



Solid Waste Management

IN THE WORLD'S CITIES

WATER AND SANITATION IN THE WORLD'S CITIES 2010



SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE WORLD'S CITIES

This page intentionally left blank

**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT
IN THE WORLD'S CITIES**
WATER AND SANITATION IN THE WORLD'S CITIES
2010

United Nations Human Settlements Programme

First published 2010
by Earthscan

Published 2014 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY, 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) 2010

All rights reserved

DISCLAIMER

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or regarding its economic system or degree of development. The analysis, conclusions and recommendations of the report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), the Governing Council of UN-HABITAT or its Member States.

Earthscan publishes in association with the International Institute for Environment and Development

Typeset by MapSet Ltd, Gateshead, UK

Cover design by Susanne Harris

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data has been applied for

ISBN 13: 978-1-849-71169-2 (hbk)

ISBN 13: 978-1-849-71170-8 (pbk)

At Earthscan we strive to minimize our environmental impacts and carbon footprint through reducing waste, recycling and offsetting our CO₂ emissions, including those created through publication of this book.

FOREWORD

Regardless of the context, managing solid waste is one of the biggest challenges of the urban areas of all sizes, from mega-cities to the small towns and large villages, which are home to the majority of humankind. It is almost always in the top five of the most challenging problems for city managers. It is somewhat strange that it receives so little attention compared to other urban management issues. The quality of waste management services is a good indicator of a city's governance. The way in which waste is produced and discarded gives us a key insight into how people live. In fact if a city is dirty, the local administration may be considered ineffective or its residents may be accused of littering. Available data show that cities spend a substantial proportion of their available recurrent budget on solid waste management, yet waste collection rates for cities in low- and middle-income countries range from a low of 10 per cent in peri-urban areas to a high of 90 per cent in commercial city centres.

Many developing and transitional country cities have active informal sector recycling, reuse and repair systems, which are achieving recycling rates comparable to those in the West, at no cost to the formal waste management sector. Not only does the informal recycling sector provide livelihoods to huge numbers of the urban poor, but they may save the city as much as 15 to 20 per cent of its waste management budget by reducing the amount of waste that would otherwise have to be collected and disposed of by the city. This form of inclusion in solid waste management shows how spectacular results can be achieved where the involvement of the informal sector is promoted.

The struggle for achieving the Millennium Development Goal and related targets for water and sanitation is being waged in our cities, towns and villages where solid wastes are generated. It is at this level that policy initiatives on solid waste management become operational reality and an eminently political affair: conflicts have to be resolved and consensus found among competing interests and parties.

This publication, *Solid Waste Management in the World Cities*, is the third edition in UN-HABITAT's State of Water and Sanitation in the World Cities series. It aims to capture the world's current waste management trends and draw attention to the importance of waste management, especially regarding its role in reaching the UN Millennium Development Goals. The publication acknowledges the escalating challenges in solid waste management across the globe. It seeks to showcase the good work that is being done on solid waste by cities around the world, large and small, rich and poor. It achieves this by looking at what drives change in solid waste management, how cities find local solutions and what seems to work best under different circumstances. The publication endeavours to help decision-makers, practitioners and ordinary citizens understand how a solid waste management system works and to inspire people everywhere to make their own decisions on the next steps in developing a solution appropriate to their own city's particular circumstances and needs. Most readers will never travel to all the 20 cities featured in this report, but through this publication they will have access to real experiences of people working on the ground. We hope it will provide a reference point for managing solid waste in the world's cities and towns, and that many will follow in the footsteps of our authors, and we can move to an improved set of global reference data.



Anna Tibaijuka

*Under-Secretary General, United Nations
Executive Director, UN-Habitat*



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities series, published every three years, was mandated by UN-HABITAT Governing Council Resolution 19/6, adopted on 9 May 2003, following the publication of the first edition, *Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities: Local Action for Global Goals*, in March 2003. This was followed by the production of the second edition, *Meeting Development Goals in Small Urban Centres: Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities 2006*.

This current production of *Solid Waste Management in the World Cities* was funded by the Water and Sanitation Trust Fund of UN-HABITAT, currently supported by the Governments of Spain, the Netherlands and Norway.

The report was prepared under the overall substantive guidance of Bert Diphoorn, Ag. Director, Human Settlements Financing Division. The conceptualization of the report and the management of its production was undertaken by Graham Alabaster who was supported by Paul Onyango.

The substantive preparation of the report was undertaken by WASTE, Advisers on Urban Environment and Development. Anne Scheinberg, (WASTE and Wageningen University and Research Centre), David C. Wilson (Imperial College) and Ljiljana Rodic-Wiersma (Wageningen University and Research Centre) were the principal authors/editors. They were supported by a team who made substantial contributions, comprising Lilia G. C. Casanova (CAPS); Bharati Chaturvedi (Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group); Manus Coffey (Manus Coffey Associates); Sanjay K. Gupta and Jeroen IJgosse (Independent Consultants); Reka Soos (Green Partners Romania); and Andrew Whiteman (Wasteaware). The report would not have been possible without the dedication, commitment, professionalism, and passion which the contributing authors undertook their work.

The report benefited from a number of consultations attended by eminent researchers and solid waste management experts. In early 2009, an outline of the report was prepared and in May 2009 the first expert group meeting took place in Gouda, the Netherlands to review the annotated outline. Participants in the expert group included Manus Coffey (Manus Coffey Associates), Edward Stentiford (Leeds University), Sonia Dias, Oscar Espinoza, Sanjay Gupta, Kossara Kisheva, Michael Simpson, Portia Sinnott, Reka Soos, Ljiljana Rodic, Anne Scheinberg, Andy Whiteman, David Wilson, Verele de Vreede, Lilliana Abarca, Ivo Haenen, Valentin Post and Alodia Ishengoma. Bert Diphoorn, Graham Alabaster and Paul Onyango oversaw the process for UN-HABITAT. A number of contributors and researchers were identified at the consultations for preparing the 20 city inserts and the key sheets for the report.

