Municipal Waste Production, Economic Drivers, and 'New' Waste Policies: EKC Evidence from Italian Regional and Provincial Panel Data

Massimiliano Mazzanti, Anna Montini
and Roberto Zoboli

NOTA DI LAVORO 155.2006

Massimiliano Mazzanti, *Department of Economics Institutions and Territory University of Ferrara, National Research Council CERIS-CNR, Milan*
Anna Montini, *Department of Economics, University of Bologna & National Research Council, CERIS-CNR, Milan*
Roberto Zoboli, *National Research Council, CERIS-CNR Milan & Catholic University of Milan*

Municipal Waste Production, Economic Drivers, and 'New' Waste Policies: EKC Evidence from Italian Regional and Provincial Panel Data

Summary

This paper provides empirical evidence on delinking and Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) for municipal waste production in Italy. First, methodological issues and literature on delinking and EKC for waste are critically re-examined. Secondly, we analyse two very disaggregated panel datasets on Italian Regions and Provinces (1996-2004 data for the 20 regions, 2000-2004 data for the 103 provinces) to estimate the extent to which delinking between waste production and economic drivers is taking place. The empirical analysis of different specifications shows mixed evidence in favour of an EKC relationship. Evidence supporting an EKC hypothesis significantly arises at a provincial level, which presents a very high data heterogeneity. Nevertheless, the turning point is at very high levels of added value per capita (around 23,000-26,000€), which characterise a very limited number of wealthy (Northern) Italian provinces. The analysis does not reveal a similar evidence for the regional dataset: only a relative delinking dynamic emerges at the provincial level, we also note a positive relationship between waste production and the share of separated waste collection, which can be explained by the sharp difference in income and waste-policy performance between Northern and Southern Italy. Population density is not significant. Finally, the test on some policy proxies, i.e. the diffusion of the new waste tariff regime at the local-level and the ability of utilities to recover waste service cost, leads to the conclusion that they are not (yet) impacting waste production. To lower the turning points and to avoid an increasing gap between geographical areas, innovative (market based) and more effective policy instruments should be implemented. In particular, the weight of waste policies should be rebalanced towards waste prevention targets and instruments, in line with the priorities stated by the EU and Member Countries. In fact, the indirect feedback effect of good post-production waste management policies/practices on reducing waste production at a source can be weak and slow. In general, the results confirm that more geographically-disaggregated data may offer more insights with respect to cross-country datasets, also from the policy perspective.

Keywords: Decoupling, Environmental Kuznets Curves, Environmental Efficiency, Waste Indicators, Waste Policy, Economic Drivers, Panel Data

JEL Classification: C23, Q38, Q56

Address for correspondence:

Massimiliano Mazzanti
Department of Economics Institutions and Territory
University of Ferrara
Via Voltapaletto 11
Ferrara
Italy
E-mail: ma.maz@iol.it.

1. Introduction

Indicators of 'decoupling' or 'delinking' are becoming increasingly popular in detecting and measuring improvements in environmental/resource efficiency with respect to economic activity. Extensive research on decoupling indicators for reporting and policy-evaluation purposes is being carried out by the OECD (see OECD, 2002). Various decoupling or resource-efficiency indicators are included in the European Environment Agency's state-of-the-environment reports (EEA, 2003c), and they are part of the work by European Topic Centres[1] A few European countries started to include delinking-type indicators in official reports on environmental performance (DEFRA/DTI, 2003). Some countries are considering delinking-based targets for major environmental policies, and the US has adopted an 'emission-intensity' target, i.e. a reduction of the CO_2/GDP ratio, for its climate policy.

Delinking trends regarding industrial materials and energy have been under scrutiny for decades[2]. In the 1990s, research on delinking extended to air pollution and GHG emissions[3]. The 'stylised fact' emerging from those analyses, i.e. an inverted-U shaped relationship between pollution and economic growth, is similar to the Kuznets' results (Kuznets, 1955) on income distribution in the long-run, and became the well-known 'Environmental Kuznets Curve' (EKC) hypothesis, which is the natural extension of delinking analysis[4]. Despite increasing applied research efforts, empirical evidence for EKC on emissions is still ambiguous. Some regional/local pollutants seem to show a 'turning point' at certain levels of income, but it is a shared view that some critical externalities, like CO_2 emissions and waste flows, are monotonically rising with income. At best, a 'relative delinking'[5] is taking place (Stern, 2004)[6].

Research on delinking and EKCs for materials and waste is actually less developed compared to pollution and GHG emissions. Although recent works, in particular those by the Wuppertal Istitut[7], produced extensive evidence on material intensity indicators, the still limited research results for the waste sector may be a serious problem in a policy perspective. The EU policy 'thematic strategies' on both resources and waste entail the reference to 'absolute' and 'relative' delinking indicators (European Commission, 2003a,b). Since a decreasing ratio of a material input with respect to an economic driver would suggest a decreasing (future) production of waste, delinking at the various stages of the material-to-waste chain can be interpreted in terms of 'prevention'. The latter is the stated first priority of the EU waste policy strategy, also transposed in national waste legislations.

---

[1] See eea.europa.eu, and the activities of the Topic Centre on Resource and Waste Management, waste.eionet.europa.eu.

[2] For a discussion of the evidence on materials and energy until the early 1990s see Zoboli (1995 and 1996). For recent analyses of the long-run trends for energy see Ayres et al. (2004), Gruebler et al. (1999) and other works carried out at IIASA, www.iiasa.ac.at.

[3] See Holtz-Eakin and Selden (1992), Ten Kate (1993), Selden and Song (1994), Grossman and Krueger (1994).

[4] The EKC hypothesis does not originally stems from a theoretical model, but recent contributions have started showing how it may be included in formalised economic models. See Andreoni and Levinson (2001), Chimeli and Braden (2005) and Kelly (2003), who finds that the EKC shape depends on the dynamic interplay between marginal costs and benefits of abatement.

[5] Delinking may occur on a relative basis (the elasticity of the environmental impact indicator with respect to an economic driver is positive, but less than unity) or on an absolute basis (when the elasticity becomes negative).

[6] The empirical literature is too extended to be surveyed here. Summing up main results, water pollution seems to present a turning point between 5.000 and 17.000$ of per capita income depending on the specific pollutant. For air emissions, all main externalities, except CO_2 and transport-related emissions, appear to have a turning point in the range of 10.000-20.000$ (Yandle et al., 2002).

[7] See Moll et al. (1999); Femia et al. (2001); Bringezu et al. (2003); Eurostat (2003, 2002, 2001).

Therefore, waste prevention activities and policies could be monitored and evaluated by addressing, in particular, the trends towards reduction of waste production at source and reuse (see also OECD 2002; 2003) and, at the macro level, through 'absolute' or 'relative' decoupling indicators, as well as by EKCs analysis[8].

This paper provides empirical evidence on delinking trends for urban waste production in Italy. Firstly, methodological issues regarding the analysis of delinking are discussed and the related Environmental Kuznets Curves literature is critically re-examined (Section 2). Secondly, two panel datasets concerning, respectively, Italian Regions and Italian Provinces are used to estimate delinking and EKC relationships between waste production and economic drivers (Sections 3 and 4). Thirdly, the policy implications of our empirical results are presented and discussed (conclusions in Section 5).

The added value of the paper is manifold. Empirical evidence on EKC dynamics for waste is still scarce, and analyses which exploit country-specific, highly disaggregated panel data are even scarcer with respect to cross-country analyses. We thus provide EKC evidence exploiting environmental-economic merged panel datasets at a decentralised level (Regions and Provinces). The datasets cover the period 1996-2004 for the 20 Italian regions and 2000-2004 for the 103 Italian provinces, deriving from official sources (Environmental agency) which are of high value both from a quantitative and qualitative point of view. The Italian environmental agency (APAT) works according to data collection guidelines of the European environmental agency (EEA, 2003a,b), and comparatively, has produced a massive effort mainly in the waste-related area. Environmental data are merged with economic official data on economic drivers. As economic drivers we exploit both added value/GDP and household expenditure, then testing the additional effect of socio-economic variables such as share of separately collected waste and population density. The analysis also includes decentralised policy-related variables: the share of municipalities that have passed from the tax on waste to the waste tariff; and the percentage of waste management costs covered by the tax/tariff. We also check for tourist-related flows, a crucial issue of local waste production in Italy. The results from international or even European level analyses are generally considered to be unsatisfactory; they produce only average elasticities for the environmental-economic relationship, and are unanimously considered to have a low information value for policy purposes. We think therefore that highly-disaggregated analyses at the country level, as the one presented in this paper, can represent a fruitful research direction.

2. Estimating EKCs: Key issues and evidence for waste

2.1. The econometrics of EKCs: Some key issues

At the econometric level, the aim of EKC analysis is to estimate a vector of coefficients, each linked to a single driver of the environmental index, by using a simple reduced form equation. EKC issues will be briefly commented referring to the extensive literature developed over the last decade[9]. The focus is twofold. First, we suggest that the EKC framework is, under certain circumstances, a necessary step forward of decoupling analysis.

---

[8] For a discussion on the prevention meaning of delinking indicators for materials and waste, and their possible adoption in policy evaluation, see Jacobsen et al. (2004). Se also Mazzanti and Zoboli (2005) for a discussion on the meaning of delinking and EKC in the framework of an IPAT model, which includes population and income as scale factors.
[9] Good critical surveys are Stern (2004), Dinda (2004) and Dasgupta et al. (2002).

Multivariate investigations add robustness to results. Second, the potential weaknesses of the EKC analysis will be thoroughly highlighted.

The EKC framework extends the basic decoupling reasoning, modelling a multivariate analysis of the environment-income relationship. Even if EKC does not rely on a specific economic model, many theoretical assumptions, on the consumption and production sides, are implicitly tested within the EKC empirical context. The main economic hypotheses underpinning the EKC setting are: (i) income increase has a 'negative scale effect' on emissions, and (ii) the main 'positive effects' of income increase are: a composition effect of economic activities within GDP, a technological effect, a preference-drive effect (environment being a normal/luxury good), a possible policy effect driven by market-instruments.

