## INDEX

A2A, 72 Age, 133 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of United Nations, 12 Alea Ambiente, 84 Alessio Ciacci, 59 6AIka Future Circular Economy Hubs in Finland project (CircHubs), 30-31 AMSA, 55 ANCI-CONAI National Framework Agreement, 74 ASCIT, 59, 69 SpA in Capannori Municipality, 41, 69, 106 Associative process, 104 Automation, 50 Berliner Stadtreinigungsbetriebe (BSR), 69 Best practices in urban waste management, 3 Better Industrial Design, 39-40, 44 Biological waste, 111 Biomass, 111 Board Composition, 75 Board of directors, 66, 74, 82 Danish principles of good governance for utilities owned by municipalities, 80 good practices in OECD countries, 75 Boardroom efficiency, 75 Capannori Municipality, 58-59

Case studies of urban waste management operators, 3, 5 Cerro Maggiore landfill, 55 Chief Executive Officer (CEO), 66 Circular economy, 1–3, 51 approach, 27, 36, 113 example of Contarina SpA, 110 framework, 8 good waste management for Voka Snaga Ljubljana, 32 innovative solutions for circular economy in Ljubljana, 31 in strategies and performance measurement, 98 Circular Economy Action Plan, 96 Circular waste cycle, 51–53 Citizens, 114, 133 Collaborative networks, good practices and, 57-60 Collective responsibility, 115 Comitato Interministeriale dei Prezzi (CIP6), 51-52 Communication, 51–52, 120 and education plans, 44 staff members, 120 and training in Helsinki area, 121 Composting, 37-39 solution, 21 of waste, 22 Consortia, 74 of municipalities, 65 Contarina, 57-58 circular economy example of, 110

framework, 115–116 model, 115 SpA, 85, 109 Waste Management Academy, 122 Cooperation Agreement, 58 Corporate governance, 3 experience of LIPOR in Portugal, 66 rules, 71, 74, 79, 82, 132 "Corruption Risk and Related Offences Management Plan", 66 Cultural hegemony, 46–48 Cutting-edge waste firms, 120 DACCAPO Reuse Center, 41 Danish principles of good governance for utilities owned by municipalities, 80 DANVA, 79-80 Data availability, 117 Decision-makers, 11 Direct public management, 73 Divers data collection methods, 4 - 5Door-to-door collection systems, 37-39, 44, 52 Door-to-door or street bins, 119 Drinking water provision, 96 Earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization (EBITDA), 100Economic incentives, 39-40 Economic prosperity, 96 Education and Environmental Intervention Program, 98 EFFECORTA store, 43 Effective communication formula, 52 Efficiency in urban waste management provision, 94-95

Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recovery Centers network (CREW), 98 Emancipation, 50 Energy production, 51 Enlargement process, 12 of European Union, 13 Environmental accounting principles, 96 Environmental protection, 96 Enzo Favoino, 7 ERICA, 60-62 ERSAR, 99 Europe incineration of domestically generated waste, 21 municipal waste generation, 14 - 17municipal waste treatment in EU-28, 22 urban waste management in, 9 - 2.5European Commission, 2 European Environmental Agency, 11 European firms, 2 European Green Deal, 31–33 European Investment Bank, 3, 36 European policymakers, 123 European Union (EU), 1, 9, 50, 64, 94, 104, 132 sustainable product policy framework, 31 waste laws, 124 Financial institutions, 3 Finland HSY in, 64–65 landfill disposal of waste in, 25 Formia Rifiuti Zero Srl. (FRZ), 88, 112 Gender, 133 Genealogy, 46, 48 "Get-produce-use-throw"

approach, 27–29

152

Global Alliance Against Incinerators (GAIA), 52-53 Good practices and collaborative networks, 57-60 Good public services, 1 Good waste management, 3 for Voka Snaga Ljubljana, 32 Grassroots movement, 59-60 Greater Porto, 65 Green supply chains, 51–52 Gross domestic product (GDP), 1–2 Hazardous waste, 118 Helsinki Region Environmental Services Authority (HSY), 25, 28, 64-65, 118 communication and training in Helsinki area, 121 Petra Waste Benchmarking in Helsinki, 119 residents' waste management in, 118 In-house providers, 117 In-house provision of local public services, 130 Incineration, municipal waste treatment by, 25 Incinerators, 49 Individual responsibility, 115 Induction programs, 75 Informants, 4 Innovation, 104, 114, 131, 134-135 at LIPOR, 113 RCERO Ljubljana, 111 relevance of waste treatment plants today, 112 in service organization and tariff setting, 106 in waste management through collaboration and knowledge sharing, 110 Institutional actors, 30 Institutionalized public-private partnership, 71