The contributors and writers for the city profiles were: Adelaide, Australia by Andrew Whiteman (Wasteaware) and Rebecca Cain (Hyder Consulting); Bamako, Mali by Modibo Keita (CEK, Cabinet d'Etudes Kala Saba), Erica Trauba (WASTE Intern), Mandiou Gassama, Bakary Diallo, and Mamadou Traoré, (CEK); Bengaluru, India by Sanjay K. Gupta (Senior Advisor and Consultant Water, Sanitation and Livelihood), Smt. Hemalatha (KBE, MTech.), BMP Environmental Engineer, Bruhat Bangalore Mahangara Palike, and Anselm Rosario (WasteWise Resource Centre); Belo Horizonte, Brazil by Sônia Maria Dias, Jeroen IJgosse, Raphael T. V. Barros (UFMG), and the team of the Planning Department of SLU; Cañete, Peru by Oscar Espinoza, Humberto Villaverde (IPES), Jorge Canales and Cecilia Guillen; Curepipe, Mauritius by Professor Edward Stentiford (University of Leeds, UK) and Professor Romeela Mohee (The University of Mauritius, Mauritius); Delhi, India by Malati Gadgil, Anupama Pandey, Bharati Chaturvedi and Prakash Shukla (Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group), Irmanda Handayani (WASTE and Chintan Environmental), Jai Prakash Choudhury/Santu and Safai Sena; Dhaka, Bangladesh by Andrew Whiteman (Wasteaware), Monir Chowdhury (Commitment

Consultants), Shafiul Azam Ahmed, Dr Tariq bin Yusuf (DCC), Prof. Ghulam Murtaza (Khulna University) and Dr Ljiljana Rodic (Wageningen University); Ghorahi, Nepal by Bhushan Tuladhar (ENPHO, Environment and Public Health Organization); Kunming, China by Ljiljana Rodic and Yang Yuelong (Wageningen University); Lusaka, Zambia by Michael Kaleke Kabungo (Lusaka City Council – Waste Management Unit) and Rueben Lupupa Lifuka (Riverine Development Associates); Managua, Nicaragua by Jane Olley (Technical Advisor for UN-HABITAT Improving Capacity for Solid Waste Management in Managua Programme), Jeroen IJgosse (Facilitator and International Consultant for UN-HABITAT Programme “Improving Capacity for Solid Waste Management in Managua”), Victoria Rudin (Director of the Central American NGO ACEPESA, partner organization for UN-HABITAT Improving Capacity for Solid Waste Management in Managua Programme), Mabel Espinoza, Wilmer Aranda, Juana Toruño and Tamara Yuchenko (Technical Committee from Municipality of Managua for UN-HABITAT Improving Capacity for Solid Waste Management in Managua Programme); Moshi, Tanzania by Mrs Alodia Ishengoma (Independent Consultant), Ms. Bernadette Kinabo (Municipal Director Moshi), Dr Christopher Mtamakaya (Head of Health and Cleansing Department), Ms Viane Kombe (Head of Cleansing Section), Miss Fidelista Irongo (Health Secretary), Mr Lawrence Mlay (Environmental Health Officer); Nairobi, Kenya by Misheck Kirimi (NETWAS), Leah Oyake-Ombis, Director of Environment, City Council of Nairobi / Wageningen University) and Ljiljana Rodic (Wageningen University); Quezon City, the Philippines by Ms Lizette Cardenas (SWAPP), Ms Lilia Casanova (CAPS), Hon Mayor Feliciano Belmonte, Hon Vice Mayor Herbert Bautista, Quezon City Councilors, Quezon City Environmental Protection and Waste Management Department headed by Ms Frederika Rentoy, Payatas Operations Group, Quezon City Planning and Development Office, Ms Andrea Andres-Po and Mr Paul Andrew M. Tatlonghari of QC-EPWMD; Rotterdam, The Netherlands by Frits Fransen (ROTEB retired), Joost van Maaren, Roelof te Velde (ROTEB), Anne Scheinberg and Ivo Haenen (WASTE); San Francisco, USA by Portia M. Sinnott (Reuse, Recycling and Zero Waste Consultant) and Kevin Drew (City of San Francisco Special Projects and Residential Zero Waste Coordinator); Sousse, Tunisia by Verele de Vreede (WASTE), Tarek Mehri, and Khaled Ben Adesslem (Municipality of Sousse); Tompkins County, USA by Barbara Eckstrom (Tompkins County Solid Waste Manager), Kat McCarthy (Tompkins County Waste Reduction and Recycling Specialist), Portia M. Sinnott (Reuse, Recycling and Zero Waste Consultant) and Anne Scheinberg (WASTE); and Varna, Bulgaria by Kossara Bozhilova-Kisheva and Lyudmil Ikonov (CCSD Geopont-Intercom).

The key sheet authors were Ellen Gunsilius and Sandra Spies (GTZ), Lucia Fernandez and Chris Bonner (WIEGO), Jarrod Ball (Golder Associates), Nadine Dulac (World Bank Institute), Alodia Ishengoma (ILO), A. H. M. Maqsood Sinha and Iftekhar Enayetullah (Waste Concern), Jeroen IJgosse, Manus Coffey, Lilia Casanova, Ivo Haenen, Michael Simpson, David C. Wilson, Valentin Post (WASTE), Choudhury R. C. Mohanty (UNCRD), Bharati Chaturvedi, Anne Scheinberg, Andy Whiteman (WasteAware), Valentina Popovska (IFC), Frits Fransen, Arun Purandhare, Sanjay K. Gupta and Ljiljana Rodic-Wiersma.

The second Expert Group Meeting was jointly organized by UN-HABITAT and WASTE, with a great deal of support from Dr Laila Iskandar and the staff of CID Consulting, Zemalek, in Cairo, Egypt in October 2009. The expert group meeting reviewed the draft and recommended a reorganization and further expansion of report.

The production management for the team was handled by Verele de Vreede (WASTE). Ivo Haenen (WASTE), Michael Simpson (Antioch New England) and Portia M. Sinnott (Lite) were in charge of data management while the writing and research team members were Sônia M. Dias, Oscar Espinoza, Irmanda Handayani, Kossara Kisheva-Bozhilovska and Erica Trauba. Photo and graphic editors were Verele de Vreede and Jeroen IJgosse.