We do not specifically focus on the more statistically oriented key issues (and potential weaknesses), such as (i) differences in estimated coefficients between parametric and non parametric models; (ii) the degree of the polynomial used to proxy the environment income relationship; (iii) the econometric model specification used[10]. Less technical but critical issues are: the environmental performance index and economic drivers investigated and the nature and quality of data. Both are crucial in this paper, which investigates EKC on the still relatively unexplored realm of waste, providing preliminary results grounded on disaggregated in-country data, as opposed to cross country analysis.

EKC studies often use different environmental indexes (absolute, per capita, output based, input based, per unit of GDP). A general consensus over what indicators to use does not exist. Different measures have nevertheless different implications and interpretations. For example, if a measure on per capita basis in OECD countries faces few problems of understanding, and absolute measures could be avoided, if we measure intensity in the vertical axis the presence of a lower bound implies that total emissions are growing at the same rate of income, in a sort of 'steady state' equilibrium. It is obvious that the measures on the vertical and horizontal axis should be compatible with each other[11]. We also note that there is no consensus about the type and number of explanatory factors introduced as potential drivers of the environmental performance. Some studies use income variables only. Other studies include many socio-economic variables with the (correct) aim of extending the conceptual setting behind the EKC empirics (Harbaugh et al., 2000); a few include policy drivers (Markandya et al., 2004). The choice obviously depends on both data availability and research objectives.

The nature and quality of data are also crucial issues. In the first wave of the EKC literature, a large majority of contributions focussed on the analysis of cross-country datasets, generally taken from official OECD and World Bank sources. Nevertheless, the quality of macro data for some regions (non OECD countries) has been questioned, and even the exploitation of panel datasets does not allow the researcher to calculate specific country-level coefficients for the income-environment relationship[12]. The conceptual key fact is that not a single

---

[10] We refer to Mazzanti, Montini and Zoboli (2006) for an updated critical survey of main literature streams.

[11] Some argue that the choice over the dependent variable could depend on the issue considered. The per capita option is probably more compatible with situations where the degradation is deriving from overexploitation linked to population growth, whereas emission intensity is more compatible with scenarios with externalities caused by industries.

[12] In fact, econometric panel studies usually provide information on mean-value coefficients since they usually rely on the assumption of different constant terms, but equal coefficients across units (fixed effects model). We note that the superiority of heterogeneous panel data models is questioned. Baltagi et al. (2002) offer evidence that simplicity and

relationship, but many different ones, may apply to different (categories of) countries. Therefore, the policy relevance of world-wide cross country analyses seems to be limited. European countries, if compared to international datasets usually exploited for EKC analyses, represent a more homogeneous set of statistical units. Although the limited data variability is an intrinsic feature of such a dataset, the relevancy for policy-making purposes is higher. Future research, as it will be stressed in the conclusions, should then focus on delinking analysis that exploit datasets regarding environmental and economic indicators at a provincial/regional level (at national/European level). As stated by Fonkych and Lempert (2005, p.29), "different EKCs are likely to exist for different countries and pollutants, and explanatory variables other than per capita income may be better determinants of emission trajectories". This confirms the need of investigating effects additional to the usual income driver, which lies at the core of EKC reasoning but may hide latent and even more important, though somewhat income correlated, driving forces.

2.2 Empirical evidence on delinking and EKC for waste

As summarised by Cole et al. (1997) and Stern (2004), the evidence provided by the first wave of studies, relying on data up until the late eighties, showed generally that EKC existed only for local air and water pollutants, but not waste, while indicators with a more global or indirect effect were increasing more or less monotonically with income.

Empirical evidence of varied nature in support of an EKC dynamics, or delinking between emission and income growths, has shown to be more limited and fragile for CO_2 compared to local emissions and water pollutants (Cole et al., 1997; Bruvoll and Medin, 2003). Decoupling between income growth and emissions of CO_2 is not (yet) apparent for many important countries (Vollebergh and Kemfert, 2005), and when delinking is observed, it is mostly of a relative and not of an absolute kind (Fischer - Kowalski and Amann, 2001[13]).

For waste production/generation, empirical contributions are scarce and tend to point out that the EKC is not emerging, despite the local nature of waste-related externalities. We nevertheless must note the differences between delinking concerning waste production and the delinking potentially associated to disposal options, at which level policy efforts have been stronger for many years in developed countries (Karousakis, 2006).

There are few EKC analyses aimed at analysing the relationship between material flows/waste and economic drivers. As noted by Karousakis (2006), most evidence on the determinants of waste production is based on US microeconomic studies carried out at the local community level. Johnstone e Labonne (2004) present an

---

parsimony in model estimation often offer better forecasts. Thus, a contribution may be found in the usual "homogenous panel analysis", but concerning national/regional datasets.

[13] The paper, which is strictly linked and refer to Matthews et al. (2000) presents descriptive quantitative evidence on material, waste and emission flows, from a perspective of material input-ouput accounting. Richer OECD countries are taken as examples. For material input, the intensity with respect to GDP shows relative but not absolute delinking, with material growing over 1975-1995 (the period considered) for all countries. As far as outflows (air emission and waste disposed into the environment) are concerned, evidence support relative but not absolute delinking as well. Outflows are then broken down by the environmental media they enter. Looking at CO_2, air emission and landfilled waste, they note that absolute delinking holds for landfilled waste (not produced!) and air emissions, but not for CO_2. This confirms that absolute delinking, more strongly associated with the EKC hypothesis, is likely to hold (sooner over the development path) for local and regional externalities (Bruvoll and Medin, 2003). A similar perspective is presented by Canas et al (2003), who find EKC evidence for direct material input concerning 16 industrialised countries, but with income ranges observed mostly on the rising pattern of the curve (relative delinking).

overview of such studies dealing with microeconomic individual or household data: income-elasticities of waste production is estimated in a range between 0.05 to 0.55, thus inelastic. They note that a microeconomic based study is problematic since it often relies on case studies and small datasets.

In our framework, this inelastic relationship may mean that a relative delinking is present, though no sign of an absolute delinking emerges.

Concerning the intrinsically macroeconomic framework of the EKC, the international report which gave rise to the EKC literature (World Bank, 1992; Shafik, 1994) did not find evidence of delinking for waste by exploiting cross-country regression analysis of data from the eighties. The elasticity is positive and equal to 0.38, actually showing a relative delinking trend. Recent reports like the UK DEFRA (DEFRA; 2003) present the positive elasticity of waste generation to income as a primary policy concern: as long as CO_2, waste production seems still to have a strict relationship with economic drivers.

Cole et al. (1997) find no evidence for an inverted-U shaped EKC curve concerning municipal waste. They use municipal waste data for the period 1975-90 in 13 OECD countries, finding no turning point, with environmental indicators (per capita municipal waste) monotonically increasing with income over the observed range. Leigh (2004) presents evidence for EKC concerning a waste/consumption indicator derived from the environmental sustainability indexes (ESI). The analysis faces two potential problems: data only exists for 2001-2002 and the index is based on a comparative rather than on an absolute scale. Wang et al. (1998) and Berrens et al (1998) also find evidence in favour of a negative elasticity, by focussing on US stock of hazardous waste as an environmental impact indicator and exploiting a county-based cross sectional dataset. The nature of the pollution effect (stock/flow, hazardous/non-hazardous) seems to matter: non-hazardous and flow externalities appear to be less likely associated with a negative elasticity, even in industrialised countries. Recent works is nevertheless emerging for waste, though always limited by data availability. A macroeconomic based study is by Johnstone and Labonne (2004) who use a panel database of solid waste in OECD to provide evidence on the economic and demographic determinants of generation rates of household solid waste, regressed over consumption expenditures, urbanization and population density. With respect to economic activity and population density, the results are largely consistent with results found in previous studies: they find positive elasticities, but lower than one, in a range from 0.15 to 0.69, evidence of relative delinking. Population density is also positively related to waste generated, while a negative effect is found for population age[14].

Karousakis (2006) also focuses on municipal solid waste generation for OECD countries. The author presents evidence both on the determinants of waste generation and the driving forces behind the proportion of paper/glass recycled, and the proportion of land-filled waste. A panel database from 30 OECD countries over 1980-2000 (four period data, thus observations are 120) is exploited. Although not explicitly dealing with EKC, it shows that Municipal Solid waste (MSW) increases monotonically with income, with an elasticity around 0.42-0.45. Urbanisation exerts even a stronger effect on waste generation, while population density is not significant, as the policy index[15]. This is one of the first studies to explicitly deal with the drivers of waste management and

---

[14] A previous similar study is by Beede and Bloom (1995) who use cross section data for 36 countries finding an elasticity of MSW with respect to income of 0.34 and with respect to population of 1.04. When using time series data for the US (1970-1988), income elasticity is 0.88 while population is not significant as a driver.

[15] The latter two variables are instead significant in a final attempted FGLS model, both with expected negative signs.

disposal options, in addition to waste generation. Though these extensions are relevant, we argue that as far sustainability arguments and waste policies are concerned, the investigation of the relationship between waste and its economic and non economic drivers is of primary relevance. The production of waste is the more relevant environmental pressure indicator: more waste means more disposal loads, more management costs, and more environmental externalities. Reduction at source is, without ambiguity, at the first level of the EU waste hierarchy, while some doubts are now cast on the relative social costs and benefits of recovery and landfilling options. The added value of waste recovery routes (recycling, incineration with energy recovery, composting, etc.) are to be demonstrated case by case, compared to (new) landfills with energy recovery and long run full cost potentially internalised (Pearce, 2004; Diikgraaf and Vollebergh, 2004). However, the amount of waste produced depends on highly resilient, structural features of processes and products at industrial and distribution levels. Therefore, it is the level at which waste policies should be stronger, and, at the same time, the level at which policies face more difficulties, due to the visibility of their costs for economic agents. On the other hand, policies at the level of waste management and disposal can hardly exert strong and direct incentives backward to waste generation at source. We will further discuss these policy issues in our conclusions.

