

## **Informal Sector and Solid Wastes Disposal in the City of Lagos, Nigeria**

**Folorunso Sunday Ayadi**

Department of Economics, University of Lagos,  
Akoka, Lagos, Nigeria  
Email: funso123@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

Waste management in Lagos has been adversely affected by large volumes of waste generation and inadequacy of disposal systems. This has led the informal sector to be involved in waste management. Unfortunately, they have also compounded the problem by engaging in illegal dumping of waste. Therefore, this study is set out to analyse the determinants of choice of service providers viewed from income angle and differences in charges. The result did not find income as a significant factor determining the choice of a particular waste service provider. Differences in service charges, however, is a significant factor determining the choice of a waste service provider. Income has no significant role in dumping behaviour in Lagos State, but high waste service charges encourage dumping behaviour. Furthermore, over 65 percent of the interviewed cartpushers' patrons indicated that they patronised the cartpushers because of non-availability of private sector participants (PSP) service providers. The study, therefore, recommends the proper review of the service charges, government may engage in cross-subsidy by utilizing the surplus receipts in the richer areas to subsidize the poorer households. In addition, government must create an enabling environment for the cartpushers to be legally integrated into the collection in low-income or squatter settlement areas. There is also a great need for proper enforcement of environmental legislations.

**Keywords:** Municipal solid wastes, Dumping, Private sector participants, Cartpushers.

### **Introduction**

There is an upward surge in the waste generation rates worldwide. For instance, the World Bank (2019) claims that 2.01 billion tonnes of solid waste was generated by the world's cities in 2016 alone. This amounted to about 0.74 kilogramme per person per day.

Coupled with the expected rise in the world population, the annual waste generation is expected to rise by 70 percent from 2016 level to 3.40 billion tonnes by 2050. According to the World Bank (2019) in comparison with the developed countries, in developing countries especially, the urban poor will be mostly affected by poor waste management strategy. In these developing countries, over ninety percent of waste generated are poorly disposed in unregulated dumpsites or openly burnt in indiscriminately sited refuse sites.

Low income residents of urban centres, therefore, are the most vulnerable to exposures from environmental health hazards, the most susceptible when exposed to pollution, and above all, are the least able to cope with the consequences of environmental disasters when they occur. The reasons for the above are as follows: Firstly, the households with inadequate incomes are less able to afford accommodation that shield them from environmental risks and as such are forced to occupy the ecologically fragile areas (usually slums/blighted areas) without pipe-borne water, adequate provisions for sanitation, drains and garbage collections. This is so because they are priced out of safe, well located, and planned residential settlements with adequate investments in infrastructure to mitigate the impact of disasters when they occur.

Secondly, in a bid to secure a means of livelihood to meet some physiological needs, they are liable to undertake work that exposes them (and in some cases their families) to environmental hazards. In addition, they have the least political power to influence government policies in their favour given environmental consequences of the higher income class' activities. For instance in Lagos as it is elsewhere in Developing countries of the World, landfills and dumpsites have been located in the vicinity of poor neighbourhood with less political resistance to Government's action. Thirdly, while the poor are expending on essential goods and services needed for life sustenance and human development, the rich are over-expending on outrageous wants, which have environmental consequences. Above all, the producing industries, and waste management facilities utilized by these rich are concentrated in the vicinity of their low-income neighbours who have less effective political resistance to their actions. Fourthly, urban poor utilized few capital goods and thus draw little from the World's finite reserves of metals and non-renewable resources. They consume less fuel oil per capita and less pollution tendency as they rely mostly on public

transport (or they walk or ride bicycle to their destinations). They also consume less electricity (as they are rarely supplied power) and thus are not responsible for the fossil fuel use arising from oil, coal or gas-fuelled power stations thereby contributing less to greenhouse emission or has low levels of greenhouse gas emission per person. They also occupy much less land per person, consume less food and generally have diets that are less energy intensive. Above all, they play a positive role from an ecological perspective because of their reclaiming, re-using and recycling of waste from industries, workshops and wealthier households

Urban environmental improvement can be an effective means of reducing poverty more so that the improvements enhance healthier living and working conditions for urban poor since better health resulting from environmental improvement leads to healthy children that grow into healthy adults without excessive expenditures on medicines and health care. They also avoid the loss of income that can result from taking time off work due to illness or to nursing sick family members. They are less likely to lose their jobs and enter a vicious circle of poverty and destitution. Relating waste management to the study area requires a brief description of Lagos state. It has a landmass of 3,577 Square Kilometres, which represent 0.4 percent of Nigeria's territorial landmass and is the smallest state in the Federation. The physical environment of Lagos State is composed of about 83% of landmass and 17% of water bodies. Natural factors such as flat topography of the state, its high water table, the swampy nature and its intensive rainfall contribute to the problems of the environment and the location of the state made it possible to receive pollution loads from rivers and streams from hinterland states.

