**Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud.** 2025; 5(3):828-832

**Received:** 11-04-2025
**Accepted:** 21-05-2025

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

# Municipal Solid Waste Management in Lagos and Moscow: A Comprehensive Comparative Analysis

**Ogbu Nneamaka Augustina**
Institute of Environmental Engineering, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow, Russia

Corresponding Author: **Ogbu Nneamaka Augustina**

**Abstract**
This comparative analysis examines municipal solid waste management (MSWM) systems in Lagos, Nigeria, and Moscow, Russia—two major metropolitan areas representing distinct socioeconomic contexts but facing similar waste management challenges. The study investigates waste generation patterns, collection systems, recycling approaches, public participation, environmental impacts, and governance frameworks in both cities.
Lagos operates a hybrid system combining formal authorities (LAWMA) with informal waste collectors who provide critical collection services and drive resource recovery where formal systems fall short. The city faces projections of generating 13 million tonnes of municipal waste by 2025, with significant environmental contamination and occupational health hazards for waste workers. Moscow employs a more centralized, technology-focused approach emphasizing waste-to-energy initiatives and circular economy principles, though implementation faces substantial public resistance to technologies like incineration.
Both cities struggle with inadequate waste segregation, public awareness gaps, and environmental concerns despite their different approaches. Lagos benefits from an adaptable informal economy that creates livelihoods and material recovery pathways, while Moscow pursues formal environmental assessments and technological solutions. The analysis reveals that while Lagos must integrate its informal sector into policy frameworks, Moscow faces challenges with public trust and technology acceptance. Both cities require tailored strategies addressing their unique cultural and systemic contexts to achieve sustainable waste management.

**Keywords:** Municipal Solid Waste Management, Informal Waste Sector, Waste-to-Energy, Environmental Sustainability

## 1. Introduction

As cities continue to grow and consumption patterns evolve, waste generation increases, placing greater pressure on existing management systems. Urbanization and rapid population growth have intensified the challenge of managing municipal solid waste (MSW) in cities worldwide. Lagos, Nigeria, and Moscow, Russia, exemplify two contrasting yet instructive cases of how large metropolitan areas address the complexities of waste generation, collection, and disposal. While Lagos contends with infrastructural limitations and relies heavily on a mix of formal and informal waste management actors, Moscow is navigating a period of transformation marked by regulatory reforms and technological modernization. Both cities face mounting waste volumes, public health risks, and environmental pressures, yet their strategies reflect distinct socioeconomic realities and policy priorities. By examining their respective approaches to waste management—ranging from informal sector integration in Lagos to centralized, technology-driven solutions in Moscow—this article aims to uncover the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement within each system. The comparative analysis not only highlights the unique challenges encountered by developing and transitioning economies but also underscores the universal need for adaptive, inclusive, and sustainable waste management practices in the face of urban growth.

## 2. Waste Generation and Trends

### 2.1 Lagos: Rapid Growth in Waste Production

As Nigeria's economic hub and one of the most populous cities in Africa, Lagos generates vast amounts of waste. Projections indicate that by 2025, the city will add 13 million tonnes of municipal waste to its current total. This surge poses significant health risks to residents near landfills, especially due to groundwater contamination [1].

The city's waste composition is dominated by organic materials (food waste), plastics, and nylon packaging. These materials reflect consumption patterns and highlight the lack of effective sorting mechanisms [2, 3]. While the composition offers opportunities for resource recovery (e.g., composting organic waste), it also underscores the challenges of managing diverse waste streams.

### 2.2 Moscow: Evolving Consumption Patterns

Moscow's waste profile reflects its transition from a Soviet-era "deficit society" to a modern "consumer society." Unlike some Western nations that are adopting environmentally conscious consumption habits, Russia is at a crossroads regarding its approach to consumption and waste management [4].

Moscow's MSW stream is heavily burdened by non-biodegradable materials like plastics [5]. Despite efforts to encourage recycling and sorting, progress remains slow [5]. The Federal Service for State Statistics (Rosstat) reports that separate collection and recycling systems are underdeveloped in Moscow compared to other regions [3, 6].

### 2.3 Comparative Perspective on Waste Generation

Both cities face mounting challenges due to increasing waste volumes. Lagos deals with a more balanced mix of organic and inorganic waste, while Moscow struggles primarily with plastics and other non-biodegradable materials. These differences necessitate tailored strategies for waste processing and recovery.

