

A Service of

ZBW

Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Freire-González, Jaume; Martinez-Sanchez, Veronica; Puig-Ventosa, Ignasi

Article — Published Version Tools for a circular economy: Assessing waste taxation in a CGE multi-pollutant framework

Waste Management

Suggested Citation: Freire-González, Jaume; Martinez-Sanchez, Veronica; Puig-Ventosa, Ignasi (2022) : Tools for a circular economy: Assessing waste taxation in a CGE multi-pollutant framework, Waste Management, ISSN 1879-2456, Elsevier BV, Amsterdam, Vol. 139, pp. 50-59, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2021.12.016

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/314380

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



ND http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/





Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Waste Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/wasman

Tools for a circular economy: Assessing waste taxation in a CGE multi-pollutant framework

Jaume Freire-González^{a,b,*}, Veronica Martinez-Sanchez^b, Ignasi Puig-Ventosa^b

^a Institute for Economic Analysis (CSIC) and Barcelona School of Economics, 08193 Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain
^b ENT Environment and Management, Josep Llanza, 1-7, 2 3, 08800 Vilanova i la Geltrú, Barcelona, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Circular economy Environmental taxes Computable general equilibrium Environmental impacts Waste

ABSTRACT

Economic theory states that incineration and landfill taxation can effectively diminish the environmental impacts of pollution and resource use by reducing their associated pollutants while stimulating the reuse and recycling of materials, and therefore, fostering a circular economy. The aim of this research is to assess the economic and environmental effects of these taxes in Spain in different scenarios with a detailed dynamic computable general equilibrium (CGE) model, as there are no studies analyzing this in detail. We focus on the economic impact on GDP and sectorial production and the environmental impact on different categories: global warming potential, marine eutrophication potential, photochemical ozone formation potential, particulate matter, human toxicity (cancer and noncancer), ecotoxicity, and depletion of fossil resources. We find in all scenarios that these taxes have a limited economic impact while reducing all of the environmental impact categories analyzed. The study reinforces the theory that policy makers need to impose taxes on landfill and incineration to reinforce the circularity of the economy and reduce environmental burdens, but also demonstrates that they can improve their design without additional costs.

1. Introduction

Environmental taxation is a powerful tool to reduce environmental pressures (Pigou, 1920; Baumol, 1972; Baumol & Oates, 1971; European Environment Agency, 2013). There are many theoretical and empirical studies that show the environmental benefits of taxes (European Environment Agency, 1996; European Environment Agency, 2016). However, the net effect of these taxes is not clear (Pearson, 1995). The balance between reducing environmental loads (welfare increase) and increasing the fiscal pressure put onto economic agents (possible welfare reduction) needs to be analyzed. Environmental taxes have many different effects, the most important effects for public and environmental policy are on health, on global warming and on the environment in general (Williams, 2003; Morley, 2012), but they also have relevant effects on the economy. For instance, on income distribution (Rapanos, 1995) and on economic output and other macroeconomic indicators (Fullerton and Heutel, 2007). These effects, however, can be different depending on the design of the environmental taxation. There is some literature that states that depending on the design of the environmental taxation, a double dividend can be obtained (i.e., a benefit to both the environment and the economy) (Freire-González, 2018; Pearce, 1991; Pereira et al., 2016; Sajeewani et al., 2015). Particularly, by using government revenues to reduce other pre-existing taxes, the costs of imposing an environmental tax are reduced, and in some cases, this leads to the aforementioned double dividend. However, in waste taxes this effect would be small because revenues from these taxes are not high in relation to the total government revenues.

Waste management is already the focus of several concurrent environmental policies, such as command and control measures and public investment or awareness-raising campaigns. However, the use of market-based instruments can also be part of the policy mix (OECD, 2007; OECD, 2019). In this sense, an environmental taxation applied to landfill and incineration activities may not only compensate for the presence of externalities, but introduce incentives to divert waste from these forms of treatment, which are at the bottom of the waste hierarchy due to higher environmental impacts. Thus, the use of environmental taxation for waste policy has spread widely, particularly in Europe (Watkins et al., 2012; Fischer et al., 2012). The most common forms are municipal waste charges for collection and treatment of waste, taxes on certain products (e.g., plastic bags), and taxes on landfill and incineration. The former is usually set to cover the costs of collecting waste in municipalities or other administrative regions but in many places has

* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* jaume.freire@iae.csic.es (J. Freire-González).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2021.12.016

Received 25 November 2020; Received in revised form 27 September 2021; Accepted 8 December 2021 Available online 18 December 2021 0956-053X/© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).







undergone changes in design to stimulate waste reduction and source separation with the adoption of pay-as-you-throw schemes (Puig Ventosa et al., 2013; Palatnik et al., 2014; ACR+, 2016). Conversely, taxes on certain products and taxes on landfill and incineration are purely conceived to create incentives toward reducing and recycling waste, improving the circularity of the economies. There are few studies assessing the effect of landfill taxes. The experience of Flanders (Belgium), Hoogmartens et al. (2016) concludes that landfill taxes can mitigate the scarcity issue of landfill capacity by reducing landfilled waste volumes. Nicolli and Mazzanti (2013) analyze the case of landfill taxes in Italy, which is characterized by the decentralized regional implementation, and they conclude that regions that have increased such taxes have improved waste disposal performances over time. Finally, Panzone et al. (2021) use a ridge regression approach on a panel dataset of English local authorities, and conclude that the landfill tax is effective in shifting waste from landfills to incineration, and it encourages recycling.