The state also has between 60-70% of Nigeria's total industries. The high population and large concentration of industrial, commercial, and trade activities in the state exposed it to various environmental pollution and ecological problems leading to environmental degradation such as those associated with industrial activities of our water and land, generation and insanitary disposal of solid wastes (some of which are toxic or hazardous) leading to deterioration of the human environment. In Lagos State, waste management is regarded as a municipal function and as such is expected to be borne by the Governments. The bulk of their revenue

comes from state subvention, Local Government deductions; other source of finance is through property tax, which is based on the value of the property. This is usually revalued every 5 years. A percentage of the property value is determined (2½% to 10%) as property tax, from which a determined percentage is passed on for waste management. With the commercialization of LAWMA Services, the Board derives additional funding from internally generated revenue from industrial waste collection (user charges). As at mid 2001, a total of about 260 industrial premises were serviced by LAWMA and revenue accruing from such is put at an average of N10 million per month. In December 1999, the private sector participation (PSP) programme was set up in a bid to effectively manage the large volume of municipal waste generated daily in the state. This programme was made in the area of domestic waste management in which consumers (domestic households) pay an agreed user's fee based on service level so as to enjoy the services of the PSP under each Local Government of operation.

Waste management in Lagos has been adversely affected by large volumes of waste generation and inadequacy of disposal systems. This has led the informal sector to be involved in waste management. Unfortunately, they have also compounded the problem by engaging in illegal dumping of waste. This problem is so serious when viewed from the fact that the cost of cleansing up illegally dumped waste can be very high. Based on Cointrean-Levin's (1994 p. 42) finding, the costs per tonne of public cleansing (including general clean up of open areas and street sweeping) are two to three times the costs per tonne of collection. In view of the above therefore; this study is set out to analyze the determinants of choice of service providers viewed from income angle and differences in charges. The null hypotheses of this study therefore are: first, there is no significant difference in household incomes of PSP patrons and that of the cartpushers' patron in Lagos state, Nigeria. The second hypothesis; there is no significant differences in charges of PSP charges for household waste services and that of the cartpushers in Lagos state, Nigeria. The results of this study will enable Us to offer reasonable suggestions towards improving the supply of waste services and the reduction of illegal dumping in Lagos State.

**Literature Review**

Waste services providers are the main determinants of whether or not waste will be well disposed off or illegally dumped on the streets and compound the waste management problems of the society. There are some studies that analyzed a number of factors determining the waste services demand factors. According to Cointreau-Levine (1982) household solid waste disposal practices are influenced by the supply of waste disposal services and availability of infrastructures. Iorhemen, Alfa and Onoja (2016) provided an overview of the current municipal waste management trends in Nigeria and proposed some remedial measures. According to them, municipal solid waste (MSW) is characterized by inefficient collection and transportation to disposal sites. Waste collections do not reach some areas because they are unplanned areas and slums where there is poor street network. Some planned areas too are not covered by waste collectors. In addition, the informal sector contributes to waste collection, resource recovery and recycling and their efforts are not recognized by the governments. They made a number of suggestions which include upgrading of dumpsites, personnel training and the need to cater for e-waste, among others.

Tadesse, Ruijs and Hagos (2007) investigated the factors affecting household waste disposal decision making using data from household survey in Mekelle in Ethiopia. They analyzed their data using multinomial logit estimation. They investigated the effects of demographic factors, economic and social status, waste and environmental attributes on household solid waste. Their results indicated that demographic features such as household size, education and age have no significant impact on the choice of alternative waste disposal means. Supply of wastes services significantly contributed to waste disposal choice. Inadequate supply of waste containers and longer distance to them increase dumping. Higher household income reduces the chance of dumping. They suggested measures that would reduce the cost of waste services. Vidanaarachchi, Yuen and Pilapitiya (2005) described problems, issues and challenges Sri Lanka was facing through public survey, discussions with local authority involved in waste management, provincial councils, government officials and politicians. They also reviewed some documents and conducted field observations. The study found that only 24 percent of households have access to waste

collection services in rural. Most of the people without access to waste collection services expect their local authorities to collect their wastes. The available sites lack the capacity to handle any increased demand for waste services. There is high willingness of residents to compost their wastes. They suggested capacity building to urgently improve waste collection.

