Chapter 19

Collaborative Transformations: Circular Economy Strategies in Europe

Ladeja Godina Košir and Petra Kuenkel

Abstract This chapter looks at ways of strengthening transformations towards a Circular Economy in Europe. The current economic system is plundering the planet and endangering the quality of life of future generations. Extractive economies take resources, produce goods and drop waste, as if resource could never get depleted, and waste would not accumulate as environmental threat. Mindset shifts are underway, because resources are increasingly getting scarce, greenhouse gas emissions have reached a point which lets people begin to experience the volatility of the future, and connections between the climate crisis and the health crisis are apparent. Yet, there is a tendency to believe, circularity is mainly about technology. But a Circular Economy approach is more than recycling: it includes many aspects of actions that lead to an overall regenerative operating system at the core of economic activities. Practitioner pioneers require support from Governments, and without national strategies and roadmaps, pathways to regenerative future will be underutilized. This chapter looks at the need for collaborative approaches to transformative change. The most important strategies get highlighted, and the challenges elaborated. The chapter concludes with recommendations to governments and other relevant stakeholders on how to drive the transition towards Circular Economies.

Keywords Circular economy • Regenerative future • Transition • Extractive economies • European green deal • Transformation strategies • Value-based society • Green recovery

19.1 Introduction

The realization that our current economic system is plundering the planet and endangering the quality of life of future generations has by now reached many citizens in

L. Godina Košir (✉)
Circular Change, Gestrinova 1, 1000, Ljubljana, Slovenia
e-mail: ladeja@circularchange.com

P. Kuenkel
Collective Leadership Institute, Kurfürstenstr. 1, 14467, Potsdam, Germany

governments, businesses and civil society. The linear way of extractive economies that take resources, produce goods, use them and drop waste, seems to move towards its end. Not only because resources are increasingly getting scarce, while populations increase, but also because greenhouse gas emissions have reached a point which lets people begin to experience the volatility of the future. This has been aggravated by the experience of the COVID-19 pandemic which and the perceived relationship between health challenges and environmental destruction. Yet, with the current trajectory of economic action, the world's resources are further depleted, the population will grow further and the demand for products will subsequently increase, while resources will shrink (OECD, 2018). This clearly hints to the need for a fast development an entirely different way of operating in production and consumption cycles. This is the starting ground for a Circular Economy. As part of the European Green Deal (COM, 2019), a concerted strategy was launched by the European Commission that creates the basis for an economy of the future, which is expected to be climate-neutral and resource-efficient. The aim of the commission is to drive change towards a Circular Economy by supporting front-runners, but also drawing in more and more mainstream business. The result should not only be a climate-neutral Europe in 2050 or even 2045, but an immensely reduced consumption footprint within the planetary boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009). The strategy is expected to contribute to what is considered regenerative growth, as well as new job creation. For businesses, it is expected to include benefits such as reduced waste, increased material efficiency, or shifts from product consumption to service for product sharing (Korhonen et al., 2018).

The concept of a Circular Economy is not only promoted by Europe, but many national governments have already made a decision to transition towards a Circular Economy, or have even developed roadmaps, as, e.g. Finland, The Netherlands, Slovenia, UK and France. China already created a law for a transition to a Circular Economy in 2008 (CIRAIG, 2015). The concept of regenerative material flows has been around since long, at least since the beginning of the industrialized era (Desrochers, 2002). Nevertheless, the mindset of regeneration and circularity did not win against the extractive, waste-producing form of industrialization. The linear throughput flow model has been determining economic development, independent of its negative impacts on people and the environment. Yet, a Circular Economy approach is more than recycling: it includes many aspects of actions that lead to an overall regenerative operating system at the core of economic activities, such as product design, material and component reuse, recycling of materials, refurbishing, upgrading products, regenerative energy production or waste-derived energy, but also sustainability in product value chains or cradle-to-cradle approaches (Braungart et al., 2007; EMAF, 2013). It is increasingly clear that the practitioner pioneers that have developed circular technologies and processes require massive support from the political realm, such as national strategies, concrete roadmaps and implementation plans. An example hinting in the right direction is the Circular Economy Action

