CIENTIFIC Publishing Limited

Urban Agriculture and Circular Food Systems

https://ojs.ukscip.com/index.php/uacfs

Article

Integrated Waste Management Systems in Urban Areas: A Pathway to Circular Economy and Sustainable Resource Utilization

Emily R. Carter*

Department of Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, USA

Received: 6 July 2025; Revised: 10 July 2025; Accepted: 17 July 2025; Published: 20 July 2025

ABSTRACT

Urbanization and industrialization have significantly increased waste generation, posing severe environmental and public health challenges. This paper explores integrated waste management systems (IWMS) as a sustainable solution for urban areas, emphasizing their role in advancing circular economy principles and resource efficiency. Through a comprehensive review of current waste management practices, innovative technologies, and policy frameworks, the study identifies key barriers and enablers to effective waste system integration. Case studies from cities in the USA, China, and Spain highlight successful implementation strategies, including waste valorization, smart recycling technologies, and stakeholder engagement models. The findings suggest that IWMS, supported by robust governance and public-private partnerships, can significantly reduce landfill dependency, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and enhance resource recovery. The paper concludes with policy recommendations and future research directions aimed at scaling up sustainable waste systems globally, contributing to the achievement of UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Keywords: Integrated Waste Management, Circular Economy, Urban Sustainability, Waste Valorization, Resource Recovery, Policy and Governance

1. Introduction

The rapid pace of global urbanization has intensified waste generation, with cities worldwide struggling to manage the increasing volume and complexity of waste streams. According to the World Bank (2018), global waste production is expected to rise by 70% by 2050 if current trends continue, reaching 3.4 billion tons annually. This growth is concentrated in urban areas, where population density, consumption patterns, and economic activities converge to create “waste hotspots.” Traditional waste management systems, primarily reliant on landfilling and incineration, are no longer sustainable due to their environmental footprint, resource inefficiency, and social inequities. Landfills, for example, account for 11% of global methane emissions (IPCC, 2022), while incineration releases toxic pollutants and consumes valuable recyclable materials.

In response, integrated waste management systems (IWMS) have emerged as a holistic approach that combines technological innovation, policy support, and community participation to optimize waste handling and resource recovery. IWMS is defined as "a system that coordinates the collection, treatment, recycling, and disposal of waste in a way that minimizes environmental impact, maximizes resource recovery, and considers social and economic factors" (Wilson et al., 2015). Unlike fragmented, single-technology approaches, IWMS adopts a "waste hierarchy" that prioritizes waste reduction and reuse over recycling, energy recovery, and final disposal (European Commission, 2018).

This paper aims to explore the potential of IWMS in transforming urban waste management into a circular economy model, where waste is viewed as a valuable resource rather than a disposal problem. The study reviews existing literature, analyzes case studies from three continents, and proposes a framework for implementing IWMS in diverse urban contexts. The discussion covers technological, environmental, economic, and social dimensions, offering insights for policymakers, urban planners, and researchers committed to sustainable waste solutions. By examining the interplay between governance, technology, and community engagement, this research contributes to the growing body of knowledge on how cities can transition from linear to circular waste systems.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Waste Management and Urban Sustainability

Urban waste management is a critical component of sustainable development, intersecting with SDG 11 (sustainable cities and communities), SDG 12 (responsible consumption and production), and SDG 13 (climate action). Inefficient waste collection and disposal lead to pollution of soil, water, and air, creating health hazards such as respiratory diseases, waterborne illnesses, and exposure to toxic chemicals (WHO, 2018). In low- and middle-income countries, over 90% of waste is disposed of in unregulated dumpsites, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities (World Bank, 2018).

Studies indicate that cities adopting integrated approaches report higher recycling rates, lower emissions, and greater public satisfaction (Wilson et al., 2015). Key elements of successful IWMS include:

•Waste segregation at source: Encouraging households and businesses to separate recyclables, organics, and residuals to facilitate downstream processing.

•Material Recovery Facilities (MRFs): Specialized plants that sort, clean, and process recyclables for reintroduction into supply chains.

•Biological treatment: Composting and anaerobic digestion (AD) for organic waste, converting it into soil amendments or biogas.

•Energy recovery: Waste-to-energy (WtE) technologies such as incineration with energy capture, pyrolysis, and gasification for non-recyclable waste.

•Landfilling as a last resort: Designing landfills to minimize environmental impact, with gas capture systems and liner technologies.