The number of studies that assess the economic and environmental impacts of incineration and landfill taxes using general equilibrium methodologies is even less. This is due to the high detail needed in the description of the economic sectors. A review of the empirical evidence from different countries can be found in Bartelings et al. (2005). These authors evaluate the effectiveness of the landfill tax in the Netherlands using a CGE model. More evidence is needed to reach stronger conclusions on the effects of waste taxes.

This study is focused on assessing the current taxation on landfill and incineration in Spain and proposing improvements based on economic and environmental indicators from the analysis. So, the objective is to obtain evidence on the effects of landfill and incineration taxes and how they could be improved, using Spain as a case study. The reason for selecting Spain is that there are several landfill and incineration taxes in place at a regional level, as presented below. These initiatives are diverse and have been in place for a long period, allowing to gather sufficient data on their performance. Moreover, in Spain there is an ongoing discussion on whether a landfill and incineration tax should be adopted at a national level.

This article provides insights on how waste taxation policies can help policy makers understand the nature of different fiscal configurations in economic and environmental terms, and how they can improve current waste taxation policies in order to achieve circular economies. We use a dynamic CGE model with energy and environmental extensions calibrated for the Spanish economy to assess the economic and the environmental impacts of these taxes. CGE models are one of the most comprehensive instruments to simulate the economic and environmental effects of policies despite their limitations, such as being circumscribed to a particular view of the functioning of economies, or, from a dynamic perspective, not considering technological changes. However, they suppose other advantages in relation to other applied instruments, as in our case, the possibility of having a high detail of waste technologies to simulate specific taxation policies, and the possibility of having a wide range of economic impacts: many changes in sectorial economic indicators and specific effects on the environment and on particular resources use, etc. Dynamic models provide the effects of policies in the mid and long term, something not captured by static models, although dynamic models include even more assumptions and uncertainty than static ones. It is important to track the potential dynamic effects of a policy, since a specific tax can provide positive results in the short term but negative after some years.

From the macroeconomic impacts perspective, we observe the effects on GDP, prices, and the production of different waste treatment technologies, as well as on the rest of the economic sectors. From the environmental perspective, we observe the effects of these taxes on 31 different pollutant emissions and eight environmental impact categories. We set five different scenarios. The first one assesses the impacts of the current situation in Spain, and the others are four fiscal proposals that could easily be implemented in Spain and could improve the incentives toward waste reduction. Two of them also include subsidies to recycling industries.

Section 2 describes the particularities of landfill and incineration taxes in Spain. Section 3 shows the data used, and Section 4 describes the methodology, with a description of the energy-environment-economy model and the different scenarios. Section 5 shows the main results and a discussion of the simulations, and Section 6 includes the main conclusions of the research.

2. Taxes on landfill and incineration in Spain

Although the Spanish national government could have promoted the congressional adoption of a law setting a tax on landfill and incineration, this never occurred; therefore, these taxes are not implemented nationwide in Spain. Regions have the legal power to create environmental taxes in the absence of similar previous national levies. In these circumstances, several regions have created landfill and incineration taxes.

As we have calibrated our model with 2007 data (see methodology section for more detail), here we analyze the state of these taxes in that year, and then set the scenarios for the analysis.

In 2007, only four regions (from seventeen) had implemented taxes on landfill. None of them had applied taxes on incineration:

Catalonia: Law 16/2003, of June 13, on the financing of waste treatment infrastructures and on the tax on waste disposal (*Ley 16/2003, de 13 de junio, de financiación de las infraestructuras de tratamiento de residuos y del canon sobre la disposición de residuos*). This law set a fixed tax rate of €10/ton of municipal waste disposed of in landfills. Industrial and construction and demolition (C&D) waste were not subject to the tax. This remained unchanged until 2008. Puig et al. (2012) have already described this tax and discussed its effectiveness.

Madrid: Law 6/2003, of March 20, on the tax on waste (*Ley 6/2003, de 20 de marzo, del impuesto sobre residuos*). This law set the following tax rates, which remained unchanged in 2007: a) \in 10 per ton of hazardous waste; b) \notin 7 per ton of nonhazardous waste, excluding C&D waste; and c) \notin 3 per cubic meter of waste from construction and demolition. Municipal solid waste was also excluded.

Andalusia: Law 18/2003, of December 29, which approves fiscal and administrative measures (*Ley 18/2003, de 29 de diciembre, por la que se aprueban medidas fiscales y administrativas*). This law approved the following tax rates, which remained unchanged in 2007: a) €35/ton of hazardous waste that is susceptible to valorization and b) €15/ton of hazardous waste that is not susceptible to valorization.

Murcia: Law 9/2005, of December 29, on tax measures regarding assigned taxes and regional taxes for 2006 (*Ley 9/2005, de 29 de diciembre, de medidas tributarias en materia de tributos cedidos y tributos propios año 2006*). In 2007, this law included the following tax rates: a) \notin 15/ton for hazardous waste, b) \notin 7/ton for nonhazardous waste, and c) \notin 3/ton for inert waste.

