



21st Century Landscape Sustainability, Development and Transformations: Geographical Perceptions


Giovanni Messina, Bresena Kopliku (Eds.)

Preface by Elena dell'Agnese

21st Century Landscape Sustainability, Development and Transformations: Geographical Perceptions

Giovanni Messina, Bresena Kopliku

Editors



IL Sileno
Edizioni

*21st Century Landscape Sustainability, Development and Transformations:
Geographical Perceptions*

Giovanni Messina, Bresena Kopliku (Eds.)

is a collective volume of the Open Access and peer-reviewed series
“Geographies of the Anthropocene”
(Il Sileno Edizioni), ISSN 2611-3171

www.ilsileno.it/geographiesoftheanthropocene



Cover: Antonio Cusimano, Rural area near Sigonella (Sicily), 2010

Copyright © 2024 by Il Sileno Edizioni
International Scientific Publisher, VAT 03716380781
Via Piave, 3/A, 87035 - Lago (CS), Italy, e-mail: ilsilenoedizioni@gmail.com

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs
3.0 Italy License.



The work, including all its parts, is protected by copyright law. The user at the time of
downloading the work accepts all the conditions of the license to use the work, provided
and communicated on the website
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/it/legalcode>

ISBN 979-12-80064-61-5

Vol. 7, No. 1 (May 2024)



Geographies *of the* Anthropocene

OPEN
ACCESS



PEER-REVIEWED
SERIES

ISSN 2611-3171

Geographies of the Anthropocene

Open Access and Peer-Reviewed series

Editor-In-Chief: Francesco De Pascale (Faculty of Literature, University eCampus, Italy).

Associate Editors: Salvatore Cannizzaro (Department of Humanities, University of Catania, Italy); Sebastiano D'Amico (Head of Department of Geosciences, University of Malta, Malta); Fausto Marincioni (Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Italy), Leonardo Mercatanti (Department of Culture and Society, University of Palermo, Italy); Francesco Muto (Department of Biology, Ecology and Earth Sciences, University of Calabria, Italy), Charles Travis (School of Histories and Humanities, Trinity College Dublin; University of Texas, Arlington, U.S.A.).

Editorial Board: Mohamed Abioui (Ibn Zohr University, Morocco), Valentina Castronuovo (Italian National Research Council – Institute for Research on Innovation and Services for Development, Italy); Andrea Cerase (Sapienza University of Rome, Italy), Lorenzo D'Agostino (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, U.S.A.); Valeria Dattilo (University "G. D'Annunzio" Chieti-Pescara, Italy), Dante Di Matteo (University E-Campus, Italy); Jonathan Gómez Cantero (Departamento de Meteorología de Castilla-La Mancha Media, Spain), Eleonora Guadagno (University of Naples "L'Orientale", Italy); Davide Mastroianni (University of Siena, Italy), Giovanni Messina (University of Messina, Italy), Joan Rossello Geli (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Spain), Gaetano Sabato (University of Palermo, Italy), Nikoleta Zampaki (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece).

International Scientific Board: Marie-Theres Albert (UNESCO Chair in Heritage Studies, University of Cottbus-Senftenberg, Germany), David Alexander (University College London, England), Lina Maria Calandra (University of L'Aquila, Italy); Salvatore Cannizzaro (University of Catania, Italy), Fabio Carnelli (EURAC Research, Bolzano, Italy); Carlo Colloca (University of Catania, Italy), Gian Luigi Corinto (University of Macerata, Italy), Girolamo Cusimano (University of Palermo, Italy), Bharat Dahiya (Director, Research Center for Integrated Sustainable Development, College of Interdisciplinary Studies Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand); Sebastiano D'Amico (University of Malta, Malta), Armida de La Garza (University College Cork, Ireland), Elena Dell'Agnese (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy; Vice President of IGU), Piero Farabollini (University of Camerino, Italy), Massimiliano Fazzini (University of Camerino; University of Ferrara, Italy; Chair of the "Climate Risk" Area of the Italian Society of Environmental Geology); Giuseppe Forino (Bangor University, Wales, UK), Virginia García Acosta (Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, CIESAS, México); Cristiano Giorda (University of Turin, Italy), Giovanni Gugg (LESC, Laboratoire d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie Comparative, CNRS – Université Paris-Nanterre, France), Luca Jourdan (University of Bologna, Italy), Francesca Romana Lugerì (ISPRa, University of Camerino, Italy), Cary J. Mock (University of South Carolina, U.S.A.; Member of IGU Commission on Hazard and Risk), Enrico Nicosia (University of Messina, Italy); Gilberto Pambianchi (University of Camerino, Italy), Silvia Peppoloni (Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Italy; Secretary General of IAPG; Councillor of IUGS), Isabel Maria Cogumbreiro Estrela Rego (University of the Azores, Portugal), Andrea Riggio (University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, Italy), Jean-Claude Roger (University of Maryland, College Park, U.S.A.; Terrestrial Information Systems Laboratory, Code 619, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, U.S.A.); Vito Teti (University of Calabria, Italy), Bruno Vecchio (University of Florence, Italy), Masumi Zaiki (Seikei University, Japan; Secretary of IGU Commission on Hazard and Risk).

Editorial Assistants, Graphic Project and Layout Design: Rosetta Capolupo, Michela Damiano, Luigi Frascino

Website: www.ilsileno.it/geographiesoftheanthropocene;

The book series "Geographies of the Anthropocene" edited by the Scientific

International Publisher “Il Sileno” (Il Sileno Edizioni) will discuss the new processes of the Anthropocene epoch through the various worldviews of geoscientists and humanists, intersecting disciplines of Geosciences, Geography, Geoethics, Philosophy, Socio-Anthropology, Sociology of Environment and Territory, Psychology, Economics, Environmental Humanities and cognate disciplines.

Geoethics focuses on how scientists (natural and social), arts and humanities scholars working in tandem can become more aware of their ethical responsibilities to guide society on matters related to public safety in the face of natural hazards, sustainable use of resources, climate change and protection of the environment. Furthermore, the integrated and multiple perspectives of the Environmental Humanities, can help to more fully understand the cultures of, and the cultures which frame the Anthropocene. Indeed, the focus of Geoethics and Environmental Humanities research, that is, the analysis of the way humans think and act for the purpose of advising and suggesting appropriate behaviors where human activities interact with the geosphere, is dialectically linked to the complex concept of Anthropocene.

