International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net
Volume 10, Issue 12, 2020

Waste Bank Governance in Local Indonesia: Problems and Opportunities

Andi Samsu Alam[a*], Andi Lukman Irwan[b], Haryanto[c], [a,b]Department of Government, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia, [c]Department of Political Science, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia, Email: [a*]andi.samsu@unhas.ac.id

This article will look at the extent of the success of the waste bank while examining the waste management model in Indonesia by using the basic concept of governance as a theoretical basis for examining the waste management model. The research was carried out in Parepare, a satellite city located in South Sulawesi, eastern Indonesia. The main argument of the article is that the waste management that has occurred in Parepare, using the Waste Bank method, has so far been ineffective. Of the 32 waste bank units that were formed, only one garbage bank is still operating. These findings will confirm if the model of waste bank management in developing countries is still at a very alarming level. Apart from the reasons associated with the availability of inadequate public budgets, facilities for waste processing are still very limited.

Keywords: *Waste Bank, Urban, Governance, Indonesia.*

Introduction

One of the obstacles faced by developing countries in the world is waste problems (Bhuiyan, 2010; Caniato, Tudor, & Vaccari, 2015; Davies, 2005, 2009; Davoudi & Evans, 2005; Ezeah & Roberts, 2014; Howell, 2017; Louise Bjerkli, 2013; Nzeadibe & Anyadike, 2012; Warshawsky, 2015). In Indonesia, the issue of waste has become a serious concern of the government in the past ten years (Pasang, Moore, & Sitorus, 2007; Zurbrügg, Gfrerer, Ashadi, Brenner, & Küper, 2012). This can be seen from the various efforts made by the government to reduce the figure of waste production, which is estimated to increase from year to year. From the Environment Statistics of Indonesia report (2018), it is recorded that

until 2018, waste production in Indonesia had reached 65.2 million per year. From this figure, only 1.2 per cent of waste is recycled and around 66.8 per cent of the waste is not recycled. Moreover, if traced further, it seems that these imaginary numbers are contributed by household waste.

This figure is astonishing, considering that Indonesia is a developing country which, when viewed in economic terms, is still underdeveloped. Supposedly, with the economic situation that is still trying to recover, waste production, especially for household waste, is not as massive as what has been reported by the Environment Statistics of Indonesia. Bearing in mind, the resulting waste production will undoubtedly reflect the conditions of household consumption. That is, if combining the two conditions above, two assumptions can be checked. First, the high production of waste in Indonesia shows that the consumption of the Indonesian people is also higher. Alternatively, on another assumption, the household consumption in Indonesia is relatively low. It can be argued that the high volume of waste is due to the management and governance of waste that is not treated correctly.

It seems that of the two assumptions above, the second choice is the most rational hypothesis. It should be noted if the distribution of waste that occurs in Indonesia takes place in many enclaves of regions with a relatively lower economic level. As an illustration, preliminary observations were made by the author to identify if the production of waste that is very alarming comes from areas whose circumstances and economic levels are relatively lower than the situation of the community and other regions. This proves that the relatively large waste production in Indonesia is not directly proportional to the economic situation of the people. Conversely, the high level of waste production is aligned with the handling of waste in Indonesia.

Various studies in many places have corroborated the authors' initial hypotheses. For example, research conducted by Bhuiyan (2010), which took place in Bangladesh. Bhuiyan (2010) found that much of the waste production was concentrated in slum areas; regions that are economically classified as weak. If we think about it, poor areas can't have a large enough volume of trash because the waste with a large enough volume indirectly illustrates the level of consumption, which is also quite high. Slum areas that are filled with rubbish piles are areas with a completely lacking population and with a shallow level of consumption. That is, the findings of scholars confirm that the volume of waste that fills residential settlements is as a result of the mismanagement of waste, and is not a matter of high consumption levels (Bhuiyan, 2010).

Unfortunately, the perspective used by Bhuiyan (2010) only occurs in developed countries which, of course, have a social context that is very different from the conditions in Indonesia. One of the most striking differences is that Bhuiyan (2010) made more observations of the

slum area only in the mainland city area. Therefore, the garbage piles and clusters are also seen in urban landfill waste. Meanwhile, for the context in Indonesia, the majority of slum areas are located in coastal areas. Thus, when the context occurs in Indonesia, the approach used Bhuiyan (2010) is limited to explaining the piles of garbage in coastal areas.

