INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY FUTURISTIC DEVELOPMENT

Integrated Waste-to-Energy Policy Model for Urban Sustainability in West Africa

Mohammed Lawal Giwah [1*], Zamathula Sikhakhane Nwokediegwu [2], Emmanuel Augustine Etukudoh [3], Ebimor Yinka Gbabo [4]

[1] Kwara State Government - Ilorin, Nigeria
[2] Independent Researcher, Durban, South Africa
[3] Independent Researcher, Nigeria
[4] Nuclear Security Technologies (UK), UK

* Corresponding Author: **Mohammed Lawal Giwah**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3618
E-ISSN: 3051-3626
Volume: 02
Issue: 01
January - June 2021
Received: 02-01-2021
Accepted: 03-02-2021
Published: 03-04-2021
Page No: 01-07

Abstract
Rapid urbanization in West Africa has intensified solid waste management challenges, exacerbating environmental degradation and energy deficits in urban centers. This paper proposes an integrated waste-to-energy policy model to enhance urban sustainability by aligning institutional coordination, technology deployment, and adaptive governance. Drawing from circular economy principles, urban metabolism theory, and systems thinking, the model addresses institutional fragmentation, technical-financial constraints, and social acceptance issues that impede waste-to-energy implementation. The model emphasizes multi-level governance alignment, tailored technology selection, and innovative financing mechanisms, supported by robust data systems for monitoring and iterative policy adaptation. This integrated approach fosters synergies between waste management and renewable energy generation, reducing landfill reliance while improving energy security. The framework also prioritizes social inclusion by integrating informal waste workers and promoting community engagement. By linking waste-to-energy initiatives to broader urban sustainability goals, this model supports climate change mitigation, energy diversification, and resilient urban planning in West African cities. It offers a comprehensive roadmap for policymakers, private sector actors, civil society, and academia to overcome structural barriers and institutionalize sustainable waste-to-energy practices collaboratively. The findings underscore the strategic potential of integrated policy frameworks to transform urban waste challenges into sustainable energy solutions, advancing environmental, economic, and social outcomes across the region.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMFD.2021.2.1.1-7

Keywords: Waste-to-Energy, Urban Sustainability, Circular Economy, Policy Integration, West Africa, Institutional Coordination

1. Introduction

1.1 Urban Waste Challenges in West Africa

Rapid urbanization in West Africa has significantly outpaced the development of waste management infrastructure, creating mounting environmental and public health challenges. Cities such as Lagos, Accra, Abidjan, and Dakar have seen population booms that have led to increased consumption, waste generation, and urban sprawl [1]. With most urban centers lacking efficient waste collection and processing systems, an estimated 30–50% of generated solid waste is either uncollected or improperly disposed of in open dumpsites, waterways, and residential zones [2, 3].

The consequences of this mismanagement are profound. Uncollected waste contributes to the blockage of drainage systems, exacerbating urban flooding and increasing vulnerability to waterborne diseases like cholera and typhoid [4, 5].

Open burning of waste releases harmful pollutants into the air, affecting respiratory health, particularly among children and vulnerable populations. Additionally, the leaching of toxic substances from unregulated dumpsites contaminates soil and groundwater, threatening urban agriculture and clean water access. These environmental and health burdens disproportionately affect low-income communities and informal settlements that are often underserved by municipal services [6, 7].

Socio-economically, poor waste governance undermines urban productivity, deters tourism, and increases municipal costs. The absence of structured waste management limits job creation potential in formal recycling and energy recovery sectors while sustaining an informal economy plagued by unsafe working conditions [8, 9]. Addressing urban waste challenges in West Africa requires a paradigm shift that combines environmental protection, energy innovation, and inclusive policy reform. This sets the stage for exploring waste-to-energy as a sustainable, cross-cutting strategy [10].