3. Data

Data used to feed the model and create scenarios come from different sources. The model developed is calibrated with an SAM of the Spanish economy for 2007. A SAM is a square matrix with information on the flow of payments between the various agents in the economic system we want to represent. The SAM we have developed has information on commodities, industries, labor, capital, households, firms, and government and great detail on taxes, investments/savings, and the foreign sector. The supply and use table for purchasers' prices is the core information of the SAM. To homogenize the information with the rest of the sources needed to develop the SAM, we first based our supply and use tables from the National Statistics Institute of Spain (INE). We then used the shares of waste treatment industries from Exiobase (Tukker et al., 2013; Wood et al., 2015) to disaggregate these industries in the INE's tables. This is an important step, as we were interested in detailed information on different waste treatment technologies. We performed a similar process to disaggregate different energy and electricity technologies.

After these adjustments, we finally obtained an SAM with 101 industries/101 commodities, with great detail on different waste treatment technologies: (1) incineration: food waste, paper waste, plastic waste, inert/metal waste, textiles waste, wood waste, oil/hazardous waste; (2) biogasification and land application: food waste, paper waste, sewage sludge, composting and land application, food waste; (3) waste water treatment: food waste, other waste; (4) landfill: food waste, paper, plastic waste, inert/metal/hazardous waste, textile waste, wood waste.

Other information used to develop the SAM came from government accounts, Social Security accounts, and tax information obtained from the General Intervention Board of the State Administration (IGAE). Foreign sector accounts came from the INE. Firms' accounts came from the Bank of Spain. Data on the stock of capital and depreciation rates by industry came from the EU KLEMS project on growth and productivity (Jäger, 2016).

Regarding the environmental information, consumption of coal, oil, and natural gas and CO₂ emissions of combustion of these sources were obtained from the IEA (2016). Moreover, we obtained information from Exiobase on the emissions of 31 different pollutants at the industry level, including 1) greenhouse gas emissions: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), and perfluorocarbon (PFC); 2) general air pollutants: particulate matter $< 10 \,\mu m$ (PM₁₀), sulphur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxide (NO_x), particulate matter $< 2.5 \mu m$ (PM_{2.5}), ammonia (NH₃), carbon monoxide (CO), and total suspended particles (TSP); 3) other organic compounds: benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k) fluoranthene, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs), dioxins and furans (PCDD_F), hexachlorobenzene (HCB), and nonmethane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC); and 4) heavy metals: arsenic (As), cadmium (Cd), chromium (Cr), copper (Cu), mercury (Hg), nickel (Ni), lead (Pb), selenium (Se), and zinc (Zn).

4. Methodology

4.1. The energy-environment-economy model

We have developed a dynamic computable general equilibrium (CGE) energy-environment-economy model for the Spanish economy. All the equations of the model are detailed in Freire-González & Ho (2018) (see Appendix A), and in Freire-González & Ho (2019) (see supplemental material). Although it has experienced many changes and adaptations, it is an evolved version of Jorgenson & Wilcoxen (1993); Ho & Jorgenson (2007) and Cao et al. (2013); for the analysis of environmental policies. The main differences in this new version of the model, developed for this research are: the adaptation of the models to the Spanish economy characteristics (specifically the inclusion of Spanish taxation system and the SAM used to calibrate the models), the inclusion of more industries (30-40 versus 101), and specifically, this version of the model (unlike the previous versions mentioned at the beginning of this section) contains the detail of 19 waste industries/ technologies with their input-output relationships with other economic sectors, final demands, capital, labor and taxes/subsidies. Finally, this version contains many more pollutants due to the availability of data from Exiobase project. See Fig. 1 for a graphical representation of the main elements and the structure of the model.

The model tries to represent all the agents of the economic system into four big categories: households, firms, government and the foreign sector. Behavioral equations specified show how income flows across all of them in aggregate terms, so their main economic functions in the model are spending money and receiving incomes. However, there are other roles assigned to them. Households also supply labor (which is mobile across sectors and its supply depends on the level of

unemployment) and pay taxes to the government. Firms produce goods and services using capital, labor, land, energy and intermediate goods. Cobb-Douglas production functions with constant returns to scale are specified in this version of the model. Firms also pay dividends to households and taxes to the government. The government basically redistributes incomes between agents through taxes, subsidies and transfers, but they also buy goods and services and invests. The foreign sector provides goods and services through imports and buy part of the domestic goods and services produced by firms through exports. This agent also generates transfers of money (inwards and outwards) and investments from other countries. Imports are combined with the domestic output using Constant Elasticity Supply (CES) functions with an Armington assumption (Armington, 1969), thus producing a composite supply for the economy and exports are price sensitive. The current account deficit and world commodity prices are set exogenously. Fig. 1 shows a graphical description of the model. As the other industries, there are economic flows between waste industries and other industries and also between waste industries and households, government and the rest of the world. Physical waste flows are, therefore, not represented in the model as they are not needed for the purpose of this analysis. We use official macroeconomic data in order to set the different economic agents who pay waste (and other) taxes, and this is represented in the Social Accounting Matrix developed for Spain.

All the agents generate savings, as the non-spent part of their incomes. These savings are important in the dynamic behavior of the model because as it is a Solow growth model, economic growth is driven by total savings. Savings from year 1 generates investments, that increase capital stock in period 2 (also decreased by depreciation rate), affecting growth possibilities. However, economic growth also depends on the rate of population growth and technical change. In this study, both the base case and the policy cases have been running for 20 years.

There are two additional sub-models, an energy and an environmental model. The former describes the energy use through the economic system and the latter the emissions of 31 different pollutants, also detailed in Freire-González & Ho (2018).

4.2. Scenario development

The study evaluates three main scenarios; however, two of them have two different configurations, so there are five scenarios in total tested into the model.