As far as Europe is concerned, Mazzanti and Zoboli (2005) find no delinking and EKC evidence exploiting municipal waste and packaging waste European panel datasets respectively from 1995 to 2000 and 1997 to 2000 (Eurostat, 2003a); estimated elasticities of waste production with respect to household expenditure are close to unity. The European waste sector emerges as an area for further exploration of the EKC hypothesis. Given (i) the relative homogeneity across those countries in terms of structural characteristics, and (ii) the panel framing which helps dropping off non observed fixed factors, the results, though preliminary, could be considered robust and of policy interest for the European framework.

The literature thus underlines that waste indicators generally tend to increase with income or other economic drivers, and, in general, an inverted-U shaped curve is still not fitting data[16]. Some authors have recently suggested that for stock pollution externalities the pollution income relationship difficultly turns into an EKC shaped curve, with stock-related externalities (as well as global ones) that are more likely to monotonically rise with income (Lieb, 2004). Another structural motivation for the lacking evidence for waste may be that the change in sign of the income elasticity of the environment/income function should occur at relatively lower income levels for pollutants whose production and consumption can be easily spatially separated, e.g. by exporting associated pollution or by relocating activities (Khanna and Plassmann, 2004)[17].

Both the literature on the determinants of waste production and the EKC literature converge to the same point: to date, macroeconomic evidence on EKC relationship for waste is still very scarce[18]. Furthermore, policy

---

[16] Rothman (1998) argues that delinking is less likely to occur when we tackle "consumption-based" measures. Gawande et al. (2001), who attempts to develop a consumption side model of EKC.

[17] Outside the waste framework, evidence has been increasingly developing over the last ten years. We refer to Ekins (1997), Dinda (2004, 2005), Cole et al. (1997), Cole (2003), Fonkych and Lempert (2005), Stern (1998, 2004), Managi (2006) and Yandle et al. (2002) for critical surveys of the literature, which is not an explicit aim of this paper.

[18] This is true for all the EKC literature. Concerning air emissions, we quote List and Gallet (1999) who present evidence on the US using state level SO_2 and NO_X emissions from 1929 to 1994. In summary, the large majority of states follow an EKC shape, predominantly in quadratic rather than cubic form, and with a larger share of states for NO_X. Then, turning points predicted by the traditional panel model are lower than the peaks observed state by state. Most countries though associated to an EKC shape witness higher than the average turning points. Thus, traditional panel analysis may lead to

implications from international cross-country studies may be weak: 'average' elasticities stemming from international panel datasets are difficult to interpret, since elasticities should be calculated at the most decentralised level possible, in order to be informative for policy makers. Macroeconomic analysis at a relatively disaggregated geographical level may be the good compromise and the best choice between microeconomic based studies, difficult to generalise, and macroeconomic investigations based on cross-country datasets.

Nevertheless, the literature still lacks single-country case studies using data at regional, provincial or municipal level. This is potentially a fruitful line of research, both for the methodological reasons mentioned above, and, not least important, for the quality of data. As Johnstone and Labonne (2004) observe, OECD and EU datasets may be affected by differences in waste classifications used by different countries. Care must be taken mainly when dealing with data reported before the 1990s. National official datasets provide a better and more reliable basis, offering in addition the possibility of exploiting geographically disaggregated datasets. Nevertheless, regional or provincial statistics help providing cross sectional heterogeneity and a sufficient number of observations to the panel matrix[19]. In this paper, we pursue this task of developing a very disaggregated, in-country analysis.

3. Empirical analysis on regional and provincial data for Italy

3.1 The datasets

The two datasets include data on the waste produced by Italian Regions and Provinces. published in the yearly editions of the APAT (Agenzia per la Protezione dell'Ambiente e per i Servizi Tecnici) "Rapporto Rifiuti" (APAT, years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005). The APAT data[20] contain information on the waste production, the separately collected waste, the energy and materials recovery and the urban waste disposal of all the Italian regions from 1996 to 2004 and from 2000 to 2004 for the Italian provinces[21].

The provincial dataset includes a variable related to the share of the provincial municipalities and the provincial population covered by a tariff regime substituting the old 'waste tax'[22]; this information derives also from the

---

overly optimistic conclusions, driven by the result which represents the average picture, hiding specific EKC dynamics by states or regions within countries.

[19] As regards Italy, Concu (2000) focuses on Sardinia, exploiting cross section data on municipal waste generation for 322 municipalities: he does not find evidence supporting EKC; he finds an exponential shape for its logarithmic specification. The analysis is nevertheless limited by the cross section nature of data. As noted, we argue that though rather complex, the new research line is one exploiting panel data at regional, provincial or municipal level, for assessing EKC evidence at a national level. Heterogeneity may exist in EKC shapes across countries, as noted in the literature, and the heterogeneity associated to disaggregated data help producing better estimates for EKC functional forms.

[20] APAT collects data through questionnaires mailed to public and private organisations (Regional and Provincial Agencies for the environment protection – such as ARPA and APPA - Regions, Provinces, Provincial observatory on the waste and in same cases the municipal firm for the management of urban hygiene services) that collect information about the waste management for different purposes. APAT collects different information through questionnaires mailed to organisations such as the Authority for the waste emergency, the CONAI consortium for the recovery of packaging waste and other material-related consortia (steel, aluminium, paper, wood, plastic material and glass) for the production and collection of specific waste.

[21] Every year the published data contain (or can contain) revisions of the previous published data; so, for every year we have considered the data of the last available publication.

[22] The decision related to the tariff application is up to the single municipal administration. The D.Lgs. 22/97 – Art. 49 introduced the tariff and abrogated the previous regime (tax scheme). The tariff regime application was then postponed by the 'Public Budget Policy Law 2005', n. 311, 30/12/2004: all the municipalities with a cover of the tax service costs at least equal to the 55% out of the total have to apply the tariff scheme from the 1st January 2006; all the municipalities with a

APAT Rapporto Rifiuti (Waste Report) and is related to the monitoring of the experimental application of the tariff and to the economic analysis of the management costs of the urban waste cycle. Generally, the municipalities' number that applies the tariff system increases every year despite the normative uncertainty[23]. The published data refer, for every province, to the number of the municipalities with a tariff, the corresponding population and includes the covering share calculated on the 2000 population and municipalities number[24].

The application of the tariff scheme mainly affects the Northern municipalities. It increased from 564 municipalities in 2004 to 747 in 2005 and, at regional level, the largest increases took place in Veneto (212 municipalities in 2005) and Lombardy (160). At regional level, the Veneto region has the biggest share (36.5%) of the municipalities that applies the tariff out of the total; Trentino Alto Adige, with a share of 35,4%, Emilia-Romagna (about 32%) and Lombardy (10,3%) follow. For the same regions the population shares covered by the tariff are 66% in Veneto, 64% in Trentino Alto Adige, 49% in Emilia-Romagna and 19% in Lombardy.

Data on the percentage of recovery of the total waste management cost that waste-management utilities have been able to achieve are available for years 2002 and 2003; so this variable can be used only by considering one year (i.e. the last one), repeated for every year in the database.

The population data used for the calculation of per capita waste production and the provincial inhabitants density refer to the 31st of December of each year (the source is ISTAT, the National Institute of Statistics). The source of per capita added value at constant prices for 1995 (Italian regions dataset) and at constant prices for the year 2000 (Italian provinces dataset) is ISTAT; the per capita yearly expenditure at constant prices derives from the yearly Italian Household Budget survey (from 1996 to 2003 due to data availability). Finally, the data on the yearly provincial tourist presence (total, Italian and foreign) are drawn from the yearly ISTAT volumes "Tourism Statistics".

3.2 The EKC empirical model

The first methodological problem for the applied analysis is how to specify the EKC functional relationship. There is no consensus on this point. Some authors adopt second order polynomial, others have estimated third and even forth order polynomials, comparing different specifications for relative robustness. It is worth noting that neither the quadratic nor cubic function can be considered a full realistic representation of the income-environment relationship: the cubic EKC specification implies that environmental degradation will tend towards a plus or minus infinity as income increases; the quadratic one implies that environmental degradation could eventually tend towards zero. Third or forth level polynomial could also lead to N rather than U shaped curves, opening new problematic issues in understanding the income-environment relationship for policymaking. The N shape would be justified by a non-linear effect by the scale of economic activity on the

---

cover of the tax service costs below the 55% out of the total have to apply the tariff scheme from the 1st January 2008. The 'Legge Finanziaria 2006' postponed again the introduction of the tariff scheme of the first group of municipalities.

[23] Considering 2005, a year not included in the database, about the 9% of the communal administrations uses a tariff scheme that corresponds to 23% of the Italian population.

[24] The number of municipalities with tariff has been compared to the 2000 number; the same has been done with the population in the APAT volumes.

environment, which is difficulty to prove[25]. Finally, the use of the income factor only, without quadratic and cubic terms, would collapse the EKC analysis to the basic decoupling analysis.

We here test the hypothesis by specifying a proper reduced form usual in the EKC field (Stern, 2004):

(1) $\log(\text{MSW generation}) = \beta_{0i} + \alpha_t + \beta_1 \text{Log(Economic driver)}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{Log(economic driver)}^2{}_{it} + \beta_4(Xi) + e_{it}$

where the first two terms are intercept parameters, which vary across provinces or regions, and years[26].

Different specifications are tested by including: (i) as dependent variable: waste per capita, log waste per capita and waste in absolute terms[27], and (ii) different economic drivers: provincial added value per capita (provincial level) and regional GDP and per capita expenditure (regional level).

