



ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: The case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: The case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films / Razza F.; Briani C.; Breton T.; Marazza D.. - In: RESOURCES, CONSERVATION AND RECYCLING. - ISSN 0921-3449. - ELETTRONICO. - 159:(2020), pp. 104753.1-104753.9. [10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104753]

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/852457> since: 2022-02-03

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104753>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

(Article begins on next page)

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Francesco Razza, Cristiana Briani, Tony Breton, Diego Marazza, *Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: The case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films*, Resources, Conservation and Recycling, Volume 159, 2020, 104753.

The final published version is available online at:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104753>

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: the case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films

Francesco Razza^a, Cristiana Briani^b, Tony Breton^c, Diego Marazza^d

^a *Novamont S.p.A. - Ecology of Product and Environmental Communication, Piazz.le Donegani 4, 05100 Terni, Italy*

^b *CIRSA Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca per le Scienze Ambientali, Via S. Alberto 163, 48123 Ravenna, Italy*

^c *Novamont S.p.A. – Via Fauser 8, 28100 Novara, Italy*

^d *Department of Physics, University of Bologna, Viale B. Pichat 6/2, 40127 Bologna, Italy*

Abstract

The concept of circularity and its quantification through the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) is well established for traditional plastic products. In this paper a methodological approach for calculating the circularity of bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products is proposed and applied to BB mulch films. BB products are different from traditional products in as much as they are sourced and regenerated (recycled) not through technical cycles but the biological loop. The suggested method is an adaptation of the MCI where two major changes were made: (i) the mass of the bio-based component corresponds to the recycled material in input and (ii) the mass of the bio-based component leaving the system through composting or biodegradation in soil is accounted as recycled. The modified MCI supports the Eco-design of innovative BB products and allows for the comparison of their circularity taking into account the biological source and the expected end of life process such as biodegradation. To demonstrate the adaptation, the method has been applied to BB mulch film. Results showed that the MCI of a biodegradable mulch film, characterized by an average bio-based feedstock content of 30% is 0.37 ± 0.04 in a 0-1 scale. For BB mulch film, the amount of bio-based feedstock is the most sensitive factor and controls linearly the value of the MCI.

Keywords: circularity indicators, circular economy, bioplastics, biodegradable mulch film, bio-based product, biodegradation

36 1 Introduction 3

37 1.1 The case study of mulch films 5

38 1.2 Goal of the paper 7

39 2 Materials and Methods 7

40 2.1 MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology 7

41 2.2 MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products 10

42 2.3 MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions 14

43 2.4 Sensitivity analysis 17

44 3 Results 17

45 3.1 Sensitivity analysis 19

46 4 Discussion 21

47 5 Conclusions 23

48
49

Abbreviations

BB	Biodegradable and bio-based
CE	Circular Economy
d.m.	Dry matter
EMF	Ellen MacArthur Foundation
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LDPE	Low-Density Poly-Ethylene
MCI	Material Circularity Indicator
NRF	Non-Restorative Flows
PBAT	Polybutylene adipate terephthalate
PE	Poly-Ethylene
PLA	Polylactic acid

50

51 **1 Introduction**

52 To overcome today's unsustainable model of 'take-make-dispose' and its related risks
53 such as hikes in raw material prices, pressures on the environment, shortage of global
54 resources and waste sinks, a circular approach needs to be applied. It is a new regenerative
55 economic view, based on a balance between economy, environment and society, a total
56 resource efficiency and a Zero Emission Strategy that aims to maximize products value
57 with zero, or minimal, environmental impact (Ghisellini et al., 2016) . Together with
58 structural changes in environmental legislation, new logistics, technologies and sharing
59 schemes, the Circular Economy (CE) approach which is regenerative by design, aims at
60 closing materials loops, *i.e.* at reducing virgin materials input and waste output.

61 In December 2015, the European Commission developed an Action Plan for Circular
62 Economy (European Commission, 2015), where plastic was considered a priority to be
63 tackled. In January 2018, an *EU Plastic Strategy* (European Commission, 2018) was
64 adopted, in order to react to the increasing environmental problems concerning plastic
65 production, consumption, use and disposal along the same lines of the CE approach. Two
66 fundamental steps to increase the circularity of different plastic products are (i) the
67 abandonment of fossil fuels, *i.e.* currently 90% of the plastic is produced by virgin
68 petroleum-based feedstock (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017), and (ii) the development
69 of easily recyclable products which are recycled. Today, in EU the share of plastics
70 collected for recycling is 30% while the use of recycled plastics is just 6% (European
71 Commission, 2018).