The book series “Geographies of the Anthropocene” publishes online volumes, both collective volumes and monographs, which are set in the perspective of providing reflections, work materials and experimentation in the fields of research and education about the new geographies of the Anthropocene.

“Geographies of the Anthropocene” encourages proposals that address one or more themes, including case studies, but welcome all volumes related to the interdisciplinary context of the Anthropocene. Published volumes are subject to a review process (**double blind peer review**) **to ensure their scientific rigor.**

The volume proposals can be presented in English, Italian, French or Spanish.

The choice of digital Open Access format is coherent with the flexible structure of the series, in order to facilitate the direct accessibility and usability by both authors and readers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

• Preface by Elena dell’Agnese	7
• Reference	8

<i>Introduction</i>	18
----------------------------	-----------

1. The Fiera del Mediterraneo: a (Post)Pandemic Landscape as Difficult Heritage

■ *Emanuela Caravello, Giulia de Spuches, Gabriella Palermo*

• Abstract	20
• 1. Introduction	21
• 2. Difficult heritage and pandemic landscape: a theoretical framework	22
• 3. The case study: the Fiera del Mediterraneo	24
• 4. Landscapes of contagious and capitalistic ruins: a (post)pandemic difficult heritage	28
• 5. Concluding thoughts	33
• References	34

2. Cultural Heritage as a Mirror of Sustainable Development. Its Potential Roles and Functions in Areas of Environmental Crisis: a Case Study

■ *Valentina Castronuovo*

• Abstract	38
• 1. Introduction: cultural heritage as a matrix for developing a culture of sustainability	39
• 2. Materials and Methods	42
• 2.1 Study area	42
• 2.2 Data Collection and Analysis	45

• 3. Results of European and ministerial policies applied to the “Taranto” contex	47
• 4. Conclusions	50
• References	52

3. The territorial challenge of the wine-growing system in Castiglione di Sicilia (Etna)

■ *Leonardo Mercatanti, Mariacristina Ruffo*

• Abstract	57
• 1. Introduction	58
• 2. Territorial framework and methodology	58
• 3. The ‘Etna Nord’ wine district	60
• 4. Castiglione di Sicilia	64
• 5. Conclusions	68
• References	70

4. The “Instagrammability” effect: a new mass tourism or a digital panacea? The case of bakeries in the Sicilian landscape

■ *Sonia Malvica*

• Abstract	73
• 1. Introduction	74
• 2. Food and local identity	75
• 3. The impact of bakeries upon food-place identity: the case of Catania (Sicily)	76
• 3.1 A non-place identity case	78
• 3.2 A “glocalized” bakery	82
• 4. Conclusions	84
• References	86

5. Social media and the iconization of natural landscapes in tourism discourse

■ *Simone Gamba*

• Abstract	91
• 1. Tourism and the mediatization of nature	92
• 2. Theoretical framework	92
• 3. A controversial canyon	94
• 4. An historical imaginary of the natural landscape	96
• 5. The algorithm and the tourist gaze	98
• 6. The end of romantic contemplation?	99
• 7. The material consequences of iconization	101
• 8. Final reflections	103
• References	105

6. Heritage and tourism: the case study of the Magna Grecia Park

■ *Mattia Spanò*

• Abstract	110
• 1. Introduction: origins and future	111
• 2. Heritage and tourism	111
• 3. Retracing ancient Kroton: territory and points of interest	112
• 3.1 <i>Capo Colonna</i>	113
• 3.2 <i>Capo Rizzuto Marine Protected Area</i>	114
• 3.3 <i>Sila National Park</i>	115
• 4. Magna Grecia Park	116
• 5. Stakeholder analysis: theory, literature, and method	119
• 6. Results	121
• 7. Final remarks	124

• References	126
• Websites	129

7. Winescapes and cultural identities: a glance on the island of Salina (Aeolian Islands)

■ *Sonia Gambino*

• Abstract	131
• 1. Introduction	132
• 2. The attraction potential of wine landscape on the island of Salina	133
• 3. The role of malvasia wine in enhancing cultural identity on the island of Salina	137
• 4. “Salina ecogastronomica”: a project to find out about high-quality productions	141
• 5. Conclusions	143
• References	145

8. Natural resources and landscape conservation in Velipoja administration unit

■ *Ervis Krymbi*

• Abstract	149
• 1. Introduction	150
• 2. Geographical position and boundaries of Velipoja administration unit	151
• 3. The potentials and the management of landscape in Velipoja administration unit	154
• 4. Velipoja coastline facing the challenges on territory and local infrastructure	163
• 5. Conclusions	166
• References	168

9. Interactions between Cultural Landscape and Gig Economy Reading New Transformations

■ *Bresena Kopliku, Brikena Dionizi, Elvira Drishti*

• Abstract	171
• 1. Introduction	172
• 2. Methodology	173
• 3. The digitalization of economy in Albania	174
• 4. Cultural landscape and gig economy – toward new transformations	176
• 4.1 <i>Transportation and mobility –</i>	176
• 4.2 <i>The spatial distribution of Gig workers and workplace</i>	179
• 4.3 <i>Urban and rural implications</i>	181
• Conclusions	182
• References	184

10. “Sicilia Archeologica” and the Sicilian archaeological park system. A reflection on the newly launched territorial branding initiative

■ *Giovanni Messina*

• Abstract	189
• 1. Introduction	190
• 2. The issue of territorial branding. Some critical insights	192
• 3. The rebranding of the archaeological heritage of the Sicilian region	193
• 3.1 “Sicilia Archeologica” project summary and methodology	193
• 3.2 <i>The role of archaeological parks in the Sicilian tourism sector</i>	193
• 3.3 <i>The “Sicilia Archeologica” project. Between policies and tools.</i>	197

• 4. Conclusions	199
• References	200
• Sitography	202

11. Environmental risk perception and attitudes on climate-induced migration: survey insights among Geography students at the University of Turin