Scenario "current": This scenario consists of testing the economic and environmental effects of current taxes on landfill. We obtain total revenues from these taxes in 2007 and test them into the model with the implicit effective tax rate Spain obtained from the total revenues from the regions that were implementing the tax in 2007: Catalonia, Madrid, Andalusia, and Murcia. Because these revenues are small compared to the total government revenues in Spain, the impacts, both economic and environmental, are expected to be small.¹

Scenario 1: This scenario assumes the extension of the average tax rates to the rest of the Spanish regions. The average tax rates for the different types of waste in the regions that this tax had in 2007 were approximately as follows: municipal waste (€10/ton), industrial waste (€7/ton for nonhazardous and €17/ton for hazardous) and construction and demolition waste (€3/m³ for nondangerous and €17/m³ for hazardous). We multiply these by the amount of each type of waste in Spain in 2007 with data obtained from the National Statistics Institute of Spain. This results in an estimation of the total government revenues if the taxes in the current scenario were extended to all regions of Spain.

We have two subscenarios inside this scenario: 1a) we test only the extension of the tax, and 1b) we use the revenues of this tax to subsidize

¹ Total tax revenues were 391,648 million euros in 2007 in Spain (htt ps://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=REVESP), so analyzed taxes represent less than 0.1% of these revenues.



Fig. 1. CGE model for the Spanish economy.

the waste recycling industries. The latter includes recovered secondary raw materials; food waste for treatment: biogasification and land application; paper waste for treatment: biogasification and land application; sewage sludge for treatment: biogasification and land application; and food waste for treatment: composting and land application. We subsidize these industries in relation to the share they have in valueadded generation. Subsidies are introduced as a negative *ad-valorem* tax to industries output (PO_j), the same way they are considered in input–output frameworks. They have a direct impact on production prices (PI_j).

$$PI_j = \left(1 + t_j^t - t_j^s + t_j^o\right) PO_j \tag{1}$$

where t_i^t are sales taxes, t_i^s are production subsidies, and t_j^o are other taxes. Taxes increase production prices of the different economic sectors directly affected (waste industries), and subsidies reduce them, which, at the same time, affects consumer prices, own demands and GDP (intermediate demands, consumption, investment and exports). Ultimately, they influence prices and demands of all other commodities leading to a new equilibrium. For more detail on how taxes and subsidies work into the equation system, see Freire-González and Ho (2018).

Scenario 2: This scenario supposes a more ambitious taxation that increases the landfill tax rates and extends the taxation to waste incineration: a) landfill: €40/ton for municipal waste, €30/ton for nonhazardous industrial waste, €60/ton for hazardous industrial waste, and €5/ m³ for C&D waste (when C&D waste cannot be considered as inert waste due its hazardous characteristics, a similar tax rate to that for industrial hazardous waste is applied); and b) incineration: €30/ton for municipal waste, €20/ton for nonhazardous industrial waste, €40/ton for hazardous industrial waste, and €10/ton for C&D waste. We have set these tax rates to simulate a scenario with more stringent policies compared to scenario 1, related to waste. These types of policies could be expected, considering how far from the European targets Spain is actually performing (SWD(2017)42 final) and considering that the European Commission has explicitly recommended Spain adopt a landfill tax (European Commission 2017). The proposed tax rates are consistent with some of the most advanced tax rates of landfill and incineration

taxes in Europe (Watkins et al., 2012; OECD, 2019).

Similar to scenario 1, here we have two subscenarios: 2a) we test only the increase in the tax rates, and 2b) we use revenues of this tax to subsidize the same waste recycling industries as in scenario 1b.

4.3. Environmental assessment

The environmental effects of each scenario (in the form of emissions or resources) have been converted into characterized environmental impacts for two main reasons: first, to facilitate the interpretation of the results by grouping the emission and resource consumption contributing to the same environmental impact category (e.g., global warming potential) and, second, to quantitatively compare the different elementary flows in terms of their ability to contribute to a specific environmental impact category.

The conversion has been done by multiplying each environmental effect (amount of emission induced by each scenario) with its substancespecific characterization factor for each environmental impact category, as done in the characterization step of the common Life Cycle Assessment studies. The characterization factors represent the potential impact of each single elementary flow (emission or resource) in terms of the common unit of the environmental impact category, such as kilogram CO_2 -equivalents for greenhouse gases contributing to the impact category global warming potential.

The present study uses the 2013 ILCD-recommended method (Hauschild et al., 2013) and includes the following environmental impact categories: global warming potential (GWP), marine eutrophication potential (MEP), photochemical ozone formation potential (POFP), particulate matter (PM), human toxicity (cancer, HTc, and noncancer, HTnc), ecotoxicity (ET), and depletion of fossil resources (Df). Freshwater eutrophication and ozone depletion were excluded because the emissions reported in the Exiobase data set do not contribute to these two impact categories. Table 1 shows the characterization factors used in the study.

Table 1

Characterization factors of the different emissions and resources for the different impact categories included in the environmental assessment.