1.2 Waste-to-Energy as a Sustainability Strategy

Waste-to-energy (WtE) refers to the process of converting municipal solid waste into usable forms of energy, such as electricity, heat, or fuel, through technologies like incineration, anaerobic digestion, gasification, or pyrolysis. This approach addresses two critical urban challenges simultaneously: the mounting burden of waste disposal and the persistent demand for reliable, affordable energy. As cities struggle with both landfill overflow and energy insecurity, WtE presents an opportunity to close the loop between environmental management and energy supply [11, 12].

The energy-environment nexus is particularly relevant in regions where energy access remains limited and urban waste accumulation threatens ecological balance. In many West African cities, electricity deficits co-exist with massive volumes of unprocessed waste, making integrated WtE systems both practical and necessary [13, 14]. By treating waste as a resource rather than a liability, cities can reduce landfill dependence, cut greenhouse gas emissions, and supplement their energy mix with locally generated, renewable sources. This transition supports broader sustainability goals, including climate mitigation and energy diversification [15, 16].

WtE also aligns with the principles of a circular economy, which emphasizes minimizing waste, extending product lifecycles, and recovering resources. Instead of relying solely on linear systems of consumption and disposal, WtE integrates with broader urban resilience strategies to ensure long-term environmental and socio-economic stability. By embedding WtE within urban planning and energy policies, cities can improve resource efficiency, enhance public health, and promote green employment. Therefore, WtE is not only a technological solution but a transformative strategy for sustainable urban development [17].

1.3 Objectives and Significance of the Policy Model

The central objective of this paper is to develop an integrated policy model that facilitates the adoption and scalability of WtE systems as a core component of urban sustainability in West Africa. While isolated WtE initiatives exist across the region, they often suffer from poor coordination, policy fragmentation, and a lack of institutional support. This model aims to provide a cohesive framework that aligns environmental goals, energy planning, regulatory frameworks, and stakeholder engagement to deliver systemic impact.

By synthesizing key principles from circular economy theory, integrated waste management, and sustainable energy transitions, the policy model offers governments and municipal planners a structured pathway for WtE integration. The model emphasizes multi-level governance, inclusive stakeholder consultation, and evidence-based planning. Its goal is not only to ensure effective waste reduction and energy generation but also to embed resilience, equity, and innovation into urban governance systems. In doing so, it addresses both immediate service delivery challenges and long-term development priorities.

The significance of this model lies in its capacity to link waste management with sustainable energy access, two pressing issues for West African cities. It offers a means to reduce landfill reliance, enhance energy self-sufficiency, and create green jobs, all while improving urban environmental quality. As cities increasingly become the epicenters of population growth and economic activity, developing integrated, adaptive, and context-specific WtE policies is essential for steering the region toward a sustainable urban future.

2. Theoretical and Policy Foundations

2.1 Urban Sustainability and Circular Economy Concepts

Urban sustainability refers to the long-term resilience of cities to environmental, social, and economic pressures. Theoretical frameworks underpinning sustainability emphasize the efficient use of resources, equitable service delivery, and ecological integrity [18, 19]. Within this context, waste generation and management are crucial indicators of urban sustainability, as they reflect both consumption patterns and environmental stewardship. Sustainable cities must therefore minimize environmental footprints while maximizing the utility of natural and human systems [20, 21].

The circular economy expands upon traditional sustainability by advocating for closed-loop systems in which materials are reused, recycled, or recovered instead of discarded. This model challenges the linear "take-make-dispose" paradigm by promoting strategies that retain value within the system [22]. In the context of waste, this involves redesigning material flows to reduce resource extraction, extend product life cycles, and reintegrate waste outputs as new inputs. Waste-to-energy plays a vital role in this framework by recovering value from residual waste streams that cannot be otherwise recycled [23, 24].

Urban metabolism theory provides further insight into how cities consume and transform resources. It conceptualizes cities as living systems with inputs (like water, energy, and raw materials) and outputs (including waste and emissions). Zero-waste strategies, informed by this metabolic perspective, aim to minimize waste flows and encourage resource optimization. Integrating waste-to-energy within these strategies ensures that energy recovery complements other circular economy goals, contributing to sustainable urban transitions across West African cities [25].