■ *Sara Ansaloni, Daniela Santus*

• Abstract	204
• 1. Introduction	205
• 2. Materials and Methods	205
• 3. Research methodology	208
• 4. Results	210
• 5 - Discussion and conclusions	228
• References	232

12. Infrastructural development under CPEC and its impact on Pakistan's agricultural landscape

■ *Muhammad Ammad Khan, Maryam Dogar, Mahreen Khalid*

• Abstract	239
• 1. Introduction	241
• 2. Transformative Impacts of CPEC on Pakistan's Agricultural Landscape	244
• 3. Sustainability Challenges	246
• 4. Sustainable Strategies: Lessons from Global Economic Corridors	251
• 5. Conclusion and Recommendations	254
• References	256

13. Cruising to the poles: narratives and representation of “last chance tourism”

■ *Gaetano Sabato*

• Abstract	264
• 1. Introduction	265
• 2. Cruising to the poles	268
• 3. The imaginary of polar tourism: the case of Ponant cruises	270
• 4. Conclusions	276
• References	278
• Web references	280

14. The African geopolitical landscape: between demography and development

■ *Giuseppe Terranova*

• Abstract	282
• 1. Introduction	283
• 2. The demographic landscape of Africa: from the slave trade to the limits to growth	283
• 3. Global population trends and the Africa’s new demographic landscape.	285
• 4. Conclusion	289
• References	293

15. Geographical analysis of WEEE (Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment) dynamics

■ *Alberto Corbino; Stefano De Falco*

• Abstract	297
• 1. Introduction	298

• 2. Geographic analysis of WEEE flows	304
• 2.1 <i>Regional scenarios</i>	306
• <i>Americas</i>	307
• <i>Europe</i>	308
• <i>Africa</i>	308
• <i>Asia</i>	309
• <i>Oceania</i>	310
• 3. Some possible positive foresight scenarios	310
• References	313
 <i>THE AUTHORS</i>	 317

15. Geographical analysis of WEEE (Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment) dynamics

Alberto Corbino; Stefano De Falco

15. Geographical analysis of WEEE (Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment) dynamics

Alberto Corbino; Stefano De Falco¹

Abstract

WEEE (Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment) is one of the global rising problems due to its increasing volume in association with health and environmental hazards occurring where the disposal happens. Most WEEE is currently generated by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries; nevertheless, all the studies suggest that developing countries will be producing a double amount of WEEE than the developed ones within the next 6–8 years.

In this framework this paper explores and accounts the status-quo of WEEE generation and handling situation in different countries, analyzing their impact on public health and environment.

Keywords: *WEEE, Green and Digital Transition, Circular Economy.*

¹ *Alberto Corbino, Corresponding Author, Department of Political Science, University of Naples Federico II, alberto.corbino@unina.it;*
Stefano De Falco, Department of Political Science, University of Naples Federico II. sdefalco@unina.it

1. Introduction

The ‘twin’ green and digital transitions are at the top of the political agenda of the EU and other organizations of states, as, among the others, recalled by the African Union 2063 Agenda², in the ASEAN³ Digital Masterplan 2025 and in the EU_LAC Digital Alliance⁴.

The EU roadmap is increasingly cited as a virtuous example of dynamics to be pursued; yet at any geographical scale (Corbino et al., 2023) it can contribute to increasing, instead of bridging, geographical gaps, due to the positive impacts they often produce only in some areas and the negative impacts in others. This paradox concerns all the phases of the production process: the extraction of raw materials with significant negative socio-environmental impacts and external diseconomies in developing countries; higher energy consumption, largely due to energy-intensive processes related to ICTs⁵; lack or inefficiency of waste disposal procedures, that are still very distant from that virtuous model of circular economy often referred to in the above-mentioned inter-governmental programs.

Among the risks included in the development of the green and digital transition trajectories, the enormous volumes of electronic waste (WEEE or E-waste) that are being generated must be taken in serious consideration. This includes the waste of secondary raw materials contained within them, such as precious metals (PM) and rare earth metals (REM) (Olanrewaju et al., 2021). Up to 60 elements can be found in some EEE; materials such as plastics, precious metals (PMs) and rare earth metals (REEs) are commonly used to produce these products (ibidem). It is calculated that, in an efficient circular economy scenario, only in West Asia from 2020 to 2050, an estimated total of 130 t of gold, 5 t of rare earth metals, 17 Mt of iron and steel, 1.5 Mt of copper, and 2.6 Mt of aluminum could be recycled.

This is why the informal sector is more active in disposing E-waste

² It is recalled by the Goals n. 2 & 7 of AGENDA 2063, that is “Africa’s blueprint and master, the continent’s strategic framework that aims to deliver on its goal for inclusive and sustainable development and is a concrete manifestation of the pan-African drive for unity, self-determination, freedom, progress and collective prosperity”. For further info: <https://au.int/agenda2063/goals>.

³ ASEAN – The Association of South Asia Nations, include ten countries today.

⁴ The European Union-Latin America and Caribbean Digital Alliance was launched in March 2023; it aims to foster the development of secure, resilient and human-centric digital infrastructures based on a values-based framework, ensuring a democratic and transparent enabling environment and putting a strong emphasis on privacy and digital rights.

⁵ ICTS are currently responsible for 5-9% of the world’s global electricity consumption (source: EU – JRC, 14/07/22 news announcement).

throughout the world: the workers involved (even children) perform crude activities without appropriate recycling facilities and are highly exposed to dangerous and unhealthy conditions (Dutta and Goel, 2021). The infamous e-waste ‘recycling’ sites in Agbogbloshie, Ghana and Guiyu, China are extreme examples of improper e-waste recycling that result in severe air, water, and soil pollution (Parajuly, 2019). The main health problems arising from WEEE are due to the presence of toxic substances and due to the non-biodegradability of these devices. If dispersed into the environment, certain components of WEEE can generate significant impacts on the environment and human health. In fact, these substances, if not carefully treated and disposed of, can generate acute and chronic effects on living organisms, often including irreversible damage. Health topic is currently more and more analyzed in the scientific debate. In fact, an analysis of the literature review through VosViewer software, using the keywords “WEEE” and “Health”, generates a series of interconnected clusters, that shows a close relationship between the two themes (**Figure 1**).




