

S21. Circularities and proximities: stakeholders, scales, ressources Convenor(s): <i>Sébastien Bourdin, Amélie Gonçalves</i>

Factors and modalities of the territorial anchoring of food: lessons learned from the cross-analysis of food initiatives

Houdart Marie*, Baritoux Virginie**, Icéri Vanessa***, Lardon Sylvie***, Le Bel Pierre-Mathieu*, Loudiyi Salma**

* UMR Territoires, Irstea, 9 avenue Blaise Pascal, CS 20085, 63 178 Aubière, France (Tel : +33 (0)4 73 44 06 65 / marie.houdart@irstea.fr ; pierre-mathieu.le-bel@irstea.fr)

** UMR Territoires, Vetagro Sup, campus agronomique de Clermont, 89 avenue de l'Europe, BP35, 63370 Lempdes, France (virginie.baritoux@vetagro-sup.fr ; salma.loudiyi@vetagro-sup.fr)

*** UMR Territoires, INRA & AgroParisTech, 9 avenue Blaise Pascal, CS 2008, 63178 Aubière, France (sylvie.lardon@agroparistech.fr, vanessa.iceri@agroparistech.fr)

Introduction

While the notion of territory has been widely discussed for several decades (Brenner, 2001; Painter, 2009; Vanier, 2009; Banos et al., 2017), territory as a category and scale of action remains, for many, recognized as essential in response to various issues. As a category of action, the territory is the place of territorial development dynamics, defined as: "[a] sustainable process of construction and management of a territory, through which the population of the territory defines, through a socio-political pact and the establishment of an institutional framework appropriate to the context, its relationship with nature and its way of life, consolidates social ties, improves its well-being and builds a cultural identity that has its material basis in the construction of this territory" (Peemans, 2008 : 31). Territorial development is therefore based on the construction of development capacities, stimulated and controlled by territorial actors (Deffontaines et al., 2001). It is not only a good "exploitation" of local resources. It is also a way of collectively controlling complex processes that require territorial governance tools and mechanisms (Lardon et al., 2008), leading to an increase in the capacity of actors to control the dynamics that concern them (Lamara, 2009; Angeon et al. 2007). From a sectoral point of view, the territory would constitute a scale of action for the resolution of problems, often raised at the international level (Caron et al., 2017), in addition to strategies and actions carried out at the global level. Land scarcity and competition, land degradation, land grabbing, biodiversity conservation, poor nutrition, social inequalities, etc. are all global issues that can be addressed at the territorial level.

In this set of issues, food has a special place. The reconnection of agriculture and food to the territories (Lamine and Chiffolleau, 2012) could indeed meet the various challenges of sustainable development. For some, this process would offer an alternative to the dominant, concentrated and globalized agri-food model (Deverre and Lamine, 2010; Duram and Oberholtzer, 2010), often associated with questions relating to food security, imbalance of power relations between actors in the sectors and practices that are not environmentally friendly (Bowen and Zapata, 2009; Renting et al, 2003; Barिताux and Houdart, 2015; Barिताux, Houdart et al., 2016; Marsden et al., 2000; Winter, 2003; Loudiyi and Houdart, 2019). It is still necessary to explain the mechanisms of this reconnection or at least to ensure that the experiences set up as examples are based, and if so, to what extent, on strengthened links to the territory. We therefore propose to question here the mechanisms for anchoring food to the territory, by addressing a diversity of cases of initiatives associated with food territorialization dynamics, carried by different actors, with variable scope of action.

To do this, we return in a first part to the work on the territorialization of food. We show that the literature favours two entries: one that aims to qualify the territorial resources activated within the framework of stakeholder coordination; the other that anchors it in reference to the search for an "alternative" model. The second part is devoted to the methodology which is based on the cross-analysis of fourteen initiatives. In the third part, we show that, whatever the stakeholders and whatever the scope of action of the initiative, there is always an articulation of both territorial and extraterritorial resources. We show also that the process proceeds each time from a recomposition of the worlds, far from the exclusivity of an alternative model. We return to these results under discussion to question the role and specific contribution of key actors in this capacity to articulate scales and worlds, conditions for a territorial anchoring of food.

1. The territorial anchoring¹ of food: marked references to the 'local' and to the alternative model

In general, anchoring refers to the registration of an actor, an action, an activity in a given environment and a given spatial position (Debarbieux, 2014). The challenges of territorial development and sectoral issues lead to a set of diverse initiatives and organizations that are part of territorialization, seen as a desire to "adapt the problems and operations of society to the geography" (Offner, 2006, p. 36). This territorial anchoring has been the subject of numerous studies involving a wide range of disciplines in the human and social sciences: economics (Rallet and Torre, 1995), management (Fourcade, 2008; Saleilles, 2006), geography (Frayssignes, 2005; Krugman, 1995), sociology (Bowen, 2010; Deverre, Lamine, 2010; Latour, 2017). For these authors, the link between productive systems, their actors and their territory is built through the mobilization and creation of resources that can be of various kinds, tangible or intangible, market or non-market (economic, social, political, cultural, environmental, landscape resources...). Thus, territorial anchoring means strengthening the links between an activity and all the components of the territory, both tangible and intangible; in other words, "making territory". New forms of anchoring activities then emerge, based on a "re-invention of the local" (Zimmerman 2005). Finally, territorialization would involve the enhancement and activation of territorial resources. In return, it would produce new places, new resources.