Plan as part of the European Green Deal¹ (COM, 2015, 2020). Also, in order for Circular Economy approaches to succeed, regulatory frameworks are required and metrics need to be identified to measure progress. One challenge in the transition towards a Circular Economy lies in the fact that mindset shifts towards regeneration and circularity in all economic activities are slow (Doz et al., 2017). In addition, societal structures, such as administrative procedures, the delineation of government departments, but also the way value chains are organized, contradict or even block the cross-cutting strategies that transitions require. This is, why new structures need to emerge that enable actors to work across societal sectors (private, public, civil society) and across product or service sector (Cramer, 2020). The role of stakeholder collaboration and networks is therefore of utmost important (Kuenkel et al., 2020).

The following interview captures these challenges and indicates pathways that ease transformative efforts towards a Circular Economy. Ladeja Godina Košir is a renowned expert on Circular Economy, has accompanied the development of several country roadmaps to a Circular Economy and has specific experience in the quality of stakeholder engagement that is needed to develop the ground for successful implementation of such roadmaps. As the chair of the coordination group of the European Circular Economy Stakeholder Platform (ECESP),² she has a thorough insight into the transformative efforts towards circularity across Europe.

19.2 A Practitioner View of Transformation Strategies Towards a Circular Economy

How do you see the take-up of circular economy approaches in Europe in the last 5 years?

The general understanding about Circular Economy approaches is about the question, how can I assure to use resources differently, in a more effective and efficient way? This is what makes people think and gains their interest (CIRIAG, 2015). Most assume this is mainly about focusing on recycling or reusing materials or products, but there is much more in the concept of Circular Economy. In this context, I see a positive effect regarding commitment. But more underlying this general interest in the Circular Economy is a noticeable shift in values that is emerging. People realize that what we took for granted in the past, is not really granted. We cannot extend the excessive exploitation of resources into the future. For example, we can transform our business models in a way, to sell services instead of products. By offering lighting instead of selling light bulbs, we assure the same solution to the user, but change the perception of what is valued. In this particular case, the company is interested to

¹ For more information see https://ec.europa.eu/environment/strategy/circular-economy-action-plan_en; accessed 23rd June 2021.

² For more information see <https://circulareconomy.europa.eu/platform/> accessed 23rd June 2021.

produce light bulbs that last long, since they provide lighting service, not the product as such.

Solutions embedded in Circular Economy approaches are much more future-proof.

If you look at the European Union and the commission, and also the political changes that are on the horizon with the European Green Deal: would you say there is a new narrative emerging that supports Circular Economy approaches?

What is written into in the European Green Deal was absolutely supported by the Circular Economy community. In addition, designing a green recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic with all the funds that are now available gives us an opportunity for a green and circular transition pathway. However, this is so far only an opportunity, because we are not there yet. What we need now in Europe is really to understand how to allocate the recovery funds so that they are going to be invested into something that is sustainable, and circular, and not just spent for the projects that are not contributing to a thorough and evidenced green recovery.

The narrative of “build back better” is something that I find challenging. At this historical moment, we should not go back to the old way of operating in the economy. Systemic change is needed. Co-creation of new, value-based society and economy is what we shall aim for, fixing things in the old way is not the right direction. An innovative spirit and creativity are needed. A good example is the New Bauhaus Initiative³ as it is innovative in content, but also in process. I would say that we now have a truly unique opportunity to rethink the system and set up solutions – in the economy, healthcare, research, education, and culture – on a fresh, green and sustainable foundation. As Einstein once said, we cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them. This is why it is so important to include experience and knowledge on the one hand, and creativity and innovation on the other. Just as we cannot solve the COVID health crisis by vaccination alone, we cannot solve the climate crisis by simply “extinguishing the fires” that we have ignited by how we manage natural resources.

The green, circular direction in combination with the New European Bauhaus encourages collaboration, integration, creation, innovation – with the aim of establishing a systemic transformation and directing all available resources – natural, financial, human – to strengthening resilience and achieving climate neutrality. In the global context, Europe is a lighthouse on this path, and right now we have a historic opportunity to prove that we are serious about a green, sustainable transition and that through radical collaboration at both cross-sectoral and international levels we are able to make it happen in an inclusive way – leaving no one behind, even the most vulnerable.