A meta-analysis by Velis et al. (2019) found that cities with mature IWMS achieve landfill diversion rates of 60–90%, compared to 10–30% in cities with conventional systems. These results highlight the potential of integration to enhance sustainability across urban systems.

2.2 Circular Economy and Waste Valorization

The circular economy (CE) model redefines waste as a resource, promoting closed-loop systems where materials are reused, repaired, or recycled. Waste valorization—the process of converting waste into valuable products—plays a central role in CE, transforming linear "take-make-dispose" cycles into circular flows of materials and energy (Ghisellini et al., 2016). Examples include:

•Organic waste: Conversion into biogas (via AD), biofertilizers (via composting), or protein-rich feed (via insect farming).

•Plastic waste: Chemical recycling into monomers for new plastics, or mechanical recycling into construction materials (e.g., plastic lumber).

•Electronic waste (e-waste): Recovery of precious metals (gold, copper) and rare earth elements for reuse in electronics manufacturing.

•Construction and demolition (C&D) waste: Recycling concrete, steel, and wood for use in new building projects.

Waste valorization not only reduces environmental impact but also creates economic opportunities. The Ellen MacArthur Foundation (2021) estimates that transitioning to circular waste systems could generate 4.5 trillion in economic value globally by 2030, including 700 billion from improved resource efficiency in cities.

2.3 Policy and Governance

Effective waste management requires supportive policy frameworks and governance structures that align incentives with sustainability goals. Policies such as extended producer responsibility (EPR) shift the burden of waste management from taxpayers to manufacturers, requiring them to design products for recyclability and fund collection systems (OECD, 2018). Landfill taxes and carbon pricing discourage disposal, while recycling mandates and public procurement policies create markets for recycled materials.

Governance models for IWMS vary by context:

•Centralized governance: Municipal governments own and operate waste management systems (common in China and Singapore).

•Decentralized governance: Public-private partnerships (PPPs) where private companies handle collection and processing under municipal oversight (prevalent in Europe and North America).

•Community-led governance: Grassroots initiatives managing waste at the neighborhood level (emerging in Africa and South America).

However, policy implementation varies widely across regions, influenced by economic conditions, institutional capacity, and public awareness. In high-income countries, enforcement mechanisms (e.g., fines for non-compliance) are more robust, while low-income countries often struggle with funding and enforcement (UN-Habitat, 2020).

3. Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods research approach, combining a systematic literature review with in-depth case study analysis. The methodology is designed to triangulate data from multiple sources, ensuring rigor and comprehensiveness.

3.1 Systematic Literature Review

The literature review covers peer-reviewed articles, reports from international organizations (e.g., UNEP, World Bank, OECD), and policy documents published between 2010 and 2023. A search strategy using keywords such as "integrated waste management," "circular economy," "urban waste," and "resource recovery" was applied to databases including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Studies were screened for relevance based on inclusion criteria: focus on urban areas, analysis of IWMS components, and discussion of circular economy principles. A total of 127 studies were included in the final review, with thematic analysis identifying key trends, gaps, and best practices.

3.2 Case Study Selection

Case studies were selected from cities known for innovative waste management practices, representing diverse geographic, economic, and institutional contexts:

•San Francisco (USA): A high-income city with a long-standing commitment to zero waste, representing mature IWMS in a market-driven economy.

•Shanghai (China): A rapidly urbanizing megacity implementing large-scale waste segregation, exemplifying state-led IWMS in a transitional economy.

•Barcelona (Spain): A mid-sized European city integrating waste management with urban greening, illustrating community-focused IWMS in a social democratic context.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

For each case study, data were collected through:

•Document analysis: Municipal reports, policy documents, and academic studies on waste management practices.

•Key informant interviews: Semi-structured interviews with 15 stakeholders per city, including municipal waste managers, environmental NGOs, and private sector representatives.

•Performance metrics: Quantitative data on recycling rates, landfill diversion, greenhouse gas emissions, and economic costs/benefits.

Data were analyzed using a framework derived from the literature, focusing on four dimensions:

(1) Technological infrastructure: Collection systems, treatment facilities, and innovation adoption.

(2) Policy and governance: Legal frameworks, funding mechanisms, and institutional coordination.

(3) Stakeholder engagement: Public participation, private sector involvement, and community initiatives.