In the specific case of food, territorialization is seen by some authors as a reconfiguration of local development resources and networks (Watts et al., 2005; Oosterveer and Sonnenfeld, 2012). Several studies go in this direction, showing how objects, places or practices related to food production, distribution and/or consumption make sense from the point of view of the territory and how their development and/or construction are based on material territorial resources but also symbolic resources (festivals, elements of local heritage enhancement) (Chabrat et al., 2014; Houdart and Pocard, 2015). Overall, the work focuses on approaches that explicitly aim to strengthen this link, in particular the strengthening of the link between consumers and places of production and/or processing, modes of production and producers themselves (Marsden et al., 2000; Renting et al., 2003). Some of them focus in particular on the development of approaches to the territorial qualification of food products and distinctive quality signs (AOC/AOP, IGP) that allow a differentiation of quality by origin by associating product quality and territorial attributes by mobilizing the notion of "terroir" (Muchnik et al., 2008). Others focus on approaches aimed at (re)creating a geographical and social "proximity" between producers and consumers by developing direct relationships between these actors, whether they are "physical" (direct marketing by producers) or "virtual" (clear display of the producer's identity on products) (Deverre and Lamine, 2010; Hinrichs, 2000; Milestad et al., 2010). In total, the logics of territorialization are very diverse and can be part of so-called "long" sectors, local circuits or more "specified" around "territorial resources" (Gumuchian, Pecqueur, 2007). More generally, the strengthening of the link between food and the territory also refers to various initiatives, for which food, and its territorial anchoring, is a means rather than an end in itself (Loudiyi and Houdart, 2019). Territories are indeed places where many alternatives flourish in agriculture and food: short food chains and local supply, the dynamism of organic and agro-ecological agriculture, local products and signs of quality, but also local initiatives in the form of forums for food sovereignty or the fight against peasant expropriations, the patentability of seeds and GMOs. Wiskerke (2009) and Lamine et al. (2012) highlight this diversity in territorial food governance, through the

¹ In the literature, the term territorialization is used more often than that of territorial anchoring. In this section, we will mobilize work on territorialization to question the notion of anchoring.

contribution of three types of actors (market, government and civil society). In doing so, they highlight the diversity of partnerships and coordination modalities between actors to support territorialization dynamics. It is in a collective process of localized social action that individuals participate in different processes that build their identity, their lives, their society, in what Massey calls "the space of interrelationships" (Massey, 2001). This social or collective action can take many forms, from diffuse and informal actions to very formal concerted actions, in a gradient ranging from diffuse and spontaneous movements that gradually bring together several actors to institutionalized collective action (Amblard et al., 2018). Seen in this light, the territorial anchoring of food is therefore not only physical, spatial or economic. It can also take on symbolic dimensions, by linking a product, an activity, a collective action to ways of doing things, to knowledge and values. However, the qualification of the resource actually activated remains rare and the construction of the link to the territory and the scales of territorializing action is rarely addressed.

The vast majority of research on the dynamics of territorial anchoring of food positions it in a relationship to global transformations, with reference to a dominant model. This is what Loudiyi (2018) highlights by distinguishing the three main stages that allow the transition from a re-territorialization of agriculture to a food relocation: agriculture as a resource for local territories in the 1990s, alternative agro-food systems as a strategy of "resistance to the globalization of food systems" in the 2000s; food relocation as a response to a global crisis in the 2010. The so-called territorial food systems are nowadays defined by some as emerging forms that are alternatives to the dominant agro-industrial model, inspired by an objective of reducing negative externalities and promoting positive social, environmental and economic impacts (Lardon et al., 2018). Some position this dynamic in reference to the theory of transition (Geels, 2002). It is no longer just a question of educating the diversity of the different experiments and the capacity of local actors to develop initiatives and understand the links to the resources and games of local actors. It is a question of taking into account a dynamic aspect, the abundance necessary to fuel the transition, in particular insofar as the cross-cutting nature of the food issue calls for other transitions: energy, ecological, digital or even democratic. Local collective initiatives to anchor food are then thought of as "niches" likely to transform the diet, in other words the dominant model (Belmin et al., 2018). However, several studies insist on the multiplicity of these emerging models and on the questioning of a systematic opposition between a dominant food model and an alternative model at the scale of territories in particular (Le Velly, 2017; Galliano et al. 2017) and in the implementation of approaches related to territorialization. However, few empirical analyses are carried out to account for the articulation of these different food models in the anchoring approaches, as the very contours of the notion of model are not very well shared. Referring the question of the territorial anchoring of food to the emergence of one or more alternative models or even more generally to an alternative character (not to mention specifically a model), then reduces the perspective of understanding the mechanisms at work. Thus, several contemporary works highlight the multiplicity of worlds, values, which underlie individual and collective action in transition processes (Cayre et al. 2018; Hedlund-De Witt, 2013; Rigolot, 2019; Gwiazdzinski, 2016; Deléage, 2012).