Babanyara (2013) did the appraisal of the extent of indiscriminate dumping in Bauchi metropolis using purposeful questionnaire and interview and photograph for on-site assessment of 1587 households. The study found that a total of 286 metric tonnes was generated daily but only 111 metric tonnes of waste were collected for disposal. In addition, there were 205 illegal dumpsites as against only 89 authorized dumpsites. He identified factors responsible for illegal dumping as poor communal attitude to environmental health, availability and nearness to open spaces, weak environmental legislation. Ogu (2011) interviewed 591 households in Benin City in order to explain the inadequacies of public provision of solid waste collection and disposal and the limitations of the private sector participants meant to address waste problems. He found that one-fifth of the sample had no access to waste collection services indicating the inadequacies of waste services provisions. The paper also indicates that there is a lack of public resources in providing the solid wastes services, hence the introduction of the privatization in 1995 to address the issue. He suggested a private sector provision tailored towards the various characteristics of the city. He therefore recommended greater priority being granted to the poor segment of the society in waste service provision as they are the least serviced in the state.

Mamady (2015) studied the socioeconomic and demographic factors associated with safety behavior, practice and knowledge by family members on household waste management in Conakry, Guinea. The study found income, lack of education and females in the family as being associated with indiscriminate waste dumping in Conakry. It also found unplanned residential areas as an important factor contributing to indiscriminate waste dumping. The community also lack knowledge of proper waste management and safe behaviour in its management. Adzawla, Tahindu, Mustapha and Azumah (2019) utilized multinational logit approach on 16,767 households in Ghana in order to examine whether or not

socioeconomic factors affect household's decision to adopt a particular waste disposal system. The study found education as determining appropriate waste disposal rather than illegal dumping. Housing characteristics as location of households also determines waste disposal systems in Ghana. They concluded that illegal wastes disposal was determined largely by socioeconomic characteristics other than income or household welfare. Anaman and Nyadzi (2015) conducted a survey-based study on methods of solid wastes disposal behaviour in Gwabe a low-income suburb of Accra, Ghana where epidemics are breaking out due to solid wastes dumping. They found that the possibility of a person using improved method of solid wastes disposal increased with household income but decreased with increasing number of household members. They therefore recommended financing of wastes collection by property taxes.

Boateng, Amoako, Poku, Appiah and Garsonu (2016), examined the factors that determine willingness to pay for solid disposal services in Kumasi metropolis using a random sampling technique. Logit regression was the tool of analysis. The study found effective bye laws, level of education, area of residence and level of income as significant determinants of willingness to pay for solid waste disposal services. Ogbonna and Mikailu (2019) examined how informal sector players contribute to waste management recycling and waste to wealth in Lagos state, Nigeria. They accomplished this through the administration of questionnaire to informal participants in sixteen local governments in Lagos state. They found that waste collectors and scavengers earn income through waste but do not take safety measures into consideration in their waste collection, waste management and scavenging. Ojewole (2014) explored the impact of some socioeconomic characteristics of methods of disposing solid waste in Lagos based on three types of population densities (low, medium, and high). He administered on Eti-Osa, Ikeja and Mushin in a stratified manner. Part of information obtained include; residential characteristics and disposal methods: The study also utilized multinomial logistic regression. The study found varying influence of socioeconomic characteristics (income, density, age, educational status, and length of stay). They concluded that most of the waste disposal methods used in Lagos state are not environmentally friendly and six disposal methods are employed in Lagos state. The major flaw of this study is the inability to capture

the activities of the cartpushers. Again the multicollinearity as income and educational qualification may be highly correlated positively.