2.2 Integrated Waste Management Frameworks

Integrated waste management (IWM) is a strategic approach that combines multiple methods of handling waste, including reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery, and disposal, into a coherent system tailored to specific local contexts [26, 27]. At its core, IWM follows a waste management hierarchy that prioritizes prevention and minimization at the top, followed by reuse, material recovery, energy recovery, and finally, safe disposal. This hierarchy guides cities in designing waste systems that are both environmentally and economically efficient [28].

Incorporating waste-to-energy into the IWM framework ensures that residual waste, those fractions that cannot be recycled, are not relegated to landfills but transformed into usable energy. This recovery process reduces environmental pollution and contributes to energy generation goals. However, WtE must be balanced with the need to maximize material recycling and ensure emissions compliance. Misapplied WtE systems, particularly those that are poorly regulated or over-capacitated, can undermine recycling efforts and contribute to environmental harm [29].

Public policy plays a critical role in operationalizing IWM. Effective policies set clear standards for waste segregation, treatment, and disposal, while also incentivizing resource recovery and private sector participation. Institutional coordination is equally important, requiring alignment across environmental agencies, energy ministries, and municipal authorities. In West Africa, where institutional fragmentation often impedes progress, integrated policy frameworks are essential for harmonizing goals, streamlining responsibilities, and ensuring that WtE initiatives are part of a broader sustainability agenda.

2.3 Policy Integration and Systems Thinking

Policy integration refers to the deliberate coordination of objectives, instruments, and responsibilities across different sectors and governance levels. In the context of urban waste and energy management, integration is essential because these issues intersect with environmental protection, public health, infrastructure, economic development, and social equity. Fragmented policy environments, where waste management, energy planning, and urban development operate in silos, lead to inefficiencies, overlaps, and missed opportunities for synergy [30, 31].

Systems thinking offers a valuable conceptual tool for addressing this complexity. It emphasizes the interdependence of components within a system and the importance of feedback loops, leverage points, and dynamic adaptation [32]. Applied to policy design, systems thinking encourages a holistic perspective that accounts for multiple stakeholders, unintended consequences, and long-term sustainability. This approach is particularly relevant in rapidly urbanizing contexts like West Africa, where cities face layered challenges and resource constraints [33].

Embedding systems thinking into urban policy development enables more responsive, resilient, and inclusive governance. For example, integrating waste data with energy forecasts and health indicators can inform better decision-making and investment planning. Likewise, participatory policy design processes can align community needs with institutional mandates. By adopting a systems-based, integrated approach to WtE policy, West African cities can design governance structures that are better equipped to manage complexity and deliver sustainable urban outcomes [34].

3. Structural and Implementation Barriers

3.1 Institutional and Regulatory Gaps

A significant barrier to the successful implementation of waste-to-energy initiatives in West African urban contexts is the presence of weak governance structures and fragmented institutional mandates. Many cities suffer from overlapping responsibilities among government agencies, leading to confusion over jurisdiction and duplication of efforts. Environmental agencies, municipal waste departments, and energy ministries often operate independently without adequate coordination, resulting in policy misalignment and ineffective program execution [35, 36].

Moreover, regulatory frameworks related to waste management and energy production are frequently outdated or incomplete, lacking clear guidelines for emerging technologies like waste-to-energy. This regulatory ambiguity discourages private sector investment and innovation, as project developers face uncertainties regarding licensing, emissions standards, and tariff structures. Even where policies exist, enforcement is often weak due to limited institutional capacity, inadequate monitoring mechanisms, and sometimes political interference [37, 38].

Planning capacity is another critical constraint. Many municipalities lack the technical expertise and resources necessary to develop comprehensive waste management plans that integrate energy recovery components. Without data-driven strategies and strategic foresight, efforts remain piecemeal and reactive. Strengthening institutional frameworks requires clearer mandates, improved inter-agency collaboration, and capacity building focused on regulatory enforcement and integrated planning to ensure that waste-to-energy becomes a viable pillar of urban sustainability [39, 40].