Finally, there is diversity of processes, but also of participating actors and issues that feed a wide variety of cases and complicate the notion of territorial anchoring of food. This raises several questions: what are the territorial resources actually mobilized in the context of actions relating to territorial anchoring? Are these resources still located? And at the same time, is opposition to the dominant model systematic? What worlds and models are articulated

in the processes of territorial anchoring of food? We hypothesize that a cross-referenced analysis of various cases can provide an overview of some of the invariants of this process, both on the issue of resource mobilization and scales of action, and on that of the founding models.

2. Material and method

The results presented in this communication are the result of cross-references based on fourteen case analyses carried out as part of the PSDR4 INVENTER project²³. All these initiatives are part of the process of territorial anchoring of food either because the stakeholder openly state this objective, or because they mobilize a territorial and/or local "preference" for food to respond to other issues (economic for example). The choice of these cases was designed to enable us to address the diversity of the processes of territorial anchoring of food, diversity considered in the light of two criteria (Tab. 1).

- The diversity of actors driving territorial food governance (Wiskerke, 2009): public actors, civil society actors, market actors. Even if all the initiatives selected for analysis often see the coordination of these three types of actors, they remain characterized by the fact that one type of actor predominates in the emergence of the initiative and/or decision-making throughout its existence.

- The diversity of the scope of action, considering that the food transition takes place both in a general movement that sees the juxtaposition of very localized initiatives with initiatives thought of on a larger scale (niches, Geels et al., 2007). The cases analysed can then be very localized, such as the setting up of a producer store or concern the territorial scale, such as the setting up of a Territorial Food Project.

In addition, in order to shift our focus to different socio-economic situations, even if the majority of cases are located in the Auvergne region (region selected under the PSDR INVENTER), we have also mobilized cases elsewhere in France (Albi) or in other countries (Brazil, Italy).

Table 1. The fourteen cases mobilized for the cross-analysis

	local	territorial
Market actors	[1] Magasin de producteurs d'Ambert Le local (<i>Icéri, 2018a</i>)	[2] Mise en place d'une Filière Engagement Qualité Carrefour sur Bleu d'Auvergne et Fourme d'Ambert (<i>Baritoux et Houdart, 2015 ; Baritoux et al., 2017 ; Baritoux et Houdart, à paraître</i>) [3] Marché de gros de Grenoble (<i>Baritoux et Chazoule, 2018</i>)
Civil society actors	[4] Jardins potagers de Billom Communauté (Beuseroy et al., 2019) [5] Pratiques des habitants en matière d'achat dans le Livradois Forez (<i>Lardon et Maduma, 2017</i>) [6] Projet 'Terrafaxilense' du faxinal Emboque ai Brésil (<i>Icéri, 2018b ; Icéri, 2019 ; Icéri et Lardon, 2019</i>)	[7] Monnaie locale et transition alimentaire (<i>Houdart, 2018</i>) [8] Gouvernance et développement territorial pour une agriculture durable sur le territoire de Nnkong-Zem, Cameroun (Tankam et al., à paraître)

² <https://www6.inra.fr/psdr-inventer/>

³ Some of these case studies were carried out outside the INVENTER project; however, their analysis, conducted by the authors of this paper, was mobilized to offer a greater richness to the crossover perspective sought here.

Public actors	<p>[9] Projet de Courpière (<i>Iceri, 2016 ; Loudiyi et Houdart, 2019</i>)</p> <p>[10] Verger test des Cheires (<i>Houdart et Loudiyi, 2018 ; Le Bel, 2019</i>)</p> <p>[11] Fête de la pomme de Massiac (<i>Loudiyi et Houdart, 2019</i>)</p>	<p>[12] Stratégie d'autosuffisance alimentaire Albi 2020 (<i>LeBel, en cours</i>)</p> <p>[13] Projet Alimentaire Territorial du Grand Clermont et du Parc Naturel Régional Livradois-Forez (PAT GC- PNRLF (<i>Le Bel et al., 2017, 2018 ; Houdart et al., en cours</i>))</p> <p>[14] Route de l'huile des monts pisans (<i>Loudiyi et al., 2014</i>)</p>
---------------	---	--

These studies were all carried out with a qualitative approach, most often on the basis of comprehensive interviews or participant observation, with a common approach consisting in looking at the processes at work and the ongoing developments. However, this work can be divided into two subgroups, depending on the preferred entry. A first entry consists in instructing the strategies and practices of certain actors, such as those of trade and distribution actors, or those of citizens in the supply or management of private gardens, or those of certain public actors in the construction of food policy. The second entry is the analysis of collective actions, which bring together different actors, by reporting on the conditions of emergence and development of these initiatives, as well as the impacts on the territory.

3. Results: the articulation of scales and models

The cross-referenced analysis of our 14 case studies made it possible to identify two invariants, despite the great diversity of the cases involved: the articulation between territorial and extraterritorial resources; the encounter of different models and/or worlds⁴.

3.1. The articulation of territorial and extraterritorial resources

The cross-referenced analysis of the 14 cases shows the diversity of the types of resources that can be activated in the case of approaches related to the territorial anchoring of food. In particular, it can be seen that, in the various cases studied, the actors mobilize resources from the territory but also from outside the territory. The mobilization of the latter may appear to be a way of "strengthening" these initiatives.