72 Biodegradable and bio-based (BB) plastics are spreading across markets (Institute for
73 Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018) as a valid contribution to meet CE aims and
74 principles. This is true as long as the supply of renewable raw materials, generally from
75 agriculture, is based on a sustainable approach and the conversion processes along the

76 supply chain are efficient and highly integrated in a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
77 perspective (EPLCA – European Platform on LCA). While traditional plastics can be
78 mechanically recycled or incinerated with energy recovery, BB plastic products offer new
79 recycling routes in waste management, due to their biodegradability. Organic recycling
80 (through composting or anaerobic digestion) or in the case of specific applications such as
81 agricultural mulch films, biodegradation in the environment, offer additional recovery
82 options resulting in less wastes.

83 Nevertheless, the research and development of innovative products, such as the BB
84 products, implies the development of methodologies and metrics capable of measuring
85 their circularity. Without this it is not possible to achieve measurable results and
86 improving actions, as well as provide unequivocal references for comparisons of products
87 of the same type/category. In 2015 the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) was
88 developed (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015) which aims to quantify
89 the regeneration of a product's material flow and is considered one of the few, among
90 sixteen CE indexes suiting a micro-scale assessment of circularity at product or company
91 level (Lonca et al., 2018). However, it focuses solely on technical cycles and recycled
92 materials. Furthermore, recovery and recycling through the biological cycle offered by
93 industrial composting, anaerobic digestion or biodegradation in natural environments are
94 not considered as end of life options. In order to apply the MCI system to BB plastic
95 products, the development of an enhanced methodology is necessary.

96 The approach proposed by the authors allows to quantify the circularity of BB plastic
97 products (*e.g.* starch-based bioplastics) and to make comparisons with equivalent
98 traditional plastic products. To demonstrate the applicability of the proposed method a
99 computational example for mulch film products is provided. In so doing so, the paper
100 aims at contributing to the Eco-design of these innovative products.

101 *1.1 The case study of mulch films*

102 Plastic mulch films represent an important agronomical technique well established for the
103 production of many crops thanks to numerous agronomical advantages such as: increased
104 yield and higher quality of productions (Steinmetz et al., 2016) ; weed control and
105 reduced use of pesticides; early crop production and reduced soil moisture loss
106 (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018). As a consequence, the plastic films consumption has
107 increased year-by-year, reaching a current global market estimated at 1.4 Mt, mainly in
108 Asia (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018; Mormile et al., 2017) , and covering 80,000 km²
109 of agricultural surface (0.6% of the global arable land). The mulch film market in Europe
110 is estimated by Agriculture Plastic & Environment and by the European Bioplastic
111 Associations at 76-80 kt. The most used raw material is Poly-Ethylene (PE) in its different
112 forms, due to its processability, chemical resistance, high durability and flexibility
113 (Kasirajan and Ngouajio, 2012).

114 Despite these benefits, manifold environmental and agronomic problems have been
115 pointed out. After its useful life – which in general does not exceed 1 to 3 months – the
116 mulch film has to be removed and properly disposed of, a time-consuming and costly
117 procedure. The recovered film is usually heavily contaminated with soil and organic
118 residues, making mechanical recycling technically difficult and not a cost-efficient
119 solution (Briassoulis et al., 2018; Figuier, 2016; De Lèpinau, Arbenz, 2016). The most
120 common end of life of collected films in Europe is still landfilling (about 50%), followed
121 by energy recovering and finally mechanical recycling (Le Moine, 2014). Recent Chinese
122 prohibition (January 2018) to import different types of wastes is heavily impacting the
123 European agricultural plastic waste management, highlighting the difficulty in properly
124 recycling this type of plastics (Tamma, 2018). Plastic films may not be properly collected
125 and recycled but disposed of by burning in the field or by uncontrolled landfilling or left

126 directly in the (agricultural) soils, causing serious environmental concerns. An example is
127 the “White pollution” phenomena described in the Xinjiang Autonomous Region (China),
128 in which the residual plastic film can reach 200 kg/ha in the top soil with detrimental
129 effects on soils’ quality, health and fertility (Liu, He, & Yan, 2014; Gao *et al.*, 2019;
130 Steinmetz *et al.*, 2016).