Fig. 1 Vos Viewer analysis. Source: authors’ elaboration on Web of Science.

WEEE are defined by the Technical Guidelines of the “Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal⁶” as “electrical and electronic equipment that is waste,

⁶ Adopted on 22 March 1989 and entered into force on 5 May 1992. It was adopted by decision III/1 of the Third meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The so called “Ban Amendment” provides for the prohibition by each Party included in the proposed new Annex VII to the

including all components, sub-assemblies and consumables that are part of the equipment at the time the equipment becomes waste”. E-waste encompasses a wide variety of discarded products and in the European Union, according to the (WEEE) Directive 2012/19/EU⁷, it’s classified into six main categories: Temperature Exchange Equipment, Screens and Monitors, Lamps, Small Equipment, Large Equipment (incl. PV panels), Small IT and Telecommunication Equipment. For statistical purposes, however, WEEE is classified by similar function, comparable material composition, average weight, and similar end-of-life attributes; the UNUKEYs, the E-waste Statistics Guidelines on Classification Reporting and Indicators therefore divide EEE into 54 different product-centric categories (Forti *et al.*, 2018).

At a global scale, it is estimated that the amount of WEEE is approximately 18% of the world’s total urban waste in 2020 with 3–5% increasing each year (Liu *et al.*, 2020).

A significant indicator of the growth of this worrying, yet little considered issue, is the extent of ICT’s penetration into people’s everyday lives. If we look, for instance, at the relationship between digital and finance in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), a region - in people’s imagination – surely not among the most innovative, we find out that here the number of mobile money agent outlets has increased significantly, from almost zero in 2008 to more than 38.000 in 2018, on average in each country. Moreover, here the number of mobile money accounts now exceeds the number of traditional deposit accounts, with 21 percent of adults in the region having a mobile money account, and mobile-money transactions more than tripled from an average of 8 percent of GDP in 2014 to 25 percent in 2018, making SSA a leading region in the world (IMF, 2020).

In response to this ICT devices proliferation, some recycling targets have been set. For instance, article 7 of the abovementioned EU - WEEE Directive states that the minimum collection rate to be achieved annually by a member State shall be 65% of the average weight of electrical and electronic

Convention (Parties and other States which are members of the OECD, EC, Liechtenstein) of: all transboundary movements to States not included in Annex VII of hazardous wastes covered by the Convention that are intended for final disposal, and; all transboundary movements to States not included in Annex VII of hazardous wastes covered by paragraph 1 (a) of Article 1 of the Convention that are destined for reuse, recycling or recovery operations. The text has been subject to various amendments since its adoption. A full text is available here: <https://www.basel.int/TheConvention/Overview/TextoftheConvention/tabid/1275/Default.aspx>

⁷ Directive 2012/19/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 July 2012 on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE).

equipment (EEE) placed on the market (POM) in the three preceding years or, alternatively, 85% of WEEE generated on the territory of a member state. As we will show in this chapter, most EU countries are very far from this objective, although some of them constitute the benchmark at a world level.

As a confirmation of the complex scenario described above, the document produced by the European Commission regarding the warning on the risks connected to the EU objectives entitled “Strategic Forecast Report 2022: twinning the green and digital transitions in the new geopolitical context” can be really enlightening. In fact, it is stated that the greater progressive use of digital technologies could increase the volume of electronic E-waste produced up to 75MT by 2030, causing a larger environmental impact. In the EU, now, only 17,4% of WEEE is adequately treated and recycled, while the production of electronic waste is increasing every year by 2,5MT in the twenty-seven Member States.

The notion of a just transition, i.e. not unfair in the impacts it generates, despite being aimed at a sustainable technological/digital evolution, is becoming increasingly common among professionals. Nevertheless, however, WEEE disposal is still characterized by low efficiency especially in the transformation from waste to resource, thus leading to problems of accumulation and disposal of electronic waste. The solution to this drift is becoming, in the short term, that of exporting this waste to other destinations which, for a series of geopolitical reasons, are willing to accept WEEE flows within their borders. According to Ibitz (2012), several Asian countries have allowed e-waste imports, to obtain raw materials for their domestic production of electronic goods. The flows of materials from one country to another, in fact, are not only regulated by specific inter or intra-country agreements, but rather triggered by “market reasons” such as, for example, the generation of employment, the differences between income communities, etc. (Estrada-Ayub and Kahhat, 2014). Kusch and Hills (2017) examined the relationship between e-waste and GDP in countries in the pan-European region and found evidence of a strong linear relationship between economic development and e-waste generation. Lepawsky and McNabb (2010) who first investigated the dynamics related to e-waste trade flows, using exports and imports data at different time intervals, supported the hypothesis that rich countries are more likely to export rather than import E-waste, also reproducing vicious circles in North-South differentials for electronic waste. The main generators of electronic waste per inhabitant are North America and Europe, which export the largest percentage to developing countries. China, in absolute terms, is the second largest generator of e-waste after the United States. The

enclave constituted by Taiwan, where the concentration of the electronics industry (especially microchips) is very high, generates very intense volumes of electronic waste, which for the most part is exported also and above all to China, where materials, classified as dangerous waste in Taiwan, are considered recyclable.

The practice of exporting electronic waste conflicts with the aforementioned Basel Convention which requires participating countries to dispose waste as quickly as possible and as close as possible to the source of production (Wirth, 1996). This ban is also proposed in the Bamako convention⁸. But, as Robinson (2009) argues, exporting countries often violate international treaties regarding the transportation of hazardous electronic waste. From the perspective of WEEE exporters, Tong (2004) examined the cross-border movement of e-waste and argued that it is driven by two forces: (i) disassembly of discarded electronic products is labor-intensive, and low-added-value and (ii) exporting countries' compliance with environmental regulations may increase the cost of disposal.

In figure 2 the distribution of the quantities of WEEE generated and recycled in OECD countries, and in figure 3 the histogram relating to the percentage distribution of the ratio between the two previous quantities are shown.

⁸ The Bamako Convention is a treaty of African nations prohibiting the import into Africa of any hazardous (including radioactive) waste. It was negotiated in 1991 and it came into force in 1998.




Fig. 2 E-waste generated, and E-waste recycled or reused in European OECD countries
Source: authors' elaboration on Global E-waste Monitor 2022.

