used in this paper. The main result of this preliminary evaluation is an obvious imbalance of the four spheres. One of the predominant spheres is Social Dynamics, which could partly be explained by referring to the long tradition of social projects, both of socialist and religious inspiration, which are characteristic of the city of Turin (Dematteis and Toldo 2010). The other most-represented sphere is Urban Metabolic Flows, which are strongly affected by the (in)efficiency of the food chain. What is clear is the lack of the intersectorial vision of food governance. So far, the analyzed practices cannot be considered to be part of a real food policy, they are rather a set of experiences that are still neither coordinated nor integrated.

**Conclusions**

This paper, the first step in a broader and longer research, shows how the city of Turin has entered a new stage of food policies and food governance, which starts from the acknowledgment, on the part of public institutions, of the many practices and projects ongoing in the city, and is slowly moving toward a real process of urban food planning. However, this process is still not supported by a real system of governance, based on
a shared systemic vision; most of the presented projects are actually sectorial and scarcely integrated. The establishment of the città metropolitana is certainly a great occasion to build a new multi-scalar and trans-scalar system of governance (such as a food council), which sets the competences of each actor in the system, within a shared framework and vision.

The analysis of practices ongoing in Turin shows that most of them, even if they have a sectorial approach, are oriented to increasing the resilience of the food system at the urban and metropolitan scale. This means that even without a food plan or a food council to set the vision, sectorial and spontaneous projects follow an implicitly shared framework, probably expressing the need for policies addressing a resilient food system, coming from society and the city.

To conclude, it is important to highlight how the city–region scale is fundamental in order to plan the urban food system, but it is not enough. Food is in fact ruled by a multi-level system of laws and policies, and the multi-level system of governance briefly described above cannot abstract from the regional and national scales, where wide-scale strategic visions and framework policies are set.
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