## 3. Collection Systems and Infrastructure

### 3.1 Lagos: Overwhelmed Services and Informal Solutions

The collection service in some parts of Lagos has been widely criticized as inefficient despite weekly average evacuation exercises [7]. The fundamental problem is that waste accumulation has exceeded the capacity of existing storage and collection facilities, resulting in an unclean environment and significant environmental degradation [7]. This service gap affects a large portion of the population, with less than half of Lagos residents receiving regular and efficient waste services due to financial constraints and poor infrastructure [8].

This deficiency in formal waste services has created space for a vibrant informal waste sector that provides critical collection services where the formal system falls short [8, 9]. The informal sector not only fills service gaps but also drives resource recovery through collecting recyclable materials, creating important livelihoods for many Lagos residents [9].

### 3.2 Moscow: Public Dissatisfaction and Emerging Systems

In Moscow and the surrounding region, public dissatisfaction with solid waste management is notably high [10]. Research reveals significant concerns about the effectiveness of public authorities in improving waste management systems. This dissatisfaction is compounded by controversy surrounding technological solutions, with over 70% of respondents expressing negative attitudes toward the construction of incinerators in the region [10].

Moscow has been exploring various waste processing technologies, with studies examining the features of waste streams entering the waste processing system, including quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the morphological composition [11]. There have been efforts to analyze pollutant emissions generated at different stages of waste sorting and processing to identify problematic areas and priority eco-toxicants [11].

### 3.3 Comparative Analysis of Collection Efficiency

Both cities struggle with collection inefficiencies, but the nature of these challenges differs significantly. Lagos has developed a dual system where informal collectors complement formal services, creating a complex but somewhat functional adaptation to infrastructure limitations. Moscow, with its post-Soviet infrastructure, faces different challenges related to modernizing systems while addressing public concerns about technological solutions. Public trust in waste management authorities appears to be a more significant factor in Moscow than in Lagos.

## 4. Recycling and Resource Recovery

### 4.1 Lagos: The Crucial Role of the Informal Sector

One of the most distinctive features of Lagos's waste management system is the prominent role of the informal sector in waste collection and recycling. Research indicates that informal recycling activities contribute more significantly to the overall recycling rate of Lagos state than formal sector initiatives [8]. This informal economy creates important material recovery pathways and also enables informal transboundary trade of recyclable materials throughout the West African sub-region [9].

Despite these important contributions, the rate of municipal solid waste generation still outweighs the combined capacity of present management strategies and recycling firms in Lagos State [12]. This indicates a need for expanded formal recycling infrastructure while recognizing and potentially integrating the existing informal waste economy.

### 4.2 Moscow: Technological Assessment and Implementation Challenges

Moscow has taken a more technology-focused approach to resource recovery, with formal studies evaluating various Waste to Energy (WTE) options for the Moscow region [13]. These assessments used analytical hierarchy process (AHP) to compare technologies including landfill biogas, anaerobic digestion, incineration, and refuse derived fuel (RDF) [13]. The analysis determined that landfill biogas is the preferred option with the highest global weight (0.448), followed by anaerobic digestion (0.320), incineration (0.138), and RDF (0.094) [13].

Despite these technological assessments, implementation faces significant barriers related to public perception and infrastructure development. The need for greater development of the processing industry has been identified, along with expanded public education on waste management principles [10].

### 4.3 Comparative Resource Recovery Approaches

The contrast between Lagos and Moscow represents two fundamentally different approaches to resource recovery. Lagos has developed an organic, largely informal system driven by economic necessity and entrepreneurship, while Moscow has pursued a more top-down, technologically-driven approach. Each system has strengths and limitations – Lagos's informal system provides livelihoods and adaptability but lacks regulation and safety standards, while

Moscow's technological focus may offer efficiency but faces implementation challenges and public resistance.

## 5. Public Awareness and Participation

### 5.1 Lagos: Limited Waste Sorting Despite Infrastructure

Public participation in waste sorting remains low in Lagos despite some basic infrastructure being in place. Studies indicate that although the majority of respondents (65%) had waste bins/bags assigned to their houses, approximately 73.86% did not sort their wastes [14]. This disconnect between available infrastructure and actual behavior suggests issues with public awareness, incentives, or the overall waste management system design.

The lack of waste sorting at the source creates downstream complications, as wastes from different sources (including potentially hazardous materials) are commonly co-disposed in open dumpsites [15]. This practice increases environmental risks and reduces the feasibility of resource recovery.

### 5.2 Moscow: Knowledge Gaps and Resistance to Certain Technologies

Moscow faces significant challenges with public awareness and acceptance of waste management practices. Research reveals that more than 40% of residents are not aware of the principles of garbage sorting [10]. This knowledge gap presents a substantial barrier to implementing effective source separation and recycling programs.

