Why Africa's Waste Entrepreneurs Are Forced to Bootstrap the Future

By RevoWaste Technologies

The building blocks of every economy in the world are land, labour, entrepreneurship, and capital, the four factors of production. The dictates of classical economics would argue for their coequal contribution to economic output. But in waste management, this equilibrium collapses dramatically. Capital emerges as the dominant factor of production, and rightly so.

Waste management is an unusually complex industry. For a new founder, the complexity manifests almost immediately. For instance, identifying customers alone requires a systems-thinking approach that decomposes the enterprise into interconnected demand-side and supply-side markets, each characterized by distinct incentives, behaviours, economics, and operational constraints. It also involves understanding who aggregates it, who processes it, who purchases the recovered outputs, and under what conditions value is either created or destroyed across the reverse supply chain. This requires an exact understanding of material flows, price dynamics, logistics costs, contamination risks, consumer behaviour, industrial demand, regulatory frameworks, and the economics governing each node of the value chain. Different from conventional businesses that optimize a single market transaction, waste management enterprises are tasked with orchestrating an entire ecosystem before the first meaningful unit of profit can be realized.

From this illustration of the founder's nightmare, capital becomes the most fundamental resource because waste management requires the coordination of fragmented material streams, labour-intensive collection systems, transportation networks, processing infrastructure, technology deployment, regulatory compliance, market creation, and continuous reinvestment in physical assets. And more importantly, because at the beginning, capital allocation mistakes that are necessary for learning are neither matched by well-resourced founders nor reciprocated by pragmatically optimistic financial industries.

This challenge is structural rather than anecdotal. The International Finance Corporation (IFC) estimates that the annual financing gap plaguing formal MSMEs in developing nations stands around $5.2 trillion, reflecting one of the largest constraints to enterprise growth worldwide. 1 For young businesses in the waste management space, the financing gap is even more pronounced. Particularly, this is the case since their business models require significant upfront investment in infrastructure, logistics, equipment, and working capital before meaningful revenues emerge.

It is disturbingly ironic that the heavy talk surrounding the space only sees marginal gains as investment fails to match up. In the words of Vietnam Gas President Doanh Chau, Kenyan leaders have a "serious execution culture" deficit. Simply put, while policymakers, development agencies, investors, and international institutions increasingly champion the circular economy as a multi-trillion-dollar opportunity capable of creating jobs, preserving ecosystems, and accelerating industrialization, the entrepreneurs tasked with building this future remain among the least financed participants in the economy, compared to asset-light digital sectors like AI and Fintech. Global recognition of this financing gap is apparent. The UNEP notes that transitioning to a circular economy requires substantial financial innovation and that many financial institutions still lack the expertise, products, and incentives necessary to finance circular business models at scale. 2

We know African waste entrepreneurs are endowed with ideas, markets, technologies, determination, and the spirit of entrepreneurship. More often than not, the degree of failure is not a function of entrepreneurial deficiency, but a consequence of attempting to bootstrap industries that, by their very nature, require substantial, patient, and intelligently deployed capital. Plus, the peculiar nature of financing in the circular economy is as complex and obfuscating as the industry itself. Financing partners must depart from viewing waste management through the lens of conventional business models.

Financing is a thorn in the flesh for many companies operating in this space. For this reason, the complexity of waste management as an economically viable venture must first be simplified and understood in preparation for transformative investment. Otherwise, the rhetorical celebration of the circular economy as the future must end if progress is to remain the reserve of the podium without actionable commitments that deliver real change.

A Capital-Intensive Industry

The structural reality when raising the distinction between software startups and circular economy ventures is stark. Circular economies are fundamentally built on land, machinery, logistics, inventory, labour, regulatory compliance, R&D;, working capital, and physical infrastructure. Principally, then, a waste startup cannot move fast and break things. Rather, these firms must move slowly and build expensive things. Financiers must, therefore, appreciate this distinction. For reasonable risk management, phased financing focusing on cash flow-positive nodes within the waste value chain can be prioritized as capital allocation matches material flow capacity. This protects unit economics and ensures businesses establish stability.

An Ironical Circular Economy Financing

For any economy, like Kenya, where MSMEs account for 99% of all businesses, it is impossible to overlook their relevance as vital vehicles for economic progress. So, financial instruments marketing the claim of affordable and progressive financial support must implement facilities that are within the realities of what constitutes Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs). Financial instruments that target MSMEs with over-the-ceiling requirements like KSH 5 million turnover, audited accounts, several years of operation, collateral, co-financing requirements, and prior investment history, without propositions for technical assistance underpinning their facilities, are deliberately flawed. Paradoxically, if a startup already meets the above eligibility criteria, then it has already solved the very problem that startup financing claims to address. It is these challenges that leave potentially promising founders stranded in failed businesses, unproductive pursuits, and stalled growth patterns where regional and global opportunities exist.

The Missing Middle

Structural mismatch is the waste financing challenge facing the African continent, not scarcity. A typical waste management startup traverses three broad stages of capital demand. Validation is the first. Here, entrepreneurs require approximately KSH 500,000–5 million to test technologies, establish supply chains, validate unit economics, and understand the complex dynamics of waste markets. In the subsequent pilot stage, KSH 5–50 million is the range of productive capital, where proven concepts are deployed at commercially meaningful scales to optimize operations, reduce costs, and establish repeatability. During commercialization, investments enter the KSH 50–500 million bracket, where infrastructure, industrial processing capacity, logistics networks, and market expansion become the primary determinants of success.

It is an absurdity that the financial ecosystem supporting circular economy enterprises is least capable of performing its function where support is most critical. Basically, grants are often too small, fragmented, and short-term to support meaningful experimentation. Commercial banks remain constrained by collateral requirements and conventional risk assessment frameworks that fail to appreciate the unique characteristics of circular businesses. Venture capital, particularly in Africa, overwhelmingly favours asset-light software companies with rapid scaling potential and low capital intensity. Private equity, on the other hand, mostly enters only after business models have already been validated and substantial revenues have been achieved. This is a difficult position, too early for institutional capital, too capital-intensive for venture financing, and too risky for traditional debt markets.

For institutions that present as supporters of entrants in the waste management field, eligibility requirements tend to bypass entities to whom such facilities are intended to empower. The consequence of this is that entrepreneurs are forced to finance the future of circularity through personal savings, family contributions, informal lending networks, and years of disciplined bootstrapping.

The Next Steps

No cash. This is the major reason why businesses in the startup domain die. But in business, death is as reversible as it is permanent. All depends on capital injection — which should happen through demonstrated revenue and unit economics rather than only growth metrics. For circular economy enterprises, this capital cannot continue to be allocated solely through the lenses of conventional finance, where historical revenues, collateral, and short-term returns determine investability. Financing must evolve to recognize that waste management businesses build infrastructure before they build profits, create markets before they generate margins, and solve coordination problems before they achieve scale, just like the company Spiro. Although an e-mobility firm, it shares the dynamics of waste management along the cross-industrial complexities.

We are still reluctant to recognize the value embedded in the entrepreneurs seeking to recover value in waste. If Kenya is serious about building a highly efficient, highly profitable circular economy, it must first build a circular economy of capital itself. One that is capable of recycling risk, redistributing opportunity, and investing in the enterprises that convert today's waste into tomorrow's industrial wealth.

References

- United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI). 2020. Financing Circularity: Demystifying Finance for the Circular Economy . Geneva: United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative. October 15.
- IFC (2017). MSME Finance Gap .