Name	Global warming potential	Marine eutrophication potential	Photochemical ozone formation potential	Particulate matter	Human toxicity (cancer HTc)	Human toxicity (noncancer HTnc)	Ecotoxicity	Depletion of fossil resources
	kg CO ₂ eq	kg N eq.	kg NMVOC eq.	kg PM _{2.5} eq.	CTUh	CTUh	CTUe	MJ
CO_2	1							
PM10				0.227				
SO ₂			0.08	0.061				
Nox		0.389	1	0.007				
PM _{2.5}				1				
CH_4	25		0.01					
N ₂ O	298							
NH ₃		0.092		0.067				
CO			0.046	0.0003	_			
Benzo(a)					$3.6*10^{-5}$		110	
pyrene						0.4+1.0-7		
PAH					0.1*10-5	2.4"10	1 000	
PCDS PCDD E					9.1~10	2 6*10-6	1,800	
PCDD_F					14.5	3.0 10	62,000	
NMVOC			1				020	
Ac			1		2 2*10 ⁻⁴	0.017	17 000	
Cd					2.3×10^{-4}	0.017	3,000	
Cr					$2.2 \ 10$ 2.2×10^{-3}	2.1×10 ⁻⁴	21 000	
CI					2.2 10	2.1 10 1 2*10 ⁻⁵	21,000	
Ha					7.0*10 ⁻³	1.3 10 8 3F-01	12,000	
Ni					5.2*10 ⁻⁵	2 0*10 ⁻⁶	6 100	
Ph					2.2×10^{-5}	9.4×10^{-3}	180	
Se					2.7 10	5.4 10	3 000	
7n						0.016	17 000	
SE6	22 800					0.010	17,000	
HEC	7.850							
PFC	9,160							
Coal	3,100							191
Oil								42.3
Natural								44.1
Gas								

Source: own elaboration.





5. Results

5.1. Economic impacts

From the economic perspective, we have obtained some results from simulations. Fig. 2 shows the GDP variation of each scenario in relation to the base case. For simulations, the base case is projected using the described model with the described data, parameters and exogenous variables (including current forms of taxation). Policy cases are similar but including the shocks described. We observe in all cases that the economic impacts of these taxes on the overall economic system are very low. Even in the case in which we simulate higher tax rates without using tax revenues to subsidize recycling (scenario 2a), GDP drops only by 0.045%. In general, we can say that when revenues from taxation are used as a subsidy for recycling sectors (scenarios 1b and 2b), the GDP variation stays quite flat during the period. Scenario 1b actually approaches a zero GDP variation after some years. So, it is interesting to point out that taxing landfill and incineration and at the same time subsidizing recycling industries in a revenue-neutral framework could have very little impact on global macroeconomic indicators, such as GDP.

If we focus on economic results at the industry level (in terms of production and price for years 1 and 20), we can analyze the results described in Fig. 3. We observe how economic impacts are small in the current situation and mostly in landfill industries. In scenario 1a, only production of waste landfill industries goes down by 2.87%, and prices go up by 2.82%. There are very low effects on other industries. In scenario 1b, we can see how recycling industries' production increases by 1.98% whereas prices drop by 1.84% (for year 1). As expected, impacts are higher in scenarios 2a and 2b due to the general increase in tax rates. The impacts on landfill industries in scenario 2a suppose a reduction in production of around 12.34% and an increase in prices of around 13.36% (for year 1). Conversely, impacts on incineration are much lower: there is a reduction of around 2.07% in production, and an increase of 2.11% in prices. If we move to 2b, we observe similar values

and also an increase of around 7% in production and a reduction of 6.16% in prices of recycling industries (for year 1).

In every scenario, even in those with higher tax rates, there are not many impacts on other sectors beyond waste treatment industries, suggesting that waste industries may not be very important in dragging down other industries in the economic system.

5.2. Energy and environmental impacts

In this section, we describe and discuss some environmental indicators from the current and proposed tax reforms. As shown in the methodology section, our model can track different forms of energy use through the economic system and track the emission of 31 different pollutants from the Exiobase project.

Fig. 4 shows the four energy indicators of the five scenarios. We observe a reduction in all indicators in all scenarios, so waste taxation induces energy savings, and these savings are larger for higher tax rates (i.e., savings of scenario 2 are larger than those of scenario 1). The largest variation can be observed in the indicator electricity use, and especially in scenario 2a, with a reduction of 0.36%. The most important reductions in electricity use are in scenarios 1a and 2a, where there are no subsidies for recycling industries. This could be explained by the fact that at this level of taxation, the energy used for recycling activities is larger than the lower energy use related to the decrease in production from virgin resources and the decrease in landfill and incineration of waste. Energy intensity and CO_2 intensities also go down in all scenarios, but especially in 1a and 2a, with no subsidies.

Fig. 5 shows the environmental results of the five scenarios included in the study as a percentage of variation with respect to the characterized impact of the base case. Each graph shows the net variation as black dots, and the emission or resource contribution to such net variation as stacked bars.

Overall, all the scenarios induce little variation in relation to the base case. The largest change was obtained by Scenario 2a in the GWP category. This can be explained by the low magnitude of the tax revenue



Fig. 3. Economic impacts at the industry level of different waste taxation scenarios. Variations in relation to the base case.



Fig. 4. Variation in different energy indicators in relation to the base case.

(in all the scenarios) compared to the global magnitude of the overall economic system. For instance, scenario 1a represents a revenue variation of 200 million euros in year 1, representing 0.01% of the GDP. In addition, similar trends between the scenarios were observed for all the environmental impact categories, although the substances driving the changes were different for each impact category.

First, the scenario representing the current level of landfill tax in Spain (scenario current) shows a small variation in all the impact categories. The characterized impacts are slightly lower (less than 0.07%) than in the base case for all the impact categories, except GWP. The scenario current shows a GWP of 0.2% higher than the base case, mainly due to the increase of CO_2 emissions. The latter could be explained by a diversion from landfill to incineration of some waste fractions causing fossil CO_2 (e.g., plastic waste).