3.2 Technical and Financial Constraints

Technical and financial limitations further complicate the deployment of waste-to-energy systems. Infrastructure deficits such as insufficient waste collection networks, lack of sorting and preprocessing facilities, and unreliable electricity grids hinder the operational feasibility of many projects [41, 42]. Waste-to-energy technologies also require tailored designs that match local waste compositions, which often vary widely and include high moisture and organic content, posing challenges for incineration or gasification systems [43].

Capital limitations remain a major hurdle. Waste-to-energy plants demand substantial upfront investment for technology acquisition, site preparation, and integration with existing urban infrastructure. Many West African cities face constrained fiscal space and rely heavily on donor funding, which can be unpredictable and tied to short-term projects. Private investors are often reluctant to engage due to perceived financial risks, regulatory uncertainty, and long payback periods [36, 44].

Additionally, financing models for waste-to-energy projects are still evolving in the region, with limited access to affordable credit, risk guarantees, and innovative funding mechanisms such as green bonds. Without robust financial frameworks that de-risk investment and ensure sustainable revenue streams, potentially through power purchase agreements or tipping fees, scaling waste-to-energy solutions remains challenging. Addressing these technical and financial constraints is crucial to move from pilot initiatives toward widespread urban application [45].

3.3 Social Acceptance and Informality Issues

The success of waste-to-energy policies is also contingent upon social acceptance and addressing the realities of informality in waste management. Public awareness of waste segregation, recycling benefits, and energy recovery remains limited in many West African urban communities [46]. Cultural attitudes that associate waste with dirt and disease can fuel resistance to new waste processing facilities, often perceived as nuisances or health hazards. This lack of community buy-in may lead to protests, sabotage, or low participation in waste separation programs [47].

Moreover, informal waste workers, scavengers and recyclers who depend on waste picking for their livelihoods, play a significant but often overlooked role in the urban waste ecosystem. Integrating these workers into formal waste management systems, including waste-to-energy supply chains, is both a social equity issue and a practical necessity. Exclusion risks exacerbating poverty and social tensions, while inclusion can enhance waste collection efficiency and promote social cohesion [48].

Social inclusion strategies should therefore be embedded within the policy model to foster behavioral change and ensure equitable participation. Awareness campaigns, capacity building, and stakeholder engagement must accompany technological investments. By recognizing and empowering informal actors alongside modern technologies, cities can create more inclusive, sustainable, and socially just waste-to-energy systems [49, 50].

4. Components of the Integrated Policy Model

4.1 Multi-level Policy Coordination

Effective waste-to-energy implementation necessitates coherent policy coordination across multiple governance levels, national, municipal, and regional. National governments play a pivotal role by setting overarching frameworks, standards, and incentives that guide urban waste management and energy production. Municipal authorities, being closest to service delivery, must translate these national policies into actionable plans that address local realities, infrastructure, and community engagement. Regional collaboration is also critical, particularly for managing waste flows across city boundaries and sharing technical expertise and financial resources [51].

Clear institutional roles and mandates reduce overlaps and foster accountability. Defining responsibilities for waste collection, processing, environmental compliance, and energy distribution within and across agencies enables streamlined operations. Joint planning platforms, such as intergovernmental committees or task forces, provide forums for dialogue, coordination, and conflict resolution. These platforms also facilitate partnerships with private sector actors, civil society, and international donors, ensuring diverse stakeholder input into policy formulation and implementation [52, 53].

Vertical and horizontal alignment strengthens policy coherence and resource optimization. For example, national energy policies should incorporate waste-to-energy targets that local governments can operationalize through urban development plans and public service mandates. Simultaneously, municipal waste strategies should connect with regional environmental goals and energy grid expansion initiatives. This multi-level integration creates a synergistic policy ecosystem capable of advancing sustainable urban waste-to-energy solutions [54].