Ojolowo and Wahab (2017) examined the volume of municipal solid waste generated per capita, projected population, quantity of waste collected and disposed at landfill between 2007 and 2013. They administered 1025 questionnaires and also mapped where drainages were blocked. Multiple regressions were employed to establish the relationship between flooding and municipal waste. They found that 77,757,749.8 tons of solid waste was generated. 27.7 percent was appropriately disposed at landfills between 2007 and 2013. 11% was collected by LAWMA, 9.9% by PSP and 29.2% was collected by cartpushers, while 49.7% were dumped in canals and lagoons. Sampled buildings were flooded at an average of 9 times among other findings. Proper waste management is essential for achieving sustainable and livable cities. Proper waste management is however a challenge to developing countries as effective waste management is too expensive for them as it gulps up to 20 to 50 percent of municipal budgets (World Bank, 2019). According to Ojolowo and Wahab (2017), the bulk of waste generated were either dumped directly into the canals and the lagoon while another large chunk were collected by the cartpushers and possibly dumped as well. While other studies concentrated mostly on income and other socioeconomic determinants of service providers, differences in the charges of service providers is lacking and this study will focus more on that.

### **Methodology**

In this analysis, the paper first tried to investigate why people patronize the cartpushers who incidentally cause substantial dumping in Lagos metropolis as opposed to the conventional PSP. In achieving this, the study therefore compared the mean incomes of patrons of PSP with those of the income of the cartpushers' patron. Secondly, the study also compared the mean user charges of the two residential solid waste service providers utilizing the difference of two means approach. This study tested the hypothesis of no significant difference between the mean charges of PSP ( $\bar{X}_1$ ) and that of the cartpushers ( $\bar{X}_2$ ) of course. It is expected (no matter the income level) that an individual will patronize the cheaper of



these two service providers provided the individual does not have a personal reason not to follow this line of thought. In carrying out this test, the paper formulated a null hypothesis of no significance difference between the population mean (ms) charges. In other words:

$$H_0: \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$$

$$H_A: \mu_1 - \mu_2 \neq 0$$

The Z formula utilized for testing the difference of two means is:

$$Z = \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

Where:

$\bar{X}_1$  is the mean value of prices charged by the private sector participants (PSP)

$\bar{X}_2$  is the mean charge of the cartpushers.

$S_1^2$  is the variance for the PSP sample

$S_2^2$  is the variance for cartpushers' sample

$n_1$  is the number of PSP in the sample

$n_2$  is the number of cartpushers sampled

The test is a two-tailed test and the study took  $\mu$  to be 0.02. The decision rule is: If Z – calculated is greater than Z-critical at  $\mu = 0.02$ , reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis that the average charges by PSP is significantly different from those of the cartpushers. If our result indicates the contrary, then we shall accept the null hypothesis.

The data for the study are based on the data by Ayadi (2008) arising from the survey he did when Lagos state managed its waste using user fee between January 2000 to December 2003 and we feel that this study is still relevant in view of similarity in waste management now. The study also conducted oral interview on patrons of cartpushers as per why they patronize them other than disparity in their charges.

### Results and Discussions

The difference of two means result for the incomes of PSP and the cartpushers' patrons produced a  $Z_{\text{calculated}}$  of 1.46 which is lower than the  $Z_{\text{critical}}$  at  $\alpha=0.02$  (that is, 2.33) which indicated that the mean income of the PSP patrons was not significantly different from the mean income of the cartpusher's patron. In order words, income was not a major determinants of which waste service provider to patronize.

Table 1: Difference of two means result for household charges.