Second, the introduction of the landfill tax in all the Spanish regions (scenario 1a) shows benefits to the environment due to the decrease in key emissions. The characterized impacts are lower than for the base case for all the impact categories, but the variations are small: 0.4% for GWP, 0.01% for MEP, 0.11% for POFP, 0.14% for PM, 0.23% for HTc and HTnc, 0.40% for ET, and 0.01 for Df.

The substances driving such environmental benefit are different for each impact category. In the case of GWP, the benefit is mainly due to the decrease in SF6 and PFC emissions. This decrease is also observed in the current scenario, but the benefit is hidden by the impact related to the increase in CO₂ emissions. It has to be noted, however, that this large contribution of SF6 and PFC in the GWP results is not only related to the decrease in emissions (i.e., kg of SF6) but also to the high characterization factors for GWP (i.e., 22.800 kg CO₂ eq./kg SF6 and 9.160 kg CO₂ eq./kg PFC; see Table 1). Appendix 1 shows the direct emissions variations without the conversion to characterized impacts.

Third, the inclusion of the incineration tax in all the Spanish regions, together with an increase in the landfill tax rate (scenario 2a), also shows environmental benefits in all the impact categories; the characterized impacts are lower than the baseline scenarios for all the impact categories (0.06% for MEP, 0.53% for POFP, 0.65% for PM, 1.06% for HTc, 1.09% for HTnc, 1.90% for ET, and 0.06% for Df). The emissions involved in the GHG savings are the same as for scenario 1a, but in this case the decrease in emissions is larger than for scenario 1a. This applies to all the impact categories, not only to GWP.

Finally, the utilization of the revenue to incentivize waste recycling activities (scenario b) appear detrimental to the environment for all the impact categories. Their characterized impacts are larger than the impacts of scenario a (comparing 1a with 1b and 2a with 2b, respectively).

For example, the characterized impacts on GWP of scenarios 1b and 2b are 0.2% and 1.2% larger than the baseline, respectively. This is mainly due to the increase of SF6, CH_4 , and PFC in both scenarios. These results highlight that, at the level of taxation simulated in scenarios 1b and 2b, the emissions induced by increased recycling (direct emissions of remanufacture) are larger than the avoided emissions related to the decrease in production from virgin resources and the decrease in landfill and incineration of waste. This means that tax revenues could be better "environmentally" used when incentivizing waste prevention and reutilization activities rather than recycling. These two waste management alternatives have priority over recycling in the waste hierarchy.

5.3. Comparison with previous studies

If we want to compare our results with previous studies on the effects of waste taxes on the environment and the economy, we have to do it with Bartelings et al. (2005), the only study authors know on the use of a CGE model to assess waste taxes. However, there are many differences between this study and the one conducted here. They can be summarized as: 1) data (region/period) used to calibrate them is different, 2) both models are different, and specific, 3) scenarios tested are different. Results should be coherent using similar scenarios, but we cannot know it from their study, as they used different scenarios. The main differences, in order to compare the results are: 1) they calibrate their model for the economy of the Netherlands while we calibrate it for the Spanish economy; 2) they consider two economic agents while we consider four; 3) they include 5 production sectors and 13 goods, while we consider 101 sectors and 101 commodities; 4) they specify nested Leontief-CES production functions while we implement Cobb-Douglass production functions; 5) beyond the economic effects generally provided by CGE studies, we include environmental information: 31 different pollutants at industry level, so we can assess the effects on these indicators and some more we construct to provide more information; and 5) our model is dynamic, proving impacts for several periods. Due to these differences and scenario development of each study, it is difficult to provide comparisons. Moreover, we provide results in terms of economic impact and environmental indicators, while Bartelings et al. (2005) mostly focus on the effects on the amount of waste. However, they estimate a global production loss of 1,300 million euros per €750/ton of landfill tax. In our simulations, for the most ambitious tax rates (scenario 2): €40/ton municipal waste, €30/ton nonhazardous industrial waste, €60/ton hazardous industrial waste, and €5/m3 C&D waste, we obtain an average output reduction of 0.95% in year 1, meaning a production loss



Fig. 5. Variation of environmental impacts of the five scenarios in relation to the base case.

of 645 million euros for the Spanish economy.

The results obtained in this research are also coherent with the economic, and more specifically, the environmental taxation theory related to the environmental and economic impacts of green taxes, from its beginnings to nowadays (see, for instance, Pigou, 1920, Baumol, 1972; Pearce, 1991, Williams, 2016), and with other more recent empirical studies, which use other methodologies to assess the impacts of environmental and waste taxation (like Hoogmartens et al., 2016; Nicolli and Mazzanti, 2013; and Panzone et al., 2021). Although there is

an inherent difficulty in establishing quantitative comparisons with these studies, since they use different methods of analysis, there is a qualitative coherence in results and conclusions in all of them, in both, economic and environmental terms.

6. Conclusions

Environmental taxes are intended to reduce the importance of targeted activities that generate detrimental environmental impacts. Most

J. Freire-González et al.

of these taxes imposed on damaging activities, however, were not originally designed with this aim but to raise revenue. There is also the belief that taxes, in general, generate costs for the economy, without considering or fully understanding the (economic) benefits of improving environmental conditions.