Switzerland stands as the champion (over 90%) of the so-called *urban mining*, that is the ability to “find” precious metals in urban waste. One of the reasons for this success is that an advance recycling fee paid by consumers finances the recycling procedure⁹ (Kamasa, 2023).




Fig. 3 % recycled on total WEEE for some OECD countries - 2019. Source: Authors' elaboration on Global E-waste Monitor 2022.

⁹ In 1998, of the ORDEE - “Ordinance on the Return, Taking Back and Disposal of Electrical and Electronic Equipment”, was introduced, imposing on consumers the so-called “advance recycling fee” on domestically bought electronics. In return, the consumers can bring back used electronics free of charge and manufacturers, importers, and retailers must take care of the disposal and recycling by regulation.

2. Geographic analysis of WEEE flows

The SCYCLE program of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) has established a global WEEE monitoring system. The researchers collected all possible data from the Basel Convention, trade statistics and literature, compiling the first Global Transboundary E-waste Flows Monitor. The report is the first attempt to track cross-border flows of e-waste, to understand where it goes and what impact it has on communities and ecosystems.

WTO has calculated that nearly 13 million women and 18 million children work in e-waste processing informally, exposed to toxic chemicals. These include lead, mercury, nickel, brominated flame retardants and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. Naturally, these impacts are concentrated in the global South, a veritable WEEE “landfill” of rich countries. Many countries lack both management infrastructure and workers rights implementation, making them attractive for cross-border trade. The new “atlas” of flows created by UNITAR estimates that around 5,1 million electronic waste (almost 10% of the total) is the subject of international trade. Only 1,8 million tons are shipped in a controlled manner. So, some 3,3 are uncontrolled, and they can become part of a legal trade, but also of an illegal trafficking of electronic waste to countries with lower treatment costs.

However, the report confirms that the movement of WEEE is mainly from north to south, from high-income countries to middle- and low-income countries. Only a very small part, between 2 and 17 thousand tons, are seized because they were illegally marketed by the European Union.

Already in 2014 Lepawsky (2014, p.10) stated that for over a decade the e-waste problem had been framed in terms of dumping of electronic discards by rich ‘developed’ nations in poor ‘developing’ ones; and although such trade was still occurring, a much more nuanced interpretation of the international trade in WEEE was needed.

Awasthi and Li (2017) argue that China and India are the two countries that mostly suffer from illegal imports of WEEE. One of the most frequent counterfeiting methodologies consists, as Huisman (2008) claims, in the transfer of volumes of used EEE in the form of electronic goods or as donations to institutions in the receiving countries (Puckett et al., 2002). Breivik et al. (2014) carried out a review of the literature to also understand different positions that positively affect the international trade of (W)EEE from developed to developing countries by justifying such flows as capable of reducing disparity in the adoption of technologies ICT.

According to this view, the export of used (W)EEE to less prosperous regions represents a reallocation of resources such as raw materials, spare parts, precious metals, etc., which can generate significant economic activity.

Efthymiou *et al.* (2016) studied the factors that influence the choice of countries where e-waste is transported illegally. They selected two types of factors: (i) macroeconomic, i.e. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita and Open Market Index (OMI) and (ii) social, i.e. Human Development Index. With reference to GDP, Lepawsky and McNabb (2010) also argue that commercial transactions on e-waste tend to occur when the importer has a lower GDP per capita than the exporter.

An interesting point of view is that of Yu *et al.* (2010) according to which the dynamics of the flows appears to be a short-term issue since the digital development trajectory of developing countries will determine a strong increase in the production of their own waste, compared to which the import volumes they will be negligible or at least minor.

Rochman *et al.* (2017) sought to understand the roles of formal and informal actors in e-waste flows and identified three categories of factors responsible for illegal e-waste transports: (i) centrifugal push factors, forces capable of driving away illegal waste transports from their source, (ii) centripetal pull factors, i.e. forces capable of attracting illegal transports to their destination and (iii) facilitating factors, i.e. anything that makes illegal transports possible. They concluded that transport actors walk a fine line between legal and illegal practice, thus allowing illegal transport of e-waste to take place.

The figure 4 regards global import and export of regional WEEE flows and shows how these flows follow the same schizophrenic dynamics of international trade, in which the majority of countries are both, at the same time, importers and exporters of the same commodity.




Fig. 4 Global Import and Export of Regional Flows. Source: Baldé et al., 2022

2.1 Regional scenarios

In this section we will briefly analyze the production, disposal, management and traffic dynamics of WEEE on a sub-continental basis. Given the geographic scale, very large differences between the different macro-region exist, due to a combination of several factors, including legal provisions, economic development, institutional efficiency and the complexity of the industrial chains. Furthermore, even within the same nation, therefore within the same legislative and institutional framework, notable differences can be identified, as, for example, it happens in Italy NUTS3 regions, as stated by the annual reports on this topic, published by the RAEE (WEEE) Coordination Center.

Table 1 reports some summary data about macro-regional differences in terms of E-waste production, sound management and import/export.

Region	Data	
	<i>e-waste generated (kg/inh) e-waste documented to be environmentally soundly managed (%)</i>	<i>e-waste % import/export</i>
Americas	13.1 Mt (13,3 kg/inh). 1.2 Mt (9%)	0.55 Mt (3%) imports. 0.39 Mt (2%) exports.
Europe	12 Mt (16,2 kg/inh) 5.1 Mt (42%)	1.2 Mt (10%) imports. 1.9 Mt (15%) exports.
Africa	2.9 Mt (2,5 kg/inh) 0.03 Mt (1%)	0.55 Mt (19%) imports. 0.13 Mt (5%) exports.
Asia	24.9 Mt (5,2 kg/inh.) 2.9 Mt (12%)	2.9 Mt (12%) imports. 2.8 Mt (10%) exports.
Oceania	0.7 Mt (16,1 kg/inh). 0.06 Mt (9%)	0 Mt (0%) imports. 0.021 Mt (3%) exports.