Interim landfills, 40 International Solid Waste Association, 50 Investment, 132 Italian corporate governance code, 72 Italian examples of costs impact, 112Italian National Anti-Corruption Authority (ANAC), 117 Italian waste management, 3 Italy good practices and collaborative networks, 57-60 Milan, 54–57 National Packaging Consortium in, 74 social innovation networks, 60 - 62zero waste in, 53, 60, 62 Key performance indicators (KPIs), 99 Knowledge exchange processes, 46, 54 Knowledge sharing, 123, 127, 131, 134, 136 approach, 132 at macro-, meso-, and microlevels, 125 Landfill(ing), 44 disposal, 49 landfilled municipal waste, 23 - 25rate, 19 of waste, 21 Lavazza, 59 Linear approach, 27–29 Linear waste cycle, 49-50 LIPOR, 122 corporate governance experience of LIPOR in Portugal, 66 experience, 98 innovation at, 113 in Porto, 65

Waste Management Academy, 122Ljubljana model, 24 Management models, 63–74 Management team, 80 Mechanical-biological treatment plant, 55 Milan, from crisis to model, 54–57 Minerva, 7 Mixed ownership model, 67 Multiple case design, 4 Municipal corporation model, 68 Municipal Department 48 (MA 48), 64–65 Municipal solid waste (MSW). See also Zero waste (ZW), 64-65 management, 11-12 publicly owned start-up in, 88 Municipal utilities, 74 Municipal waste generation, 14-17 management system, 38 treatment by incineration, 25 and treatment in EU, 19 utilities, 67 Municipalities and waste firms, 120 Municipally owned enterprises (MOEs), 67 National Innovation Agency (ANI), 113 National Packaging Consortium in Italy, 74 National ZW Observatory, 59 Neoliberal discourse, 130 Nomination framework and practices, 75 Nonbusiness Entity of Research and Innovation System (ENESII), 113 Nonpublic organization, 125 Not In My Backyard syndrome (NIMBY syndrome), 119 - 120

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 11 Board of Directors good practices in, 75 countries, 75 Organized crime, 117 Owner municipality, 80 Ownership, 3, 6, 10 firms with, 3 role and potential impacts of different management models, 63-74 Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), 8 Pay-as-you-throw (PAYT), 31 systems, 40, 44, 58–59 tariffs, 40, 106 Performance of entrepreneurial actors, 131 indicators, 46 of public service operators, 93 Petra Waste Benchmarking in Helsinki, 30-31, 119 Point pricing systems based on PAYT principle, 52 Policymakers, 11 Polluter pays principle, 40 Private management model, 73 Privatization of public services, 130 Professionalism, 133 Project of ZW Research Center of Capannori, 41 Proportionality, 10 Public organization, 125 Public ownership, 132–133 Public policy development, 51–52 Public procurement, 44 Public sector organizations (PSOs), 97 Public service obligations (PSOs), 11 Public services, 1, 9 in EU framework, 9–10

provision, 71, 93, 96 remunicipalization process in public service provision, 82-92 Public shareholders, 133 Public tenders, 117 Publicly owned start-up in municipal solidwaste management, 88 Publicly owned waste operators, 133 Public-private conflict, 72 Punctual rate, 106 Quadrinomy, 58 Radio-frequency identification (RFID), 106 Recovery and disposal methods, 23 Recycling, 37–38 municipalities of Legambiente, 61-62 plants, 114 of waste, 22 Reduce and Recycle (Re. Re), 61 Reduction, recycling, and reuse, 12 Regional Recycling Plant, 31 Regional Waste Management Centre Ljubljana (RCERO Ljubljana), 23, 111 Remuneration, 75 Remunicipalization process, 82, 92, 130Contarina SpA, 85 publicly owned start-up in municipal solidwaste management, 88 Research, Development, and Innovation Unit (UIDI), 113 Residents waste management in HSY, 118 Residual separation and research facilities, 39-40 Responsibility, 114, 117, 131–133, 135 Retiambiente, 69