We have assessed the economic and environmental effects of incineration and landfill taxes in Spain in different scenarios. The current scenario considers the current situation (i.e., this tax is only in force in a few regions). Scenario 1 considers a realistic improvement in our view, as it extends this tax to the entire country. Scenario 2 is a desirable and more ambitious scenario that increases current tax rates on landfill and incineration to converge with European objectives regarding waste policies. In addition, scenarios 1 and 2 also include two additional subscenarios in which we simulate a subsidy to recycling industries that amounts to the total revenues from these taxes. These scenarios allow us to depict a complete picture of the environmental and economic effects of these kinds of taxes.

In all cases, the results of simulations with the dynamic CGE model show limited economic impact, which is reduced when revenues are used for subsidies in recycling industries. This is mainly due to the low weight of this industry within the whole economic system. Incineration and landfill industries are always the most affected activities with low effects on other industries.

The results do show some relevant environmental benefits of the taxation. Although the benefit caused by the current level of taxation was small related to the overall magnitude of the economy, we can see that increases in taxation bring significant benefits for all the impact categories assessed. In contrast, and unexpectedly, the use of such taxes to subsidize recycling activities decreases some of these environmental benefits to a degree that they worsen in relation to the base case. This is the case for the toxicity impact categories (HTc, HTnc, and ET).

In addition to the environmental impacts included here, aspects that could favor the adoption of these policies could also be considered. On the one hand, the impacts of landfill (e.g., methane or groundwater emissions) remain for many years after the economic activity has finalized and make the land unusable for other purposes for many years, which could be considered a scarce resource close to urban areas. On the other hand, these policies stimulate recycling, whose main rationale is minimizing the extraction of raw materials. Recycling can be considered in practice as a sort of domestic production of raw materials, which is particularly relevant for those that are not available in the country (e.g., most metals and rare earths in the case of Spain). Recycling, therefore, can also help minimize the economic vulnerability derived from excessive exposure to certain raw materials and foster a circular economy.

If we consider the non-market economic benefits (fewer externalities) of reducing these pollutants on aspects such as human health and global warming due to landfill and incineration taxation, the negative economic impacts could be partly or totally compensated. Further research is necessary to analyze this in depth.

From an academic perspective, this paper improves the existing literature on waste policies and circular economy strategies by adding significantly more detail to the economic and environmental analyses of waste taxation policies. First, from an economic perspective, given that both our simulation model and the SAM contain specific detail on different waste treatment industries, we can observe the specific effects of taxation on landfill and incineration, rather than on the waste sector as a whole. Second, as the model provides detail on many different pollutants, unlike other studies, we can assess the impact of these taxes on the pollutants and develop environmental indicators that are useful for environmental, economic, and health policies. This can help policy makers more deeply understand the nature of different fiscal configurations from a global perspective and how they can improve current waste taxation. These results, however, have to be considered just as a guidance in policy-making, and should be combined with other kind of assessments, given the uncertainty and assumptions behind this type of models. The use of a dynamic CGE model has limitations which can affect the conclusions of this research. One important limitation comes from the fact that potential changes in technology (a reduction in waste generation or an increase in the use of cleaner waste treatment technologies) driven by taxation are not reflected. However, the inclusion of a dynamic Solow-type model with capital accumulation reflects better the mid and long-term effects of taxes than a static model, thus providing more informed insights for policy-making.

This research shows that incineration and landfill taxes are effective in reducing environmental impacts at a low economic cost. We have considered the option of using revenues in creating subsidies for recycling industries, but empirical studies have found that other uses for these revenues, such as reducing other pre-existing taxes, could lead to even better results in economic terms, leading to a double dividend (Freire-González, 2018). Environmental impacts can be managed by the use of taxation. An adequate design of these policies is key for circular economy strategies to obtain effective environmental results while minimizing economic impacts.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

This project received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Program under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement, no. 654189.

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2021.12.016.

References

- ACR+ (2016) Cross-analysis of 'Pay-As-You-Throw' schemes in selected EU municipalities. Brussels, May 2016.
- Armington, P.S., 1969. A theory of demand for products distinguished by place of production. Staff Papers 16 (1), 159–178.
- Bartelings, H., van Beukering, P.J.H., Kuik, O.J., Linderhof, V.G.M., Oosterhuis, F.H., Brander, L.M., Wagtendonk, A.J., 2005. Effectiveness of landfill taxation. R-05/05. Institute for Environmental Studies. Vrije Universiteit.

Baumol, W., 1972. On taxation and the control of externalities. Am. Econ. Rev. 62, 307–321.

- Baumol, W., Oates, W., 1971. The use of standards and prices for the protection of the environment. Swedish J. Econ. 73, 42–54.
- Cao, J., Ho, S., Jorgenson, D.W., 2013. The economics of environmental policies in China. In: Nielsen, C.P., Ho, M.S. (Eds.), Clearer Skies over China. MIT Press, Cambridge MA, pp. 329–372.
- Commission, E., 2017. Municipal Waste Compliance Promotion Exercise. Roadmap Spain, Brussels.
- European Environment Agency, 1996. Environmental taxes. Implementation and Environmental Effectiveness, Copenhagen.
- European Environment Agency, 2013. Green fiscal reform can create jobs and stimulate innovation across the EU, Copenhagen.
- European Environment Agency, 2016. Environmental taxation and EU environmental policies. European Environment Agency, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Fischer, C., Lehner, M., Lindsay Mckinnon, D., 2012. Overview of the use of landfill taxes in Europe. European Topic Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production. ETC/SCP Working paper 1/2012.
- Freire-González, J., 2018. Environmental taxation and the double dividend hypothesis in CGE modelling literature: a critical review. J. Pol. Model. 40 (1), 194–223.
- Freire-González, J., Ho, M.S., 2018. Environmental fiscal reform and the double dividend: evidence from a dynamic general equilibrium model. Sustainability 10 (2), 501.
- Freire-González, J., Ho, M.S., 2019. Carbon taxes and the double dividend hypothesis in a recursive-dynamic CGE model for Spain. Econ. Syst. Res. 31 (2), 267–284.
- Fullerton, D., Heutel, G., 2007. The general equilibrium incidence of environmental taxes. J. Public Econ. 91 (3-4), 571–591.
- Hauschild, M.Z., Goedkoop, M., Guinée, J., Heijungs, R., Huijbregts, M., Jolliet, O., Margni, M., De Schryver, A.n., Humbert, S., Laurent, A., Sala, S., Pant, R., 2013. Identifying best existing practice for characterization modeling in life cycle impact assessment. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 18 (3), 683–697.