The vector X refers to other drivers, added to the core EKC specification as controls for the base income only specification and possible other significant drivers of waste generation, and it may include population density, policy factors, legislations, socio economic factors like household size and population age, environmental public expenditures. In our model, it includes the percentage share of separately collected waste, population density (for both provincial and regional analysis) and tourist flows, recovery capacity of waste service cost, and share of population subject to waste tariffs (rather than waste taxes) for the province-level analysis (see Section 3.1).

The population density is included as a control variable, following other studies, for instance Johnstone and Labonne (2004) and Kaurosakis (2006): the expected sign is ambiguous, since on the one hand economies of scale may help reduce average waste collection costs (reducing incentives for waste prevention), while on the other hand population density may imply higher scarcity of land resources, thus more pressure to preserve land dedicated to waste disposal.

As suggested by other studies, the inclusion of policy proxies may be a fruitful addition in valuing the effect of policies within the EKC framework and in general assessing ex post policy effectiveness (Markandya et al., 2004; Kaurosakis, 2006; Millock and Nauges, 2006). We then include decentralised policy variables showing a strong geographical heterogeneity: (i) the share of municipalities (in the province and the region) which already implemented the new regime based on the waste management tariff, introduced by Italian bill n.22/97, which substitutes for the old waste management tax, with the latter however still prevailing in many Italian municipalities until 2006[28]; the tariff is based on principles of full-cost pricing of waste management services and can be considered as an 'economic instrument', although it does not include external environmental costs

---

[25] Shobee (2004) suggests a third order polynomial specification as a more realistic relationship between environmental degradation and income per capita. The issue still remains unresolved, with the EKC hypothesis relying mainly on empirical evidence.

[26] Cubic specifications are preliminary tested but they are not deemed relevant for waste.

[27] We stress that our municipal waste production includes a variety of waste sources other than household waste, such as commercial and public administration waste, generated at the municipal level (see also Johnstone and Labonne, 2004).

[28] Given the provisions of bill 22/97 – par.49, the transition phase is quite gradual and slow. Early implementation, which is partly at the choice of the municipality, may be a sign of policy commitment. We note that such implementation is heterogeneous even across areas similar by income and by social economic variables. It thus add relevant heterogeneity. The shift from tax to tariff should also captures the incentive effect of the former, though we underline (see below) that the impact on waste generation, if significant, is not quite visible in the short term. The variable is a way to capture waste policy features and policy commitment at a decentralised level.

(see below); (ii) the actual percentage of variable costs covered by the tax/tariff for each province and region, which is correlated to the level of the tax/tariff itself[29].

Such policy variables are continuous and time variant, differently from the synthetic indexes of time-invariant dummies used in most studies, which prevent from estimating them in a panel fixed effects model. They should capture, on the one hand, the implementation of an instrument which is more market–based. The tariff is correlated to socio-economic indicators, differently from the old Italian waste tax that was independent from waste production and household income. On the other hand, they should capture cost recovery, for both public and private waste management companies, as a proxy of the degree of subsidisation (the higher cost recovery, the lower subsidisation). We should expect that both policy proxies should be (significantly) negatively related to waste generation: the more the system is 'market based', the more waste production should be discouraged. Nevertheless, in the short term, their influence could be not significant, provided that changes in production and consumption behaviour take time and waste production is less dependent, compared to waste disposal/recovery/recycling, on price-based instruments and management approaches (see below).

Finally, in order to correct for "tourist hot spot areas", we check whether the introduction of tourist numbers at provincial level affect the estimates.

The last three mentioned variables are specified only for the provincial dataset, which provides higher heterogeneity and is more suitable in analysing decentralised, local-level waste policies.

Table 1 sums up all dependent and independent variables, showing descriptive statistics. For each combination of the dependent and independent variables, different specifications are estimated, including: the linear regressors only (delinking baseline case), linear and squared terms (EKC most usual case), and finally a specification with linear, squared and, only as an ancillary test, cubic terms. Then, the additional covariates are introduced and tested. Given the panel data framework, the relative fit of fixed effects and random effects models is compared by the Hausman statistic.

Though the logarithmic specification model is used as preferred specification, there is no clear evidence of its advantages over a non logarithmic model. Despite the fact that the coefficients, at least in the log linear case, are easily associated to elasticity values, we also estimate the non logarithmic specifications. Another check is carried out by estimating a LSDV model with time period effects, which may be relevant for the regional dataset covering 9 years. In any case, our panel datasets capture more cross-sectional heterogeneity than time-series dynamics, and, by exploiting this higher cross-section heterogeneity, we can have the advantage of improving estimates reliability and controlling for both individual heterogeneity and unobservable missing values.

---

[29] The exact tax/tariff level is an information not easily available, since its is determined by the single (private or public) utility company which manages waste flows at a municipal or provincial level. We then use two policy/management proxies derived from official APAT annual databases.

4. Results

4.1 Provincial level: 2000-2004, 103 Provinces

The results of econometric estimates on the provincial dataset, for different specifications of equation (1), are summarised in Table 2. We first estimate the model in non-logarithmic form. Results show evidence in support of an EKC. The random effects specification[30] is preferred following Hausman tests, though results are basically the same in terms of coefficient level and significance. The fit is highest when both the linear and squared value-added variable are included. The specification is also estimated correcting for first order serial correlation[31]: the outcome nevertheless does not change, apart from a slight decrease in the turning point (TP)[32]. When including time effects, the overall fit decreases.

When the share of separate waste collection is introduced as an additional covariate, it is associated to a positive and significant coefficient (see below). When adding this variable, only the AR-corrected specification (column 4 in Table 2) leads to a significant quadratic term. The population density factor (population/surface) is positive in sign, but not significant in all specifications. Elasticities of waste production to added value in squared models 1-4 are estimated in a range between 1.29 and 2.23. Cubic specifications do not perform well in term of overall significance and single coefficient significance. This result is somewhat expected.

Considering all specifications (column 1-4, table 2), estimated turning points are in between 22,815€ and 25,917€ per capita added value. These values are much higher than the median and mean values for added value in the period considered, and quite close to the maximum added value observed. Only a few provinces out of 103 either overcome or are close to this threshold, which is in any case close to the highest added value observed. In fact, taking the low level in the range, the following provinces present a added value higher than that estimated in 2004: Rome, Mantua, Firenze, Bologna, Modena, Milano, Bolzano, Parma, and Aosta and Bergamo are very close; while taking the highest level in the range Bologna and Modena are slightly lower, and only Milan and Bolzano are strictly higher than the estimated turning point. Many other Northern provinces are very close, in their 2003-2004 levels, to the lower estimated turning point[33].

---

[30] We estimate the model by NLogit 3.0, using a least square dummy variable specification (fixed effects). The Hausman test generally provides evidence in favour of the FE model; nevertheless, results do not differ sharply when the random effects model is estimated. We use a LSDV model since we are not specifically interested in estimating individual fixed effects, which may be inconsistently estimated when N increases. On the other hand, the alternative within effect model does not present an intercept. Since no dummy is used, this model has a larger degree of freedom for error, resulting in incorrect (smaller) standard errors for the parameter of interest.

[31] Following the procedure in Wooldridge (2002, p.176), which tests serial first order correlation by a t test on the coefficient of the lagged fitted residual term in a regression which sees as dependent variable the fitted residual in time T and the vector of explanatory factors. Lagged residuals are significant in both FEM and REM models, thus the correction model, which does not consider time T for estimation, is indicated. As noted by Wooldridge (2002, p.176), one interpretation of serial correlation in the errors of a panel data model is that the error in each time period contains a time constant omitted factor. Serial correlation may be verified by a test on the residuals (Wooldridge, 2002, p.176). If the null hypothesis of no correlation is not rejected, the model is definable as dynamically complete in the conditional mean. In any case, the loss of efficiency in presence of correlation, in models that involve relatively slowly changing variables, like consumption and output, is not so severe (Greene, 1997, p.589-590). In addition, we note that if the stationarity assumption holds, autocorrelation fades over time, but auto-correlation has to be dealt with since it may cause more or less severe losses of efficiency. We recall that the corrected correlation model reduces the number of observations since it is based on T-1 periods, unlike the time period effect model.

[32] See Johnstone and Labonne (2000, p.535), who estimate a model correcting both for AR1 and heteroskedasticity.

[33] Other wealthy northern provinces are close to the turning point, since they present an average added value, in the observed period, in between 23,000 andd 25,000€ per capita (at constant 2000 prices). We may say that some other

By using a logarithmic form, the squared term is not significant in the base specification: the elasticity of waste production to added value is 0.36. Nevertheless, AR correction leads to a significant turning point of 25,310€. The inclusion of population density does not affect results. Instead, when separated waste collection is included, the estimated elasticity of waste production to added value is around 0.28-0.31 (FEM/REM), leading to an evidence of 'relative delinking'[34]. The EKC shape emerges only when correcting for serial correlation, though FEM and REM results slightly differ, with associated a Hausman statistic of 7.77. Thus, the REM-corrected specification show EKC evidence with a turning point at 25,196€, and the waste collection variable loses significance. Logarithmic specifications thus present an EKC TP only in AR-corrected estimates: TPs nevertheless do not differ from the ones estimated for non-log specifications.

We also tested a logarithmic model in the absolute level of the variables (not per capita), where the dependent variable is waste production, and explanatory variables are the added value terms, population and share of separated collection (estimates are not shown). The EKC shape is not emerging as significant in this case, but added value, population, and separated-collection share are all positively and significantly linked to waste production. Elasticities of waste generation to added value and population are respectively estimated within ranges 0.28-0.34 and 0.64-1.00, depending on the inclusion of separated collection or not. Such elasticities confirm previous literature outcomes (Johnstone and Labonne, 2004).

The introduction of a tourist-flow factor, aimed at further correcting estimates for omitted variables biases, shows that the total provincial tourist presence positively influences the per capita waste production with high significance, as expected. In addition, it is not highly correlated to VA. As above, the logarithmic base specification is associated to low significance. The AR1 corrected specification consistently provide two VA terms significant at 5%, and a total tourist flow per capita at 1%. The TP is 25,232€ in the REM preferred model (output similar to the FEM). The elasticity of waste generation to tourist attendance is 0.059 in the base model and 0.062 in the AR1 corrected one[35].