³ For more information, see: https://europa.eu/new-european-bauhaus/about/about-initiative_en, accessed: 5th June 2021.

In your experience, what resonates with people when you talk about Circular Economy? Is there a difference between government actors and business people?

Narratives are important. Concepts like the climate crisis, climate change or Circular Economy, if you put it on the agenda for the average person or even for business people, it is usually something that is detached from them. They will have trouble to identify with it. Hence, it is important how we introduce such concepts. I like to use it in the correlation with the quality of life and wellbeing, because that is something every person can identify with, no matter if the concept is Circular Economy or a green recovery. You need to create this connection: What does it have to do with me? What is in it for me? How will it affect me? The good news is that these concepts are much more in the media in recent years, some have become daily narratives. So, people realize the necessity for change. What worries me is the capability of bringing it into action. This exactly is the topic of transformation literacy – the capability to actually implement the change together. Solutions need to be doable, affordable and accessible. This also means that when we are talking about new circular practices, let us introduce them in a way that people can identify with, and decision-makers can see how they contribute to this transition. At the end of the day, it is about the lifestyle. About values that we nourish and decision we take on daily basis. In July 2021, Slovenia is taking over the presidency of EU Council and our Circular Change team has decided to publish a special publication, titled **CIRCULAR INSIDER⁴—A Speed Date with Circular Economy Frontrunners**. To show, how Circular Economy is embedded in different segments of daily life—from multinational companies to young entrepreneurs, from cities to educational programmes, from luxury brands to start-ups.

Could it be that many people think Circular Economy approaches are mainly about technological innovation?

Most often, this is the case, but it is a wrong understanding. For example, you need to look at network strategies and identify all the actors that are active in the different aspects of Circular Economy approaches as well as related actors. Moreover, you need to look at the structures in a society—what needs to shift and change? Can we implement a Circular Economy with exactly the societal and economic set-ups that we have at the moment? Or are there blockages that we actually need to overcome and look at different structures? Jacqueline Cramer (2020) has elaborated this very convincingly in her book about network governance, a crucially important aspect of transformations. She describes that we are used to governmental structures and their administrative functioning on the one hand, but on the other hand, we need to build networks that are bottom-up, connecting different actors, but also different sectors across public sector, private sector and civil society, even the arts. For transformations to happen, the question is how to find the orchestration between these different structures. It is not about fighting against each another, for example, business against government, but it is all about collaboration.

⁴ For more information, see: Link: <https://www.circularchange.com/news/2021/6/23/circular-insider-a-speed-date-with-circular-economy-frontrunners>.

When we are working on national Circular Economy strategies, such as national roadmaps, the first thing is that you identify the change-makers, those actors that are already working towards Circular Economy approaches. Often, they are not loud enough or recognized enough, or even overlooked. Sometimes they may not even notice that their activities belong to Circular Economy strategies. So, the first step is to recognize these change-makers, to identify them and then, secondly, to really engage them. This is important, because this is a novel approach that many actors, particularly from government, are not used to. This is not the way they used to work before or how these processes were organized. But in transformations to a Circular Economy, we need those change-makers to be active and to participate in the creation of strategies and roadmaps. There is a third aspect important, which I have realized from my experiences in Central and Eastern Europe. People are often not willing to express their interest, they think putting your interest upfront, is wrong or unethical. However, it is important that people put their interest on the table, otherwise, we cannot negotiate around what is our common goal and how to accomplish something together. Such transformation processes require so-called transition brokers, or backbone support. Mandated people need to facilitate and orchestrate the process. This is about creating a safe space, in which people are willing to express their interest and concerns. Such transformations are not revolutionary, and they are evolutionary.

There is something interesting now happening as a result of the pandemic. Many systems are in disruption: the educational system, the health system, political governance. Almost everything is under threat, nothing is as stable as it looked before. And at the same time, new forms of collaboration and cooperation are happening. What one can see is that the old structures are there, but something new is emerging. We should be wise enough to support this, to empower what is emerging, not by abolishing the old structures, but by finding a new way of coexistence. Then we can co-create together new systems that are more responsive to today's challenges and more resilient regarding the requirements of the future.

Governments need to open up to bottom-up processes and what Cramer (2020) calls network governance, but how to you see the role of governments in also taking a more regulatory approach to push Circular Economy approaches?