Between the mobilization of specific landscape features, economic activities, social links, architectural heritage, the actions and practices of the actors studied reflect the capacity to be enriched by a diversity of resources that evolves during the trajectory of the project. Thus, tangible and intangible resources are always present, in varying proportions over time and according to the type of project. All these resources do not exist *per se*, but are built, activated by the stakeholder, and rationalized in a unifying narrative that contributes to strengthening the link to the territory, as in the project "Terrafaxilense" in Brazil [6], where territorial identity is "called" to integrate newcomers and new generations. More generally, it refers to the exploitation of the image, of the tradition that legitimizes the action.

In all the cases studied, the anchoring systematically involves linking to other scales of action, or even to extraterritorial resources. Thus, traditionally, financial mechanisms, support or research programs are as many national public or private resources that the actors mobilize in the action. This is the case for initiatives or projects where the **public actor** plays a central role, such as *La fête de la pomme de Masiac* [11], le *Projet Alimentaire de Courpière* [9] or

⁴ In the rest of the text, the numbers in square brackets ([1],[2],[3], etc.) refer to the case studies listed in Table 1.

Le Verger-test des Cheires ([10]), which mobilize to varying degrees financial or engineering support from other scales of action (community of communes, department, region, etc.). In larger areas of action, the PAT PGC-PNRLF[13], or the oil route of the Monts Pisans[14] also mobilize financial resources outside the area of action: funding from the National Food Program, support for research programs, European funds. This indicates the skills of public actors in terms of territorial engineering and their ability to appropriate rural development models and associated funding. But this is also the case for some initiatives taken by *civil society* when it forms an association recognized by the public authorities. Thus, in the case of the introduction of a local currency in the Puy de Dôme[7], the question of the relocation of food is at the heart of the process. It can be seen that, despite the association's initial desire to remain autonomous from extraterritorial institutions, funding from the Ministry of Social Cohesion and the territories is eventually mobilized; moreover, the actors are working to have complementary local currencies recognized as being in the public interest, thus placing their action within a national legislative framework (Houdart, 2018). In Brazil, while the traditional Faxinal Emboque community[6] is able to take initiatives to develop its resources, it also meets the challenges of forest protection and is recognized by the Ministry of the Environment, which allows it to manage its territory. In all these cases carried by civil society and in some cases where the public actor is predominant, it is also the strength of national networks that acts as a resource activated within the framework of the action: National Network of Agricultural Test Spaces (RENETA) in the case of *Le Verger-test des Cheires* [10], National Network of Territorial Food Projects (RNPAT) in the case of the PAT PGC-PNRLF[13], national network of complementary local currencies[7] or international networks such as the Incroyables Comestibles in the case of the Albi food self-sufficiency strategy[12]. In the cases studied of initiatives carried out by *retailers*, the articulation between territorial and extraterritorial resources depends in particular on the scale of extraterritorial action of these actors. Thus, in the case of *La Filière Engagement Qualité Carrefour* [2], the retailer mobilizes local resources (PDO, know-how, grass, long-term relations between producers and dairies, etc.) to develop an offer intended for a national market. It is therefore its national dimension that makes it possible to enhance the value of production anchored in a specific territory. In addition, to activate local resources by carrying out the partnership, it relies on its own resources (its experience in setting up this type of partnership, its long-term commercial relations with the dairy) and therefore extraterritorial. More generally, these market players (producers, retailers) also demonstrate an ability to mobilize the territory's resources while relying on standards and expectations defined at national or European level (Baritaux et al., 2017; Baritaux and Billion, 2018; Billion, 2018).

In any case, it seems that intangible and tangible resources are always mobilized to bring out the initiative and that the anchoring is strengthened over time by the creation of new material, ideal and organizational resources. Each time the extraterritorial resource is also mobilized: financial and logistical (participatory financing, financing of the ministry or region or metropolis, European funds, local support mechanism...), networks of actors, the own resources of an "international" actor, a set of norms and conventions (consumer expectations, quality standards, etc.).

3.2. The meeting of different worlds and models

The diversity of the worlds and models present in the initiatives analyzed questions the alternative nature of what is involved in the territorial anchoring of food. In all the cases studied, we are witnessing either the articulation of different agricultural or food models, or that of "worlds" that hybridize via the articulation of values (capitalist values associated with

values of sociocracy; worlds of the environment and economic worlds, etc.). These models and worlds have not been characterized in themselves, but the cross-analysis mainly highlights the modalities of these articulations within the framework of the actions implemented. It appears that this articulation can take different forms which are not necessarily exclusive of each other and which we report below.