Summing up, the provincial level analysis shows some evidence supporting an EKC shape, though results are somewhat dependent on the specifications used. Separated collection share, though significant, and population density, do not affect results concerning the relationship between waste and income. This is the first evidence, as far as we know, in favour of EKC in the waste environment. Turning points, as expected, occur at very high income level, close to the highest added value levels observed in the sample. They characterise some of the richest provinces of Northern Italy. It could be the first sign, emerging from a very detailed and heterogeneous provincial dataset, of a process which is reversing its structural feature from a positive elasticity to a negative elasticity of waste production with respect to income/added value. Given the non conclusive evidence and the high turning point, with only some wealthier provinces trespassing it, further empirical evidence is needed to confirm there results.

Northern provinces could have reached the estimated range in the period 2004-2006. A rough calculation suggests that 14 out of 103 provinces lie within this range: except for Rome they are all Northern provinces.

[34] In this case, the test for serial correlation shows the presence of correlation only for the REM model, which is nevertheless not preferred to the FEM.

[35] Splitting tourist flows into national and foreign attendances (0,73 correlation) the aforementioned regression is still significant, with respective elasticities of 0.060 and 0.043, and EKC TPs of 26,353€ and 24577€.

It is worth discussing the emerging positive and significant sign of the variable 'share of separated collection'. The interpretation may be the following: the separately-collected share of total waste produced is sharply higher in Northern and richer areas of Italy. Waste management is easier where public institutions are more committed to waste collection and recovery/recycling, where European and national policies are better and more fully implemented, and when funding possibilities are higher, also as a consequence of the introduction of the waste management tariff. Thus, the higher waste generation, as is the case in Northern provinces, the higher separate waste collection, and both are driven by and correlated to provincial economic welfare indexes (added value, GNP, household expenditure). It might be expected that a better performing and more effective collection/management system (i.e. a high share of separate collection) can be also a factor possibly contributing to reduce the still positive correlation between waste production and economic drivers. However, this 'waste prevention effect' of the collection systems is far from being certain and it does not emerge in practice. Therefore, the establishment of policy targets at the of source, i.e. waste production, would be needed. This should help the waste-added value relationship reversal into a negative elasticity, with a potential process of 'tunnelling through' the exogenously determined EKC[36]. We will further discuss this point in the conclusions.

With regard to policies, the APAT dataset allows us to specifically test, at the provincial level, two covariates that can represent proxies of the policy shift towards 'market-oriented' approaches (Table 1): (i) Share of total population living in municipalities that introduced a 'waste tariff' substituting the old 'waste tax' (TARIFF); it is an interesting 'policy proxy' since it captures the speed of local waste utilities in moving towards the 'full-cost pricing' approach provided by the Italian waste policy laws (a long implementation period is allowed for); data are available for the five years 2000-2004 and they are highly heterogeneous, even within Northern regions and over time; (ii) the percentage of recovery of the total waste management cost that waste-management utilities have been able to achieve (COST-REC); this variable should capture the way waste management is moving towards a private-enterprise approach, even within the public ownership/management sphere[37]; we use only the data for 2003, which has a reasonable reliability, because, in this case, the time trend is less relevant than cross-section heterogeneity[38]. The two variables are positively correlated, as expected. However, the correlation is not so high (0.18), and they capture different economic and institutional trends. Therefore, they can be included jointly in the regression[39].

---

[36] As we noted above, the share of separated waste collection is generally positively correlated with added value. We have exploited the variable as a control factor, since it may capture relevant heterogeneity concerning institutional, policy and other unobserved socio economic factors. We have also tested a two stages procedure, estimating in the first step the usual specification, then using the predicted values for waste generation, included in the second step in a regression where the dependent variable is COLLECT and the two covariates those predicted values and population density: both emerges with a very significant and positive coefficient (estimates not shown).

[37] For both waste and water management, Italy currently witnesses a long-run shift towards an institutional setting in which, even when remaining the owner and the manager of the service, the local public agents give rise to a variety of utilities configurations. In some of the latter, also private entities are involved and, in any case, the service must be tendered on the market. Therefore, the trend is one of an increasing capacity of full-cost recovery, also based on the shift from tax to tariff (waste), at least for the variable part of costs.

[38] We cannot consider logs given the high number of "0".

[39] A high correlation with added value is also expected since the trends represented by the two variables are spreading more in Northern areas. Given their high correlation also with COLLECT, we omit the latter term in the present analysis. The quite high correlation with added value opens the way to reasoning around the possible endogeneity of policy elements with respect to added value. This is a crucial issue within the realm of ex post environmental policy evaluation (Frondel and

Results are summarised in Table 4. When omitting COLLECT and including the two variables, EKC shapes remains, with TP at around 22,500-22,600€, on the lower bound. Nevertheless, TARIFF is positively and significantly correlated with waste production, but this is not true for COST-REC, which results to be not significant[40]. Including them jointly does not change the result. The interaction term is also significant at 10%, driven by the TARIFF effect. Looking at logarithmic specifications, nothing changes on relative terms. The TARIFF significance is nevertheless lower, at 10%. Estimated TP is 24,427€[41].

4.2 Regional level: 1996-2004, 20 Regions

The results of the analysis at the regional level are summarised in Table 3. We use two alternative economic drivers: GDP and household expenditure. The latter (not available at provincial level) could emerge as a closer driver of waste production (Mazzanti and Zoboli, 2005). FEM model is overwhelmingly preferred.

When using regional GDP (non logarithmic specifications), the base specification with income terms only does not show EKC evidence. An AR corrected model leads instead to some (very weak[42]) EKC evidence (TP in any case is outside of the income range), with and without the variable COLLECT (share of separate collection) and population density.

In the estimates of the linear forms, the two significant covariates, both with a positive sign, are added value (GDP) and COLLECT, whose inclusion does not affect the significance of added value We find positive coefficients for some dummies associated to Southern regions, while negative signs on Northern ones, confirming what commented above. As far as GDP, estimated elasticities in linear specifications are in a range between 0.36 and 1.31, showing a high variability depending on the specifications. Elasticities are 1.31, 1.15 and 0.71 in linear models, corrected and not corrected for serial correlation[43] and heteroskedasticity. The latter model lowers the value of the elasticity. The inclusion of separated collection lowers elasticity from 1.31 to 1.01 in the non-corrected model, and from 1.15 to 0.79 in the corrected one, and from 0.41 to 0.36 in a LSDV with time period effects.

The logarithmic specification confirms the higher plausibility of the linear specification: the elasticity is in this case estimated across different specifications (only GDP, with separated collection, with correlation correction; specifications 4-6) in a range between 0.87 and 1.15 (lower when additional factors are estimated). Those values are higher than at provincial level, and also higher than the evidence shown in international contributions.

The squared model generates non significant terms when adding COLLECT and using the more proper correlation corrected model. Without correction, coefficients are significant but with reverse signs. This confirms that EKC evidence remains, as noted in the literature, quite dependent on the specification used.

Schmidt, 2005; Mazzanti and Zoboli, 2006; Jacobsen et al., 2004). Nevertheless, the existence and the level of a TP are not affected by the inclusion of such set of covariates correlated with VA.

[40] Alternatively to TARIFF, we verify whether the share of municipalities (number, not population) that introduced a tariff (TARIFF2), leads to a diverse evidence (see Table 1). This variable is independent from effects deriving from huge urban areas opting for tariffs, since each municipality within a Province has the same weight.

[41] TARIFF endogeneity is tested by estimating predicted values in a first step (covariates density and added value) and the carrying out of a Wu-Hausman test. Predicted values are significant in the test regression, and are then exploited alternatively to TARIFF. In this case, nevertheless, the variable is not significant in the waste regression, thus lowering the relevance of previous outcomes if we assume endogeneity a key problem here.

[42] Squared term is very close to 10% significance.

[43] The test (not shown) confirms this hypothesis, both in the base LSDV model and in the LSDV with time effects.

Summing up, elasticity to GDP ranges between 0.41 to 1.31 across different log and non-log specifications. When using household expenditure as an economic driver (we lose one year due to data availability), we note that non logarithmic specifications do not provide robust regression results. Neither economic driver, in linear and squared terms, emerges significant. The logarithmic specification instead confirms the significance of the linear term and waste separated collection: the estimated elasticity is nevertheless lower than above, estimated in a range (across specifications) between 0.10 and 0.35[44].

Population density is significant: using a logarithmic factor, its elasticity is negative and equal to 2.38: economies of scale inherent to urban areas seem to count, maybe capturing more effective waste management in some more urbanized regional environments (see more below). This is partially counterintuitive, since we would have expected a greater role of this variable in the provincial dataset. The better fit of the provincial dataset with respect to income terms could be the reason why this variable emerges with more strength in the regional framework. All in all, given the higher fit of the provincial data, population density appears not to affect waste trends.

As for provinces, we also test a model using variables in absolute (not per capita) terms, but adding population LEVEL as explanatory factor. Contrary to above, population is emerging at a regional level as a driving force only when the variable related to separated collection, which is as usual found positively significant, is omitted[45]. Confirming international evidence, population elasticity is at both regional and provincial level higher than income elasticity. Our regional dataset, which exploits GDP data instead of added value, provides higher elasticities for both driving factors[46].

All in all, the regional dataset seems to provide relatively less robust empirical evidence compared to province-level analysis. We argue that the main cause is the higher heterogeneity which enriches the provincial dataset[47].

5. Conclusions and policy implications

The paper provides a methodological perspective and econometric estimates on delinking for waste indicators in Italy. Environmental Kuznets curves are addressed as a natural extension of delinking analysis. The results provide evidence in favour of an EKC for waste, with turning points within the observed income range, but such evidence emerges mainly from province-level data. For the specifications showing the EKC shape the estimated turning point is between 22,815€ and 25,917€ added value per capita. These values are higher than the median and mean values for added value in the period considered, and quite close to the maximum added value observed. Only a few provinces out of 103 either overcome or are close to this threshold, which is in any case close to the highest observed value-added per capita.