The report was widely circulated among UN-HABITAT professional staff members and consultants, and benefited from their review, comments and inputs. Valuable contributions were made by Graham Alabaster, Andre Dzikus, Paul Onyango, Daniel Adom and Debashish Bhattacharjee.

Antoine King and his team of the Programme Support Division, Marcellus Chege, Veronica Njuguna, Grace Wanjiru and Helda Wandera of Water, Sanitation and Infrastructure Branch of UN-HABITAT and Margaret Mathenge of UNON provided valuable administrative support.

Special thanks are due to our publishers, Earthscan, led by Jonathan Sinclair Wilson, with Hamish Ironside and Claire Lamont. Their support in working to extreme deadlines is gratefully acknowledged. Special recognition goes to Arnold van de Klundert, Founder of WASTE, who, with support from Justine Anschutz, distilled the ISWM framework in the course of the Urban Waste Expertise Programme.

This publication is dedicated to the memory of Brian Williams, who passed away during its production. Brian was heavily involved in previous editions of this report.

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>Contents</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of Figures, Tables and Boxes</i>	<i>xii</i>
<i>List of Acronyms and Abbreviations</i>	<i>xvii</i>
A Note to Decision-Makers	xix
Key Sheet 1: Modernizing Solid Waste in the Asian Tigers	xxvi
1 Executive Summary	1
<i>Bharati Chaturvedi</i>	
2 Introduction and Key Concepts	3
Introducing this book	3
About the authors	5
About the organization of this book	6
The scale of the solid waste problem	6
What is municipal solid waste (MSW)?	6
Key Sheet 2: Special Waste Streams	8
Taking the measure of MSW	11
Managing more and more waste	13
Key Sheet 3: Health Risks Related to Solid Waste Management	14
Learning from history	19
The role of development drivers in solid waste modernization	19
Modernization of solid waste management systems in developed countries	20
The solid waste challenge in developing and transitional country cities	21
Moving towards sustainable solutions	22
Solid waste and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)	22
The integrated sustainable waste management (ISWM) framework	23
Sustainability in solid waste management is possible	23
Dare to innovate	25
Key Sheet 4: Recyclers and Climate Change	26
3 Profiling the Reference Cities	28
Selecting the reference cities	28
Understanding the reference cities	30
Methodology	31
The process flow approach and the use of a process flow diagram	31
Information and indicators	36
The role of city profilers	37

Information quality	38
Quick look at the main indicators in the reference cities	39
City indicators	39
Interpreting the data	39
Description of each indicator	39
City Inserts	41
Adelaide	46
Bamako	48
Belo Horizonte	50
Bengaluru	52
Cañete	54
Curepipe	56
Delhi	58
Dhaka	60
Ghorahi	62
Kunming	64
Lusaka	66
Managua	68
Moshi	70
Nairobi	72
Quezon City	74
Rotterdam	76
San Francisco	78
Sousse	80
Tompkins County	82
Varna	84
4 The Three Key Integrated Sustainable Waste Management System Elements in the Reference Cities	87
Waste collection: Protecting public health	87
Basic issues	87
Insights from the reference cities and global good practice in waste collection	89
Key Sheet 5: Examples of Municipal Waste Collection and Transfer Systems	90
Key Sheet 6: Emerging Global Good Practice in the Design of Small-Scale Solid Waste Equipment: The Situation in Solid Waste Divisions in Cities in Low- and Middle-Income Countries	93
Waste treatment and disposal: Front lines of environmental protection	104
Basic issues	104
Key Sheet 7: Draft Report of the Inaugural Meeting on the Regional 3R Forum in Asia, 11–12 November 2009	106
Insights from the reference cities and global good practices in waste disposal	108
Key Sheet 8: Phasing Out Open Dumps	111
Resource management: Valorizing recyclables and organic materials and conserving resources	116
Basic issues	116
Key Sheet 9: Waste Concern and World Wide Recycling: Financing Dhaka Market Composting with Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) and Carbon Credits	117
Key Sheet 10: Building the Private Sector and Reducing Poverty through Sustainable Recycling in South-Eastern Europe	124

Key Sheet 11: Key Insights on Recycling in Low- and Middle-Income Countries, from the GTZ/CWG (2007) Informal-Sector Study	128
Key Sheet 12: The Dutch Approach to Producer Responsibility	133
Insights from the reference cities and global good practices in resource recovery	134
5 Integrated Sustainable Waste Management Governance Features in the Reference Cities	141
Inclusivity	141
Key issues and concepts	141
Key Sheet 13: WIEGO, Its Work on Waste-Pickers and the First World Encounter of Waste-Pickers in Colombia in 2008	145
Key Sheet 14: First World Conference and Third Latin American Conference of Waste-Pickers, Bogotá, Colombia, 1–4 March 2008	146
Inclusivity in the reference cities and global good practices	149
User inclusivity: Consultation, communication and involvement of users	149
Key Sheet 15: The Evidence Base for Household Waste Prevention: How Best to Promote Voluntary Actions by Households	150
Key Sheet 16: The International Labour Organization and the Model of Micro-Franchising in East Africa	157
Financial sustainability	164
Collection	164
Disposal	165
Key Sheet 17: Closure and Upgrading of the Open Dumpsite at Pune, India	167
Resource management and sustainable finance	169
Insights from the reference cities and global good practices in financial sustainability	170
Key Sheet 18: Solid Waste, Recycling and Carbon Financing: Fact or Fiction?	179
Sound institutions, proactive policies	184
Issues	184
Key Sheet 19: Waste Management and Governance: Collaborative Approaches for Public Service Delivery	187
Cities and experience with good governance practices	191
6 Reflections and Recommendations	203
Reflecting back on the key messages of the book	203
Lessons from the cities	204
Local solutions to local problems	204
Different approaches to a similar problem	205
Data is power: Indicators of good practice in integrated sustainable waste management	206
Putting integrated sustainable waste management into practice	207
Consider all the dimensions of integrated sustainable waste management	207
Building recycling rates	207
A focus on waste reduction	208
Use all available sources of finance	209
Our key conclusion	210
Moving towards financial sustainability and the role of donors	210
Closing words: What makes an ISWM system sustainable?	212
<i>Glossary of Terms</i>	213
<i>References</i>	217
<i>Index</i>	223