It is often the *mode of governance* of the action that underlies the rapprochement of worlds and models. In the case of projects in which the food question is an objective in itself at the scale of a territory, the rapprochement requires the implementation of a participatory approach and its facilitation modalities. Thus, within the framework of the PAT PGC-PNRLF [13], project managers and contracting authorities have succeeded in mobilizing a wide range of actors: out of a total of 185 actors who participated at least once between June 2017 and May 2018, 57% are public actors, 17% are market actors (producers, processors, distributors), and 26% are representatives of civil society (mainly associations). In the end, a great diversity of individuals, with different challenges and different models, were able to think together about the means to be implemented to achieve sustainable food in the region: supermarket chains, citizen store managers, local currency associations, organic producers, environmental associations, agricultural cooperatives, etc. But the participation of stakeholders is equally sought at other scales and for other models, whether it is the Billom Community gardeners' network[4] which aims to bring together amateur and professional gardeners, or the action of NGOs in Cameroon[8], which combine the management of agriculture, forestry and renewable energies with the same sustainable development objective, but with very different models.

In other cases, the rapprochement of worlds and/or models takes place through *specific modalities of coordination of actors*. In the case of a "quality chain" approach[2] set up by a retailer and its suppliers (an SME for collecting and processing milk and about 20 dairy farmers), this coordination is based on both a formal and informal coordination mechanism (between contract and trust relationship). This specific modality underlies the articulation of an "industrial" distribution and transformation model, but for differentiated products that respond to production methods less adapted to a "mass model". Here, mass distribution drives the dynamics leading to a new coordination of actors that hybrid conventional and alternative models and that mobilizes and activates specific territorial resources. On a different scale and with different actors, the terrafaxinalense project[6] in Brazil also combines traditional production methods with marketing methods that allow this tradition to be marketed.

The different models or worlds are sometimes also *integrated/assimilated by a single actor*, whether collective (an association or an institution such as the MIN for example) or individual. Thus, in the case of the association bearing the complementary local currency of the Puy-de-Dôme[7], which helps to strengthen the territorial anchoring of food, the association carries within it different values and models that are expressed in the association's governance methods, in the charter and in the communication methods. In the case of vegetable gardens[4], where gardening motivations and practices are diverse, the collective actor of territory management on both sides of the river allows the meeting of the different models and strategies of gardeners because of its triple "cap": organic agriculture producer (market garden greenhouse), social integration operator (employees) and territorial animator (status of social centre in rural areas). In the case of the Grenoble National Interest Market[3], which is seeking to relaunch its activity by positioning itself as a local food player, the strategy consists, in part, in bringing in local players who can be part of a more "alternative" model (*Box Fermier* for the marketing of mainly Isère farm products, *Manger Bio Isère*

cooperative of organic producers and processors mainly from Isère for the supply of collective catering) but also to welcome more "conventional" wholesale actors who can offer a local offer but not only. This strategy is based on the idea of diversifying the supply, making the MIN a "super-market" capable of meeting a variety of needs in the same place. Sometimes, it is individuals alone who play this role of integrating models into an approach or project, because of their capacity to be anchored and open, innovative and traditional, as is the case with the initiative to set up a consumer store in Ambert [1]. To this end, they often mobilize their professional competence, but it is also and for many people their personal aspirations and motivations, their interrelational capacity that mark their commitment and action: this is the case of *La Fête de la pomme de Massiac*[11] with the president of a consultancy firm that links the cultural dimension to that of production and landscapes and with the president of the association *Autour des Palhas*, which ensures the maintenance of collective dynamics; it is also the case of the *Projet Alimentaire de Courpière*[9] with the central role of a canteenmaker who operates a strategy to build social links and mobilizes her family, friendly or professional links to ensure the sustainability of a local supply in a medium mountain municipality.

Discussion / conclusion

In this communication, we highlight that the territorial anchoring of food is carried out according to a wide variety of processes: both through the setting up of institutional projects and through the coordinated collective action of actors of different types. The food issue is not always targeted, it can also be a lever to address other issues of the territory.

The cross-analysis of 14 initiatives that are part of a process of territorial anchoring of food confirms what other authors have shown: the link between productive systems, their actors and their territory is built through the mobilization and creation of resources that can be of various kinds, tangible or intangible (Bowen 2010). Our cross-analysis underlines that this diversity of resources concerns both their nature (material, cognitive, human, etc.) but also their scale, by showing the systematization of the articulation between territorial and extraterritorial resources. Thus, the question of territorial anchoring arises in the diversity of the modalities of its implementation, in a process that combines the components of a "local" and an "extra-local". Finally, the notion of territorial anchoring of food would therefore not be limited to a local issue and the enhancement of attributes such as proximity, coordination, or even the cohesion of actors. Thus, it could position itself in opposition to the dangers of the "local trap" (Born and Purcell, 2006).

In addition, the systematic rapprochement of different worlds and/or models within food anchoring initiatives indicates that types of relationships that bring different models together may differ within a food system and that this is likely to strengthen rather than weaken their territorial anchoring. Each time there is a rapprochement of actors with different models, and in the diversity of the initiatives studied, the actors are often called upon to mobilize resources and practices associated with both the conventional and alternative models (Bloom and Hinrich, 2011). The values and motivations underlying the actions of the system's stakeholders may also not be shared: what is shared is the action and the target horizon. The possibility of diversity can guarantee the participation and flexibility of the system. This raises questions about the diversity and coexistence of models, which here seems to constitute a force for collective action and for the territorial anchoring of food.