---

[44] AR correction reduces the significance of the consumption term. Overall, the regional dataset seems to produce a less robust result, and quite unexpectedly the model with consumption rather than GDP does not perform better. Provincial heterogeneity may be indicated as the main statistical added value.

[45] With included separated collection, added value is significant in its linear terms with an associated elasticity of 0.37. When excluded, this elasticity increases to 0.60, while the elasticity of waste generation with respect to population is 1.22.

[46] As for provinces, we also test a two stage model, estimating first the predicted values for waste generation, in order to include this element as an explanatory factor of separated waste collection: results are the same as observed for provinces.

[47] We argue that the AR and time-period effect models are more compatible with the regional data set, which is characterised by a stronger weight of the times series component with respect to the cross section heterogeneity.

Regional based evidence weakly supports EKC-like relationships, and at this level a linear relationship between waste production and income emerges with more strength. At the regional level, the waste production estimated elasticity with respect to income drivers is estimated across specifications between 0.17 and 0.35 when using household expenditure as a driver, and between 0.45 and 1.31 when using GDP. Then, results somewhat depend on the specification we use, and the province-based analysis tends to be more robust with respect changes in specifications.

Among the other covariates, population density is associated with a negative effect, but it is never significant. The positive and negative effects of population on waste generation are probably balancing one another. This is in line with other recent empirical evidence.

We also estimate a model with variables in absolute levels (not per capita) at both regional and provincial level: elasticity with respect to added value and population are respectively estimated within ranges 0.28-0.34 and 0.64-1.00 for provinces, and 0.37-0.60 and 1.22 for the regional case.

To sum-up, the results presented here are, to our knowledge, the first evidence supporting EKC for waste. This result differs from that by Mazzanti and Zoboli (2005) for municipal and packaging waste at the European level, who did not find evidence for EKCs. In the present analysis, the emergence of an EKC for waste largely depends on the availability of highly disaggregated data. By exploiting a more disaggregated dataset at regional and provincial level, we find that, at least for Italy, the relationship between waste generation and economic drivers is associated to a conventional EKC shape. This result confirms that international cross-country analyses, even if focused on regionally homogenous areas, may be misleading since they capture only the average effect. A disaggregated, within-country analysis is more plausible in economic terms, and also provides a more robust statistical ground. When exploiting the within-country heterogeneity different relationships between the environmental pressure and the economic driver may arise, also calling for differentiated policy interventions. In this regard, our analyses exploit the cross section regional/provincial heterogeneity more than the time series related trend, given data availability. This is partially different from the usual EKC framework, but it is a relevant perspective for quantitative analysis because it is, we think, more informative for policy making at a national level.

The nation-specific situation remains a crucial issue at the European level, where policies are often implemented assuming that single country situations are similar regarding the environmental issue. If national situations differ with respect to 'abatement costs' and with respect to the point at which the country lies along the EKC development dynamic, more heterogeneity in national/local policies could be claimed. Empirical analysis on single countries could provide more information to policy makers on those directions.

More in general, although our result may be the first sign of a reversal of the waste-income relationships, we are far from a general reversal of the positive relationships between waste and economic drivers. We cannot rely only on the expected endogenous effects of economic growth, and more focused, stringent and effective waste prevention policies, able to decouple waste production from its income-related drivers, are needed.

We estimated the possible effect of two policy proxies: (1) the share of separately collected waste and (2) the shift from the tax waste collection to the tariff on waste management, which represent in Italy the (still evolving) move towards market-oriented management/policy approaches. The two variables do not affect the EKC

evidence (province level). The only significant effect is positive: waste production is higher where the share of population experiencing the new tariff-based system is higher. Similar results emerge for the share of separate collection on total waste production, which is always significant and positively related to waste production across different regressions. The richest provinces in Northern Italy tend to be more innovative in terms of new institutional/policy approaches (i.e. market-oriented management settings, introduction of market-based instruments, better enforcement of waste policies), but they produce more waste per capita. The analyses of material recycling in Kaurosakis (2006) gives support to this argument of positive correlation between income, waste production and waste management capacity. The 'income effect' still tends to prevail, and the endogenous dynamics linking waste and income is not (yet) influenced by the new (evolving) institutional/policy setting.

Even if tariffs/taxes and collection systems should, in theory, stimulate a behavioural change by waste producers (i.e. consumers, households) towards producing less waste (prevention), their actual ex post role is mainly that of covering the costs of produced waste management. The innovative approaches to waste policies adopted by richer Italian provinces are expected to have an *indirect* negative feedback on waste production at source (prevention), but they nevertheless are still characterised, even ex ante, by a greater emphasis on the recovery of waste-management costs and, both ex ante and ex post, by little incentives to reduce waste production at source (i.e. waste prevention). Indirect effects of this latter kind cannot be ruled out, but they are, at best, very slow as they depend on a systemic reaction of the whole system at the different stages (good production, waste production, waste recovery, recycling, disposal, etc.). Furthermore, the existence of waste-prevention effects might be better detected on long time series at very disaggregated, even sub-provincial, local level (e.g. towns), and the short length of our province-level time series do not allow us to perform such a detailed case-by-case analysis over time. For the moment, similarly to what suggested by Mazzanti and Zoboli (2005) at the European level, our results for Italy seem to confirm that waste policies are more successful in developing waste recovery/recycling and new disposal routes, rather than in promoting waste prevention. The problem of lacking incentives for prevention is common to other environmental policies, but it seems to be exacerbated in the case of waste policies.

The main policy implication that, in order to reduce the costs and increase effectiveness of major waste policies (e.g.. landfill, packaging waste), also based on important European directives, a reduction at source of waste production must be explicitly pursued instead of relying on the hypothetical indirect feedbacks on waste production at source that might stem from improving waste management/disposal in the post-production phase. Waste policy instruments are not yet giving their desired/expected 'prevention effect', which remain nonetheless the first priority of European and Member States' waste policy. Our empirical evidence suggests that waste policy efforts should be strengthened towards prevention and they should rely on a greater use of policy schemes aimed at changing agents' behaviour at the level of waste production. Otherwise, and Italy is a clear example, an increasing gap, fuelled by the income-driven, endogenous dynamics of delinking and EKC, will emerge between low- and high-income areas. The latter could achieve a sustainable path in the near future - may be even an absolute delinking in spite of their high production of waste- whereas low income areas risk getting caught up in a situation of relatively lower (but increasing) waste generation and no reversal of its link with income growth (ascending EKC curve). The role of prevention-oriented policy could then be differentiated from area to area.

References

Andreoni J. Levinson A., 2001, The simple analytics of the environmental Kuznets curve, *Journal of Public Economics* vol.80, pp.269-86.

APAT, 2005, Rapporto Rifiuti (waste report) 2005, APAT & Osservatorio Nazionale Rifiuti (Italian environmental agency & National monitoring office for Waste), Ministry of the Environment, Rome. www.apat.it

- 2004, Rapporto Rifiuti 2004, APAT & Osservatorio Nazionale Rifiuti, Ministry of the Environment, Rome. www.apat.it

- 2003, Rapporto Rifiuti 2003, APAT & Osservatorio Nazionale Rifiuti, Ministry of the Environment, Rome. www.apat.it

- 2002, Rapporto Rifiuti 2002, APAT & Osservatorio Nazionale Rifiuti, Ministry of the Environment, Rome. www.apat.it

Ayres R.U. Ayres L.W. Pokrovsky V., 2004. On the Efficiency of US Electricity Usage since 1900, Interim Report IR-04-027, IIASA, Luxemburg.

Baltagi B. Bresson G. Pirotte A., 2002, Comparison of Forecast Performance for Homogenous, Heterogeneous and Shrinkage Estimators. Some Empirical Evidence from US Electricity and Natural Gas Consumption, *Economic Letters* vol.76, pp.375-382.

Beede D. Bloome D., 1995, Economics of the generation and management of MSW, MBER working paper 5116, Cambridge, MA.

Berrens Bohara A. Gawande K. Wang P., 1998, Testing the inverted U hypotehsis for US hazardous waste. An application of the generalized gamma model, *Economic Letters*, vol.55, n.3, pp.435-40.

Bringezu S. Schütz H. Moll. S., 2003, Rationale for and Interpretation of Economy-Wide Material Flow Analysis and Derived Indicators. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* vol.7(2), pp.43-64.

Bruvoll A. Medin H., 2003, Factors behind the environmental Kuznets curve. A decomposition of the changes in air pollution, *Environmental and Resource Economics* vol.24, pp.27-48

Canas A. Ferrao P. Conceicao P., 2003, A new EKC? Relationship between direct material input and income per capita: evidence from industrialised countries, *Ecological economics*, vol.46, n.2, pp.217-29.

Chimeli A. Braden J., 2005, Total factor productivity and the Environmental Kuznets curve. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* vol.49, pp.366-80.

Cole M.A., 2003, Development, Trade and the Environment: How Robust is the Environmental Kuznets Curve? *Environment and Development Economics* vol.8, pp.557-80.

Cole M., Rayner A., Bates J., 1997, The EKC: an empirical analysis. *Environment and Development Economics* vol.2, pp.401-16.

Concu N., 2000, La tirannia del trade off sconfitta? Turismo, ambiente naturale e rifiuti solidi urbani: la ricerca di una EKC, CRENOS, Cagliari.

Dasgupta S. Laplante B. Wang H. Wheeler D, 2002. Confronting the Environmental Kuznets Curve. *Journal of Economic Perspectives vol.*16, pp.147-68.

DEFRA/DTI 2003. *Sustainable Consumption and Production Indicators.* London: DEFRA.

Dinda S., 2004, Environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis: a survey. *Ecological Economics* vol.49, pp.431-55.