	X <sub>1</sub>	X <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	Difference of 2 means calcul.	Critical Z at $\alpha = 0.02$	N <sub>1</sub>	N <sub>2</sub>
1	144.16	97.96	104.65	82.62	4.29	2.33	162	177
2	145.57	99.65	104.73	84.69	4.23	2.33	162	177
3	147.68	98.52	106.49	84.67	4.48	2.33	162	177
4	149.1	99.09	106.52	83.33	4.58	2.33	162	177
5	149.8	97.96	106.85	83.30	4.56	2.33	162	177
6	151.2	99.09	104.84	81.96	4.85	2.33	162	177
7	151.91	99.65	101.75	82.65	4.95	2.33	162	177
8	153.32	100.78	101.72	84.69	4.93	2.33	162	177
9	149.8	101.91	100.00	85.35	4.54	2.33	162	177
10	152.61	101.91	102.08	84.68	4.75	2.33	162	177
11	154.02	105.3	106.13	89.77	4.36	2.33	162	177
12	156.13	109.82	105.71	92.54	4.11	2.33	162	177
1	181.49	113.21	96.16	92.13	6.42	2.33	162	177
2	184.3	113.78	106.45	92.05	6.24	2.33	162	177
3	184.3	113.78	107.77	92.67	6.18	2.33	162	177
4	186.42	115.47	110.67	94.23	6.07	2.33	162	177
5	186.42	115.47	108.73	94.23	6.14	2.33	162	177
6	187.12	115.47	108.16	94.83	6.21	2.33	162	177
7	185.5	117.73	104.52	95.64	5.95	2.33	160	177
8	185.5	117.73	105.21	95.64	5.93	2.33	160	177
9	185.5	118.11	105.21	96.97	5.85	2.33	160	176
10	184.79	120.39	103.72	100.01	5.57	2.33	160	176
11	186.21	120.95	105.99	101.03	5.55	2.33	160	176
12	186.93	123.23	106.76	100.54	5.41	2.33	160	176
1	218.11	132.32	115.19	103.15	6.91	2.33	162	176
2	218.11	132.99	115.19	104.33	6.84	2.33	162	177
3	219.51	134.12	117.41	102.32	6.83	2.33	162	177
4	219.51	136.38	119.21	102.65	6.58	2.33	162	177
5	221.63	135.81	120.04	102.85	6.76	2.33	162	177
6	223.04	136.94	120.96	103.01	6.74	2.33	162	177
7	222.33	135.81	119.91	102.85	6.82	2.33	162	177
8	220.92	136.38	118.97	103.21	6.69	2.33	162	177
9	220.92	136.94	118.97	104.65	6.61	2.33	162	177
10	221.42	139.2	118.65	106.53	6.42	2.33	161	177
11	223.55	139.77	120.05	107.39	6.47	2.33	161	177
12	224.26	140.9	119.31	107.49	6.47	2.33	161	177

**Source:** Fieldwork

Where:

$X_1, S_1$  and  $N_1$  are respectively the mean charges, the standard deviation and the no of respondents patronizing the PSP  $X_2, S_2$  and  $N_2$  are respectively the mean charges, the standard deviation and the number of respondents patronizing the cartpushers.

The difference of means' results indicated that the mean charge of the cartpushers was significantly different from the mean charge of the private sector participants. On further inspection of the two means, the cartpushers' charges were significantly lower than those of the PSP which may of course explain why many people are patronizing the cartpushers and indirectly contributing to illegal dumping in Lagos state. The conclusion here is that households will normally patronize the cheaper of the waste service providers and hence the cartpushers as can be seen from their cheaper services. Another reason why some households end up patronizing the cartpushers is that of service inadequacy of the authorized PSP operators who were not able to access some areas of the state because they are classified as squatter settlements, they are unplanned and most times slums or blighted areas. Over 65 percent of the interviewed cartpushers' patrons indicated that they patronized the cartpushers because of non-availability of PSP service providers due to the remote location of their residences.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

This study is set out to analyze the determinants of service providers viewed from income angle and differences in charges. In other words, it a study aimed at determining the factors responsible for the choice of a particular waste service provider viewed from income and differences in service charges only. The study did not find income as a significant factor determining the choice of a particular waste service provider. Differences in service charges however, is a significant factor determining the choice of a waste service provider. Income has no significant role in dumping behaviour in Lagos state, but high waste service charges encourage dumping behaviour. In addition to the above, over 65 percent of the interviewed cartpushers' patrons indicated that they patronized the cartpushers because of non-availability of PSP service providers. The study therefore recommends the following:

There must be a proper review of the service charges. According to the department of environmental affairs (2012), there must be vertical equity and poverty alleviation impact of tariff. That is, poor consumers should pay proportionally less for waste services. They may pay tariffs that only cover operating and maintenance costs, or have special lifeline tariffs or be subsidized in such a way as to allow access to basic services. Such tariff should be designed in such a way that it avoids illegal dumping. They should not also provide incentives for tariff avoidance through illegal dumping. In other words, government may engage in cross-subsidy by utilizing the surplus payment in the richer areas to subsidize the poorer households. In addition to the above, government must create an enabling environment for the cartpushers to be legally integrated into the Well defined systems of collection in low-income or squatter settlement areas since low income areas are often characterized by narrow or steeply graded roads that are often inaccessible even to smaller vehicles so, an integration of cartpushers by a PSP should be his sole discretion including their control. Privatizing some aspects of solid waste service delivery does not and should not in any way take away the need for Local Government, Ministry of Environment and LAWMA to be fully responsible for solid waste management service especially when it comes to enforcement weak environmental legislation.