Tab. 1 Macro-regional Import and Export Hotspots. Source: authors' elaboration on Baldé et al., 2022

Americas

In the American continent, the production of WEEE is characterized by a non-homogeneous geographical distribution, especially along the North-South route. This lack of homogeneity can also be seen in relation to the different adoption from state to state of specific legislation on the topic. Furthermore, it is obvious that generation rates are very different depending on the number of people and the level of ICT penetration, since for example a city like New York generates more WEEE than many entire scarcely populated states in the nation.

In North America, Canada and the United States, WEEE production per capita is approximately 19-20 kg/person/year. Canada collects a wider range of products, but the recycling rate is only about 20% (Kumar and Holuszko, 2016). In South America, legislation related to WEEE is not widespread, although countries such as Argentina (2013) and

Brazil (2010) have drafted related legislation for the management of WEEE, whose production is increasing everywhere in the sub-continent.

Regarding the type of import/export of WEEE, North America imports printed circuit board waste, as several specialized recyclers are based in the region, while Central America and South America export this category of waste. As in many other cases, the lack of available information may hinder a better understanding and improvement of the e-waste problem in the Latin American region (Wagner *et al.*, 2022).

Europe

In European Union countries, sustainable development and the progressive adoption of circular economy models could prove to be distinctive factors in the ability to manage WEEE, however, according to the UNITAR SCYCLE programme, only 3 of the 27 EU member states (Croatia, Bulgaria and Poland) have reached the collection target of the WEEE directive. The rapid replacement rate of electronic devices also affects this dynamic¹⁰.

As an example of the criticality of the E-waste issue with respect to negative data even in the presence of efficient dynamics, we can cite the Netherlands, where in 2018 366 kt of WEEE were generated, half of which was recorded as recycled in compliance with the NWR. It is estimated that around a quarter were recycled non-compliantly (27%) and around another quarter were disposed of in waste containers or exported for reuse, or could not be documented (UNITAR, 2020).

Africa

The use of EEE is still low in Africa compared to other areas in the world, but it is growing at a fast rate. In the last decade for instance, the penetration rate of personal computers has increased by a factor of 10, while the number of mobile phone subscribers has increased by a factor of 100, which a consequent price reduction and more affordable technology (Secretariat of the Basel Convention, 2021). In 2019 Africa was producing 2,9 MT of E-waste, in 2021 3 MT and an (under)estimated value for 2030 is 4 Mt, which accounts for a + 33% in less than 10 years-time (Massa and Archodoulaki, 2023).

It's calculated that today Africa locally generates between 50 and 85%

¹⁰ In Europe, on average, smartphones are replaced every 2-3 years., as reported by “Science for Environment Policy”: European Commission DG Environment News Alert Service, edited by the Science Communication Unit, The University of the West of England, Bristol.

of its total e-waste, the remaining originating from illegal transboundary imports from developed countries from the Americas, Europe, and China. About 2.9 Mt of e-waste was generated in Africa in 2019, with the highest e-waste generating countries (Egypt, South Africa and Nigeria) also being major population centers.

Even though monitoring the transboundary movement of e-waste into Africa is notoriously difficult, three African countries, two on the West coast, Ghana, and Nigeria, and one on the East coast, Tanzania, have been identified as recipients of e-waste from the EU/UK (Maes *et al.*, 2022).

As highlighted by Okwu *et al.* (2022), in Nigeria unprofessional WEEE burning and dismantling methods contribute significantly to the pollution of air, as some of the pollutants are able to travel over a long distance from the recycling sites. The soil, as well as the crops grown in the WEEE dumpsites, are exposed to a high concentration of metals.

Very little reporting of transboundary movement of e-waste exists within the African continent. This may be due to either low levels of reporting or to the import of used-EEE that become waste while already in the region.

Asia

Figures for the Asian continent rose to 24,9 Mt in 2019 (Forti *et al.*, 2020), and now make up almost 50% of WEEE generated globally, making Asia the largest generator of WEEE worldwide.

China ranked first in the world for the generation of e-waste in 2014, generating 8.53 million tons. This quantity is forecasted to be 15,6 and 28,4 million tons by 2020 and 2030, respectively, increasing dramatically by 25,7% each year (Wang *et al.*, 2016);

In Western Asia¹¹, the total absence of practices relating to the management of electronic waste suggests very negative estimates (UNITAR, 2023) for the future, with very significant increases in the quantities of POM EEE (7.5 Mt in 2050). Similarly, again according to estimates (UNITAR, 2023), correct management of activities related to e-waste could generate enormous demand for work, with 225,000 full-time equivalent jobs in 2050.

In Central Asia, particularly in Kazakhstan, very high growth trends in EEE consumption per capita can be recognized, and, therefore, here too the 250 forecasts estimate large increases in electronic waste (432 million kg in total, according to UNITAR, 2023)

¹¹ It includes Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, State of Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen.

In India approximately 95% of E-waste is treated in the backyard without any expert personnel, equipment, technologies, and infrastructure (Arya *et al.*, 2021).

In Malaysia, as elsewhere, informal recyclers have flooded the WEEE recycling market, adopting “backward dismantling methods” to carry out operations, in pursuit of high profits, thus causing heavy environmental deterioration. In addition, due to the low-cost competition of informal recyclers, formal recyclers cannot obtain sufficient revenues to cover the operating costs and obtain reasonable profits. Therefore, WEEE recycling policies have been introduced and implemented (Krishnaswamy, 2019), and in China, already in 2011 government began to implement WEEE recycling management regulations to subsidize formal recyclers, as part of the solution policies (Liu *et al.*, 2018).

Oceania

Australia and New Zealand are the largest producers of WEEE in this continent. While Australia has a product management program that has generated schemes for waste and recycling of WEEE, New Zealand has yet to develop a legal framework to support the management of WEEE, and it currently manages its e-waste via voluntary product stewardship schemes (Van Yken *et al.*, 2021)

Oceania exports printed circuit board waste mainly to Asia but has a low level of reporting on other kind of e-waste transboundary flows. As for other regions, the lack of information hinders a better understanding of the e-waste problem in the region.

3. Some possible positive foresight scenarios

The demand for, and production of EEE is expected to continue to rise in future. With technological advances and increased accessibility and penetration of electronics, WEEE generation is expected to rise substantially, with total volume generated expected to rise to 75 MT by 2030 (Forti *et al.*, 2020).