Additionally, there is strong public resistance to certain waste technologies, particularly incineration. More than 70% of Moscow region respondents expressed negative attitudes toward the construction of incinerators [10], limiting the feasibility of this treatment option despite its potential role in an integrated waste management system.

### 5.3 Comparative Public Engagement Analysis

Both cities face substantial challenges with public participation in waste sorting and management. The barriers appear somewhat different – in Lagos, the issue may be more related to systemic limitations and incentives, while in Moscow, knowledge gaps and specific technological concerns dominate. Both cities would benefit from improved public education and engagement strategies, though these would need to be tailored to the specific cultural and systemic contexts of each location.

## 6. Environmental and Health Impacts

### 6.1 Lagos: Contamination and Occupational Hazards

The environmental and health impacts of Lagos's waste management system are significant and well-documented. Studies have found higher concentrations of heavy metals (Co, Zn, Ni, and Mn) in soil samples from waste-affected areas compared to control samples [14]. This contamination poses risks to both environmental and human health in surrounding communities.

Occupational health hazards for waste handlers are also substantial. Personal protective equipment is not used by many waste managers in Lagos, increasing their exposure to hazardous materials [15]. The lack of waste segregation at source means waste workers often handle mixed waste streams that may contain dangerous materials, leading to skin infections and other health conditions [15].

### 6.2 Moscow: Environmental Assessment and Technological Solutions

Moscow's approach has included more formal assessment of environmental impacts from waste processing. Studies have analyzed the composition of pollutant emissions generated at different stages of waste sorting and processing, identifying the most problematic areas and priority eco-toxicants [11]. This scientific approach provides a basis for targeted mitigation measures.

The Moscow region has also considered environmental criteria in its assessment of various waste-to-energy (WTE) technologies, with sensitivity analysis showing that the priorities of WTE alternatives are particularly sensitive to environmental considerations [13].

### 6.3 Comparative Environmental Management

Both cities face substantial environmental challenges from waste management, but their approaches to assessment and mitigation differ considerably. Lagos appears to have more immediate and severe environmental and health impacts, particularly related to open dumping and lack of protective measures for waste workers. Moscow has invested more in formal environmental assessment and technological solutions, though implementation gaps remain significant. Both cities would benefit from stronger environmental monitoring and enforcement mechanisms.

## 7. Governance and Policy Frameworks

### 7.1 Lagos: Reform Efforts and Integration Challenges

Lagos has been pursuing reforms in its solid waste policy, with increasing investments and management practices in the formal economy [9]. However, the role of the informal economy in creating livelihoods and enabling material recovery remains somewhat disconnected from formal policy [9].

Studies suggest that integrating the informal economy into MSWM policy frameworks offers potential for more inclusive development while enabling sustainable waste management [9]. This integration remains a challenge but represents an important opportunity for systemic improvement.

### 7.2 Moscow: Public Satisfaction and Implementation Gaps

The governance of waste management in Moscow faces significant challenges related to public trust and policy implementation. High levels of public dissatisfaction with waste management authorities have been documented [10], suggesting a disconnect between policy goals and public perception of outcomes.

Recommendations have focused on the need to review and improve waste management strategies, with emphasis on developing the processing industry and expanding public education initiatives [10]. The effective implementation of these recommendations remains an ongoing challenge.

### 7.3 Comparative Governance Analysis

Both cities face governance challenges in waste management, though the nature of these challenges differs. Lagos must navigate the complex relationship between formal and informal waste sectors, seeking integration that preserves livelihoods while improving environmental outcomes. Moscow faces challenges related to public trust and technology implementation, requiring improved communication and demonstration of effective results. Both cities would benefit from more transparent, participatory governance approaches that engage stakeholders at multiple levels.

## 8. Conclusion and Recommendation

The comparative analysis of municipal solid waste management (MSWM) in Lagos and Moscow reveals two cities at different developmental stages facing similar challenges but employing distinct approaches shaped by their unique socioeconomic contexts.

Lagos operates through a hybrid system where the formal sector (LAWMA) works alongside a vibrant informal waste economy that provides critical collection services and drives resource recovery. Despite this adaptability, Lagos struggles with overwhelming waste volumes, inefficient collection systems, limited waste segregation, and significant environmental and health impacts, particularly for waste workers exposed to hazardous materials without proper protection.