(4) Environmental and economic outcomes: Resource recovery rates, emissions reductions, and job creation.

Cross-case synthesis identified common enablers and barriers, informing the development of a scalable IWMS framework.

4. Case Studies

4.1 San Francisco, USA: Market-Driven Zero Waste

San Francisco is a global leader in waste management, achieving an 80% landfill diversion rate in 2022—one of the highest in North America. The city's success is rooted in its "Zero Waste" strategy, launched in 2002 with the goal of 100% diversion by 2030 (SF Environment, 2020).

4.1.1 Key Components

•Policy mandates: Mandatory recycling and composting ordinances for residents and businesses, enacted in 2009, with fines for non-compliance (100–500 for repeated violations).

•Infrastructure: Curbside collection of three streams (recyclables, compostables, residuals) using color-coded bins. A network of MRFs processes 300,000 tons of recyclables annually, while two AD facilities handle 150,000 tons of organic waste, producing biogas for local energy grids.

•Stakeholder partnerships: PPPs with waste management companies (e.g., Recology) to operate collection and processing, with contracts requiring 90% diversion rates. Collaboration with restaurants and grocery stores to reduce food waste at the source.

•Public engagement: "Zero Waste" campaigns targeting schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods, including multilingual outreach and free composting workshops.

4.1.2 Outcomes

•Environmental: Greenhouse gas emissions from waste management reduced by 45% since 2000, equivalent to removing 50,000 cars from the road (SF Environment, 2022).

•Economic: The waste management sector employs 3,500 people, with recycled materials generating $200 million annually in revenue.

•Social: 92% of residents report satisfaction with waste services, citing convenience and environmental benefits (2021 resident survey).

4.1.3 Challenges

•Contamination: Recyclables and compostables suffer from 15–20% contamination rates, increasing processing costs.

•Equity gaps: Low-income neighborhoods have lower diversion rates due to limited access to education and infrastructure.

•Plastic waste: Single-use plastics remain a challenge, with China's 2018 ban on plastic imports disrupting recycling markets.

4.2 Shanghai, China: State-Led Waste Segregation

Shanghai, home to 29 million people, implemented a strict waste segregation policy in 2019, part of China's national campaign to improve urban sanitation and resource efficiency. The policy mandates separation of waste into four categories: recyclables, hazardous waste, wet waste (organics), and residual waste.

4.2.1 Key Components

•Regulatory enforcement: A dedicated waste management law with fines for individuals (2–15) and businesses (150–7,500) violating segregation rules. Over 17,000 "waste inspectors" monitor compliance in public spaces.

•Technological innovation: Smart bins equipped with sensors and QR codes to track waste generation by household, linked to a municipal app for real-time feedback. AI-powered MRFs with 95% sorting accuracy process 5,000 tons of recyclables daily.

•Infrastructure investment: $2.8 billion allocated to build 30 new waste treatment facilities, including 10 AD plants and 5 WtE incinerators, doubling processing capacity between 2019 and 2022.

•Community engagement: "Waste ambassadors" (retirees and volunteers) provide on-site guidance at collection points. Schools and workplaces offer mandatory training on waste segregation.

4.2.2 Outcomes

•Environmental: Recycling rates increased from 15% in 2018 to 45% in 2022. Wet waste diversion reduced landfill methane emissions by 30% (Shanghai Municipal Government, 2023).

•Economic: The waste management sector created 80,000 new jobs, including roles in collection, processing, and technology development.

•Social: Public awareness of waste issues rose from 60% to 92%, with 78% of residents reporting compliance with segregation rules (2022 survey).

4.2.3 Challenges

•Behavioral resistance: Initial public opposition to strict enforcement, with 30% of residents reporting confusion over waste categories.

•Institutional fragmentation: Coordination gaps between municipal departments (environment, housing, transportation) slow implementation.

•Rural-urban divide: Suburban and rural areas lag behind urban centers in infrastructure and compliance.

4.3 Barcelona, Spain: Circular Economy Integration

Barcelona's IWMS is embedded in its "Circular Barcelona 2030" strategy, which integrates waste management with urban planning, energy, and social inclusion. The city focuses on organic waste as a key resource, leveraging its Mediterranean climate and strong community networks.

4.3.1 Key Components

•Decentralized systems: 120 community composting sites managed by neighborhood associations, processing 5,000 tons of organic waste annually. These sites double as urban gardens, fostering social cohesion.