131 As a reaction, there has been significant research into novel materials especially related to
132 biodegradable and bio-based (BB) mulch films, which enable an effective biodegradation
133 in soil and provide comparable agronomical performances (Touchaleaume *et al.*, 2016).
134 The term “bio-mulch film” brings together several types of both bio-based and fossil oil-
135 based biodegradable polymers and blends of them, such as polylactic acid (PLA),
136 polybutylene adipate co-terephthalate (PBAT), starch-based polymer blends or
137 copolymers. They biodegrade when exposed to bioactive environments such as soil and
138 compost (Kasirajan *et al.*, 2012) which means that they can be left *in situ* to be fully
139 biodegraded after being used. However, their biodegradability must be proved by
140 accredited certification bodies and standardized procedures.

141 The EN 17033:2018 is a new European Norm (standard) concerning “Plastics -
142 Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test
143 methods”, which sets the necessary tests and limits to define biodegradability,
144 performances and environmental impacts of BB much films. The material is considered
145 completely biodegradable if it achieves a complete biodegradation (absolute or relative to
146 the reference material) in a test period no longer than 24 months (mineralization into
147 CO₂). Additionally, a control of constituents (such as metals) and eco-toxicity testing
148 (acute and chronic toxicity tests on plant growth, earthworm; nitrification inhibition test
149 with soil microorganisms) were required. A certified mulch film guarantees that the

150 product will completely biodegrade in the soil without adversely impacting on the
151 environment.

152 **1.2 Goal of the paper**

153 The goal of the paper is to provide a general and common metric to measure the
154 circularity of a bio-based and biodegradable (BB) product and to apply the methodology at
155 product level to a category of products, namely bio-based and biodegradable mulch films.

156 **2 Materials and Methods**


157 **2.1 MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology**

158 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), according to the Ellen MacArthur Foundation
159 (EMF) methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015), is a number
160 that can range from 0 (pure linearity) to 1 (pure circularity). A purely linear production
161 provides for the exclusive use of virgin raw materials that turn into waste at the end of the
162 use phase of the product. Vice-versa, pure circularity includes the use of recycled
163 materials and does not produce wastes (regenerative streams). Circularity can be achieved
164 in different ways: as for the purpose of this paper, only recycling will be considered since
165 reuse is not an option for thin biodegradable mulch films. Since the method considers only
166 mass flows, the recycling corresponds to the recovery of materials for the original purpose
167 or for other purposes and excludes energy recovery, considered as a loss of materials equal
168 to landfill disposal. The materials recovered feed back into the process as recycled
169 feedstock.

170 The MCI methodology differentiates ‘technical cycles’ from ‘biological cycles’,
171 modelling only the former. The first contains products and materials re-entering into the
172 system (market) with the highest possible qualities and for as long as possible (thanks to
173 reuse, repair, refurbishment and recycling) and the latter includes biological materials used

174 in cascade until their restoration into the biosphere and the re-constitution of natural
 175 resources.

176 The material flows associated to the production of a generic technical cycle from non-
 177 renewable sources are summarized in Figure 1. The dashed lines indicate that recycled
 178 feedstock does not have to be sourced from the same product but can be acquired on the
 179 market. With reference to Figure 1, the list of the parameters used in the EMF
 180 methodology is reported in Table 1, while the equations relevant for the analysis carried
 181 out in this paper are described in the following sections (Table 2, Chapter 2.2).



182

183 **Figure 1:** Diagram of material flows and associated variables of a generic
 184 product (modified from Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015).

185

186 **Table 1:** Parameters and relative definitions used in the EMF methodology.

Parameter	Definition
-----------	------------

M	Total mass of the product
F_R	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from recycled sources
F_U	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from reused sources
V	Mass of virgin feedstock used in a product
C_R	Fraction of mass of a product being collected to go into a recycling process
C_U	Fraction of mass of a product going into component reuse
E_C	Efficiency of the recycling process used for the portion collected for recycling
E_F	Efficiency of the recycling process used to produce recycled feedstock for a product
W	Total mass of unrecoverable waste associated with a product
W_0	Mass of unrecoverable waste (landfill, waste to energy and any other type of process where the materials are no longer recoverable)
W_C	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated in the process of recycling parts of a product (after use)
W_F	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated when producing recycled feedstock for a product
X	Utility of a product, calculated as $X = (L/L_{av})(U/U_{av})$

L	Actual average lifetime of a product
L_{av}	Actual average lifetime of an industry-average product of the same type
U	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of a product
U_{av}	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of an industry-average product of the same type

187

188 The Material Circularity Indicator is determined as follows: ,
 189 where LFI is the Linear Flow Index measuring the flows of virgin materials and
 190 unrecoverable wastes associated to the examined product.