Moscow, with its post-Soviet infrastructure, has adopted a more technology-focused, centralized approach to waste management. The city is undergoing regulatory reforms aimed at modernizing its MSWM system with emphasis on circular economy principles, increased recycling, and waste-to-energy initiatives. However, Moscow faces considerable public resistance to new waste treatment facilities (particularly incinerators) and low public awareness regarding waste sorting principles.

Both cities demonstrate that effective MSWM requires more than technical solutions alone. Lagos could benefit from formalizing and integrating its informal waste sector while improving environmental standards and worker safety. Moscow needs to address the disconnect between its technological ambitions and public acceptance, focusing on transparency and community engagement.

The comparison highlights how socioeconomic contexts shape waste management approaches, with Lagos developing bottom-up, labor-intensive solutions driven by necessity, while Moscow pursues top-down, technology-driven strategies. For both cities, the path forward requires balancing technological innovation with social inclusion, environmental protection, and public participation to create sustainable waste management systems that can meet the challenges of rapidly growing urban populations and changing consumption patterns.

## 9. Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my project supervisor, Professor Kapralova Daria, for her invaluable guidance, encouragement, and support throughout the course of this research. Her expert insights, constructive feedback, and unwavering patience have been instrumental in shaping the direction and quality of this work. Thank you for inspiring me to pursue my best and for your continuous support.

## 10. References

1. Zhang S, Lv Y, Yang H, Han Y, Peng J, Lan J, *et al*. Monitoring and Quantitative Human Risk Assessment of Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Using Integrated Satellite-UAV-Ground Survey Approach. Remote. Sens. 2021; 13:4496.
2. Sajjad F, Chhoker GS, Thirunavukkarasu GS, Jamei E, Seyedmahmoudian M, Horan B, *et al*. A study on small-scale municipal solid waste management practices and its impact on carbon emission and mitigation cost. International Journal of Smart Grid and Clean Energy, 2019.
3. Sohkhlet D, Nagargoje S. Municipal Solid Waste Management: A comparative study between Sydney (Australia) and Pune (India). E3S Web of Conferences, 2020.
4. Asaturian D, Erguneva V. To Eat or Not to Eat? The Modern Consumption Model Through the Prism of Food Wasting: Moscow Citizens Case. Journal of Economic Sociology. 2018; 19:167-194.
5. Krelberg AB. Algorithm for solving one of the tasks of the closed-loop economies – how to return municipal solid waste made of plastic to production. Russian Journal of Industrial Economics, 2024.
6. Zhou C, Ma S, Yu X, Chen Z, Liu J, Yan L. A comparison study of bottom-up and top-down methods for analyzing the physical composition of municipal solid waste. Journal of Industrial Ecology. 2021; 26:240-251.
7. Olaniyi TK, Ajayi A. A Road Map for Sustainable Municipal Solid Waste Management In Lagos: Using Scotland As A Case Study Of Best Practice. Advances in Multidisciplinary and scientific Research Journal Publication, 2023.
8. Salau O, Sen L, Osho S, Adejonwo-Osho O. Empirical Investigation of Formal and Informal Sectors in Waste Recycling of the Municipal Waste Management System of Developing Countries: The Case Study of Lagos State, 2016.
9. Mbah PO, Ezeibe CC, Ezirim GE, Onyishi CJ, Nzeadibe TC. Value reclamation from informal municipal solid waste management: Green neoliberalism and inclusive development in Lagos, Nigeria. Local Environment. 2019; 24:949-967.
10. Ryabova TM, Amerslanova EK. The main directions in the field of solid municipal waste disposal in the Moscow region: Problems and prospects. Социодинамика, 2022.
11. Kharlamova MD, Spirin M, Lukanin AV, Romanovskaya KS, Nikulina C, Cherepanova E. Environmental and Technological Aspects of the Functioning of Municipal Solid Waste Recycling Complexes (on the Example of the Moscow Region). Ecology and Industry of Russia, 2024.
12. Chidiebere OA, Abubakar M, Shabako JG. municipal solid waste management in African cities: A case study of Lagos State, Nigeria. Malaysian Journal of Civil Engineering. 2018; 30(1).
13. Kurbatova AS, Abu-Qdais HA. Using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis to Select Waste to Energy Technology for a Mega City: The Case of Moscow. Sustainability, 2020.
14. Yakubu J, Udochukwu U. Impact of Solid Waste on Soil Bacterial and the Municipal Waste Management in Some Communities of Lagos Island. Nigerian Journal of Biotechnology, 2023.
15. Adeyi AA, Adeyemi AM. Potential occupational health effects of municipal solid waste management in

Nigeria, the case of Lagos and Ibadan. Ife Journal of Science, 2019.