4.2 Technology, Infrastructure, and Investment Strategies

Choosing appropriate waste-to-energy technologies is essential to ensuring both environmental performance and economic viability. Technology selection must consider the composition of urban waste streams, local climatic conditions, available skills, and maintenance capacity. Common technologies include anaerobic digestion for organic waste, incineration with energy recovery for mixed waste, and gasification for cleaner fuels. The policy model advocates technology diversity tailored to specific urban contexts to maximize resource recovery while minimizing emissions [55].

Infrastructure planning involves the development of sorting facilities, transfer stations, energy conversion plants, and grid connections. Adequate infrastructure enables efficient waste processing and reliable energy delivery. Integrating waste-to-energy plants within broader urban infrastructure plans, such as transportation, water management, and energy grids, ensures system compatibility and operational resilience.

Financing remains a cornerstone challenge. The model promotes blended financing strategies combining public funds, private investments, and international climate finance. Public-private partnerships (PPPs) offer mechanisms to leverage private sector expertise and capital while ensuring public oversight. Innovative financing instruments, such as green bonds, feed-in tariffs, and risk guarantees, can incentivize investment and lower costs. The policy model emphasizes creating enabling environments for investors, including transparent regulations, contractual clarity, and supportive subsidies [56, 57].

4.3 Data Systems, Monitoring, and Adaptation Mechanisms

Reliable data systems are fundamental for evidence-based policy design and ongoing performance evaluation. Urban waste characterization, energy generation metrics, emission levels, and financial data must be collected, analyzed, and shared systematically. Geographic information systems (GIS), smart sensors, and digital platforms can enhance real-time monitoring and spatial analysis, providing decision-makers with actionable insights [58].

Monitoring frameworks should incorporate key performance indicators aligned with environmental standards, energy output, economic efficiency, and social impact. Transparent reporting mechanisms increase accountability and build public trust. Feedback loops, enabled by continuous data flow, allow policymakers to identify operational bottlenecks, emerging risks, and opportunities for improvement.

Adaptive governance involves iterative learning processes that respond dynamically to feedback and evolving conditions. Pilot projects, impact assessments, and stakeholder consultations contribute to a learning culture within institutions. Embedding flexibility within regulatory frameworks and investment models permits timely adjustments without compromising policy goals. Ultimately, data-driven adaptation ensures that waste-to-energy policies remain relevant, effective, and resilient amid the complexities of urban West African environments [59].

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper has articulated an integrated waste-to-energy policy model designed to overcome the multifaceted challenges of urban waste management and energy access in West Africa. The model addresses institutional fragmentation, technical and financial constraints, and social acceptance barriers by proposing multi-level governance coordination, context-specific technology and infrastructure strategies, and robust data-driven adaptive mechanisms. These solutions collectively respond to the urgent need for sustainable and resilient urban development pathways.

The theoretical contribution of this work lies in synthesizing circular economy principles, urban sustainability concepts, and systems thinking into a cohesive framework tailored to the West African context. By explicitly linking waste management with energy policy and urban planning, the model advances the discourse beyond siloed approaches. It demonstrates how waste-to-energy can function as a nexus for environmental protection, economic development, and social inclusion, fostering a more holistic understanding of urban sustainability.

From a policy perspective, the model provides practical guidance for harmonizing institutional roles, incentivizing investments, and embedding continuous learning processes. This integrated approach enhances the potential for scalable and replicable waste-to-energy solutions. It underscores the importance of aligning policy objectives with local realities while maintaining flexibility to adapt to dynamic urban challenges. Overall, the model offers a valuable roadmap for policymakers seeking to transition West African cities toward sustainable energy and waste management futures.

The integrated policy model has far-reaching implications for advancing urban sustainability across West African cities. Waste-to-energy systems, when effectively implemented, contribute significantly to achieving climate change mitigation goals by reducing landfill methane emissions and enabling renewable energy generation. This directly supports national and regional commitments under international environmental agreements.