Several studies conducted in Indonesia to date, which also talk about the problem of waste, are still limited to seeing the ongoing relations of actors (Pasang et al., 2007; Zurbrügg et al., 2012). Scholars pay more attention to waste management with an approach that seems to isolate the relations of actors. Thus, the explanation produced is more technocratic. This approach is not unimportant when looking at waste management in Indonesia, but this approach is only able to explain the problem of waste management in a biased manner, and at the same time, is very limited in explaining the relationship between various actors. This position is important, because governance is the main idea of multi-actors in terms of waste management in Indonesia, with the presence of governance as a multi-actor necessity.

Even if some identify the relation of actors to waste management in Indonesia, scholars still minimally see waste management in terms of the arguments that depart from the grassroots. Most scholars' attention, when looking at solid waste management, focusses on the actors in governance, including on solid waste management, with an angle of analysis outside of the grassroots. In developing countries like Indonesia, informal networks are often an alternative or are at least still alive amid social activities. In specific contexts, this informal network has become more dominant compared to formal organisations of the government. On that basis, the position of this article would like to see how waste management takes place in Indonesia by looking at the relations of the actors at the grassroots level, with derivative questions: How do the relations of the actors at the grassroots level take place in waste management in Parepare? How do the relations of the actors take place to have an impact on waste management?

Material and Method

The study was conducted in the city of Parepare, South Sulawesi. Parepare was chosen as a research location after considering many aspects. Among them, Parepare is one of the three cities in South Sulawesi with a very unitary character and characteristics. A city with the nickname as a commercial city, Parepare is used as a shipping lane, especially for ships going to Kalimantan and even to Malaysia. It is also used as a port city in South Sulawesi, in addition to Makassar. These characteristics make Parepare grow as a city with principal activities in commercial activities. Along with that, commercial actors, in general, have the opportunity to be involved in the administration of government, including in terms of urban waste management.

The research is focussed on grassroots actors, with the main emphasis on community activities in organising, processing, and responding to the issue of waste in Parepare. Therefore, during the research, the informants chosen were more concentrated on the social activities of the grassroots community. The interviewees comprised community leaders in Parepare, student activists, HIPMI (Indonesian Young Entrepreneurs Association) branch of Parepare, scavengers and activists. To obtain maximum results, the interview data confrontation effort was carried out in this study; the confrontation was carried out by clashing the views of grassroots governance with the local government. Then on another occasion, the writer also interviewed one of the headmen in Parepare.

In addition to interviews, the data source used in this study also uses secondary data. Secondary data was collected in the form of documents and official reports that have been released by the government, with a very high level of credibility. This is in addition to some secondary data that is used in the routine reports from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), routine reports from the Ministry of Environment, and reports and archives from the Parepare City Environment Agency. The results of the interviews and secondary data were then analysed. The theoretical footing used to analyse this research is governance theory, with the main concern being the relationship of the actors. Furthermore, the results of the analysis are presented in this article.

Results

The debate about waste management has been a debate theme that has long been discussed by many scholars. In general, two main streams look at waste management. The first stream is those who see waste management with the main focus on the program implementers. In this case, the party whose academic position focusses more on the capacity of government organisations. While on the other hand, those who are more inclined to see waste management outside the tradition of the first party. That is, they see waste management from an angle of argument outside of the government organisations. This article takes an academic position on the second party, looking at waste management by distancing government organisations.

For a long time, the focus of scholars who paid attention to waste management by labelling mistakes on government organisations has monopolised academic debates (Bhuiyan, 2010; Caniato et al., 2015; Davies, 2005, 2009). This view is especially developed in developing countries, such as Indonesia. The argument is based on whether the waste management carried out by the government runs ineffectively. This is caused by the inability of the government. The manifestation of the inability of the government to overcome the waste problem is reflected in the rubbish piles and protests by residents. As a result, public evaluation of government performance is very poor. The public considers whether the

government is capable of solving the existing waste problem. These phenomena are perpetuated by Bhuiyan (2010), through a field study that took place in Bangladesh and comprised of observations from 2000 to 2009. The findings of Bhuiyan (2010) provide a complex picture of waste management for developing countries, including those that hit Indonesia. The significant contribution presented by Bhuiyan (2010) is a picture of waste management in developing countries which tends to be minimal, causing strong reactions from citizens, who at their insistence, make waste management change dramatically. From the very minimum before, and in the end, it was evaluated by the government after a protest. This is something that in the context of Indonesia, has not yet proceeded as it did in Bangladesh.