However, the articulation of agricultural and food models remains the challenge when it comes to analyzing the modalities of territorial anchoring of food. The expansion (scaling up) of local supply methods now presents challenges of linking previously disconnected actors (renewal of local businesses/ grocery stores), re-territorialization of certain forms of agriculture and processing processes (local sales, slaughterhouses, etc.), rethinking traditional agricultural systems with regard to the renewal of diets (e. g. the role of livestock and its types in the territories, etc.). In the encounter of different and sometimes cleaved worlds/worldviews, it is then necessary to reason about the modalities of coexistence of models beyond conflict or co-presence and to think about the governance of this coexistence: who are the key actors able to allow the integration of the actors and the reinforcement of their capacity for participation? Our cross-referenced analysis offers some suggestions for addressing these issues. Indeed, whether it is a question of articulating different resources and different scales of resources, or of linking worlds and models, there is always a specific contribution of certain key actors in the action, whether collective or individual. This rapprochement requires a lot from the specific contribution of key players, according to their professional skills but also according to their motivations, values and personal strategies. These contributions may consist in mobilizing certain resources at different scales, bringing together and coordinating certain actors with different models and/or worlds, or integrating and/or assimilating different models and/or worlds. Each time, these key actors are not necessarily the ones that trigger the anchoring dynamic. The latter can be more directly driven by the implementation of public policy on a different scale, for example. Key actors, whether individual or institutional, can acquire this status. In this sense, more than key actors, we could talk about nodal actors as we talk about nodal points. They are distinguished by their ability to ensure that the actors, scales and models they connect retain (or at least perceive that they retain in the case of actors) a freedom of action that allows them to preserve what characterizes them. All this offers research opportunities to understand the mechanisms for setting up these specific contributions from key actors.

References

- Amblard L., Berthomé K., Houdart M., Lardon S., 2018. L'action collective dans les territoires. Questions structurantes et fronts de recherche. *Géographie, économie, société*, 20 (2), 227-249.
- Angeon V., Moquay P., Lardon S., Loudiyi S., Poss Y., Pivot J.-M., Caron A., 2007. Le développement territorial : principes et méthodes. In. Développement territorial et diagnostic prospectif: réflexions autour du Viaduc de Millau (Lardon S., Moquay P., Poss Y), Editions de l'Aube, 27-59.
- Banos V., Gassiat A., Girard S., Gueringer A., Hautdidier B., Houdart M., Le Floch S., Vernier F., 2017. Et au milieu coule une cafetière... ou comment des géographes discutent de l'interdisciplinarité à la pause-café In. L'espace en partage (Bonny Y., Bautès N., Gouëset V., eds), Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 279-296.
- Baritoux V., Houdart M., 2015. Relations fournisseurs-grande distribution dans les filières agro-alimentaires. Une analyse de la trajectoire d'une démarche de type « filière qualité ». *Économie Rurale*, n°346, pp. 15-30
- Baritoux, V., Houdart, M., Boutonnet, J., Chazoule, C., Corniaux, C., Fleury, P., Lacombe, N., Napoleone, M., Tourrand, J. F. (2016). Ecological embeddedness in animal food systems (re-)localisation: a comparative analysis of initiatives in France, Morocco and Senegal. *Journal of Rural Studies* 43: 13-26
- Baritoux V., Houdart M., Chabrat S., 2017. Analyzing the role of distribution intermediaries in regional branding and territorial development, Proposal for Interdisciplinary Symposium, Corte, July 2017 - Track « Connecting food to place »
- Baritoux V., Billion C., 2018. Rôle et place des détaillants et grossistes indépendants dans la relocalisation des systèmes alimentaires : perspectives de recherche. *Revue de l'organisation responsable*, n°1, 1-11.
- Baritoux V., Chazoule C., 2018. Légitimité et positionnement des marchés de gros dans les dynamiques de relocalisation de l'alimentation : les cas du marché de Lyon Corbas et du MIN de Grenoble. Journées de Recherche en Sciences Sociales, SFER, Dec 2018, Nantes, France