EEA, 2003a, *Evaluation analysis of the implementation of the packaging Directive.* Copenhagen: European Environment Agency.

-2003b, *Assessment of information related to waste and material flows.* Copenhagen: European Environment Agency.

-2003c, *Europe's environment: The third assessment.* Copenhagen: European Environment Agency.

Ehrlich P.R., 1971, *The population bomb.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Ekins P., 1997, The Kuznets curve for the environment and economic growth: examining the evidence, *Environmental planning*, vol.29, pp.805-830.

European Commission, 2003a, *Towards a thematic strategy for waste prevention and recycling.* COM (2003) 301, Brussels: European Commission.

- 2003b, *Towards a thematic strategy on sustainable use of natural resources,* COM(2003)572.

Eurostat 2003, *Waste generated and treated in Europe. Data 1990-2001.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

-2002, *Material use in the European Union 1980-2000: Indicators and analysis,* Working Paper and Studies series. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

-2001, *Economy-wide Material Flow Accounts and derived Indicators – A Methodological Guide, Methods and Nomenclature series.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Femia A. Hinterberger F. Luks F., 2001, Ecological Economic Policy for Sustainable Development: Potential and Domains of Intervention for Delinking Approaches. *Population and Environment*, vol.23, pp.157-174.

Fischer Kowalski, M., Amann, C., 2001, Beyond IPAT and Kuznets Curves: globalization as a vital factor in analyzing the environmental impact of socio economic metabolism. *Population and the environment* vol.23.

Fonkych K. Lempert R., 2005, Assessment of environmental Kuznets curves and socioeconomic drivers in IPCC's SRES scenarios, *The journal of environment & development,* vol.14, n.1, pp.27-47

Frondel M. Schmidt C., 2005, Evaluating environmental programs: The perspective of modern evaluation research, *Ecological Economics,* Vol. 55, n. 4, pp.515-26.

Gawande K. Berrens R. Bohara A., 2001, A consumption based theory of the EKC, *Ecological economics*, vol.37, n.1, pp.101-12.

Greene W., 2000, *Econometric analysis*, Fourth edition, New York, McGraw-Hill.

Grossman G.M. Krueger A.B., 1994, Economic growth and the environment, NBER Working Papers 4634. NBER.

Gruebler A., Nakicenovich N. Victor D.G., 1999, Dynamics of energy technologies and global change, *Energy Policy* vol.27, pp.247-280

Harbaugh W. Levinson A. Wilson D., 2000, Re-examining the empirical evidence for an environmental Kuznets curve. NBER Working Paper n. 7711. NBER.

Holtz-Eakin D. Selden T.M., 1992, Stoking the fires? CO_2 emissions and economic growth, NBER Working Papers 4248. NBER.

Jacobsen H. Mazzanti M. Moll S. Simeone M.G. Pontoglio S. Zoboli R., 2004, Methodology and indicators to measure decoupling, resource efficiency, and waste prevention. ETC/WMF, European Topic Centre on Waste and Material Flows, European Environment Agency, P6.2-2004, Copenhagen, October.

Johnstone N. Labonne J., 2004, Generation of Household solid waste in OECD countries. An empirical analysis using macroeconomic data, *Land Economics*, vol.80, n.4, pp.529-38.

Kaurosakis K., 2006, MSW generation, disposal and recycling: a note on OECD intercountry differences, paper presented at envecon 2006: Applied Environmental Economics Conference, 24th March 2006, the Royal Society, London

Kelly D., 2003, On EKC arising from stock externalities. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* vol.27, n.8, pp.1367-90.

Khanna N. Plassmann F., 2004, The demand for environmental quality and the environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis. *Ecological Economics* vol.51, pp.225-36.

Kuznets S. 1955. Economic growth and income inequality. *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings* vol.45, n.1 pp.1-28.

Leigh R., 2004, Economic growth as environmental policy? Reconsidering the Environmental Kuznets Curve. *Journal of Public Policy* vol.24, pp.27-48.

Lieb C.M., 2004, The environmental Kuznets Curve and flow versus stock pollution: the neglect of future damages. *Environmental and Resource Economics* vol.29, n.4, pp.483-506.

List J.A. Gallet C.A., 1999, Does one size fits all?, *Ecological Economics*, vol.31, pp.409-424.

Managi S. 2006, Are there increasing returns to pollution abatement? Empirical analytics of the environmental Kuznets Curve in pesticides, *Ecological Economics*, vol.58, n.3, pp.617-36.

Markandya A. Pedroso S. Golub A., 2004, Empirical analysis of national income ad SO_2 emissions in selected European countries. Nota di lavoro 1, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei. FEEM: Milan.

Matthews E. Amann C. Fischer Kowalski M. Bringezu S. Huttler W. Klejin R. Moriguchi Y. Ottke C. Rodenburg E. Rogich D. Schandl H. Schutz H. van der Voet E. Weisz H., (2000), The weight of nations: material outflows from industrial economies, Washington, World resources institute.

Mazzanti M. Zoboli R., 2006, Economic Instruments and Induced Innovation. The European Policies on end of life Vehicles. *Ecological Economics*, vol.58, n.2, pp.318-37.

Mazzanti M. Montini A. Zoboli R., 2006, Delinking, emission trends and the EKC hypothesis, paper presented at the CONACCOUNT meeting on dematerialization and material waste flows, Wien, 13-14 September.

Millock K. Nauges C., 2006, Ex post evaluation of an earmarked tax on air pollution, *Land Economics*, forthcoming.

Moll S. Femia A. Hinterberger F. Bringezu S., 1999, An Input-Output Approach to Analyse the Total Material Requirement (TMR) of National Economies. in: Kleijn R., Bringezu S., Fischer-Kowalski M., Palm V. (eds.) Ecologizing Societal Metabolism: Designing Scenarios for Sustainable Materials Management, ConAccount workshop proceedings, 21 November 1998, Amsterdam, CML report 148. Centre of Environmental Science (CML), Leiden, 39-46.

OECD, 2003, *Response indicators for waste prevention within the OECD area*. ENV/EPOC/WGWPR/SE(2003)2. Paris: OECD.

-2002, *Indicators to measure decoupling of environmental pressure from economic growth*. Paris: OECD.

Pearce D.W., 2004, Does European Union waste policy pass a cost benefit test?, mimeo.

Roca J., 2003, Do individual preferences explain the EKC? *Ecological Economics*, vol.45, n.1, pp.3-10.

Rothman D., 1998, EKC, real progress or passing the buck? A case for consumption based approaches. *Ecological Economics* vol.25, pp.177-94.

Selden D.H. Song D., 1994, Environmental quality and development: Is there a Kuznets curve for air pollution emissions?, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, vol.27, n.2.

Shafik N., 1994, Economic Development and Environmental Quality: An Econometric Analysis. *Oxford Economic Papers*, vol.46, pp.757-73.

Shobee S., 2004, The environmental Kuznets curve (EKC): a logistic curve? *Applied Economics Letters* vol.11, pp.449-52.

Stern D., 2004, The rise and fall of the Environmental Kuznets curve. *World Development* vol.32, n.8, pp.1419-38.

- 1998, Progress on the environmental Kuznets curve? *Environment and Development Economics* vol.3, pp.173–196.

Ten Kate A., 1993, Industrial development and environment in Mexico. Working Paper Series, n. 1125. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Vollebergh H. Kemfert C., 2005, The role of technological change for a sustainable development. *Ecological Economics* vol.54, pp.133-147

Wang P. Bohara A. Berrens R. Gawande K., 1998, A risk based environmental Kuznets curve for US hazardous waste sites. *Applied Economics Letters* vol.5, pp.761-63.

Woolridge J., 2002, *Econometrics Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT press.

World Bank, 1992, *Development and the environment*, World bank Report, Oxford University Press.

Yandle B. Vijayaraghavan M. Bhattarai M., 2002, The environmental Kuznets curve. A primer, PERC Research Study 02-01.

Zoboli R., 1996, Technology and Changing Population Structure: Environmental Implications for the Advanced Countries. Dynamis-Quaderni, 6/96. Milan: IDSE-CNR. www.idse.mi.cnr.it.

-1995, Technological Innovation and Environmental Efficiency: Empirical Evidence and Explaining Factors, Dynamis-Quaderni. 5/95. Milan: IDSE-CNR. www.idse.mi.cnr.it.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics: dependent and independent variables

acronym	Variable description	mean	min	max
		Provinces		
WASTE	MSW generated in tons per capita	517.13	289.61	893.23
VA	Provincial added value per capita (€2000)	17742.52	9704	28796
DENS	Population/surface (inhabitants/km2)	243.73	36.55	2640.91
COLLEC	% Share of separated collection	18.52	0.4	64.9
TARIFF	Share of population living in municipalities that introduced a waste tariff substituting the former waste tax (%)	8.42	0	99.72
TARIFF2	Share of municipalities that introduced a waste tariff substituting the former waste tax (%)		0	
COST-REC	Cost recovery of waste management services (tax/tariff revenues on variable service costs, only one data for 2003) (%)	84.05	0	105
TOURIST	TOURIST yearly Attendance (per capita)	7,,27	0.43	58.3
		Regions		
WASTE	MSW generated in tons per capita	491.11	335.60	692.55
GDP	GDP per capita (€1995)	17141	9885.3	24091.33
C	Household consumption per capita (€1995)	735.18	412.47	1030.03
DENS	Population/surface (km2)	175.8	36.42	426.54
COLLEC	% Share of separated collection	12.31%	0.6%	44%

Mean, min and max are calculated across provinces and over time

Table 2. Provincial level: base estimations and additional specifications

€	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Cons	*	*	*	/	***	**		**
VA	0.032***	0.0335***	0.047***	0.0425***				
VA²	-0.000000627**	-0.000000659***	-0.00000103***	-0.00000091**				
logVA					0.3627***	8.17**	0.283***	8.29**
(logVA)²						-0.402**		-0.409**
DENS		0.20	0.25	-0.211			-0.0003	0.000044
COLLEC				1.304***			0.002***	0.00073
Turning point	25917€	25417€	22815€	23351€		25311€		25196€
FEM/REM	REM	REM	REM (AR1)	FEM (AR1)	REM	REM (AR1)	FEM	REM(AR1)
adjR²				0.938				
F test and Chi-sq prob.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
N	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515

Coefficients are shown in cells: *10% significance, **5%, ***1%.

