Greater circularity leads to lower criticality, and other links between criticality and the circular economy

Tercero Espinoza, Luis; Schrijvers, Dieuwertje; Chen, Wei-Qiang; Dewulf, Jo; Eggert, Roderick; Goddin, James; Habib, Komal; Peck, David; Hool, Alessandra; More Authors

DOI
10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104718

Publication date
2020

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Resources, Conservation and Recycling

Citation (APA)
Tercero Espinoza, L., Schrijvers, D., Chen, W.-Q., Dewulf, J., Eggert, R., Goddin, J., Habib, K., Peck, D., Hool, A., & More Authors (2020). Greater circularity leads to lower criticality, and other links between criticality and the circular economy. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, *159*, Article 104718. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104718

Resources, Conservation & Recycling 159 (2020) 104718

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Resources, Conservation & Recycling

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/resconrec

Perspective

Greater circularity leads to lower criticality, and other links between criticality and the circular economy

Luis Tercero Espinoza[a,b], Dieuwertje Schrijvers[c], Wei-Qiang Chen[d], Jo Dewulf[e], Roderick Eggert[f], James Goddin[g], Komal Habib[h], Christian Hagelüken[i], Alan J. Hurd[j], René Kleijn[k], Anthony Y. Ku[l], Min-Ha Lee[m], Keisuke Nansai[n], Philip Nuss[o,1], David Peck[p], Evi Petavratzi[q], Guido Sonnemann[c], Ester van der Voet[k], Patrick A. Wäger[r,b], Steven B. Young[h], Alessandra Hool[b,*]

[a] *Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research ISI, Breslauer Str. 48, 76139 Karlsruhe, Germany*
[b] *ESM Foundation, Junkerngasse 56, 3011 Bern, Switzerland*
[c] *Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, ISM, UMR 5255, F-33400, Talence, France*
[d] *Key Lab of Urban Environment and Health, Institute of Urban Environment, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 1799 Jimei Road, Xiamen 361021, China*
[e] *Research Group Sustainable Systems Engineering, Department Green Chemistry and Technology, Faculty of Bioscience Engineering, Ghent University, Campus Coupure, Building B, Coupure Links 653, 9000 Ghent, Belgium*
[f] *Division of Economics & Business, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401, USA*
[g] *Granta Design/ANSYS, Rustat House, 62 Clifton Road, Cambridge, CB1 7EG, UK*
[h] *Faculty of Environment, University of Waterloo, 200 University Ave West, Waterloo Ontario, N2L3G1, Canada*
[i] *Umicore AG & Co KG, Rodenbacher Chaussee 4, 63457 Hanau, Germany*
[j] *Los Alamos National Laboratory, PO Box 1663, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*
[k] *Leiden University, Department Industrial Ecology, Institute of Environmental Sciences, Einsteinweg 2, 2333 CC Leiden, The Netherlands*
[l] *NICE America Research, 2091 Stierlin Ct, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA*
[m] *Korea Institute of Industrial Technology (KITECH), 156 Gaetbeol-ro, Yeonsu-Gu, 21999 Incheon, Republic of Korea*
[n] *National Institute for Environmental Studies, 16-2 Onogawa, Tsukuba 305-8506, Japan*
[o] *German Environment Agency (UBA), Unit I1.1 - Fundamental Aspects, Sustainability Strategies and Scenarios, Sustainable Resource Use, Woerlitzer Platz 1, 06844 Dessau-Rosslau, Germany*
[p] *Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Architectural Engineering and Technology, Building 8, Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Julianalaan 134, 2628BL, The Netherlands*
[q] *British Geological Survey, Environmental Science Centre, Keyworth, Nottinghamshire, NG12 5GG, UK*
[r] *Empa, Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Science and Technology, Technology & Society Laboratory, Lerchenfeldstrasse 5, CH-9014 St. Gallen, Switzerland*

Society requires a stable and secure supply of raw materials. Raw materials supply stability and security are, amongst others, addressed by the concept of raw materials criticality, which focuses on the vulnerability of an economic unit (most commonly a country or region, but also the world, specific sectors, companies or products) to supply restrictions of certain mineral raw materials (cf. Schrijvers et al., 2020). The idea of keeping materials in the economic cycle for longer is specified in the Circular Economy (CE) concept, which encompasses efforts that reduce waste and improve material efficiency (Ellen McArthur Foundation, 2013; European Commission, 2018). So far, CE beyond recycling has not played a prominent role in the criticality debate. At the same time, critical raw materials (CRM) have only been a minor topic in the discussion on CE (recent exceptions include European Commission, 2018, and Gaustad et al., 2018). If properly aligned, criticality assessments might help in defining priority materials for the CE, and circularity strategies could substantially mitigate supply risks. In this paper, we explore the potential benefits, as well as caveats, of adopting a CE approach to CRM, based on our own experiences and our discussions organized by the IRTC (International Round Table on Materials Criticality) project.

For orientation, we use a simplified representation (Fig. 1) of CE and match this to key issues addressed in the criticality discussion: the diversity and stability of supply chains, including the contribution of recycling to supply, and the ability to use different materials or technologies to achieve a given function (substitution).

Diversity and stability of primary supply are fundamental to criticality assessment methodologies and reflected in all of them (cf. Schrijvers et al., 2020). Although CE models can have supply security as an objective, the aspect of securing primary supply is absent. Instead, they focus on gaining more value from raw material extraction and maintaining this value (cf. European Commission, 2018).

CE and criticality share common ground regarding recycling: both encourage it. Recycling of end-of-life (EoL) products, constituting the longest loop of CE models, is an important component of both (Fig. 1).

---

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: luis.tercero@isi.fraunhofer.de (L. Tercero Espinoza), alessandra.hool@esmfoundation.org (A. Hool).