191 A function of the utility, $U = F(L)$, is used to correct the LFI . The function F is chosen in
 192 such a way that improvements of the utility of a product (e.g., by using it longer) have the
 193 same impact on its MCI as a reuse of components, leading to the same amount of
 194 reduction of virgin material use and unrecoverable waste. Setting $a = 0.9$, MCI takes, by
 195 convention, the value 0.1 for a fully linear product (*i.e.*, $LFI = 1$) whose utility equals the
 196 industry average (*i.e.*, $X = 1$). This leaves some margin to distinguish between processes
 197 with a high linearity but different utilities.

198 **2.2 MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products**

199 To apply the EMF methodology to BB products, formulas and flows (Figure 1 and Figure
 200 2) are adapted as it follows:

- 201 1. The fraction of the recycled feedstock, F_R , corresponds to the share of the bio-
 202 based feedstock content in the final BB product, $F_{R(i)}$. It is the ratio of the d.m.

203 amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m. amount of the total mass of BB
 204 product (EN 16785-2:2016).

205 2. The fraction of restorative mass going into a recycling process, C_R , corresponds
 206 to the share of bio-based feedstock content in the BB product biologically
 207 recovered (e.g. through composting) or biodegraded in the natural
 208 environment, as it happens for specific applications (e.g. biodegradable mulch
 209 film, etc.). It is the ratio of the d.m. amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m.
 210 amount of the total mass of BB product that is biologically recycled.

211 The modified scheme is shown in Figure 2. Table 2 lists the formulas as adapted to BB
 212 products.

213 **Table 2:** List of formulas as developed by EMF methodology compared to the
 214 *proposed adaptation to BB products.*

EMF methodology	Adaptation to BB products
_____	_____

_____ _____	_____


—

215

216 The mass of fossil-based feedstock which may be contained in BB products (V) is
217 obtained as a difference of the total mass (M) minus the bio-based fraction; in this case the
218 F_R in the EMF methodology corresponds to the sum of the fractions of all the bio-
219 based feedstock/s used in manufacturing the BB product. Therefore, is the
220 total bio-based feedstock mass in the product. In single-use products, such as mulch films,
221 reuse is not considered for BB products, so that $F_U = C_U = 0$.

222 W_F is the total amount of unrecoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
223 feedstock used to produce BB products (*i.e.* the amount of uncoverable waste per unit of
224 BB product). Bio-based feedstocks such as starch and PLA generate non-restorative flows
225 which can be quantified. Such unrecoverable waste correspond to $R_{(i)}$, the specific amount
226 of waste generated within cradle-to-gate boundaries per unit of bio-based feedstock going
227 into manufacturing, and it is estimated through LCA studies. Thus all inputs from growth
228 and harvesting phases and the related wastes generated by fertilisers and pesticides are
229 here accounted. $R_{(i)}$ can be easily found in specific literature or life cycle inventories
230 (LCI) present in LCA databases. In the calculation of W_F , also the efficiency of
231 manufacturing process of BB products E_P is considered, as the ratio of the overall bio-
232 based feedstock content in the final BB product to the bio-based feedstock in input to the
233 manufacturing process.

234 The material flows associated to the production of a generic BB product are summarized
235 in Figure 2.



236

237 **Figure 2:** Description of material flows adaptation to BB products; in this paper,
 238 the reuse flow is out of scope ($C_U = F_U = 0$).

239 The biodegradation of bio-based feedstock does not imply the generation of waste W_C as it
 240 occurs in a standard mechanical recycling process. This implies that C_R and E_C (i.e. the
 241 efficiency of the biodegradation process) equal to 1. Indeed, a BB raw material, sent to
 242 biological treatment (composting) or biodegraded in a natural environment, is fully
 243 transformed in its chemical elements (C, H and O mainly) derived from the decomposition
 244 of complex molecules (polymers) without the release of waste (Witt et al., 2001; Marten et
 245 al., 2003; Eubeler et al., 2010; BASF, 2018; Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites,
 246 2018; OWS, 2018; Zumstein et al., 2018). These natural elements return into the
 247 environment and are then available in the respective biogeochemical cycles. The
 248 (biodegradable) fossil portion behaves as well; consequently, $W_C = 0$.