Energy access in many West African urban centers remains limited and unreliable. Incorporating waste-to-energy into energy portfolios diversifies supply sources, improves local energy security, and reduces dependence on fossil fuels. This fosters resilience against external shocks such as fuel price volatility and supply disruptions, enhancing urban livability and economic stability. Long-term urban planning benefits from this integrated approach by promoting resource efficiency and circularity. It encourages cities to view waste as a resource rather than a problem, embedding sustainability into core urban functions. This systemic shift supports the creation of green jobs, stimulates innovation, and strengthens institutional capacities, thereby reinforcing the foundation for resilient, inclusive, and prosperous urban futures in the region.

For the successful implementation of the integrated waste-to-energy policy model, concerted efforts from diverse stakeholders are essential. Governments must lead by establishing clear legal frameworks, facilitating multi-level coordination, and allocating adequate resources for capacity building and infrastructure development. Creating enabling environments for private sector investment through risk mitigation tools and transparent procurement processes is equally important.

The private sector can contribute technical expertise, innovation, and financing mechanisms vital for scaling waste-to-energy projects. Public-private partnerships should be encouraged to blend strengths and share risks. Civil society organizations play a critical role in raising public awareness, promoting social inclusion, and holding implementers accountable. Engagement with communities ensures cultural sensitivities and local knowledge are incorporated into project design. Academic and research institutions should support the model through applied research, technology development, and training programs that build local expertise. Continuous monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge sharing among all actors will foster adaptive governance and policy learning. Together, these stakeholders can institutionalize the integrated policy framework, enabling West African cities to realize the full potential of waste-to-energy solutions for sustainable urban development.

6. References

1. Merem E, Twumasi Y, Wesley J, *et al*. Analyzing emerging environmental issues in major areas: The case of lagos in South West Nigeria. Architecture Research. 2018;8(1):19-38.
2. Onibokun AG. Managing the monster: urban waste and governance in Africa. Ottawa: Idrc; 1999.
3. Aliyu AA, Amadu L. Urbanization, cities, and health: the challenges to Nigeria–a review. Annals of African Medicine. 2017;16(4):149-158.
4. Ikurekong FUEE. Evolution of New Coastal Urban Lifestyles in West Africa: Implications for Planning Sustainable African Cities. Evolution. 2015;5(6).
5. Buhari SO, Aponjolosun MO, Oni BG, Sam MW. Sustainable urban mobility: An approach to urbanization and motorization challenges in Nigeria, a case of Lagos state. Journal of Sustainable Development of Transport and Logistics. 2020;5(2):90-97.
6. Abou Rayan MM, Djebedjian B. Urban water management challenges in developing countries: The Middle East and North Africa (MENA). In: Sustainable Water Management in Urban Environments. Cham: Springer; 2016:295-326.
7. Wentz J. URBANIZATION AND THE SPREAD OF HIV IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: A COMPARISON OF LAGOS, NIGERIA AND JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA. 2020.
8. van Heerden AD. Valuing waste and wasting value: rethinking planning with informality by learning from skarrelers in Cape Town's Southern Suburbs. 2015.
9. Baabereyir A. Urban environmental problems in Ghana: A case study of social and environmental injustice in solid waste management in Accra and Sekondi-Takoradi. Nottingham: University of Nottingham; 2009.
10. Öberg G, Metson GS, Kuwayama Y, Conrad SA. Conventional sewer systems are too time-consuming, costly and inflexible to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Sustainability. 2020;12(16):6518.
11. Moya D, Aldás C, López G, Kaparaju P. Municipal solid waste as a valuable renewable energy resource: A worldwide opportunity of energy recovery by using Waste-To-Energy Technologies. Energy Procedia. 2017;134:286-295.
12. Bishoge OK, Huang X, Zhang L, Ma H, Danyo C. The adaptation of waste-to-energy technologies: Towards the conversion of municipal solid waste into a renewable energy resource. Environmental Reviews. 2019;27(4):435-446.
13. Mukherjee C, Denney J, Mbonimpa EG, Slagley J, Bhowmik R. A review on municipal solid waste-to-energy trends in the USA. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews. 2020;119:109512.
14. Tozlu A, Özahi E, Abuşoğlu A. Waste to energy technologies for municipal solid waste management in Gaziantep. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews.