Furthermore, accusations about the government's lack of capacity to manage waste are present from studies conducted by Caniaoto by photographing the phenomenon of health waste (Caniato et al., 2015). Caniaoto's observations were made by considering global waste production. Although the research conducted is only limited to the study of literature, at least from the results of his hard work, it was found that the production of health waste at the global level from year-to-year began to be very alarming. Unfortunately, the countries that contribute significantly to global waste production are developing countries. The situation illustrates a very sharp contradiction between waste production with the level and economic activity in developing countries. That is, the problem of waste that takes place on a global scale is not because of the problem of waste production. More precisely, according to Caniaoto's findings, the problem of waste is more on the capacity and ability of the government.

Waste production in one country may be of a relatively lower volume than in other countries. However, low waste production is not handled well by the government. Thus, small volumes of garbage gradually accumulate and eventually become a problem that affects many things. Conversely, developed countries do not mean they do not produce large amounts of waste. The findings show that developed countries produce twice as much waste as developing countries. It is just that the problem of waste in developed countries does not cause problems to the extent of those which occur in developing countries. Because, in developed countries, waste management is carried out with applied technology that is adequate. As a result, waste products can be reduced. Meanwhile, a waste treatment that takes place in developing countries is still in the stage of handling.

Furthermore, Caniaoto sees that the difference in the treatment of waste in both developing and developed countries is inseparable from several things. Among them are gross income and national economic growth. Developing countries have a gross income and a national economic growth that is still relatively low. For the context in Indonesia, economic growth occurs only at the five per cent level. Meanwhile, developed economies and gross income

have surpassed five per cent. Economic growth and gross income indicate a stable economic activity and situation. Regarding waste management, countries with a higher national economic situation have the opportunity for better waste management.

On the other hand, effective regulation also becomes an important variable that will determine the direction and future of waste management. The success of developed countries overcoming the problem of waste can be attributed to support by the regulation of waste management. The presence of this regulation is significant to provide a legal umbrella on how to deal with the waste problem. More than that, the regulation on waste is also a set of documents that will offer garbage handling in the future. For the context in Indonesia, regulations on waste have been issued by the government. However, the existing regulations do not yet provide a platform for the future of waste management. There is no long-term scheme offered. Even if there is, so far it is still limited to the handling of the plastic waste. Apart from that, garbage with other categories has not received serious attention from the government, except only to pile up in garbage collection.

Meanwhile, other scholars see the waste problem as an indication that there is good news about growth and a stable economic movement (Davoudi & Evans, 2005). This view is especially developed in developed countries. In general, the scholars see the pile of garbage as a domino effect from the increasing level of public consumption. The high level of public consumption indicates that the economic situation of the people is also getting better. So, indirectly, when waste production is at a large volume, the economic situation of the people is also stable. This view, for example, was popularised by Davies through his study entitled "Clean and green? A governance analysis of waste management in New Zealand". Davies examined the pain between economic growth and the volume of waste (Davies, 2005). Fahri found the volume of waste that occurred in New Zealand is in line with the increasing economic growth of the community. Therefore, the increasing volume of waste must be seen as an economic success. Regardless of whether the waste is detrimental and has a negative social impact, that is another matter. The point is, if it is related to the high growth of solid waste volume, it is an indication that the direction of the economy, especially in New Zealand, is experiencing quite rapid development.