249 Nevertheless, the fossil-based feedstock cannot be considered as a regenerative circular
250 feedstock, since it derives from carbon stored for millions of years and extracted by man,
251 not being part of the active and fast biogeochemical carbon cycle. This is accounted in the
252 quantification of W_0 , the mass of unrecoverable waste from use (*i.e.* the linear stream
253 going to landfill or incineration, the Non-Restorative Flows, NRF), as $W_0 = W_C + W_{NRF}$, the total
254 amount of fossil-based feedstock.


255 Since W_F and W_C are associated to complete different processes and W_C is always equal
256 zero, the double counting issue does not occur and the quantification of W and LFI is
257 modified as reported in Table 2.

258 **2.3 MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions**

259 The new formulas reported in Table 2 were applied to a single use product namely a BB
260 mulch film, to calculate their corresponding MCI. The transformation of BB materials
261 into the final products (*i.e.* white mulch films) takes place without any modification of the
262 bio-based feedstock content and the process yield is close to 1.

263 In the global market, there are several branded BB mulch films (Moreno et al., 2017), both
264 starch-based or blends of polyesters. In the following, the BB film is assumed to be a
265 starch-based mulch film with a 30%-portion of bio-based feedstock (*i.e.* 23% of starch,
266 $F_{(S)}$, and 7% of a bio-based plasticizer, $F_{(BP)}$), while the rest was assumed to consist of
267 fossil feedstock (Figure 3). Since a generalized approach was used and no primary data
268 were implemented, the information were extrapolated from literature; the main
269 characteristics of the two examined products are presented in Table 3.

270



271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

Figure 3: Examples of starch-based polymers; in this paper, the first option on the

left (starch blend 30/70) has been chosen as representative of a BB mulch film. The figure

considers a 100%-efficiency in every phase of production, so that the residues are equal to

zero; the same assumption is done in this paper. *TPS (Thermoplastic starch), starch

content 75%; **Ratio TPS/Polymer; modified from Institute of Bioplastics and

Biocomposites, 2018.

Table 3: Key features representative of the BB mulch films.

	BB mulch film
Material	30% bio-based feedstock (23% starch + 7% bio-based plasticizer) + 70% fossil-based feedstock
Thickness (µm)	12
Density (g/cm³)	1.25
Weight (g/m²)	15.2
Functional unit (the covering of the agricultural land)	6000 m²/ha (the actual mulched soil in a hectare is generally equal to the 60% of the total area; Malinconico, 2017)

280

281

282 In the calculation of MCI for the BB mulch film, the adapted formulas were used together
283 with assumptions. As stated before, BB mulch films are blends of bio-based and fossil
284 based feedstocks (in the specific case, 30% and 70% respectively). Unlike the LDPE
285 mulch film that has to be removed and disposed of, the BB mulch film is left in soil where
286 it undergoes an ultimate biodegradation (so that $C_R = 1$) with no waste (so that $E_C = 1$), in
287 respect of the specific standard EN 17033:2018. As a result of polymers' decomposition,
288 the derived (biogenic) C, H and O finally return into biosphere (atmosphere,
289 microorganism biomass, organic material pool), and back into biogeochemical cycles in a
290 relatively short time ("Biogenic elements accounted as recycled" in Figure 2), with the
291 exception of humified compounds. Actually, also C, H and O deriving from fossil-based
292 sources undergo biodegradation but they are not considered as a regenerative flow
293 ("Waste from non-restorative flow" in Figure 2) and their "wastes" are indeed calculated
294 in W_0 .

295 Applying a conservative approach, W_F , the waste generated by the production of each bio-
296 based feedstock, is quantified considering a "cradle to gate" LCA study. The estimated
297 solid wastes $R_{(i)}$ for the presented case study are related to the production of starch ($F_{(S)}$),
298 with an amount $R_{(S)}$ of 0.014 kg of waste per kg of renewable feedstock (source: personal
299 communication A. Novelli), and to the production of the bio-based plasticizer ($F_{(BP)}$), with
300 $R_{(BP)}$ equals to 0.025 kg waste/kg renewable feedstock, (source: US-LCI database
301 "Polylactide biopolymer resin at plant kg/RNA"). As assumed in Figure 3, the production
302 efficiency of BB product E_P (how much bio-based feedstock is needed for every unit of
303 BB product) is estimated equal to 1 and no unrecoverable wastes are generated by the
304 process.