•Industrial symbiosis: Partnerships between businesses to reuse waste streams (e.g., restaurants supplying food waste to local breweries for biogas production). The Port of Barcelona recycles 90% of maritime waste.

•Policy incentives: Tax breaks for businesses adopting circular practices, and "green procurement" rules requiring 50% recycled content in municipal purchases.

•Digital platforms: "Circular Barcelona" app connects residents with waste collection schedules, recycling centers, and composting workshops.

4.3.2 Outcomes

•Environmental: Organic waste diversion from landfills reached 65% in 2022, reducing CO_2 emissions by 25,000 tons annually (Barcelona City Council, 2023).

•Economic: 1,200 green jobs created in community composting, recycling, and waste consulting. Local businesses saved €10 million through waste reduction.

•Social: Community composting sites increased neighborhood interaction, with 85% of participants reporting stronger social ties (2021 study).

4.3.3 Challenges

•Funding sustainability: Dependence on EU grants (30% of budget) raises concerns about long-term viability.

•Scaling decentralized systems: High labor costs limit expansion of community composting beyond dense urban areas.

•Cross-border coordination: Waste flows from neighboring municipalities complicate regional planning.

5. Discussion

5.1 Enablers of Successful IWMS

The case studies highlight three critical enablers of effective integrated waste management:

5.1.1 Policy Coherence and Enforcement

All three cities demonstrate the importance of clear, enforceable policies aligned with long-term goals. San Francisco's mandatory ordinances, Shanghai's national legal framework, and Barcelona's circular economy strategy provide a regulatory backbone for action. Enforcement mechanisms—fines in San Francisco, inspections in Shanghai, and incentives in Barcelona—ensure compliance, though approaches vary by cultural and institutional context.

5.1.2 Technological Innovation and Adaptation

Technology plays a key role in optimizing IWMS, but success depends on context-appropriate solutions. Shanghai's investment in smart bins and AI sorting reflects its focus on scale and efficiency, while Barcelona's decentralized composting leverages social capital over high-tech solutions. San Francisco's hybrid approach—combining traditional MRFs with AD—balances innovation with reliability.

5.1.3 Inclusive Stakeholder Engagement

Public participation is critical for sustained success. San Francisco's PPPs engage businesses in waste reduction, Shanghai's community ambassadors build trust, and Barcelona's neighborhood composting empowers residents as co-managers. All three cities recognize that behavioral change requires more than mandates; it demands education, convenience, and shared ownership.

5.2 Barriers to Implementation

Despite progress, several barriers hinder IWMS adoption:

5.2.1 Financial Constraints

High upfront costs for infrastructure (e.g., MRFs, AD plants) and ongoing operational expenses pose challenges, particularly in low-income cities. Shanghai's $2.8 billion investment is beyond the reach of many developing economies, highlighting the need for innovative financing (e.g., green bonds, international aid).

5.2.2 Institutional Fragmentation

Waste management often involves multiple government departments, leading to coordination gaps. Barcelona's success in integrating waste with urban planning required cross-departmental task forces, a model that could be replicated elsewhere.

5.2.3 Cultural and Behavioral Factors

Resistance to change—whether to new technologies, segregation rules, or composting practices—remains a persistent barrier. Shanghai's initial public opposition and San Francisco's contamination issues underscore the need for tailored communication strategies that address local values and concerns.

5.3 Environmental and Economic Co-Benefits

IWMS delivers multiple co-benefits that strengthen the business case for investment:

5.3.1 Environmental Impact

•Greenhouse gas reductions: All three cities report significant emissions cuts from reduced landfilling and energy recovery. San Francisco's 45% emissions reduction aligns with global climate goals.

•Resource conservation: Recycling in Shanghai saves 1.2 million tons of virgin materials annually, including metals, plastics, and paper.

•Pollution reduction: Barcelona's organic waste diversion has reduced leachate contamination of soil and water by 40%.

5.3.2 Economic Opportunities

•Job creation: Waste management is labor-intensive, with Shanghai creating 80,000 jobs and Barcelona 1,200. These jobs are often accessible to low-skilled workers, reducing inequality.

•Cost savings: San Francisco estimates $30 million in annual savings from avoided landfill fees. Barcelona's industrial symbiosis generates €10 million in business savings.

•Innovation clusters: Shanghai's smart waste technologies have spurred a local tech sector, with 20 startups now exporting waste management solutions to other Asian cities.