Governments and policy development certainly play an important role in the development and implementation of Circular Economy roadmaps. Yet, one challenge is that, often, such roadmaps require collaboration between different ministries, which is usually lacking, because ministries are organized in silos and sometimes fiercely defend their territories. For example, the ministry for finances is promoting one strategy, the ministry for infrastructure something else, and the ministry of agriculture has totally different priorities. Yet, for example, in sustainable and circular food production, all would have to pull the same strings to transform the system. I have experienced that in Slovenia where I was the only person not from government sitting on an inter-ministerial board during the process of developing the roadmap (Godina Košir et al., 2018). There is definitely not enough inter-ministerial collaboration to introduce different management measurements, be it taxation, incentives

or subsidies, which are so important to further a Circular Economy. Hence, different government departments need to be aligned in order to further economic transformation. This will only work with a systemic approach, we have to walk together, and see how one thing affects another. This understanding is still not present in the mindsets of most government actors.

But there are also good examples in Europe, such as Finland with the continued national Circular Economy roadmap (SITRA, 2016); or the Netherlands with the examples described in Cramer's book; or France where there was the attempt made to reduce food waste. It was interesting that they introduced a law requiring restaurants to not throw away the food, but distributed it in a different way. It was a shock in the beginning, because the infrastructure had not been ready for that. People did not know what to do, but it was pushed by government, an solution emerged to the infrastructure challenges.

I think, what is important is to find a balance between top-down approaches from government that set a new frame, and bottom-up collaboration and network governance that either pushed for policies and orchestrates the actual implementation, supported by brokers or facilitators. Sometimes governments can push and then businesses will react, and vice versa. If businesses have the solutions, why wouldn't governments support those solutions? We see very often that despite the fact that there are no incentives or no benefits regarding, for example, taxations, companies are implementing circular solutions, because this is bringing them advantages on the market. It would be fair, if the governments supported this more proactively, and favour those companies that are on a transformative change route.

What was your experience in Slovenia creating the Circular Economy roadmap?

It was a government-led initiative roadmap at the beginning. We established our Circular Change platform – a private non-profit organization – back in 2016, then very much inspired by the Netherlands. During their EU presidency in 2016, Circular Economy had been in the focus. At that time, we started in Slovenia the process of developing a national vision and strategy. I was very active and vocal at that time, and even got the nickname “Circular Economy on two legs”, because I was pushing the topic so much and insisted that core elements of that strategy needed to go in crucial documents. So, indeed, the approach got written in the strategy. I was invited into an advisory group established by our Prime Minister back then for a green transition. I introduced the good examples of Finland and the Netherlands. We finally won the tender for developing the national Circular Economy roadmap, which became a very elaborate document on the basis of through consultations.⁵ Of course, we were hoping that Circular Economy action plans would follow. But the government changed and the priorities changed. Time was passing by. Today, after five years, I can say it is stagnation on the side of the government. Not much happened afterwards. This is the crucial point: unless either there is political support, or the circular strategies are already anchored in regulations and administrative procedures,

⁵ For more information, see <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b97bfa236099baf64b1a627/t/5f5f669663c71e3d42711d3a/1600087704493/bsf-Times-2020+f+27.pdf>.

the danger is high that even the best roadmaps get lost. The situation was different in Finland. When the new government came in, they continued supporting the Circular Economy roadmap. So, the question then really is, what kind of regulatory approaches or laws do national Circular Economy roadmaps need to feed in, so that they cannot be changed quickly by a new government. This means, the way such a transformative approach is anchored in structures and in regulations is crucially important.

There is an ongoing discussion that we need to move away from GDP, and there are many suggestions for new sustainability indicators or wellbeing indicators. What do you think is the role of metrics to further Circular Economy approaches?