Not only in New Zealand, research conducted by Ezeah and Roberts in Nigeria also found similarities with Davies' findings. Ezeah and Roberts revealed that environmental observers' criticism of the volume of waste that crowded the big cities in Nigeria must not be over-responded. Ezeah and Roberts admitted that the waste problem in Nigeria is very crucial. However, there is another side that must be seen from the increasing volume of waste. In line with Davies, for Ezeah and Roberts, the accumulation of waste is due to the increasing economic activity of the community (Ezeah & Roberts, 2014). Thus, the domino impact on

consumption levels also increases. From this point of view, Ezeah and Roberts' academic position is more to improve government capacity.

From the two main opinion lines, it can be concluded that the new waste management is based on two significant arguments. Firstly, the increase in waste in a country is as a result of economic growth and is also getting better. The impact of the domino effect on the consumption of people has also improved. As a result, increased public consumption has the potential to produce a larger volume of waste than before. Secondly, the argument that the volume of waste that occurs in a country is not always directly proportional to economic growth. For this party, the piles of garbage that occur in a country could be due to the capacity and failure of the local government to develop sustainable waste management schemes. Thus, from this view, it is assumed that even developed countries can deal with the waste problem. Likewise, with developing countries, it is not always a failure in terms of the handling waste, neglected capacity and local government support.

This article takes the position of the second argument, that waste management in a country depends on the capacity and support of local governments. It is generally stated in terms of involving the grassroots in respect of waste management. For the context in Parepare, waste management with the involvement of the grassroots is seen from the aspect of access and opportunities for the grassroots in relation to the handling of waste, as well as in a position where the grassroots can contribute to reducing the volume of waste.

Discussion

Various attempts have been made by the Indonesian Government to reduce the volume of waste. One of the many strategies that businesses have recently applied is to reduce the distribution of waste with the garbage bank program. Through the garbage bank, the government encourages community participation to get involved in controlling waste. The assumption is that the waste problem that occurs in Indonesia, especially in big cities, is sourced from the people's carelessness. The disposing of trash is not in place, so that with the garbage bank program, it is hoped that the community can raise the awareness of waste.

To encourage the people's motivation to care about the distribution of waste, does not stop there. The garbage bank that has been initiated by the government provides material rewards. Like a bank, the community deposits a certain amount of waste into a garbage bank and then is given an amount of money by the nominal value of the garbage that has been determined. The price varies depending on the type of waste. For types of plastic waste, the range for each peril in bandrol is priced at 500 rupiahs (0.04 US $) per kilogram, while for types of waste such as paper and cardboard, it is at prices of 300 to 400 rupiah per kilogram.

The Government efforts to overcome the problem of waste through waste banks are contained in Government Regulation No. 81 of 2012, concerning waste management. This regulation was then used as a legal umbrella for the implementation of waste banks in various regions. Through this scheme, the government hopes that the volume of waste can be reduced. This scheme, which was then carried out by the Parepare City Government, resulted in creating a waste bank as a form of realisation of the implementation of the policy. With this regulation, the city governments in various regions were obligated to form a garbage bank immediately. In Parepare, it has even been arranged through guardian No. 38 of 2018, concerning policies and strategies of the local government in managing household waste and to the type of household waste. Taking place since 2012, now the realisation of the garbage bank in Parepare is deadlocked. There are around 30 garbage banks that have been formed, however currently, only one garbage bank unit is still in operation. The garbage bank in Parepare is a vacuum and no longer in operation.

Table 1: Number of Waste Piles

Years	Population	The amount of waste (ton)
2013	135.200	94,64
2014	136.903	95,83
2015	138.099	96,67
2016	140.423	98,29
2017	142.097	99,48
2018	143.710	100,60

Source: Parepare Environment Agency, 2019

Based on the field findings, the problem that makes a garbage bank a vacuum can be seen from several aspects. Among them, the garbage bank in Parepare is a vacuum because the production of the waste that is generated is still very minimal compared to other cities in Indonesia. It has been noted that the waste products from year-to-year in Parepare are only 90 tons per month (See Table 1).

It should be noted that the garbage bank that has been initiated by the government only focusses on plastic waste. Meanwhile, garbage outside the plastic waste category has not received serious attention from the government. At the same time, the economic activities in Parepare which tend to be engaged in commerce are very minimal in producing plastic waste, such as mineral bottles and other beverage bottles. Thus, even if the garbage bank must operate, the difficulties faced by each waste bank are raw materials or plastic waste, which will be sold in very limited amounts. This makes the state of the garbage bank in Parepare stagnate.

