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SHARECITY: Aims and Objectives

SHARECITY will assess the practice and sustainability potential of city-based ICT-enabled food sharing economies by:

- Developing deeper theoretical understandings of contemporary food sharing
- Generating comparative international data about food sharing activities
- Assessing the sustainability impacts of food sharing activities and envisioning the future of food sharing in cities
Research Phases

1. **Phase One (2015 - 2016)**
   Conceptual development and SHARECITY100 Database

2. **Phase Two (2017 - 2018)**
   Multi-sited city ethnographies in contrasting contexts

   Co-designing impacts of food sharing

4. **Phase Four (2019-2020)**
   Visioning future food sharing landscapes
What is ifoodsharing?

**Food sharing:** No agreed definition. OED (2014):
- Have a portion of FOOD with another or others; [shared consumption]
- Give a portion of FOOD to others; [gifting]
- Use, occupy, or enjoy FOOD jointly; [shared use of space & experiences]
- Possess an interest in FOOD in common; [shared interest]
- Tell someone about FOOD [shared knowledge/skills]

**ifood sharing:**
- ICT, web 2.0 innovations
- Transformative claims e.g. Scholz, 2016, Choi & Foth, 2013
- Increased ICT penetration worldwide e.g. 50% Internet penetration, USA 88%, UK 88%, India 35%
Why Coding and Decoding?

• Lack of comparative international empirical data on food sharing economies

• Undefined “fuzzy” concept of food sharing

• Scattered data across cities within existing sub-categories of food sharing (e.g. community gardens, community supported agriculture, food banks, gleaning networks)

• Weak understanding of emergent or unregulated activities

• Lack of data on transformative potential of ICT
## Processes of Coding & Decoding

1. **Scoping Phase**  
   Developing a food sharing typology - what is being shared and how  
   Selecting 100 cities

2. **Recruitment Phase**  
   Team expertise, knowledge, language skills, geography

3. **Development Phase**  
   Defining and re-defining typologies

4. **Collection Phase**  
   Data collection  
   Negotiating and coding  
   Validity  
   Positionality  
   Challenges and limitations
Top 10 Cities
London 198
NYC 188
Melbourne 144
Berlin 137
Sydney 108
Barcelona 107
Philadelphia 82
Chicago 72
Buenos Aires 70
Vancouver 68

4028 ifood sharing enterprises across 100 global cities
What is Shared and How?

What is Shared:
- Knowledge & Skills: 53% vs 16%
- Meals
- Fruits & Vegetables
- Eating together
- Land
- Food Products
- Tools
- Plants & Seeds
- Kitchen Devices
- Kitchen Space
- Compost
- Meat & Fish

How it is Shared:
- Selling
- Gifting
- Collecting
- Bartering

Multi functionality
What is Shared: 70% How is shared: 21%
e.g. ifoodsharing Social Enterprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is shared?</th>
<th>How is it shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Gifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organization of Sharing and Flows

Multi functionality (ALL:29% Cooperatives: 62%)

- Nonprofits: 1386
- Associations: 1101
- For profits: 1007
- Informal: 829
- Cooperatives: 261
- Social Enterprises: 229

- Peer2Peer: 2384
- Charity2Individual: 864
- Business2Individual: 86
- Business2Charity: 779
- Charity2Charity: 183
- Individual2Charity: 161
- Business2Business: 121

- Economic: 3150
- Social: 3078
- Environmental: 2455
- All 3: 1379

34%
The Role of ICT in ifoodsharing

1. **Website (ICT-supported)**
   95% of all for profit enterprises have a proper website, whereas only 84% of informal activities.

2. **Facebook + Twitter (ICT-enhanced)**
   16% of informal enterprises use only social media versus 6% of for profit.

3. **Apps (ICT-enabled)**
   73% of all apps are used by for profits. Less than 1% of all apps are used by cooperatives.
Summary

• First global landscape of ifood sharing in 100 global cities

• Database as a snapshot that provides comparative international empirical data on food sharing economies and the use of ICT

Next Steps

• Selecting city profiles for in-depth ethnographies

• Selecting and developing relationships with food sharing enterprises
Thank you!

Presentation by Monika Rut – rutm@tcd.ie

Anna Davies, Ferne Edwards, Brigida Marovelli, Oona Morrow, Monika Rut, Marion Weymes

Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

www.sharecity.ie
@sharecityire