We have had lengthy discussions around this topic for years now. For example, there is a still ongoing consultation process around metrics for a Circular Economy driven by the World Economic Forum⁶ that we are part of. It is also supported by the Dutch government. This was initiated for exactly that reason: to develop metrics that tell us how to measure progress towards a Circular Economy. This also means looking at a common understanding of what kind of metrics we need, then exploring what already exists, seeing what can be aligned and how can it be used, so that they are comparable between countries and continents. There is also the famous Circularity Gap Report.⁷ It highlights what is most urgent in the transition to Circular Economies in order to substantiate decisions in the right direction by governments and businesses in order to accelerate the change. They bring different stakeholders together and gather data on the state of circularity. This is built on the insight that access to data and knowledge is crucial to facilitate informed decisions. What the report also does, showing a way of developing country profiles so that people can see where the potential is for a circular transition – this encourages institutional actors and activists, to share the examples and push their agenda in their countries. This contributes to immense learning. What we are seeing is that, on the macro level, we are able to measure our material flow. Again, the example is The Netherlands, as they have introduced such methodology. It helps actors to see, where the country is best, what is coming in and what is getting out and what is reused and recycled. On the level of material flow this is still complicated, but relatively easy compared with the measuring of the many other aspects that are important in a Circular Economy. The issue is to really look at what we measure. If you are measuring something just to show how excellent you are, but not how this is contributing to the change, then these metrics are lacking one important dimension. For example, how do we measure when business models are changing, from production to services, how do we measure social aspects or the level and quality of jobs. Which jobs are more related to circularity, which are adjacent, but evenly important? I think there is still a lot of work to do and a lot to learn. Measuring how much primary material we use, is easy, but considering all the other components

⁶ For more information see: <https://pacecircular.org>, accessed 23rd June 2021.

⁷ For more information see <https://www.circularity-gap.world>: Circular Gap report methodology: https://assets.website-files.com/5e185aa4d27bcf348400ed82/5e4d0a24eb0887b1ddfa59b9_Measuring%20and%20Mapping%20Circularity%20-%20technical%20methodology%20document.pdf accessed 23rd June 2021.

that are also relevant for a Circular Economy, is much more difficult. What we need is not in place yet. In addition, there is a lot of competition on indicators. We are still looking to productively work with the competition between indicator developers and try to align them or harmonize them.

People often think, a Circular Economy is mainly about product and technological innovation, or artificial intelligence, less about social innovation. How do you see the issue of innovation for a Circular Economy?

The first thing is to understand what innovation actually is, knowing the difference between being creative and inventing something that can be proved in the market. Because only this is innovation. There is this gap: money is spent for inventions, but then they don't really go to market. Hence, money is lost and potentials are missed. In my view, the whole ecosystem for innovation around Circular Economy approaches is not yet functioning very well. There are so many start-ups, and many of them close down within five years. It is important how innovation ecosystems are embedded in societal processes, and in the transformation towards different and new forms of economics. In addition, indeed, people are so much focused on technological innovation. I would say we don't need so many new technological solutions. We have a lot of technological and digital solutions already, it is more about making them known, making them accessible to more people and understanding how to use them or to develop them further. In order for Circular Economy approaches to take root, we need much more social innovation, because the new role of an economy of the future must benefit social systems. What is needed is a mindset shift on the purpose of economic activities. So, this soft part of innovating and creating is becoming more and more important. For example, in agriculture, there is a lot of technology available that helps farmers to monitor in detail how much fertilizer they need and what the humidity of the soil is. So much technology is already there. But the question is, do we have the capability to enable the farmer to see his or her role as a guardian of an entire ecosystem that includes so much more than the specific output of their fields? What is his or her role in the community? How are the different actors related and interact and how can they collaborate to create an agriculture that is regenerative in the sense that it creates co-benefits for entire ecosystems? We are focusing too much on technology and not enough on the society and the interconnectedness of actors. But in the end, and this is of crucial importance, for the transformation to a Circular Economy, the human capital is at least as important as technology.

19.3 Conclusion: Collaborative Systemic Change

What are recommendations that you would give to governments on how to advance the transformation to a Circular Economy?

First, I would urge them that they really understand what a systemic approach is and how it could be furthered by the strong collaboration between different ministries.

Different line ministries need to work together, walk together into the same direction, and agree on a common agenda for a Circular Economy. Nobody should think, this is something that only the Ministry of Environment is responsible for. Hence, I would recommend to give priority to a Circular Economy approach on the national level, for example, by creating a guiding national roadmap. This topic must be high on the agenda: everybody, not only businesses, but also citizens need to understand what a Circular Economy is about. The society needs to reach an agreement that this is the way to go.