2016;54:809-815.
15. Ram C, Kumar A, Rani P. Municipal solid waste management: a review of waste to energy (WtE) approaches. Bioresources. 2021;16(2):4275.
16. Beyene HD, Werkneh AA, Ambaye TG. Current updates on waste to energy (WtE) technologies: a review. Renewable Energy Focus. 2018;24:1-11.
17. Tsui T-H, Wong JW. A critical review: emerging bioeconomy and waste-to-energy technologies for sustainable municipal solid waste management. Waste Disposal & Sustainable Energy. 2019;1(3):151-167.
18. Seeliger L, Turok I. Towards sustainable cities: extending resilience with insights from vulnerability and transition theory. Sustainability. 2013;5(5):2108-2128.
19. Romero-Lankao P, Gnatz DM, Wilhelmi O, Hayden M. Urban sustainability and resilience: From theory to practice. Sustainability. 2016;8(12):1224.
20. Spiliotopoulou M, Roseland M. Urban sustainability: from theory influences to practical agendas. Sustainability. 2020;12(18):7245.
21. Zhang X, Li H. Urban resilience and urban sustainability: What we know and what do not know? Cities. 2018;72:141-148.
22. Sharifi A, Yamagata Y. Resilience-oriented urban planning. In: Resilience-oriented urban planning: theoretical and empirical insights. Cham: Springer; 2018:3-27.
23. Qazi WA, Abushammala MF, Younes MK. Waste-to-energy technologies: a literature review. The Journal of Solid Waste Technology and Management. 2018;44(4):387-409.
24. Parashar C, Das P, Samanta S, Ganguly A, Chatterjee P. Municipal solid wastes—a promising sustainable source of energy: a review on different waste-to-energy conversion technologies. In: Energy Recovery Processes from Wastes. Cham: Springer; 2020:151-163.
25. Tan ST, Ho WS, Hashim H, Lee CT, Taib MR, Ho CS. Energy, economic and environmental (3E) analysis of waste-to-energy (WTE) strategies for municipal solid waste (MSW) management in Malaysia. Energy Conversion and Management. 2015;102:111-120.
26. Cobo S, Dominguez-Ramos A, Irabien A. From linear to circular integrated waste management systems: A review of methodological approaches. Resources, Conservation and Recycling. 2018;135:279-295.
27. Memon MA. Integrated solid waste management based on the 3R approach. Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management. 2010;12:30-40.
28. Davies KC. Landfill Containment and Waste Management Systems. Cardiff: University of South Wales (United Kingdom); 2000.
29. Meyer N, Auriacombe C. Good urban governance and city resilience: An afrocentric approach to sustainable development. Sustainability. 2019;11(19):5514.
30. Runhaar H. Tools for integrating environmental objectives into policy and practice: What works where? Environmental Impact Assessment Review. 2016;59:1-9.
31. Nilsson M, Eklund M, Tyskeng S. Environmental integration and policy implementation: competing governance modes in waste management decision making. Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy. 2009;27(1):1-18.
32. Merali Y, Allen P. Complexity and systems thinking. In: The SAGE handbook of complexity and management. London: SAGE; 2011:31-52.
33. Zotos G, Karagiannidis A, Zampetoglou S, *et al*. Developing a holistic strategy for integrated waste management within municipal planning: Challenges, policies, solutions and perspectives for Hellenic municipalities in the zero-waste, low-cost direction. Waste Management. 2009;29(5):1686-1692.
34. Briassoulis H. Policy integration for complex policy problems: What, why and how. In: Greening of Policies: Interlinkages and Policy Integration. Berlin: Springer; 2004:3-4.
35. David VE Jr, John Y, Hussain S. Rethinking sustainability: a review of Liberia's municipal solid waste management systems, status, and challenges. Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management. 2020;22(5):1299-1317.
36. Mutezo GT. Challenges impeding South African municipalities from adopting waste-to-energy schemes: an exploratory approach. 2016.
37. Corfee-Morlot J, Kamal-Chaoui L, Donovan MG, *et al*. Cities, climate change and multilevel governance. OECD environmental working papers. 2009.
38. Kemausuor F, Adaramola MS, Morken J. A review of commercial biogas systems and lessons for Africa. Energies. 2018;11(11):2984.
39. Mmereki D, Baldwin A, Li B. A comparative analysis of solid waste management in developed, developing and lesser developed countries. Environmental Technology Reviews. 2016;5(1):120-141.
40. Mmereki D. Current status of waste management in Botswana: A mini-review. Waste Management & Research. 2018;36(7):555-576.
41. Tun MM, Palacky P, Juchelkova D, Síťař V. Renewable waste-to-energy in southeast Asia: Status, challenges, opportunities, and selection of waste-to-energy technologies. Applied Sciences. 2020;10(20):7312.
42. Pan S-Y, Du MA, Huang I-T, *et al*. Strategies on implementation of waste-to-energy (WTE) supply chain for circular economy system: a review. Journal of Cleaner Production. 2015;108:409-421.
43. du Plessis A. Climate governance in South African municipalities: Opportunities and obstacles for local government. In: Local Climate Change Law. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing; 2012.
44. Rogoff MJ, Screve F. Waste-to-energy: technologies and project implementation. Cambridge: Academic Press; 2019.
45. Bao Z, Lu W, Chi B, Yuan H, Hao J. Procurement innovation for a circular economy of construction and demolition waste: Lessons learnt from Suzhou, China. Waste Management. 2019;99:12-21.
46. May H, Bridger K. Developing and embedding inclusive policy and practice in higher education. York: Higher Education Academy; 2010.
47. Mohee R, Simelane T. Future directions of municipal solid waste management in Africa. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa; 2015.
48. Sow I. Wastes management in african cities. In: Smart Economy in Smart African Cities: Sustainable, Inclusive, Resilient and Prosperous. Cham: Springer; 2019:201-218.
49. Raffo C, Gunter H. Leading schools to promote social inclusion: developing a conceptual framework for