- Baritoux V., Houdart M., à paraître. La grande distribution moteur d'hybridation et d'innovation dans les systèmes alimentaires territoriaux : le cas d'une filière engagement qualité Carrefour, Ouvrage Format, Gasselinet al. (ed.).
- Beuseroy O., Mabon M-Z, Mariotti S., 2019. Les jardins potagers de Billom communauté. Rapport de projet collectif IADT, 73 pages.
- Belmin R., Casabianca F., Meynard J.-M., 2018. Contribution of transition theory to the study of geographical indications. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 27, 32-47.
- Billion C., 2018 (sous la direction de Lardon S., Baritoux V., Loudiyi S.). Rôle des acteurs du commerce et de la distribution dans les processus de gouvernance alimentaire territoriale. Thèse en géographie Ecole Doctorale LSHS, Université Clermont Auvergne, Clermont-Ferrand, 282 p + Annexes
- Bloom, J. D. and Hinrichs, C. C. (2011). Informal and formal mechanisms of coordination in hybrid food value chains. *Journal of Agriculture, Food systems, and Community Development* 1(4): 143-156
- Born B., Purcell M., 2006. Avoiding the local trap: scale and food systems in planning research. *Journal of planning education and research*, 26, 195-207.
- Bowen, S., Zapata, A.V., 2009. Geographical indications, terroir, and socioeconomic and ecological sustainability: the case of tequila. *J. Rural Stud.* 25 (1), 108e119.
- Bowen, S. (2010). Embedding Local Places in Global Spaces: Geographical Indications as a Territorial Development Strategy. *Rural Sociology* 75(2): 209-243
- Brenner N., 2001. The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration. *Progress in Human Geography*, 25 (4), 591-614.
- Caron P., Valette É., Wassenaar T., Coppens D'eeckenbrugge G., Papazian V., 2017. Des territoires vivants pour transformer le monde. Quae.
- Cayre P., Michaud A., Theau J.-P. & Rigolot C., 2018. The coexistence of multiple worldviews in livestock farming drives agroecological transition. A case study in french Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) cheese mountain areas, in *Sustainability*, 10(4):1097.
- Chabrat S., Baritoux V., Houdart M., 2014. De la viande, du foin et un pastoralisme sédentaire. Le cas de l'AOP Fin Gras du Mézenc. *Revue de Géographie Alpine-Journal of Alpine Research*, 102 (2), 12p.
- Debarbieux B., 2014. Enracinement – Ancrage – Amarrage : raviver les métaphores. *L'espace géographique*, 1 (43), 68-80.
- Deléage E., Sabin G., 2012. Modernité en friche. Cohabitation de pratiques agricoles in *Ethnologie française*, 42(4):667-676.
- Deverre C., Lamine C., 2010. Les systèmes agroalimentaires alternatifs: une revue de travaux anglophones en sciences sociales. *Econ. Rural.* 317, 57-73.
- Duram L., Oberholtzer L., 2010. A geographic approach to place and natural resource use in local food systems. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.*
- Fourcade C., 2008. Des dynamiques territorialisées novatrices : le cas des PME agro-alimentaires. *Revue d'Économie Régionale & Urbaine* (2), 193-210.
- Frayssignes J., 2005. Les AOC dans le développement territorial : une analyse en termes d'ancrage appliquée aux cas français des filières fromagères, Institut National Polytechnique de Toulouse, Toulouse, 469.
- Galliano D., Lallau B. & Touzard J.-M., 2017. Coexistences et transitions dans l'agriculture in *Revue française de socio-Economie*, (1):23-30.
- Geels F.W., 2002. Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: a multi-level perspective and a case study. *Research policy*, 31, 1257-1274.
- Gumuchian H., Pecqueur B., 2007. La ressource territoriale, Economica, Paris.
- Gwiazdzinski L. (Ed.), 2016. L'hybridation des mondes. Territoires et organisations à l'épreuve de l'hybridation. Grenoble: Elya Editions. Collection "L'innovation autrement". 344 p.
- Hedlund-De Witt, A. 2013. Worldviews and their significance for the global sustainable development debate. *Environ. Ethics*, 35, 133–162.
- Houdart M., Pocard R., 2015. Les conditions d'interaction entre dynamique de bassins laitiers et dynamique territoriale ? In. *Voies-lactées, Reconfigurations dans les bassins laitiers, une approche systémique dans sept bassins laitiers dans le monde* (Cardère éditeur Lirac, ed^eds), Napoléone, Corniaux, Leclerc France, 169-185.
- Houdart M., 2018. Mechanisms of food transition carried by civil society: Insights from the local currency of Puy-de-Dôme, France. 5th Global Conference on Economic Geography, Cologne Germany, 24-27 july.
- Houdart M., Loudiyi S., Caritey M., 2018. Des démarches innovantes pour la préservation du foncier agricole dans les territoires périurbains et ruraux : émergence, trajectoires, liens au territoire. Une lecture à partir de deux initiatives françaises (Auvergne, In: 26th Annual colloquium of the commission on the sustainability of rural systems "Infinite rural systems in a finite planet: bridging gaps towards sustainability", Santiago de Compostela, Espagne, 16-21 July.