Reuse, repair, and deconstruction step, 37–38 Rossano Ercolini, 59 "Scuola Agraria del Parco di Monza", 56 Sector-specific sustainability, 98 Separate collection of recycling materials, 38 Separate collection systems, 52 Separate waste collection, 47 Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI), 10 Services of general interest (SGIs), 9 - 10Sintesi Srl, 58 Slovenia, urban waste management in, 23 Small-sized public-owned firm, 69 Snowball sampling technique, 4 Social actors, 4 Social contract, 47 Social equity, 96 Social innovation networks, ZW and, 60–62 Social movement, 46 Socio environmental responsibility, 133 Soft laws, 79 Solid Waste Association of North America, 50 Solid waste production and disposal, 11 Sorting Plant and Support Platforms, 113 Sortti pick-up service, 118 Source separation, 37–38 Stakeholders, 125 in circular economy practices, 122 engagement, 117, 122, 131–133, 136 State-owned enterprises (SOEs), 75, 79, 82 Subsidiarity, 10

Survey on Local Infrastructures and Equipment, 96 Sustainability, 103 reports, 99 environmental, 96 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), 98 Sustainable reporting, 100 Sustainable urban solid waste management, 103 innovation, 104-114 knowledge sharing, 123–127 responsibility, 114-117 stakeholder engagement, 117 - 122Sustainable waste management system, 6-7 Take-make-waste model (TMW model), 48, 53, 130 circular waste cycle, 51–53 linear waste cycle, 49-50 Tariff system, 109 Technological developments, 50 Technological innovations in waste treatment and recycling, 44 Training programs, 75 Triple bottom line approach (TBL approach), 3, 6, 96, 103, 134 circular economy in strategies and performance measurement, 98 efficiency in urban waste management provision, 94 - 95performance of public service operators, 93 sustainable reporting, 100 Voka Snaga in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 97 Unification process, 1 Urban solid waste collection and treatment, 11 management systems, 103

Urban waste generation, 2 Urban waste management. See also Sustainable urban solid waste management, 1–3, 11, 67, 115, 130 activities, 63 activities in performance measurement, 95 circular economy approach, 27 - 36in Europe, 6, 9, 25 factors affecting efficiency in, 94-95 operators, 95 remunicipalization process in, 82 - 92zero waste strategy for municipalities throughout world, 36–44 Urban waste services, 63 Board of Directors and other corporate governance rules, 74-82 corporate governance experience of LIPOR in Portugal, 66 management models in public service provision, 64 National Packaging Consortium in Italy, 74 ownership role and potential impacts of different management models, 63-74 remunicipalization process, 82 - 92small-sized public-owned firm, 69 Valorization, 131 Valpe Ambiente, 84 Voka Snaga, 24 in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 97 pillars of good waste management for, 32 Waste. See also Zero waste (ZW),

1-2, 51-52

collection and treatment systems, 47 crisis in Milan, 54 operators, 96, 120 policy, 2 privatization, 130 reduction initiatives, 2, 39-40 sector, 2 separate waste collection, 2 waste-to-energy plant, 28 Waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE), 100 Waste Framework Directive, 1–2 Waste management, 1–2, 29–30, 94, 130 firms and municipalities, 3 innovation in, 110 professionals in, 4 start-up for, 7 system, 45, 109, 1035 Waste Management Academy throughout Europe, 122

Waste of electrical and electronic equipment waste (WEEE waste), 64-65, 106 Zero waste (ZW). See also Municipal solid waste (MSW), 23, 45–46, 48, 94-95, 131 approach, 103 ASCIT Spa, Capannori, Italy, 41 in Europe, 4 framework, 3, 6 in Italy, 4, 53, 62 and social innovation networks, 60-62 strategy for municipalities throughout world, 36-44 thinking zero waste sociologically, 46-48 TMW vs., 48–53 Zero waste Europe (ZWE), 53 Zero waste International Alliance (ZWIA), 52