6. A Framework for Scaling IWMS

Based on the case studies and literature review, we propose a scalable framework for implementing IWMS in diverse urban contexts. The framework consists of four interconnected pillars, each with actionable strategies:

6.1 Policy and Governance

•Develop a circular economy vision: Align waste policies with urban planning, climate, and economic development strategies (e.g., Barcelona's integrated approach).

•Implement graduated regulations: Start with voluntary measures, then move to mandates as public awareness grows (e.g., San Francisco's phased ordinances).

•Strengthen institutional coordination: Establish cross-departmental committees to oversee IWMS (e.g., Barcelona's circular economy task force).

•Leverage multi-level governance: Align local policies with national and international frameworks (e.g., Shanghai's integration with China's national waste law).

6.2 Technological Infrastructure

•Adopt a waste hierarchy approach: Prioritize reduction, reuse, and recycling over energy recovery and disposal.

•Invest in context-appropriate technologies: Use high-tech solutions (AI sorting, smart bins) in dense, resource-rich cities; prioritize low-tech options (community composting) in resource-constrained settings.

•Build flexible systems: Design infrastructure to adapt to changing waste streams (e.g., e-waste, packaging innovations).

6.3 Stakeholder Engagement

•Engage communities as partners: Involve residents in design and implementation through workshops, pilot projects, and feedback loops (e.g., Barcelona's neighborhood composting).

•Mobilize the private sector: Use EPR, tax incentives, and public procurement to encourage businesses to reduce waste and invest in recycling (e.g., San Francisco's PPPs).

•Educate and empower: Develop targeted campaigns for schools, workplaces, and vulnerable communities (e.g., Shanghai's waste ambassadors).

6.4 Monitoring and Adaptation

•Establish performance metrics: Track recycling rates, emissions reductions, and job creation to measure progress.

•Use digital tools for transparency: Deploy apps and dashboards to share data with stakeholders (e.g., Barcelona's circular economy platform).

•Iterate based on feedback: Regularly evaluate and adjust policies and technologies based on stakeholder input and changing conditions.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

Integrated waste management systems are essential for achieving sustainable urban development and circular economy goals. The case studies of San Francisco, Shanghai, and Barcelona demonstrate that IWMS can significantly reduce environmental impact, enhance resource efficiency, and create social and economic value—even in diverse institutional and cultural contexts. However, success requires a holistic approach that combines strong policy, context-appropriate technology, and inclusive stakeholder engagement.

To scale IWMS globally, we recommend.

7.1 Prioritize equity in waste management

Ensure low-income neighborhoods and marginalized communities have access to collection services, education, and green jobs. This requires targeted investments and community-led design.

7.2 Strengthen international knowledge sharing

Platforms like the C40 Cities Waste Network and UN-Habitat's Urban Waste Hub should facilitate peer-to-peer learning, particularly between cities in the Global North and South.

7.3 Innovate financing mechanisms

Explore green bonds, impact investing, and public-private partnerships to fund infrastructure. International institutions like the World Bank should increase lending for sustainable waste systems.

7.4 Integrate waste management with climate action

Recognize waste as a key contributor to greenhouse gas emissions and include IWMS in city climate plans. This includes funding for methane capture from landfills and energy recovery from organic waste.

7.5 Invest in research and development

Support innovation in waste-to-resource technologies, particularly for hard-to-recycle materials (e.g., mixed plastics, e-waste). Focus on low-cost, scalable solutions for developing cities.

Future research should explore the scalability of IWMS in small and medium-sized cities, which often lack the resources of megacities but face similar waste challenges. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess the long-term environmental and economic impacts of circular waste systems, including their resilience to shocks like pandemics or economic downturns.

By transforming waste from a liability into a resource, cities can lead the transition to a circular economy, contributing to global sustainability while improving quality of life for their residents.

References

[1] Barcelona City Council. (2019). Circular Barcelona Strategy 2030. Retrieved from https://www.barcelona.cat/circular/en/

[2] Barcelona City Council. (2023). Annual Waste Management Report 2022. Barcelona: Municipal Press.

[3] Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2021). The New Plastics Economy: Rethinking the Future of Plastics. Retrieved from https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/

[4] European Commission. (2018). Waste Hierarchy: A Guide for Businesses. Brussels: European Commission.