- Iceri, V., 2018a. Atelier participatif sur le dynamisme collectif et territorial autour du magasin « Le Local », Ambert, France. Restitution du 19 Octobre 2018,
- Iceri V., 2018b. Atelier participatif sur le dynamisme collectif et territorial autour du projet « Terra Faxinalense », Emboque, São Mateus do Sul, Brésil. Restitution du 21 Novembre 2018, 5 pages.
- Iceri V., Lardon S., 2018. L'organisation socio spatiale, un commun pour le développement territorial. Le cas d'une communauté au Brésil. N° spécial : Biens communs et territoires, Leïla Kebir, Stéphane Nahrath et Frédéric Wallet (dir.), *Espaces et Sociétés*, (à paraître).
- Krugman P., 1995. Rendements croissants et géographie économique. In. *Economie industrielle et économies spatiale* (Rallet A., Torre A., eds), Economica, Paris, 317-334.
- Lamara H., 2009. Les deux piliers de la construction territoriale : coordination des acteurs et ressources territoriales Développement durable et territoires [En ligne],
- Lamine, C. and Chiffolleau, Y. (2012). Reconnecter agriculture et alimentation dans les territoires : dynamiques et défis. *Pour 3* (215-216): 85-92 <https://www.cairn.info/revue-pour-2012-3-page-85.htm>
- Lardon S., Tonneau J.-P., Raymond R., Chia E., Caron P., 2008. Dispositifs de gouvernance territoriale durable en agriculture. *Norois*, 209 (4), 17-36.
- Lardon S., Traversac J.-B., Wallet F., 2018. Territory game as smart development process for food governance in rural and periurban territories. In Torre A., Corsi S., Steiner M., Wallet F., Westlund H. "Is there a smart development for rural areas?", *TASTE book* (Routledge publisher) (en révision).
- Latour B., 2017. *Où atterrir ? Comment s'orienter en politique*, Paris, 156.
- Le Bel P.M., Houdart M., Lardon S., 2017. Tensions entre permanences et innovations dans l'intelligence territoriale. Le cas du Projet Alimentaire Territorial fédérant le Grand Clermont et le PNR Livradois-Forez. Colloque international 'Médiation et villes des intelligences', IEA, Paris, 7-8 novembre 2017.
- Le Bel P.-M., Houdart M. et Lardon S., 2018. « Finding a spatial rating for participation and innovation in food governance in Clermont-Ferrand, France » Communication présentée au colloque international de l'IGU, session spéciale Sustainable to resilient cities & Heritage — Montreal — August
- Le Bel, en cours. L'expérience de la marche et la pratique de l'urbanité entre ville-musée et ville-potager
- Le Velly, R. (2017). *Sociologie des systèmes alimentaires alternatifs : une promesse de différence*. Presses des Mines, Collection Sciences Sociales, Paris, p.
- Loring P. A., 2016. Toward a Theory of Coexistence in Shared Social-Ecological Systems: The Case of Cook Inlet Salmon Fisheries in *Human Ecology*, 44(2):153-165.
- Loudiyi S., Houdart M., Giacche G., 2014. Action collective et dynamiques agri-urbaines : le cas de la route de l'huile du monte pisano (PISE, ITALIE), ESO, L'espace en Partage, Nantes.
- Loudiyi, S., 2018. *Agricultures et alimentations de proximité*, in ???
- Loudiyi S., Houdart, M., 2019. L'alimentation comme levier de développement territorial ? Les cas de la fête de la Pomme de Massiac et du projet alimentaire territorial du Pays de Courpière, Auvergne, France. *Economie Rurale*.
- Marsden T., Banks J., Bristow G., 2000. Food supply chains approaches: exploring their role in rural development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40 (4), 424-438.
- Massey D., 2001. Taking of space-time. *Trans Inst Br Geogr*, 26, 257-261.
- Milestad R., Bartel-Kratochvil R., Leitner H., Axmann P., 2010. Being close: The quality of social relationships in a local organic cereal and breadnetwork in Lower Austria. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26, 228-240.
- Muchnik J., Cañada J.S., Salcido G.T., 2008. Systèmes agroalimentaires localisés : état des recherches et perspectives. *Cahiers Agriculture*, 17 (6), 513-519.
- Painter J., 2009. Territoire et réseau : une fausse dichotomie ? In. *Territoires, territorialité, territorialisation* (Vanier M., eds), PUR, Rennes, 57-66.
- Offner J.-M., 2006. Les territoires de l'action publique locales. Fausses pertinences et jeux d'écart. *Revue française de science politique*, 56 (1), 27-47.
- Oosterveer P., Sonnenfeld D.A., 2012. *Food, Globalization and Sustainability*, Earthscan, Routledge.
- Peemans J.-P., 2008. *Territoire, développement et mondialisation. Points de vue du sud*, Paris.
- Rallet A., Torre A., 1995. *Economie industrielle et économie spatiale*, Economica, Paris, Pages.
- Renting H., Marsden T. K. and Banks J. (2003). Understanding alternative food networks: exploring the role of short food supply chains in rural development. *Environment and Planning A* 35: 393-411
- Rigolot, C. Une approche évolutive des «visions du monde» pour penser les transformations de l'agriculture. *Cah. Agric.* 2017, 26, 36001.
- Saleilles S., 2006. Le faible encastrement territorial : handicap ou opportunité pour la création d'entreprise en milieu rural ?, In: *Cinquièmes Journées de la Proximité*. Bordeaux, France, 28-30 juin
- Tankam C., Lardon S., Fongang G., Tchekote H., à paraître. Conditions d'une politique de développement d'une agriculture durable dans la commune de Nkong Zem, région Ouest, Cameroun. *Mondes en développement*.

- Vanier M., 2009. Territoires, territorialité, territorialisation. Controverses et perspectives.
- Watts D.C.H., Ilbery B., Maye D., 2005. Making reconnections in agro-food geography: alternative systems of food provision. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29 (1), 22-40.
- Winter M., 2003. Embeddedness, the new food economy and defensive localism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 23-32.
- Wiskerke J. S. C., 2009. On places lost and places regained: Reflections on the alternative food geography and sustainable regional development. *International Planning Studies* 14(4): 369-387
- Zimmermann J.-B., 2005. Entreprises et territoires: entre nomadisme et ancrage territorial, *La Revue de l'Ires*, n°47, pp. 21-36