LIST OF FIGURES, TABLES AND BOXES

FIGURES

2.1	A world of variation in classifying MSW composition in the reference cities	12
2.2	The integrated sustainable waste management (ISWM) framework	27
3.1	Process flow diagram for Cañete, Peru	33
3.2	Process flow diagram for Lusaka, Zambia, from the GTZ/CWG (2007) report	34
3.3	Process flow diagram for Delhi, India	35
4.1	Collection coverage for non-slum and slum households	88
4.2	Waste management hierarchy	105
4.3	Stepwise progression controlling disposal	109
K9.1	How the Clean Development Mechanism project uses public, private and community cooperation	119
K18.1	Carbon market growth in 2008	180
K18.2	Who is buying and who is selling carbon credits?	182
5.1	Regulation process of solid waste in Peru	194

TABLES

K2.1	Healthcare waste generation by income level	8
2.1	Municipal solid waste generation in the reference cities	11
2.2	Waste composition in the reference cities	12
2.3	Estimates of current world MSW generation and projections of what it might become	13
2.4	Relevance of improved SWM to the Millennium Development Goals	25
3.1	The reference cities	30
3.2	Values of a short set of indicators in the reference cities	38
4.1	Waste collection rates in urban areas in selected Latin American and African countries	96
4.2	Average collection coverage in the reference cities, in ranked order from 100 per cent	96
4.3	Percentage of fleet working in the reference cities	101
4.4	Feedback mechanisms and satisfaction levels	102
4.5	Waste disposal in the reference cities	108
K9.1	Impact of carbon financing on total investment	121
K11.1	Citywide generation of solid waste in the six GTZ/CWG (2007) cities	129
K11.2	Composition of waste in the six GTZ/CWG (2007) cities and in cities in the US and The Netherlands	129
K11.3	Material recovered by the formal and informal sector	130
K11.4	Informal-sector collection of recovered material in the six cities	130
K11.5	Informal-sector income and earnings from recycling in the study cities	131
K11.6	Modelled total solid waste materials handling system costs per tonne, net costs per tonne and total net costs for the whole sector for all tonnes handled by that sector	131
K12.1	Dutch national recycling goals in 2008 and their achievement levels in Rotterdam	133

4.6	Reference city recycling rates as a percentage of municipal solid waste	134
4.7	Actual recovery rates vs recovery targets in the reference cities	135
4.8	Destinations of organic waste in the reference cities	135
4.9	Optimizing recovery by building on successes	136
5.1	Participation and inclusivity in the reference cities	154
5.2	Profile of informal activities in solid waste	156
5.3	Informal and formal participation in waste system	160
5.4	Institutional context for inclusive provider practices	161
5.5	Understanding revenues and values of different types of materials to be recycled	169
5.6	Waste management costs and budgeting in the reference cities	170
5.7	Annual municipal waste management budget calculations	171
5.8	Sources of operational funds: Revenues	172
5.9	Fees and incentives	173
5.10	Sources of funds	175
5.11	Benchmark indicators for sustainable financing	176
K18.1	Numbers of projects and programmes	179
K18.2	Preparedness of the projects	179
K18.3	Carbon market at a glance: Volumes and values, 2007–2008	180
K18.4	Issuance rate in 2009 for CDM landfill gas and composting projects	181
K18.5	Verified emissions reductions for landfill gas, composting and incineration projects in the voluntary carbon market in 2009	181
K18.6	List of current methodologies	183
5.12	Professional recognition	201

BOXES

S.1	Some recent solid waste crises	xix
K3.1	Health risks for waste workers and recyclers	16
2.1	Waste management and climate change	20
2.2	Plague-like epidemic in Surat, India	21
2.3	Integrated sustainable waste management (ISWM)	27
4.1	The economic cost of poor waste management	89
4.2	Importance of waste for the Silicon Valley of India	97
4.3	Collecting air in Byala, Bulgaria	97
4.4	Beijing Spring Festival	98
4.5	Principles of a good collection service	98
4.6	Taking waste matters into their own hands	99
4.7	The motorization debate in Bamako, Mali	100
4.8	A tale of two cities (in one)	100
4.9	<i>Swatchh Mitra</i> in Bengaluru	102
4.10	Creating trust and willingness to pay in Nairobi	102
4.11	Public engagement for enhanced recycling in the UK	103
4.12	Dandora among the dirty 30	104
4.13	A crisis stimulates change	105
4.14	The Matuail landfill, Dhaka, Bangladesh	110
4.15	Failed treatment facilities in India	114
4.16	Understanding the function of technology	114

4.17	Beware the 'magic solution' salesman	115
K9.1	Compost plant in Bulta, Narayanganj – a capacity of 130 tonnes per day	121
4.18	The <i>Maraichers</i> : Agricultural supply chain sink for the Bamako waste problem	126
4.19	<i>Economic Aspects of the Informal Sector in Solid Waste</i> , 2007	127
4.20	Plastic bag reduction	136
4.21	Institutionalizing the sink value of recycling in The Netherlands	138
4.22	A scrap of decency	139
5.1	Public interest litigation in India: Sugar PIL or bitter PIL?	142
5.2	<i>Programa de Selo Verde</i> , Ceará State, Brazil	149
5.3	Participatory urban waste planning in Vietnam	155
5.4	Siting the new Tompkins County landfill	156
5.5	The early bird gets the ... e-waste	160
5.6	Framing social dialogue and social inclusion in Brazil	162
5.7	Legal backing for waste-pickers in Cali, Colombia	162
5.8	The Swabhimana platform: Key to waste planning in Bengaluru	163
5.9	COGEVAD: A stakeholder platform in Mali	163
5.10	Integrating user feedback mechanisms with municipal monitoring and supervising tasks in Quezon City	163
5.11	Involving the community in assessing collection routes in Catia La Mar, Venezuela	164
5.12	Where there is a will, there is a way	166
5.13	Making getting to know your costs a priority, from Hong Kong to Nicaragua	171
5.14	Belo Horizonte, Brazil	172
5.15	Why the donkeys of Bamako, Mali, were dying in 1999	172
5.16	Considerations when setting up revenue collection strategies	174
5.17	Recovering costs of collection in Bengaluru, Karnataka State, India	177
5.18	Urban environmental accords: Setting an example in policy commitments	191
5.19	Separating the political head from the administrative body: Different experiences from the reference cities	192
5.20	Sector analysis leading to change at all policy levels	194
5.21	Reserving land for a landfill to avoid being caught by surprise	195
5.22	Roles in waste management	196
5.23	Owning up for the landfill in Bamako, Mali	197
5.24	Working together in Brazil	198
5.25	International Labour Organization (ILO) micro-franchising in Africa	199
5.26	Safi youth group in Mombasa, Kenya	199