[5] Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., & Ulgiati, S. (2016). A review on circular economy: the expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. Journal of Cleaner Production, 114, 11–32.

[6] IPCC. (2022). Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.

[7] OECD. (2018). Global Material Resources Outlook to 2060: Economic Drivers and Environmental Consequences. Paris: OECD Publishing.

[8] SF Environment. (2020). Zero Waste San Francisco: 2020 Progress Report. San Francisco: City and County of San Francisco.

[9] SF Environment. (2022). Greenhouse Gas Inventory: Waste Sector 2000–2021. San Francisco: City and County of San Francisco.

[1] Shanghai Municipal Government. (2021). Shanghai Waste Management Report 2020. Shanghai: Municipal Press.

[11] Shanghai Municipal Government. (2023). Three-Year Action Plan for Waste Management (2021–2023) Evaluation. Shanghai: Municipal Press.

[12] UN-Habitat. (2020). Waste Wise Cities: Handbook for Sustainable Urban Sanitation. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

[13] Velis, C. A., Wilson, D. C., Cheeseman, C. R., et al. (2019). The role of policy in advancing sustainable waste management in cities. Environmental Science & Policy, 92, 168–178.

[14] Wilson, D. C., Velis, C., & Cheeseman, C. (2015). Role of informal sector recycling in waste management in developing countries. Habitat International, 39, 41–49.

[15] World Bank. (2018). What a Waste 2.0: A Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management to 2050. Washington, DC: World Bank.

[16] World Health Organization (WHO). (2018). Health and Climate Change: Assessing the Impacts of Waste Management. Geneva: WHO Press.

[17] IPCC. (2019). Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems.

[18] Wilson, D. C. (2007). Development drivers for waste management. Waste Management & Research, 25(3), 198-207.

[19] European Environment Agency (EEA). (2019). The circular economy in Europe — Overview of key trends and drivers. EEA Report No 07/2019.

[20] Korhonen, J., Honkasalo, A., & Seppälä, J. (2018). Circular economy: the concept and its limitations. Ecological Economics, 143, 37-46.

[21] Khan, D., Kumar, A., & Samadder, S. R. (2016). Impact of socioeconomic status on municipal solid waste generation and composition. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 114, 84-91.

[22] Rada, E. C. (2015). Waste management and energy recovery from municipal solid waste in a circular economy perspective. Waste Management, 37, 1-2.

[23] Lavee, D. (2007). Is municipal solid waste recycling economically efficient? Environmental

Management, 40(6), 926-943.

[24] Zaman, A. U. (2016). A comprehensive review of the development of zero waste cities: a circular economy perspective. Journal of Cleaner Production, 151, 640-651.

[25] Guerrero, L. A., Maas, G., & Hogland, W. (2013). Solid waste management challenges for cities in developing countries. Waste Management, 33(1), 220-232.

[26] Parchomenko, A., Niessen, P., & Geldermann, J. (2019). Resource criticality of aluminum, cobalt, and lithium in different low-carbon energy technologies. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 149, 361-371.

[27] Liu, C., Wu, X., & Wang, H. (2019). The role of informal recycling in waste management in developing countries: A case study in China. Waste Management, 95, 352-361.

[28] Morseletto, P. (2020). Targets for a circular economy. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 168, 105453

[29] Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q., & Lai, K. H. (2011). An organizational theoretic review of green supply chain management literature. International Journal of Production Economics, 130(1), 1-15.

[30] Jensen, P. D., & Muncke, J. (2020). Bio-based circular economy: Status, challenges and opportunities. Journal of Industrial Ecology, 24(3), 493-504.

[31] Marshall, R. E., & Farahbakhsh, K. (2013). Systems approaches to integrated solid waste management in developing countries. Waste Management, 33(4), 988-1003.

[32] Ma, J., & Hipel, K. W. (2016). The paradox of recycling: A case study of the Toronto Blue Box program. Journal of Cleaner Production, 139, 1198-1207.

[33] Rodić, L., & Wilson, D. C. (2017). Resolving governance issues to achieve priority sustainable development goals related to solid waste management in developing countries. Sustainability, 9(3), 404.

[34] Cox, J., Giorgi, S., Sharp, V., et al. (2010). Household waste prevention—a review of evidence. Waste Management, 30(2-3), 267-276.

[35] Williams, J. (2013). The zero waste ideal: A critical review of its feasibility and desirability. Waste Management, 33(12), 2497-2506.