The increase in WEEE can be explained not only by a greater consumption of technology on a global level, but also by the reduced life cycle of the devices themselves - read planned obsolescence - and by consumers' low propensity to repair them. This explains why, although the weight of electronic devices

decreases with technological evolution, the production of WEEE increases. In other terms, the subtractive dynamics of the electronic weight due to new technologies and more efficient production, is losing compared to the additive dynamics of the production of new devices due to the increase in demand.

The analysis of the current global state of disposal of e-waste has highlighted, as expected, a very different regulatory framework and very different management efficiency, ranging from over 90% in Switzerland to 0.1% in the West Asia. At the same time, everywhere, there is emerging awareness of a very needed change of scenario, necessary both to recover precious resources (urban mining) and to reduce damage to public health and the environment, deriving from mostly informal and therefore out of control disposal.

In fact, adequate regulation and application of the matter, supported by substantial public incentives to implement efficient recovery and recycling policies, will not only be able to block or decrease the flows of volumes of illegal electronic waste, but trigger virtuous circles within countries, in line with the much-vaunted principles of the circular economy. Furthermore, this would lead to both a reduction in the release of polluting substances into the environment - from mega landfills and from improvised small-scale dismantling laboratories - and obviously also in terms of employment it will lead to various advantages induced by a more regulated production chain of pre-treatment and waste recycling. It is, in fact, estimated that roughly 225.000 full-time equivalent jobs would be created for repair of used EEE and collection and pre-treatment of e-waste. In South Africa, for instance, there are currently an estimated 25 full-time equivalent recycling jobs per 1.000 t handled, and the sector has the potential to increase this number as more recycled e-waste is reintroduced back into the value chain (Lydall *et al.* 2017).

According to the current and forecasted data (Bagwan, 2024) of E-waste processing capacity and recycles it's possible to state that, the processing capacity of E-waste has been steadily increasing from 2014 to 2021. Looking ahead, the forecasted data from 2023 to 2030 suggests a continued upward trend in the number of recyclers, albeit with a more moderate rate of change. The projected rates of change range from 5,65% to 26,26% (ibid), indicating steady growth in the recycling capacity of E-waste over the forecasted period, from about 127 Mt to 199 Mt. These findings highlight the importance of promoting and supporting E-waste recycling initiatives.

Currently, fewer and fewer precious metals are employed in electronic devices, so the few metals that can be salvaged are sold for a very cheap price

in international markets, making the process of recycling less convenient than exporting e-waste to countries with little-to-no regard for worker safety or environmental protections.

Instead, the African continent, where, among other things, a massive use of solar energy and therefore the installation of millions of solar panels is expected (WB, 2022), could become an international hub for legal and qualified disposal of E-waste, subverting its economic destiny from a destination for illegal waste trafficking to a hub of a virtuous global value chain.

References

- Arya, S., Rautela, R., Chavan, D., Kumar S., 2021, “Evaluation of soil contamination due to crude E-waste recycling activities in the capital city of India Process”, *Saf. Environ. Protect.*, 152, 641-653.
- Awasthi, A.K., Zeng, X., Li, J., 2016, “Environmental pollution of electronic waste recycling in India: a critical review”, *Environ. Pollut.*, 211, 259–270.
- Bagwan, W., 2024, “Electronic waste (E-waste) generation and management scenario of India, and ARIMA forecasting of E-waste processing capacity of Maharashtra state till 2030”, *Waste Management Bulletin*, 1 (4), 41-51, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wmb.2023.08.002>.
- Baldé, C.P., D’Angelo, E., Luda, V., Deubzer, O., Kuehr, R., 2022, *Global Transboundary E-waste Flows Monitor* - 2022, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), Bonn, Germany.
- Breivik, k., Armitage, J., Wania, F., Jones, K., 2014, “Tracking the Global Generation and Exports of e-Waste. Do Existing Estimates Add up?”, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 48, 15, 8735–8743, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es5021313>
- Corbino, A., De Falco, S., Simonetti, L., 2023, “Blue and green transition? Dinamiche di convergenza/divergenza nelle traiettorie digitali ed ecologiche delle province italiane”, *Bollettino dell’Associazione Italiana di Cartografia*, 175 (2023)”, 32-53.
- Dutta, D., Goel, S., 2021, “Understanding the gap between formal and informal e-waste recycling facilities in India”, *Waste Management*, 125, 163-171.
- Estrada-Ayub, J.A., Kahhat, R., 2014, “Decision factors for e-waste in Northern Mexico: To waste or trade”, *Resources, Conservation & Recycling*, 86, (C), 93–106
- Forti V., Baldé, C.P., Kuehr R., 2018, *E-waste Statistics: Guidelines on Classifications, Reporting and Indicators*, second edition. United Nations University, ViE – SCYCLE, Bonn, Germany

- Forti, V., Baldé, C.P., Kuehr, R., Bel, G., 2020, The Global E-waste Monitor 2020: Quantities, flows and the circular economy potential. United Nations University (UNU)/United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) – co-hosted SCYCLE Programme, International Telecommunication Union (ITU) & International Solid Waste Association (ISWA), Bonn/Geneva/Rotterdam.

- Huisman, J., Leroy, P., Tertre, F., 2017, *Prospecting Secondary Raw Materials in the Urban Mine and mining wastes (ProSUM)* - Final Report (ISBN: 978-92-808-9060-0). Brussels, Belgium.

- Ibitz, A., 2012, Environmental policy coordination in ASEAN: the case of waste from electrical and electronic equipment, *ASEAS - Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 5(1), 30-51. <https://doi.org/10.4232/10.ASEAS-5.1-3>.

- IMF - International Monetary Fund. African Dept. 2020, Digitalization in Sub-Saharan Africa, in *Regional Economic Outlook*, Sub-Saharan Africa. USA: International Monetary Fund. Retrieved Jan 11, 2024, from <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513536835.086.ch003>.

- Kamasa J., 2023, Mind the E-Waste: A Case for Switzerland, in *Policy Perspectives*, Vol. 11/3, August 2023, Center for Security Studies (CSS), ETH Zürich (ISSN: 2296-0244; DOI: 10.3929/ethz-b-000627493).