### References

- Adzawla W., Tahidu, A., Mustapha, S. & Azumah, S. B. (2019). Do socioeconomic factors influence households' solid waste disposal systems? Evidence from Ghana. *Waste Management and Research*, 37(1), 51-57.
- Anaman, K.A & Nyanzi, W. B. (2015). Analysis of improper disposal of solid wastes in a low-income area of Accra Ghana. *Applied Economics and finance*, 2(1), 66-75.
- Ayadi, F. S. (2008). *Economics of wastes management in Lagos State, Nigeria (1980 – 2003)*. Ph.D.dissertation, University of Lagos, Nigeria.
- Babanyara, Y. Y. (2013). "Indiscriminate solid waste disposal in Bauchi: Causes and impacts on the community and the environment. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 3(4), 40 – 54.
- Boateng, S., Amoako, P., Poku, A. A. & Appiah, D. (2016). Household willingness to pay for solid waste disposal services in urban Ghana: The Kumasi metropolis situation. *Ghana Journal of Geography*, 8(2), 1-17
- Cointreau-Levine, S. J. (1982). *Environmental management of urban solid wastes in developing countries: A project guide*. Washington D. C.: World Bank.

- Cointrean-Levine, S. J. (1994) *Private sector participation in municipal solid waste services in developing countries*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Department of Environmental Affairs (2012). *Solid waste tariff setting: Guidelines for local authorities*.
- Iorhemen, O., Alfa, M. & Onoja, S. B. (2016). The review of municipal solid waste management in Nigeria: The current trends. *Advances in Environmental Research*, 5(4), 237 – 249.
- Mamady, K. (2016). Factors influencing attitude, safety behavior, and knowledge regarding household waste management in Guinea: A cross – Sectional study. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 5, 1 – 9.
- Ogbonna, A. C. & Mikailu, A. (2019). The role of the informal sector in sustainable municipal solid waste management: A case study of Lagos state, Nigeria. *Annals of Faculty Engineering Hunedoara-International Journal of Engineering*, 17(3), 117-122.
- Ogu, V. I. (2011). “Private sector participation and municipal waste management in Benin City, Nigeria”. *Environment and Urbanization*. 12 (2): 103 – 117.
- Ojewale, O. S. (2014). Intraurban analysis of domestic solid waste disposal methods in a sub-Sahara African city. *Journal of Waste Management*, 7, 1-7.
- Ojelowo, S. (2017). “Municipal solid waste and flooding in Lagos metropolis, Nigeria: Deconstructing the evil nexus. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 10(7), 174-185.
- Tadesse, T., Ruijs, A. & Hagos, F. (2007). Household waste disposal in Mekelle City, Northern Ethiopia. *Waste Management*, 28, 2003– 012.
- Vidanaarachchi, C. K., Yuen, S. T. S., & Pilapitiya, S. (2005). Municipal solid waste management in the Southern Province of Sri Lanka: Problems, issues and challenges. *Waste Management*, 26: 920 – 930.
- World Bank (2019). Solid waste management. *Understanding poverty urban development*. Retrieved 23 Jan. 2020, from: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

**Appendix: PSP Performance in Lagos State**

<u>S/N</u>	<u>LOCAL GOVT.</u>	<u>NO OF REGISTERED PROS</u>	<u>NO OF HOUSES SERVICED</u>	<u>NO OF TONAGE PER DAY</u>	<u>% COMPLIANCE</u>
1.	AGEGE	40	25,198	223	62
2.	AJEROMI/				
3.	IFELODUN	45	40,825	316	88
4.	ALIMOSHO	87	43,531	176	49
5.	AMUWO/ODOFIN	22	20,946	288	80
6.	APAPA	40	22,656	198	55
7.	BADAGRY	10	5,918	180	50
8.	ETI-OSA	35	29,789	288	80
9.	IFAKO-IJAIYE	38	27,517	255	71
10.	IKEJA	25	21,456	302	84
11.	IKORODU	32	13,426	144	40
12.	KOSOFE	33	16,000	172	48
13.	LAGOS ISLAND	30	21,591	252	70
14.	LAGOS MAINLAND	30	25,000	298	83
15.	OJO	31	24,727	277	77
16.	OSHODI-ISOLO	47	36,814	273	76
17.	MUSHIN	49	32,218	234	65
18.	SOMOLU	18	10,849	198	55
19.	SURULERE	34	24,347	252	70

**Source:** Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning Ministerial Press Briefing in Commemoration of 3<sup>rd</sup> Year in Office (Activity Report).