This does not mean that Parepare is now a city with a state of waste that can be handled. Although the past few years have managed to maintain the Adipura trophy, the fact is that along the coast in Parepare a pile of garbage adorns the beach docks. From the author's point of view looking along the dock at Parepare, it is filled with dry rubbish which is left united with a pile of rocks between parked fishing boats. In an interview with an environmental observer in Parepare, the production of plastic waste is still in minimal quantities:

"*In Parepare, the volume of plastic waste is still lacking. The most worrying is not the plastic waste from here, but the plastic waste sent. Especially in coastal areas, in the rainy season, there is usually much plastic waste in the coastal areas. That is not produced by coastal communities, but the waste is sent from the people above. Below through the river current, and the mouth reaches the coast. Therefore, every rain often piled up there. I think that what is more serious should be thought of"(Muliawan, Environmental Observer, Personal Interview, 2019).*

This finding shows the garbage problem in Parepare is more dominated by non-plastic waste concentrated on the coast. Meanwhile, the garbage bank initiated by the government is for plastic waste with concentrations in urban centres. The difference between the garbage cluster and the space for spreading garbage is also related to the mandate of the garbage bank in Parepare.

Furthermore, geographically the City of Parepare is one of the cities in South Sulawesi whose area is relatively smaller than other cities, such as Makassar and Palopo. The area of the City of Parepare is only around 99.33 kilometres squared. Regarding the garbage bank, a narrow area is also inhabited by the community with a minimal amount. The domino impact on waste production is also relatively more limited. Not to mention, the Parepare community activities with a very high level of mobility make waste production more limited.

Supporting waste management can be handled well when the waste fleet and budget availability are adequate. This was conveyed by Caniato, that the direction of waste management was reflected in the quality of human resources and the economic support of the local government. When a city has qualified human resources, with a large waste management budget, efforts to reduce waste will be very easy to do. Conversely, when the quality of human resources is still low, and the available budget is also limited, waste management will be constrained (Caniato et al., 2015).

For the context in Parepare, the two indications that were put forward by Caniato can be found very quickly, both within the government and in the community. At the community level, public awareness about waste is still deficient. People still often treat garbage with a very ignorant attitude, including disposing of trash at will. Meanwhile, when the community's

pragmatic attitude is very ignorant about the problem of waste, the community has not been able to optimise waste as an economic support. Apart from the reasons mentioned earlier, if the production of plastic waste is still minimal, there is a kind of general knowledge that is built indirectly that waste always has a negative connotation. Thus, anyone who deals with waste is always viewed with a lower social status.

At the government level, the garbage bank established by the government is only to abort obligations. No follow-up was done as an effort to boost the waste bank more optimally. Even in an interview with one of the headmen in Parepare, it was revealed that at the headmen level alone, the garbage bank was not valued by the headmen. However, this finding cannot be used as a basis for arguments to say that the government, at the headmen level, relinquishes responsibility for the garbage bank.

This problem is more aligned to the lack of available budget support. The budget needed for waste treatment is quite high. As an illustration, for the only fleet honorariums, the cost must be provided by local governments of at least Rp. 1,500,000 for each fleet. Meanwhile, so far, the number of fleets operating in the environmental service in Parepare are only for the fleet of garbage vehicles until the street sweepers have reached the hundreds. This means that every year, the Parepare Government must provide a significant budget to cover the costs of the garbage fleet. This figure does not include other costs, such as vehicle operating costs.