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

3-R	reduce, reuse, recycle
3-R Forum	A programme of UNCRD
AAU	assigned amount unit
ACEPESA	Asociación Centroamericana para la Economía, la Salud y el Ambiente (Central American Association for Economy, Health and Environment)
ACR+	Association of Cities and Regions for Recycling and Sustainable Resource Management
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AECID	Spanish Agency for International Cooperation for Development
AIE	accredited independent entity
AIT	Asian Institute of Technology
APFED	Asia-Pacific Forum for Environment and Development
APO	Asian Productivity Organization
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BATF	Bangalore Agenda Task Force
BCRC	Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre for Asia and the Pacific
BMP	Bengaluru Municipal Corporation
BMW	biomedical waste
BoI	Board of Investment
BOO	build–own–operate
3Cs	confine, compact, cover
C&D	construction and demolition
C&I	commercial and industrial
CAN	Coupe d’Afrique de Nations
CBE	community-based enterprise
CBO	community-based organization
CCX	Chicago Climate Exchange
CDIA	Cities Development Initiative for Asia
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	certified emissions reduction
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
COFESFA	Coopérative des Femmes pour l’Éducation, la Santé Familiale et l’Assainissement
CONPAM	Ceará State Council for Environment Policy and Management
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
CTRS	Centro de Tratamento de Resíduos Sólidos (Brazil)

CWG	Collaborative Working Group on Solid Waste Management in Low- and Middle-Income Countries
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DBOO	design–build–own–operate
DCC	Dhaka City Corporation
DCCI	Dar es Salaam City Council
DCCn	Dar es Salaam City Commission
Defra	UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DOE	designated operational entity
PDUD	Projet de Développement Urbain et Décentralisation
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DIY	do it yourself
DNA	Designated National Authority
DSD	Division for Sustainable Development
EIA	environmental impact assessment
EMC	Environmental Municipal Commission
EnTA	Environmental Technology Assessment
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
EPR	extended producer responsibility
ERM	Environmental Resources Management
EU	European Union
EU ETS	European Union Emissions Trading Scheme
FEAM	Federal State Environmental Authority (Brazil)
GDP	gross domestic product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIE	<i>Groupement d'Intérêt Économique</i>
GIS	green investment schemes
GNP	gross national product
GS	Gold Standard
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Technical Cooperation)
HDI	Human Development Index
HDPE	high-density polyethylene
HHW	household hazardous waste
HLC	High-Level Consultation (Group)
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
ID	identification
IETC	International Environmental Technology Centre (UNEP)
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IFI	international financial institution
IFP	ILO Programme on Boosting Employment through Small Enterprise Development
IGES	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies
IGNOU	Indira Gandhi National Open University
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPC	intermediate processing centre
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPF	intermediate processing facility
ISHWM	Indian Society of Hospital Waste Management

ISP	informal service provider
ISWM	integrated sustainable waste management
ISWMP	Integrated Solid Waste Management Programme
IUF	International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers
IULA	International Union of Local Authorities
IWB	itinerant waste buyer
JI	joint implantation
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JV	joint venture
KKPKP	Trade Union of Waste-Pickers in Pune, India
KSTP	Keppel Seghers Tuas Waste-to-Energy Plant
LDPE	low-density polyethylene
LEI	Dutch Agricultural Economics Institute
LF	landfill
LFG	landfill gas capture/extraction
LGA	local government authority
LTS	large transfer station
MCD	Municipal Corporation of Delhi
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEIP	Metropolitan Environmental Improvement Programme
METAP	Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forests
MRF	materials recovery facility
MSE	micro- and small enterprise
MSW	municipal solid waste
MW	megawatt
NDMC	New Delhi Municipal Council
NGO	non-governmental organization
NIMBY	not in my backyard
NOC	No-Objection Certificate
NO _x	nitrogen oxide
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
5-Ps	pro-poor public–private partnerships
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PAHO	Pan-American Health Organization
PBDE	polybrominated diphenyl ether
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PET	polyethylene terephthalate
PFD	process flow diagram
PGAP	Multi-Annual Municipal Action Plan (Brazil)
PIL	public interest litigation
PP	polypropylene
PPP	public–private partnership
PPP-SD	public–private partnership for sustainable development
PS	polystyrene
PSP	private-sector participation
3Rs	reduce, reuse, recycle

R&D	research and development
RLP	Recycling Linkages Programme
SBC	Secretariat of the Basel Convention
SCP	Global Sustainable Cities Programme
SDP	Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project
SEALSWIP	South-East Asia Local Solid Waste Improvement Project
SEAM	Support for Environmental Assessment and Management project
SEIA	strategic environmental impact assessment
SEWA	Self-Employed Women's Association (India)
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SLU	Superintendência de Limpeza Urbana (Brazil)
SME	small- and medium-sized enterprise
SO ₂	sulphur dioxide
SPG	<i>Strategic Planning Guide for Municipal Solid Waste Management</i>
STS	small transfer station
SWAPP	Solid Waste Management Association of the Philippines
SWM	solid waste management
TPD	(metric) tonnes per day
TPY	(metric) tonnes per year
UBC	used beverage container
UCLG	United Cities and Local Governments
UNCHS	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) (now UN-Habitat)
UK	United Kingdom
UNCRD	United Nations Centre for Regional Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UN ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme (formerly UNCHS (Habitat))
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
US	United States
UWEP	Urban Waste Expertise Programme
VCS	Voluntary Carbon Standard
VOC	volatile organic compound
VOS	Voluntary Offset Standard
WEEE	waste electrical and electronic equipment
WHO	World Health Organization
WHO SEARO	World Health Organization Regional Office for South East Asia
WIEGO	Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing
WRAP	UK Waste and Resources Action Programme
WREP	Waste and Resources Evidence Programme
WTE	waste-to-energy
ZW	zero waste
ZWSA	Zero Waste South Australia

A NOTE TO DECISION-MAKERS

A good solid waste management system is like good health: if you are lucky to have it, you don't notice it; it is just how things are, and you take it for granted. On the other hand, if things go wrong, it is a big and urgent problem and everything else seems less important.