analysing research, policy and practice. Journal of Education Policy. 2008;23(4):397-414.
50. de Freitas C, Martin G. Inclusive public participation in health: policy, practice and theoretical contributions to promote the involvement of marginalised groups in healthcare. Social Science & Medicine. 2015;135:31-39.
51. Bennett L. Using empowerment and social inclusion for pro-poor growth: a theory of social change. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2002.
52. Gunningham N. The new collaborative environmental governance: The localization of regulation. Journal of Law and Society. 2009;36(1):145-166.
53. Rondinelli DA, Berry MA. Corporate environmental management and public policy: Bridging the gap. American Behavioral Scientist. 2000;44(2):168-187.
54. Morgera E. Corporate accountability in international environmental law (no. 2nd). Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2020.
55. National Research Council, Committee on Geosciences, Board on Radioactive Waste Management, Committee on the Remediation of Buried and Tank Wastes. Long-term institutional management of US Department of Energy legacy waste sites. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2000.
56. Ramgopal NC, Mohanty AK. Bridging funding gaps for climate and sustainable development: Pitfalls, progress, and potential of private finance. Dogo Rangsang Research Journal. 2019;9(3).
57. Clark R, Reed J, Sunderland T. Bridging funding gaps for climate and sustainable development: Pitfalls, progress and potential of private finance. Land Use Policy. 2018;71:335-346.
58. Newell P. The governance of energy finance: the public, the private and the hybrid. Global Policy. 2011;2:94-105.
59. Gardiner A, Bardout M, Grossi F, Dixson-Declève S. Public-private partnerships for climate finance. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers; 2015.