If viewed from the nominal wages received by each fleet, it can be said that the wages earned are still far below the average UMP in Parepare. That is, the wage received is still far from the standard of living economically. This has led some of the garbage fleets to take the attitude to make waste a side business. The aim is to patch the wage shortage. The waste business is carried out by selling plastic waste to garbage collectors in Parepare. One of the garbage entrepreneurs in Parepare who is involved in the waste business is Mr Crack (Pseudonym). Mr Crack's business is done by cooperating with the garbage fleet in Parepare. The process is that each garbage fleet will pick up garbage in every village. During the pick-up process, the waste fleet will separate plastic waste from non-plastic waste. This sorting is to facilitate when at the final disposal site (TPA). Then, the garbage will be collected to the landfill site. Right here, Mr Crack and (unscrupulous) garbage fleet run their business. Before entering the landfill area, waste will be sold by the fleet to Mr Crack. The type of waste sold to Mr Crack is just a type of plastic waste. Furthermore, non-plastic waste will be forwarded by the fleet to the landfill. Meanwhile the plastic waste that Mr Crack has bought will be separated and accommodated in a separate place. Waste that has been separated will be re-processed by several workers, mostly women:

"Since the last three months, I have worked here, along with dozens of other women. We are in charge of sorting trash. We work for Mr Crack. Our job is straightforward, just waiting

for the plastic waste then we process it. Separate the plastic bottle from the lid. A month if lucky everyone here can pocket 300,000 rupiahs (21 US $) per month. However, if the incoming waste supply is reduced, we sometimes only get 150,000 - 200,000 rupiah per month" (Nursiah, worker, personal interview, 2019).

The waste business that occurs between the waste fleet and Mr Crack becomes another obstacle that makes the garbage bank in Parepare mandatory. This is because the garbage bank has a rival, a waste entrepreneur whose needs are the same as the need for a garbage bank; namely, raw materials in the form of plastic waste. This was also recognised by one of the Headmen whom the writer met in the field:

"In addition to the garbage bank, there is also a garbage entrepreneur here. In terms of price, the purchase price of the entrepreneur (collector) is far greater than the price offered by the garbage bank. The difference is up to Rp. 200 to Rp. 500 per kilogram. It does look tiny, but when viewed from large numbers, it is very influential. Maybe that is what makes people more happy to sell their waste to collectors than the garbage banks in the villages" (Akbar, Headman Ujung Lare, personal interview, 2019).

Apart from the garbage business involving the waste fleet with Mr Crack, so far the handling of waste with the model of the garbage bank remains with many problems. In Parepare, the environmental service recognises that waste management has become a chore that has not yet come to light. One crucial problem is the imbalance between the costs incurred for waste operations with the results obtained:

"One of the things that makes the garbage bank in Parepare stagnant includes the general problem of unfinished waste due to the budget. Just imagine, we have to pay the garbage fleet every year, car operating costs, daily costs for gasoline. Meanwhile, garbage does not produce a return value. While here alone, more honorary who work as garbage fleets. That is increasingly burdensome for regional finances. However, how would you like it, just one day of not picking up trash has been a phone call, so it is very dilemmatic"(Hamdi, Employee of the Parepare Life Agency, personal interview, 2019).

It should be noted whether the operational budget for the waste bank instructed by PP81/2012 comes from the regional budget. That is, if they want a garbage bank to have an adequate financial situation, it must be supported by regional finance. The only garbage bank in Parepare, which still exists today, has even switched to saving and borrowing gold starting with budget support from various parties. One form of support, for example, came from the Governor of South Sulawesi, who at that time was still held by Sahrul Yasin Limpo (SYL). SYL assisted by providing Rp 10 million to support the garbage bank in the Labukkang village. This fund was initially used to support the garbage bank to survive until now.

Initially, funds of Rp 10 million were used in the form of savings and loans and groceries savings.

The process and the management of the waste bank uses a budget of Rp 10 million to buy groceries. It is these necessities which will then be handed over to the people who deposit garbage to the garbage bank. Each deposit will be recorded and accumulated by the weight of the scale that has been agreed upon from the beginning. When it is fulfiled, the management of the garbage bank will give a coupon to the garbage bank depositor. The coupon is exchanged for food.

Meanwhile, the garbage that has been collected will be resold by the management of the garbage bank with a price difference of Rp 200 to Rp 700 per kilogram from the purchase price, depending on the type of waste. This price difference is obtained from the results of the selection of waste. This is because the plastic waste that has been sorted and grouped according to the cluster has a much higher price. As an illustration, garbage with clear bottles mixed with coloured bottles will be cheaper when clear bottles are separated with coloured bottles.