Managing solid waste well and affordably is one of the key challenges of the 21st century, and one of the key responsibilities of a city government. It may not be the biggest vote-winner, but it has the capacity to become a full-scale crisis, and a definite vote-loser, if things go wrong.

This note to decision-makers introduces UN-Habitat's Third Global Report on Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities: *Solid Waste Management in the World's Cities*.

A unique feature of the book is that it is based on new information, collected in a standardized format, from 20 reference cities around the world. The cities demonstrate a range of urban solid waste and recycling systems across six continents and illustrate how solid waste management works in practice in tropical and temperate zones, in small and large cities, in rich and poor countries, and at a variety of scales.

The book shows that cities everywhere are making progress in solid waste management – even relatively small cities with very limited resources – but also that there is plenty of room for improvement. The authors are interested in understanding and sharing insights on what drives change in solid waste management, how things work in cities and what seems to work better under which circumstances.

If you take just one message from this book, it should be that there are no perfect solutions, but also no absolute failures: the specific

technical and economic approaches that work in, say, Denmark or Canada or Japan may not work in your country. As in most other human endeavours, 'the best is the enemy of the good'.

There is only one sure winning strategy, and that is to understand and build upon the strengths of your own city – to identify, capitalize on, nurture and improve the indigenous processes that are already working well. These may well be outside the 'formal' waste management system provided by the city – the research for his book shows that the informal and micro-enterprise sectors in many developing country cities are often achieving recycling rates, comparable to those reached in Europe and North America only after years of high investment by the city. For example, the research for this book shows that informal recyclers handle 27 per cent of the waste generated in Delhi; if they were to disappear, the city would have to pay its contractors to collect and dispose of an additional 1800 tonnes of waste every day.

The overall aim of the book is to facilitate actors in cities everywhere – the mayor, other politicians, officials, citizens, non-governmental

Urban cities continue to expand to areas with difficult accessibility, posing a challenge for collecting waste from these neighbourhoods. The example from Caracas, Venezuela is representative for many Latin American cities.

© Jeroen IJgosse



organisations, the formal and informal private sector, and indeed the national government – to make their own decisions on the next steps in developing a solution appropriate to their own city's particular circumstances and needs.

We hope that this book will inspire you to be both creative and critical: to design your own models, to pick and mix, adopt and adapt the components and strategies that work in your particular circumstances. You and your citizens and stakeholders deserve the best system, and nothing less. If this book can contribute to that, we will have done our work well.



THE ISWM FRAMEWORK

This book is built around the concept of integrated and sustainable (solid) waste management, known as ISWM. We have divided an ISWM system for convenience into two 'triangles', the physical elements and the governance features. The first triangle comprises the three key physical elements that *all* need to be addressed for an ISWM system to work well and to work sustainably over the long term:

Solid waste is a vital municipal responsibility. You need to be able to put all three elements in place – collection, disposal and materials recovery.

- 1 **public health:** maintaining healthy conditions in cities, particularly through a good waste collection service;
- 2 **environment:** protection of the environment throughout the waste chain, especially during treatment and disposal; and
- 3 **resource management:** 'closing the loop' by returning both materials and nutrients to beneficial use, through preventing waste and striving for high rates of organics recovery, reuse and recycling.

Triangle 2 focuses on ISWM 'software': the governance strategies to deliver a well functioning system. Until the 1990s, this would probably have been framed primarily around technology; but there is consensus today on the need for a much broader approach. Three interrelated

requirements for delivering ISWM are distinguished here under the framework of 'good waste governance'. There is a need for the system to:

- 1 be **inclusive**, providing transparent spaces for stakeholders to contribute as users, providers and enablers;
- 2 be **financially sustainable**, which means cost-effective and affordable; and
- 3 rest on a base of **sound institutions and pro-active policies**.



THREE KEY SYSTEM ELEMENTS IN ISWM

Public health (collection)

The safe removal and subsequent management of solid waste sits alongside the management of human excreta (sanitation) in representing two of the most vital urban environmental services. Other essential utilities and infrastructures, such as water supply, energy, transport and housing, often get more attention (and much more budget); however, failing to manage properly the 'back end' of the materials cycle has direct impacts on health, length of life, and the human and natural environment.

Uncollected solid waste blocks drains, and causes flooding and subsequent spread of water-borne diseases. This was the cause of a major flood in Surat in India in 1994, which resulted in an outbreak of a plague-like disease, affecting 1000 people and killing 56. Annual floods in East and West African, and Indian cities are blamed, at least in part, on plastic bags blocking drains.

The responsibility of municipalities to provide solid waste collection services dates back to the mid-19th century, when infectious diseases were linked for the first time to poor sanitation and uncollected solid waste. There are major cities in all continents that have had collection services in place for a century or more.

The data collected for this book, and other UN-Habitat data, show waste collection coverage for cities in low- and middle-income countries

ranging from a low of 10 per cent in peri-urban areas to a high of 90 per cent or more in commercial city centres. This means that many households in many cities receive no services at all, with the result that far too much waste ends up in the environment. UN-Habitat health data also show that rates of diarrhoea and acute respiratory infections are significantly higher for children living in households where solid waste is dumped, or burned in the yard, compared to households in the same cities that receive a regular waste collection service.

Perhaps surprisingly, even in Europe and North America uncollected waste can still hit the headlines, as in the 2008 example of Naples, Italy, where mountains of solid waste lined the streets for months; collectors stopped picking up the waste because all of the region's landfills were full, and residents protested fiercely.