- Krishnaswamy, J., Seela, V., Shruthi, R., Imtiaz, M., 2019, “The proposed e-waste management model from the conviction of individual laptop disposal practices-An empirical study in Malaysia”, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 208, 688-696. [10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.125](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.125).

- Kumar, A., Holuszko, M., 2016, Electronic waste and existing processing routes: a Canadian perspective, *Resources*, 5 (35), 1–19.

- Kusch, S., Hills, D., 2017, “The Link between e-Waste and GDP—New Insights from Data from the Pan-European Region”, *Resources*, 6(2), 1-15, DOI: [10.3390/resources6020015](https://doi.org/10.3390/resources6020015).

- Lepawsky, J., McNabb, C., 2010, “Mapping international flows of electronic waste”, *Canadian Geographer*, 54 (2), 177–195.

- Liu, G., Xu, Y., Tian, T., Wang, T., & Liu, Y., 2020, "The impacts of China's fund policy on waste electrical and electronic equipment utilization", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 251, 119582 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095965261934452X?via%3Dihub>

- Liu, H., Wu, X., Dou, D., 2018, "Determining recycling fees and subsidies in China's WEEE disposal fund with formal and informal sectors", *Sustainability*, 10 (9), 2979, 10.3390/su10092979.

- Lydall, M. Nyanjowa, W. and James, Y. 2017., *Mapping South Africa's Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Dismantling, Pre-Processing and Processing Technology Landscape*, Mintek External Report # 7574.

- Maes, T., Preston-Whyte, F., 2022, "E-waste it wisely: lessons from Africa", *SN Appl. Sci.* 4, 72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-022-04962-9>.

- Moyen Massa, G.; Archodoulaki, V.-M., 2023, "Electrical and Electronic Waste Management Problems in Africa: Deficits and Solution Approach", *Environments*, 10(44). <https://doi.org/10.3390/environments10030044>.

- Olanrewaju, S., Shittu, D., Williams, P., Shaw, J., 2021, "Global E-waste management: Can WEEE make a difference? A review of e-waste trends, legislation, contemporary issues and future challenges", *Waste Management*, 120, 549-563, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2020.10.016>.

- Okwu, O.; Hursthouse, A.; Viza, E.; Idoko, L., 2022, "New Models to Reduce the Health Risks of Informal WEEE Recyclers in MTN Phone Village, Rumukurushi, Port Harcourt, Nigeria", *Toxics*, , 10, 84. <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics10020084>.

- Parajuly, K., Wenzel, H., 2017, "Potential for circular economy in household WEEE management", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 151, 272–285.

- Puckett, J., 2010, Indonesia turns back illegal shipment of e-waste from USA "recycler". Toxic Trade News. Basel Action Network, Seattle, Washington, Retrieved from: http://archive.ban.org/ban_news/2010/100301_indonesia_turns_back.html, (accessed 13 November 2023).

- Robinson, B. H., 2009, “E-waste: An assessment of global production and environmental impacts”, *Science of the Total Environment*, 408, 183-191.
- Rochman, F., Weslynn S., Ashton, A., Wiharjo, M., 2017, “E-waste, money and power: Mapping electronic waste flows in Yogyakarta, Indonesia”, *Environmental Development*, 24, 1-8, ISSN 2211-4645, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2017.02.002>.
- Tong, X., 2004, Global mandate, national policies, and local responses: scale conflicts in China’s management of imported e-waste, in 2004 *IEEE International Symposium on Electronics and the Environment*, 204–207.
- United Nations Environment Programme and United Nations Institute for Training and Research (2023). 2050 Electronic and Electrical Waste Outlook in West Asia. Nairobi and Bonn, Kenya and Germany.
- United Nations Environment Programme and United Nations Institute for Training and Research (2023). 2050 Electronic and Electrical Waste Outlook in West Asia. Nairobi and Bonn, Kenya and Germany.
- Van Yken, J., Boxall, N.J., Cheng, K.Y., Nikoloski, A.N., Moheimani, N.R., Kaksonen, A.H., 2021, “E-Waste Recycling and Resource Recovery: A Review on Technologies, Barriers and Enablers with a Focus on Oceania”, *Metals*, 11, 1313. <https://doi.org/10.3390/met11081313>.
- Wagner, M., Baldé, C.P., Luda, V., I. Nnorom, C., Kuehr, R., Iattoni, G., 2022, *Monitoreo regional de los residuos electrónicos para América Latina: resultados de los trece países participantes en el proyecto UNIDO-GEF 5554*, Bonn (Alemania).
- Wang et al., 2016, Z. Wang, D. Guo, X. Wang, Determinants of residents’ e-waste recycling behaviour intentions: evidence from China, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 137 (2016), pp. 850-860, [10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.07.155](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.07.155).
- Wirth, D., 1996, “Trade implications of the Basel convention amendment banning North-South trade in hazardous wastes”, *International Environment Reporter.*, 1-47.

Territories continue to transform due to endogenous and exogenous development drives. The thickening of logistics and transport networks, large commercial hubs, energy supply options, agricultural and industrial policies, tourism and migrations constitute then, individually and in a systemic sense, some of the lenses available to read the transformative dynamics of territories in the crucial current geopolitical context. In addition, the increasing reach of digital technologies in the spaces and practices of our daily lives, has changed the way we perceive and use the landscape. These transformations find a reified outcome in landscape transitions, becoming a foothold for a trans-scale geographical reflection. We therefore want to insert this volume on this horizon. In fact, we have wanted to stimulate the geographical community to try their hand at landscape analysis to identify, through methodological and/or applied research contributions, problems, practices and trajectories inherent in the transformative dynamics of territories, compressed between the urgency of development and the need to change the energy and consumption paradigm.

Giovanni Messina is Geographer at the Department of Ancient and Modern Civilizations (DICAM) of the University of Messina. His research mainly focuses on geography and literature, cultural landscapes and local development. His last book (Pontecorboli, 2022) is About the journey. Stasis, chiasmus and interruptions. A geography essay.

Bresena Kopliku is a Researcher and Lecturer at the Department of Geography University of Shkodra, Albania, where she is currently the Head of the Department. Her research interests relate to migration and its diverse typologies, return migration, transnationalism, and diaspora.