J. Freire-González et al.

- Ho, M.S., Jorgenson, D., 2007. Policies to control air pollution damages. In: Ho, M.S., Nielsen, C.P. (Eds.), Clearing the Air: The Health and Economic Damages of Air Pollution in China. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 331–372.
- Hoogmartens, R., Eyckmans, J., Van Passel, S., 2016. Landfill taxes and Enhanced Waste Management: combining valuable practices with respect to future waste streams. Waste Manage. 55, 345–354.
- Jäger, K., 2016. EU KLEMS Growth and Productivity Accounts 2016 Release. Statistical Module, Description of methodology and country notes for Spain.
- Jorgenson, D.W., Wilcoxen, P.J., 1993. Reducing U.S. carbon emissions: An econometric general equilibrium assessment. Resour. Energy Econ. 14, 243–268.
- Morley, B., 2012. Empirical evidence on the effectiveness of environmental taxes. Appl. Econ. Lett. 19 (18), 1817–1820.
- Nicolli, F., Mazzanti, M., 2013. Landfill diversion in a decentralized setting: a dynamic assessment of landfill taxes. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 81, 17–23.
- OECD, 2007. Instrument Mixes for Environmental Policy. OECD Publishing, Paris.
- OECD, 2019. Waste Management and the Circular Economy in Selected OECD Countries: Evidence from Environmental Performance Reviews. OECD Publishing, Paris, OECD Environmental Performance Reviews.
- Palatnik, R.R., Brody, S., Ayalon, O., Shechter, M., 2014. Greening household behaviour and waste. OECD Environment Working Papers, No. 76, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Panzone, L., Ulph, A., Areal, F., Grippo, V., 2021. A ridge regression approach to estimate the relationship between landfill taxation and waste collection and disposal in England. Waste Manage. 129, 95–110.
- Pearce, D., 1991. The role of carbon taxes in adjusting to global warming. Econ. J. 101 (407), 938. https://doi.org/10.2307/2233865.
- Pearson, M., 1995. The political economy of implementing environmental taxes. Int. Tax Public Financ. 2 (2), 357–373.
- Pereira, A.M., Pereira, R.M., Rodrigues, P.G., 2016. A new carbon tax in Portugal: a missed opportunity to achieve the triple dividend? Energy Po. 93, 110–118.

- Pigou, A.C., 1920. The Economics of Welfare. Macmillan and Co., Ltd, London.
- Puig Ventosa, I., Calaf Forn, M., Mestre Montserrat, M., 2013. Guide for the Implementation of Pay-As-You-Throw Systems for Municipal Waste. Agència de Residus de Catalunya.
- Rapanos, V.T., 1995. The effects of environmental taxes on income distribution. Eur. J. Polit. Econ. 11 (3), 487–501.
- Sajeewani, Disna, Siriwardana, Mahinda, Mcneill, Judith, 2015. Household distributional and revenue recycling effects of the carbon price in Australia. Climate Change Econ. 06 (03), 1550012. https://doi.org/10.1142/S2010007815500128.
- SWD(2017)42 final. The EU Environmental Implementation Review: Common Challenges and How to Combine Efforts to Deliver Better Results. European Commission.
- Tukker, A., de Koning, A., Wood, R., Hawkins, T., Lutter, S., Acosta, J., Rueda Cantuche, J.M., Bouwmeester, M., Oosterhaven, J., Drosdowski, T., Kuenen, J., 2013. EXIOPOL - development and illustrative analyses of a detailed global MR EE SUT/IOT. Econ. Syst. Res. 25 (1), 50–70.
- Watkins, E., Hogg, D., Mitsios, A., Mudgal, S., Neubauer, A., Reisinger, H., Troeltzsch, J., Van Acoleyen, M., 2012. Use of economic instruments and waste management performances - Final Report. Study prepared for the European Commission, DG Environment.
- Williams III, R.C., 2003. Health effects and optimal environmental taxes. J. .Publ. Econ. 87 (2), 323–335.
- Williams III RC (2016) Environmental taxation (No. w22303). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Wood, R., Stadler, K., Bulavskaya, T., Lutter, S., Giljum, S., de Koning, A., Kuenen, J., Schütz, H., Acosta-Fernández, J., Usubiaga, A., Simas, M., Ivanova, O., Weinzettel, J., Schmidt, J.H., Merciai, S., Tukker, A., 2015. Global sustainability accounting-developing EXIOBASE for multi-regional footprint analysis. Sustainability 7 (1), 138–163.