The 20 reference cities in this report provide many examples of different approaches that have been successful in providing collections services across the city. For example, both Bengaluru (Bangalore) in India and Quezon City in the Philippines have collection coverage rates over 90 per cent. One key message is to adopt and adapt technology that is appropriate, and can easily be maintained locally. Just as it is amusing to picture a cycle rickshaw collecting waste in Adelaide, it is ridiculous to send a giant compactor truck designed for Australian roads into the lanes of the old city in Dhaka, or even onto the main roads which have not been designed for such high axle loading rates. Another key message is to 'mix and match' the methods of service delivery. New Delhi is an example of a city where primary collection is done by authorized informal sector collectors/recyclers, who deliver the waste by hand cart to a large private sector operator who provides secondary collection from communal bins.

Environmental protection (waste treatment and disposal)

Until the environmental movement emerged in the 1960s, most wastes were disposed of with



little or no control: to land, as open dumping; to air, by burning or evaporation of volatile compounds; or to water, by discharging solids and liquids to surface, groundwater or the ocean. There was little regard for the effects on drinking water resources and health of those living nearby – the philosophy was 'out of sight, out of mind'.

Over the last 30 to 40 years, countries and cities seeking to take control of growing quantities of waste and to maintain a clean environment have built up experience about what works. Moving towards modern disposal has generally followed a step-by-step process: first phasing out uncontrolled disposal, then introducing, and gradually increasing, environmental standards for a disposal facility. In the process, controlling water pollution and methane emissions from sanitary landfills, and air pollution from incinerators, receive increasing attention.

Attention in high-income countries may now be moving on to other aspects, but many cities in low- and middle-income countries are still working on phasing out open dumps and establishing controlled disposal. This is a necessary first step towards good waste management; a properly controlled landfill site is an essential part of any modern waste management system.

Whatever technologies and equipment are used, they should be appropriate for and adapted to the local conditions. The small and relatively remote city of Ghorahi in Nepal shows what can be achieved with limited local resources: their well-sited and managed facility includes waste sorting and recycling, sanitary landfilling,

Sorted and crushed ferrous and non-ferrous metals being loaded on a truck for transportation to the recycling industry (Caine, Brazil)

© Jeroen IJgosse

Phasing out and upgrading open dumps and controlling the disposal of waste is a necessary first step.

leachate collection and treatment, and a buffer zone with forests, gardens and a bee farm that shields the site from the surrounding area.

Many 'new' technologies are being developed to treat solid wastes, and salesmen target both developed and developing country cities. In principle, this is fine, but it is important that decision-makers have the information they need to make informed choices. Unfortunately, experience shows that there are no magic solutions: technologies developed for relatively dry wastes with high calorific value in the 'North' may not work when confronted with wet and mainly organic wastes with low calorific value in the 'South'. If a solution seems 'too good to be true', it's probably not true.

Resource management (valorization of recyclables and organic materials)

Prior to the industrial revolution, most cities had few material resources, money was scarce and households had more needs than they could meet. Wastage was minimized, products were repaired and reused, materials were recycled and organic matter was returned to the soil.¹ Extensive informal recycling systems flourished, but began to be displaced by emerging formal municipal waste collection systems in the late 19th century. Recycling and materials recovery became large, but almost invisible, private industrial activities.

During the past 10–20 years, high-income countries have been rediscovering the value of recycling as an integral part of their waste (and resource) management systems, and have invested heavily in both physical infrastructure and communication strategies to increase recycling rates. Their motivation is not primarily the commodity value of the recovered materials, which was the only motivation of the earlier, informal or private sector, systems. Rather, the principal driver is that the recycling market offers a competitive 'sink', as an alternative to increasingly expensive landfill, incineration of other treatment options.

Many developing and transitional country cities still have an active informal sector and micro-enterprise recycling, reuse and repair

systems, which often achieve recycling and recovery rates comparable to those in the West; the average recovery rate across the 20 reference cities is 29 per cent. Moreover, by handling such large quantities of waste, which would otherwise have to be collected and disposed of by the city, the informal recycling sector has been shown to save the city 20 per cent or more of its waste management budget. In effect, the poor are subsidizing the rest of the city.

There is a major opportunity for the city to build on these existing recycling systems, to increase further the existing recycling rates, to protect and develop people's livelihoods, and to reduce still further the costs to the city of managing the residual wastes. The formal and informal sectors need to work together, for the benefit of both.

The priorities of good resource management are expressed by the '3Rs' – reduce, reuse, recycle. The last can be further split between 'dry' recyclables and bio-solids or organic wastes:

- 1 **Reduce** the quantities of waste being generated. This is the new focus of modernization in developed countries; but it is important also for rapidly growing cities in middle- and low-income countries to bring their waste growth rates under control.
- 2 **Reuse** products that can be reused, repaired, refurbished, or remanufactured to have longer useful lives.
- 3 **Recycle** materials that can be extracted, recovered and returned to industrial value chains, where they strengthen local, regional and global production.
- 4 **Return nutrients to the soil**, by composting or digesting organic wastes ('bio-solids') – plant and animal wastes from kitchen, garden and agricultural production, together with safely managed and treated human excreta. These are sources of key nutrients for the agricultural value chain, and their proper utilization is important to food security and sustainable development.

Beware the 'magic solution' salesman, whose technology will solve your problem at little or no cost.

Waste is a resource, and the entire waste system should be designed to maximize the benefits from the discarded materials.



THREE ISWM GOVERNANCE FEATURES

Inclusivity

The municipal government is responsible for solid waste management in a city, but cannot deliver on that responsibility by prescribing or undertaking measures in isolation, entirely on their own. The best-functioning solid waste systems involve *all* the stakeholders in planning, implementing, and monitoring the changes.

A solid waste system consists of three main groups of stakeholders: the providers, including the local authority, who actually offer the service; the users, who are the clients; and the external agents in the enabling environment, including both national and local government, who organize the boundary conditions and make change possible.²

Users, or waste generators, are key stakeholders in waste management, as are the NGOs, women's unions, and other organizations that represent them in the policy and governance processes. The reference cities demonstrate a range of good practices, in areas such as:

- consultation, communication, and involvement of users;
- participatory and inclusive planning;
- inclusivity in siting facilities; and
- institutionalizing inclusivity – the solid waste 'platform'.