Table 3. Regional level: base estimations and additional specifications

specification	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Const							***	
GDP	0.037***	0.054***						
GDP²		-0.00000087						
logGDP			1.154***	0.881***	0.871***			
(logGDP)²								
logC						0.133***	0.352***	0.106**
(logC)²								
DENS		-0.61			-0.0011	-0.0096***		-2.38***
COLLEC		1.85***		0.0038***	0.032**	0.0089***		0.0096***
Turning point		31034€ (outside the observed range)						
FEM/REM	FEM	FEM (AR1)	FEM	FEM	FEM(AR1)	FEM	REM	FEM
adjR²	0.9088	0.832	0.906	0.919	0.91	0.91	0.845	0.927
F test and Chi-sq prob.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
N	180	180	180	180	180	160	160	160

Coefficients are shown in cells: *10% significance, **5%, ***1%.

Table 4. The effect of waste policy instruments

	1	2	3
Cons	Not sign	Not sign	Not sign
VA	0.0472***	0.0464***	
VA²	-0.00000104***	-0.00000102***	
logVA			9.045**
(logVA)²			-0.4478**
DENS	0.025	0.026	0.000048
TARIFF	0.321**		0.00053*
COST-REC		0.275	0.00016
Turning point	22692€	22549€	24427€.
FEM/REM	REM(AR1)	REM(AR1)	REM(AR1)
F test and Chi-sq prob.	0.000	0.000	0.000
N	515	515	515

Coefficients are shown in cells: *10% significance, **5%, ***1%.

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html

http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html

http://www.repec.org

http://agecon.lib.umn.edu

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2006

CTN	80.2006	*Maria MONTERO*: Inequity Aversion May Increase Inequity
CCMP	81.2006	*Vincent M. OTTO, Andreas LÖSCHEL and John REILLY*: Directed Technical Change and Climate Policy
CSRM	82.2006	*Nicoletta FERRO*: Riding the Waves of Reforms in Corporate Law, an Overview of Recent Improvements in Italian Corporate Codes of Conduct
CTN	83.2006	*Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK*: Coalition Governments in a Model of Parliamentary Democracy
PRCG	84.2006	*Raphaël SOUBEYRAN*: Valence Advantages and Public Goods Consumption: Does a Disadvantaged Candidate Choose an Extremist Position?
CCMP	85.2006	*Eduardo L. GIMÉNEZ and Miguel RODRÍGUEZ*: Pigou's Dividend versus Ramsey's Dividend in the Double Dividend Literature
CCMP	86.2006	*Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL*: The Impact of Climate Change on Domestic and International Tourism: A Simulation Study
KTHC	87.2006	*Fabio SABATINI*: Educational Qualification, Work Status and Entrepreneurship in Italy an Exploratory Analysis
CCMP	88.2006	*Richard S.J. TOL*: The Polluter Pays Principle and Cost-Benefit Analysis of Climate Change: An Application of *Fund*
CCMP	89.2006	*Philippe TULKENS and Henry TULKENS*: The White House and The Kyoto Protocol: Double Standards on Uncertainties and Their Consequences
SIEV	90.2006	*Andrea M. LEITER and Gerald J. PRUCKNER*: Proportionality of Willingness to Pay to Small Risk Changes – The Impact of Attitudinal Factors in Scope Tests
PRCG	91.2006	*Raphäel SOUBEYRAN*: When Inertia Generates Political Cycles
CCMP	92.2006	*Alireza NAGHAVI*: Can R&D-Inducing Green Tariffs Replace International Environmental Regulations?
CCMP	93.2006	*Xavier PAUTREL*: Reconsidering The Impact of Environment on Long-Run Growth When Pollution Influences Health and Agents Have Finite-Lifetime
CCMP	94.2006	*Corrado Di MARIA and Edwin van der WERF*: Carbon Leakage Revisited: Unilateral Climate Policy with Directed Technical Change
CCMP	95.2006	*Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Chiara M. TRAVISI*: Comparing Tax and Tax Reallocations Payments in Financing Rail Noise Abatement Programs: Results from a CE valuation study in Italy
CCMP	96.2006	*Timo KUOSMANEN and Mika KORTELAINEN*: Valuing Environmental Factors in Cost-Benefit Analysis Using Data Envelopment Analysis
KTHC	97.2006	*Dermot LEAHY and Alireza NAGHAVI*: Intellectual Property Rights and Entry into a Foreign Market: FDI vs. Joint Ventures
CCMP	98.2006	*Inmaculada MARTÍNEZ-ZARZOSO, Aurelia BENGOCHEA-MORANCHO and Rafael MORALES LAGE:* The Impact of Population on CO2 Emissions: Evidence from European Countries
PRCG	99.2006	*Alberto CAVALIERE and Simona SCABROSETTI*: Privatization and Efficiency: From Principals and Agents to Political Economy
NRM	100.2006	*Khaled ABU-ZEID and Sameh AFIFI*: Multi-Sectoral Uses of Water & Approaches to DSS in Water Management in the NOSTRUM Partner Countries of the Mediterranean
NRM	101.2006	*Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslav MYSIAK and Jacopo CRIMI*: Participatory Approach in Decision Making Processes for Water Resources Management in the Mediterranean Basin
CCMP	102.2006	*Kerstin RONNEBERGER, Maria BERRITTELLA, Francesco BOSELLO and Richard S.J. TOL*: Klum@Gtap: Introducing Biophysical Aspects of Land-Use Decisions Into a General Equilibrium Model A Coupling Experiment
KTHC	103.2006	*Avner BEN-NER, Brian P. McCALL, Massoud STEPHANE, and Hua WANG*: Identity and Self-Other Differentiation in Work and Giving Behaviors: Experimental Evidence
SIEV	104.2006	*Aline CHIABAI and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES*: Economic Valuation of Oceanographic Forecasting Services: A Cost-Benefit Exercise
NRM	105.2006	*Paola MINOIA and Anna BRUSAROSCO*: Water Infrastructures Facing Sustainable Development Challenges: Integrated Evaluation of Impacts of Dams on Regional Development in Morocco
PRCG	106.2006	*Carmine GUERRIERO*: Endogenous Price Mechanisms, Capture and Accountability Rules: Theory and Evidence
CCMP	107.2006	*Richard S.J. TOL, Stephen W. PACALA and Robert SOCOLOW*: Understanding Long-Term Energy Use and Carbon Dioxide Emissions in the Usa
NRM	108.2006	*Carles MANERA and Jaume GARAU TABERNER*: The Recent Evolution and Impact of Tourism in the Mediterranean: The Case of Island Regions, 1990-2002
PRCG	109.2006	*Carmine GUERRIERO*: Dependent Controllers and Regulation Policies: Theory and Evidence
KTHC	110.2006	*John FOOT* (lxxx): Mapping Diversity in Milan. Historical Approaches to Urban Immigration
KTHC	111.2006	*Donatella CALABI*: Foreigners and the City: An Historiographical Exploration for the Early Modern Period
IEM	112.2006	*Andrea BIGANO, Francesco BOSELLO and Giuseppe MARANO*: Energy Demand and Temperature: A Dynamic Panel Analysis
SIEV	113.2006	*Anna ALBERINI, Stefania TONIN, Margherita TURVANI and Aline CHIABAI*: Paying for Permanence: Public Preferences for Contaminated Site Cleanup
CCMP	114.2006	*Vivekananda MUKHERJEE and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE*: Global Climate Change, Technology Transfer and Trade with Complete Specialization
NRM	115.2006	*Clive LIPCHIN*: A Future for the Dead Sea Basin: Water Culture among Israelis, Palestinians and Jordanians
CCMP	116.2006	*Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO and A. Denny ELLERMAN*: The Allocation of European Union Allowances: Lessons, Unifying Themes and General Principles
CCMP	117.2006	*Richard S.J. TOL*: Carbon Dioxide Emission Scenarios for the Usa

(lxxviii) This paper was presented at the Second International Conference on "Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development - Macro and Micro Economic Issues" jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari and Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy, and supported by the World Bank, Chia, Italy, 16-17 September 2005.

(lxxix) This paper was presented at the International Workshop on "Economic Theory and Experimental Economics" jointly organised by SET (Center for advanced Studies in Economic Theory, University of Milano-Bicocca) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy, Milan, 20-23 November 2005. The Workshop was co-sponsored by CISEPS (Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Economics and Social Sciences, University of Milan-Bicocca).

(lxxx) This paper was presented at the First EURODIV Conference "Understanding diversity: Mapping and measuring", held in Milan on 26-27 January 2006 and supported by the Marie Curie Series of Conferences "Cultural Diversity in Europe: a Series of Conferences.

(lxxxi) This paper was presented at the EAERE-FEEM-VIU Summer School on "Computable General Equilibrium Modeling in Environmental and Resource Economics", held in Venice from June 25th to July 1st, 2006 and supported by the Marie Curie Series of Conferences "European Summer School in Resource and Environmental Economics".

2006 SERIES		
CCMP	*Climate Change Modelling and Policy* (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)	
SIEV	*Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation* (Editor: Anil Markandya)	
NRM	*Natural Resources Management* (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)	
KTHC	*Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital* (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)	
IEM	*International Energy Markets* (Editor: Matteo Manera)	
CSRM	*Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management* (Editor: Giulio Sapelli)	
PRCG	*Privatisation Regulation Corporate Governance* (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)	
ETA	*Economic Theory and Applications* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)	
CTN	*Coalition Theory Network*	