[1] Disclaimer: This paper does not necessarily reflect the opinion or the policies of the German Federal Environment Agency (UBA).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104718
Received 8 January 2020; Accepted 19 January 2020
Available online 22 April 2020



Fig. 1. Simplified representation of a more circular economy (all loops) coupled to key points of the criticality concept, formulated as objectives for the stages "raw materials", "design" and "recycling". The material losses occurring at all stages of the life cycle are not shown.

Recycling is also regarded as a mitigation strategy in the criticality discussion because it can increase supply independence and complement current primary extraction. In particular, a number of critical materials are by-products or co-products of other metals and minerals mined and their markets are dependent on those of the host metals. Introducing supply through recycling could potentially reduce risks by partially decoupling supply from the primary material source. Three caveats should be considered. First, primary and secondary production of a given raw material affect economic viability of recycling through price; however, this is not explicitly accounted for, either in criticality methodologies or in the CE model. Second, although recycling is usually considered riskless in criticality methodologies and has priority over disposal in the CE model, neither of these is necessarily the case. The quality and quantity of EoL scrap cannot be taken as a given in many cases. There are challenges in collecting and channeling EoL products to the appropriate facilities, and it can be impractical during recycling to recover certain metals that are used together in products but which are thermodynamically incompatible with conventional thermal or chemical separation processes used in recycling (International Resource Panel, 2013). In the latter case, the EoL product is recycled but some materials (including CRM) are nevertheless lost to other cycles or to slags because their recovery would imply prohibitive economic and/or environmental burdens. Third, bulk materials such as cement, paper, plastics, iron and copper dominate current discussions on CE. CRM tend to be used in smaller volumes than these base materials and are not in high profile from a CE perspective alone (although some CE models look at individual material flows, e.g. the EU Material System Analysis). Since recycling targets are usually mass-based, there is a need for adequate indicators and targets for the circularity of CRM. Ideally, both indicators and targets could be standardized in a way that is directly useful at the level of individual companies and for policy making.

The shorter loops of the CE model are neglected in many discussions on criticality (cf. Schrijvers et al., 2020), as is the discussion on resource efficiency in CE (i.e., improving the ratio between a certain benefit or result and the resource use and environmental burdens associated with it). Nevertheless, a move towards a more circular economy could reduce material resource demand by increasing the longevity of products and parts even though the enabling technologies for the "shorter loop" activities (reuse, repair, refurbish/remanufacture) can be CRM dependent themselves. Overall, the "shorter loops" could limit demand growth, which is included as an indicator in some criticality methodologies. This is particularly important for CRM related to the energy transition. If demand stagnates or even decreases, it is possible that the share of recycling in total supply would increase – also seen as positive in criticality discussions within the caveats sketched above.

A key pillar for establishing all loops in the CE model is appropriate design for circularity, for example material selection that includes the use of metal mixtures which are compatible with recycling technologies (International Resource Panel, 2013). Design for the shorter loops of the circularity model could use a modular approach which makes it easier for components to be separated, recovered, or replaced during repair, reuse, or remanufacturing. Increased recyclability and longevity of products – as a consequence of design for circularity – support supply security, which is a central aspect in criticality assessments.

Another aspect of design pertains to material flexibility: the ability to provide the same function using different raw materials and/or technologies, also discussed as "substitution". Substitution plays a key role in criticality discussions (Schrijvers et al., 2020) and is also relevant in the CE model. Whereas criticality assessments evaluate the potential of replacing CRMs by non- (or less) critical materials or technologies, CE approaches are interested in the impact of the substitute material or technology on reducing the overall inflow of non-recoverable and non-biodegradable materials (Ellen McArthur Foundation, 2013). In both approaches, unwanted side effects can occur: from a criticality point of view, material substitution increases demand for the substitute materials, potentially leading to shortages, and from a CE point of view, additional/different waste might be generated in the alternative process. There appears to be no intrinsic contradiction between CE and criticality regarding the goal of material flexibility/substitution.

The arguments sketched above show there is a potential to mitigate criticality through a move towards a more circular economy. This is most obvious in the case of recycling, where both CE and criticality discussions align. Less obvious considerations have to do with design choices and the shorter loops of the CE model, where long-term planning, including logistics of materials and products – and possibly decisions on trade-offs – will be crucial. A continued transformative process will be required to provide both the societal basis and the technical infrastructure for a sustainable future and to ensure a reliable long-term supply of the raw materials needed by society.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This perspective paper is the result of an International Round Table on Materials Criticality (IRTC) gathering on the topic of “Criticality and the Circular Economy” organized in Tokyo on October 9, 2018, back to back with the EcoBalance Conference, and an IRTC Round Table on “Secondary sourcing of CRMs” in Bejing on July 7, 2019, back to back with the ISIE2019 Conference. A summary of the Round Tables can be found at https://irtc.info. The IRTC project has received funding from the EIT RawMaterials, supported by the Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT), a body of the European Union, under the Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

References

Ellen McArthur Foundation, 2013. Towards the Circular Economy: Economic and Business Rationale for an Accelerated Transition.

European Commission, 2018. Report on Critical Raw Materials and the Circular Economy.

Gaustad, G., Krystofik, M., Bustamante, M., Badami, K., 2018. Circular economy strategies for mitigating critical material supply issues. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 135, 24–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.08.002.

International Resource Panel, 2013. Metal Recycling: Opportunities, Limits, Infrastructure. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi.

Schrijvers, D., Hool, A., Blengini, G.A., Chen, W.-Q., Dewulf, J., Eggert, R., et al., 2020. A review of methods and data to determine raw material criticality. in press. Resour. Conserv. Recycl.