Service providers include the formal municipal waste organization, in partnership with a variety of private, informal and/or community actors of widely varying sizes and capabilities. They can supplement the knowledge and capacity of the local authority to implement recycling, manage organic waste and serve households with waste collection. In urban waste systems in most low- and middle-income countries, the informal and micro-enterprise collection and recycling sector is particularly important, providing a livelihood for an average of 0.5 per cent of the urban popu-

lation across 10 of reference cities, and of more than 1 per cent in both Delhi and Dhaka. The numbers are much lower, but the informal sector does operate also in the US, Canada, Europe and Japan.

Financial sustainability

Financial sustainability in solid waste management is a major issue for cities all over the world. In developing and transitional country cities, solid waste management represents a significant proportion of the total recurrent budget of the city, with figures of 3 to 15 per cent being reported by the reference cities. When the solid waste budgets are divided by the population, and this per capita figure is expressed as a percentage of per capita GDP, most of the cities are in the range of 0.1–0.7 per cent, with two greater than 1 per cent. Yet in spite of relatively high costs, collection service coverage is often low and disposal standards remain poor.

Costs in high-income country cities are continuing to increase as wastes are collected in several separate streams to facilitate recycling, wastes are diverted from landfill to higher cost facilities, and the costs of environmental protection at treatment and disposal sites have increased.

For most cities in low- and middle-income countries, the coming years will see increased waste, more people, more vehicles, more labour needed for collection, more transfer stations, more separated waste types of collection and more administration. As the city spreads and

The private sector includes both formal and informal enterprises, of widely varying sizes and capabilities. They can supplement the knowledge and capacity of the local authority to implement recycling, manage organic waste, and serve households with waste collection.

An appropriate time schedule of collection routes needs to coincide with local circumstances: in Managua, Nicaragua, it is early morning when citizens are at home

© UN-Habitat, Jeroen IJgosse





Poster encouraging the people to take a subscription to primary waste collection service provided by local NGOs in Benin

© WASTE, Justine Anschutz

An essential first step is to establish your current costs, to serve as a baseline for comparing the costs of any proposed improvements to the waste management system.

standards improve, suitable sites for landfills will be scarcer, further from the city centre, and (much) more expensive. Making service delivery more efficient should free up some resources, but many cities can expect to see costs rise substantially. It will therefore be imperative to find both regular sources of revenue and significant amounts of investment finance.

Where international donors, or other investors, are involved in providing finance to cities for new waste management vehicles, equipment or infrastructure, one precondition is often that the city can demonstrate that they are able to pay both the recurrent costs and to repay any capital that has been borrowed. This usually involves discussion both on establishing the full current costs of providing the service, which is commonly underestimated by up to 50 per cent, and on the introduction of user fees, which in turn raises the issues of equity, affordability and willingness to pay.

Discussions with international donors are often complicated by their internal rules, which may restrict them to funding waste facilities that meet the latest international environmental standards, which may make them unaffordable to the city. This conflicts with one of the basic recommendations of this book: that each city should select next steps in the development of their waste management system that are appropriate, and thus affordable, in their own particular circumstances.

Experience has shown that service users

are prepared to pay for their waste to be removed when they agree with the service levels, when the charging system is transparent and when services are provided for locally acceptable prices. Even in slum areas, people are generally willing to pay for appropriate primary collection services. Moving from a position where solid waste management is paid for through general revenues, to one where it is paid for entirely from user charges, is likely to be a gradual transition, particularly if the overall costs are rising at the same time. So, at least in the medium term, a significant proportion of the total cost will still have to be paid for by the municipality or the national government from general revenues, as part of its public health and environmental protection responsibilities.

Sound institutions and proactive policies

A strong and transparent institutional framework is essential to good governance in solid waste. Without such a framework, the system will not work well over the long term. Indeed, it was suggested at the 2001 UN-Habitat World Urban Forum that the cleanliness of a city and the effectiveness of its solid waste management system could be useful as proxy indicators of good governance. The adequacy of services to lower-income communities also reflects how successfully a city is addressing issues of urban poverty and equity.

If waste services are to be effective, a city must have the capacity and the organizational structure to manage finances and services in an efficient and transparent manner, streamline management responsibilities with communities, and listen to users. For waste management to work well, the city needs to address underlying issues relating to management structures, contracting procedures, labour practices, accounting, cost recovery and corruption. Clear budgets and lines of accountability are essential.

Private sector involvement in service delivery is an option for improving cost-effectiveness, quality and coverage. However, private sector involvement in waste management is not simple 'privatization'. The municipal authorities remain

responsible and, as the contracting body, need to have sufficient understanding and capacity to carry out their 'client' function. The necessary conditions that must be met for successful private sector involvement include competition, transparency and accountability, all of which help to ensure that the contracting process is free from corruption and that citizens receive the services as contracted. The concept of pro-poor public-private partnerships (5-Ps) develops this more explicitly, by addressing the need to engage users, the rights of small and micro-enterprises and the informal sector to hold on to their livelihoods, and the obligation to serve poor communities fairly and effectively.



CONCLUSIONS

The stories from our 20 reference cities – rich and poor, and in all parts of the world – show that it is possible to make progress in tackling solid waste management. There is no 'one size fits all': any successful solution must address all three physical elements of ISWM and all three features of good governance. But a reliable approach is to be critical and creative; to start



from the existing strengths of the city and to build upon them; to involve all the stakeholders to design their own models; and to 'pick and mix', adopting and adapting the solutions that will work in any particular situation.

Notice of municipal ordinance published in two languages in Quezon City, Philippines advising of the legal consequences of not keeping your premises clean

There is no single 'right answer' to solid waste management; rather, a mix of measures and approaches. The solutions that will work in your city have to fit your own circumstances.

NOTES

- 1 Strasser, 1999.
- 2 Spaargaren and van Vliet, 2000; Scheinberg, in press.