The final problem in the waste business that makes the garbage bank mandatory in Parepare, is the availability of supporting facilities and technology that is still minimal. In Parepare, almost all the garbage banks, both from the village office to the city, have no garbage chopping machines. In contrast to the garbage entrepreneur (collector), which is supported by a chopping machine that is adequate. The absence of a chopping machine in a garbage bank makes the selling value of waste from the garbage bank much cheaper. This situation also makes the purchase price of the garbage from the garbage bank lower than the garbage collector. The chopping machine is a waste support device, whose function is to destroy the waste into plastic granules. Waste that has been processed into plastic granules has a more expensive sale value.

"One of the obstacles of the garbage bank is in our family because there is no chopper machine here. So the existing garbage does not know what it is to be processed. The ends will also be sold to collectors. Why the collector? Because in Parepare the chopper is only owned by the collector. However, next year, I have already planned my urban budget for one of them by procuring a reading machine. This is solely to support waste management" (Akbar, Headman Ujung Lare, personal interview, 2019).

This finding shows the economic surplus value generated by the garbage bank is relatively lower than that of the garbage entrepreneur in Parepare. The production of plastic waste then worsens the situation as raw material for waste banks, which are still produced in small quantities. At the same time, the operational costs required for waste management in Parepare

are relatively expensive. These various problems have finally made the garbage bank in Parepare stagnate.

Conclusion

The general view, so far, has seen waste as a source of problems which seem to be resolved. However, field findings in Parepare show the opposite. Waste becomes a coffer of wealth, especially for garbage collectors. Plastic waste becomes a blessing that makes garbage entrepreneurs reach tens of millions per month. On the other hand, the strengthening of the garbage business in Parepare has an impact on the mandate of the implementation of government policies on waste banks. The garbage bank program, which is limited to ceremonial programs that have been formed to overcome the problem of waste, increasingly does not run effectively. On the contrary, the waste problem that takes place in Parepare is solved independently by the community. However, that does not mean that the presence of the government, with all the efforts that have been made, does not contribute to reducing the volume of waste. It stands, for the context of plastic waste, that to date there has been no seriousness shown by the government in overcoming the waste problem.

REFERENCES

Bhuiyan, S. H. (2010). A crisis in governance: Urban solid waste management in Bangladesh. *Habitat International*, 34(1), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.08.002

Caniato, M., Tudor, T., & Vaccari, M. (2015). International governance structures for health-care waste management: A systematic review of scientific literature. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 153, 93–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.01.039

Davies, A. R. (2005). Incineration politics and the geographies of waste governance: A burning issue for Ireland? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 23(3), 375–397. https://doi.org/10.1068/c0413j

Davies, A. R. (2009). Clean and green? A governance analysis of waste management in New Zealand. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 52(2), 157–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640560802666503

Davoudi, S., & Evans, N. (2005). The challenge of governance in regional waste planning. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 23(4), 493–517. https://doi.org/10.1068/c42m

Ezeah, C., & Roberts, C. L. (2014). Waste governance agenda in Nigerian cities: A comparative analysis. *Habitat International*, 41, 121–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2013.07.007

Howell, J. P. (2017). Waste governance and ecological identity in Maui, Hawaii, USA. *Geoforum*, 79, 81–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.12.015

Louise Bjerkli, C. (2013). Governance on the ground: A study of solid waste management in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(4), 1273–1287. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2013.01214.x

Nzeadibe, T. C., & Anyadike, R. N. C. (2012). Social participation in city governance and urban livelihoods: Constraints to the informal recycling economy in Aba, Nigeria. *City, Culture and Society*, 3(4), 313–325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2012.10.001

Pasang, H., Moore, G. A., & Sitorus, G. (2007). Neighbourhood-based waste management: A solution for solid waste problems in Jakarta, Indonesia. *Waste Management*, 27(12), 1924–1938. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2006.09.010

Warshawsky, D. N. (2015). The devolution of urban food waste governance: Case study of food rescue in Los Angeles. *Cities*, 49, 26–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2015.06.006

Zurbrügg, C., Gfrerer, M., Ashadi, H., Brenner, W., & Küper, D. (2012). Determinants of sustainability in solid waste management - The Gianyar Waste Recovery Project in Indonesia. *Waste Management*, 32(11), 2126–2133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2012.01.011