Second, I would recommend, based on a roadmap or a joint agenda, to agree on priorities. Because you cannot implement everything at the same time. So, for example, picking up three goals within an overall roadmap and making sure they get implemented and evaluated, is absolutely key. This will lead towards the first stage of the implementation of a Circular Economy. You achieve tangible results in a reasonable time span, and people can watch and experience the results. By doing this, you need to foster collaborations and networks on the ground as well as between government departments. The government cannot implement a Circular Economy alone, this requires collaboration between different stakeholders. My recommendation is to identify and use the potential that is already there, foster collaboration and start with those that are already interested and want to contribute to the change.

Third, I would strongly recommend to create a compelling narrative around a Circular Economy. How you communicate about it, what it means and how it will take the society into the future, is very important. If people think a Circular Economy is about sacrificing something, or about higher costs, or about suffering, they will not get inspired. Instead, the communication and narrative should be around wellbeing, the quality of life and how to preserve or even improve it. because in Europe, the quality of life is already very high. And getting across that a transformation to a Circular Economy needs everybody, every citizen, not only businesses. It is a joint story, bringing benefits to everybody.

References

- Braungart, M., McDonough, W., & Bollinger, A. (2007). Cradle-to-cradle design: Creating healthy emissions-a strategy for eco-effective product and system design. *Journal of Clean Production*, 15(13), 1337–1348.
- CIRIAG (International Reference Centre for the Life Cycle for Products, Processes and Services). (2015). *Circular economy: A critical literature review of concepts*. Polytechnique Montréal, Canada.
- CIRAIG (International Reference Centre for the Life Cycle of Products, Processes and Services). (2015). *Circular Economy: A Critical Literature Review of Concepts*. Polytechnique Montréal, Canada.
- COM (European Commission). (2015). Closing the Loop - An EU Action Plan for the Circular Economy. Communication From the Commission to the European Parliament. The Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.
- COM (European Commission). (2019). 640 final. The European Green deal. Retrieved from: <https://www.eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j9vvik7m1c3gyxp/vl4cnhyplort> 23rd June 2021

- COM (European Commission). (2020). A new Circular Economy Action Plan For a cleaner and more competitive Europe. Communication From the Commission to the European Parliament. The Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.
- Cramer, J. (2020). How network governance powers the Circular Economy. Ten guiding principles for building a Circular Economy, based on Dutch experiences. Publication of the Amsterdam Economic Board.
- Desrochers, P. (2002). Regional development and inter-industry recycling linkages: Some historical perspectives. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 14(2002), 49–65.
- Doz, Y., Hellström, E., Kosonen, M., Lähdemäki, J. & Wilson, K. (2017). Reflections on the “leadership under complexity” workshop. *SITRA working papers*. The Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation (EMAF). (2013). *Towards the circular economy*. London, UK. Ellen MacArthur Foundation
- Godina Košir, L., Korpar, N., Potočnik, J. et al. (2018). Roadmap Towards the Circular Economy in Slovenia. Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning of Slovenia: Ljubljana. Retrieved 23 June 2018 from <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b97bfa236099baf64b1a627/t/5beabb62f950b773950d1ce7/1542110257669/ROADMAP+TOWARDS+THE+CIRCULAR+ECONOMY+IN+SLOVENIA.pdf>
- Korhonen, J., Honkasalo, A., & Seppälä, J. (2018). Circular Economy: The Concept and its Limitations. *Ecological Economics*, 143(2018), 37–46.
- Kuenkel, P., Kuehn, E., Williamson, D., & Stucker, D. (2020). *Leading Transformative Change Collectively: A Practitioner Guide to Realizing the SDGs* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- OECD (Organization for Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2018). Global Material Resources Outlook to 2060. Economic Drivers and Environmental Consequences.
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K. Å., Persson, F. S., Chapin, III, Lambin, E. & Foley, J. (2009). Planetary boundaries: Exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2), 32.
- SITRA. (2016). *Leading the cycle. Finnish road map to a circular economy 2016–2025*. The Finnish Innovation Fund, Sitra Studie 121. <https://media.sitra.fi/2017/02/28142644/Selvityksia121.pdf>.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.