305 In addition, an explorative sensitivity analysis has been performed regarding exclusively
 306 the amount of bio-based feedstock content of the BB mulch film, *i.e.* $(i.e., F_{(S)} +$
 307 $F_{(BP)})$, as shown in Figure 4 (Chapter 3).

308 **2.4 Sensitivity analysis**

309 A sensitivity analysis was conducted for BB mulch film to examine the effects of
 310 changing the main variables. Given a non-linear dependence of results on parameter
 311 values, a Monte Carlo approach (see, *e.g.*, Lloyd and Ries, 2008) has been adopted. The
 312 model has been implemented using specifically written routines in the C++ programming
 313 language. The model was run with 100,000 events for BB mulch film, where the value of
 314 each parameter has been randomly chosen following a Gaussian distribution with a
 315 standard deviation within a range of possible and realistic values (Table 5 and **Error!**
 316 **Reference source not found.**; Figure 5 and Figure 6).

317 **3 Results**

318 Considering the characteristics of the films (weight, g/m^2 , or thickness, μm , and density,
 319 g/cm^3) and the relative functional unit ($6000 m^2/ha$, Table 3), it is possible to calculate a
 320 mass, M , that is 90 kg/ha for the BB one. Once calculated the masses, the formulas
 321 reported in Table 2 (Chapter 2.2) are applied. Results are shown in Table 4.


322 Figure 4 shows how the value of the MCI varies according to the percentage variation of
 323 the bio-based feedstock in the total mass of the product.

324

325 **Table 4:** Resulting parameters in the calculation of MCI for BB mulch film.

Parameter	BB mulch film

326
327



328
329
330

Figure 4: MCI as a function of $\Sigma F_{R(i)}$, the percentage of all the bio-based feedstock/s of the mulch film on mass basis (X-axis).

331

332 **3.1 Sensitivity analysis**

333 The results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in the followings Table 5 and Figure 5
334 and Figure 6. The accuracy band is a fraction of the average and corresponds to a
335 probability of 95%. It has been chosen in order to be representative of the variability of the
336 product category, the BB mulch films. The simulation can thus be regarded as a system
337 composed by a high number of companies, each producing films with different
338 characteristics, that are accounted for in the accuracy band.


339 **Table 5: Parameters used for the sensitivity analysis of the BB mulch film. (**) The**
340 **Accuracy Band is defined as twice the standard deviation of the distribution.**

Variable name	Average	Accuracy Band (**)	Unit
M	1000.00	0%	kg
$F_{(S)}/F_{(BP)}$	3.29	10%	fraction
$F_{(S)} + F_{(BP)}$	0.30	30%	fraction
F_U	0.00	0%	fraction
C_U	0.00	0%	fraction
$R_{(S)}$	0.014	100%	fraction
$R_{(BP)}$	0.025	100%	fraction
E_C	1	0%	fraction
E_P	0.95	10%	fraction
C_R	1.00	0%	fraction

341

342


343



344

345

Figure 5: Resulting distribution of MCI values for BB mulch film.



346

347

348

Figure 6: The most sensitive and relevant parameters in the calculation of the MCI of the BB mulch films.

349 **4 Discussion**

350 This work applies the principles of the EMF methodology into BB products so as to define
351 common metrics for calculating their circularity. By doing so it proposes some substantial
352 changes to the EMF methodology but still coherent with the overall methodological
353 framework. Such changes should be seen as a generalisation of the methodology provided
354 the following rules are applied:

355 (1) fossil-based feedstocks or component materials embodied in the BB products whatever
356 is the final disposal (even biological recycling) shall be considered as non-restorative;

357 (2) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to biological
358 recycling like composting, or biodegrade in the environment (i.e. BB mulch film) shall be
359 considered restorative as long as they flow through the biosphere safely, without any harm
360 to the environment (e.g. no toxicity effects).

361 (3) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to incineration and
362 landfill shall be considered as non-restorative;

363 The justification of these rules is described in the following.

364 Fossil-based component materials in the product derive from deposits where they
365 remained stocked for a geological time scale. Once the product is mineralised, its fossil-
366 based portion will be accounted as non-regenerative and therefore linear, due to its origin
367 (Joos et al., 2013). This is true, even if fossil carbon, for example, will re-enter biological
368 cycles, like CO₂ in the atmosphere and other streams, since both fossil-based and bio-
369 based component materials will physically and chemically behave the same, once
370 biodegraded. However, the source of the bio-based carbon was circular before its use
371 (concept of “carbon neutrality”, equilibrium between the biogenic carbon released and the
372 carbon absorbed by plants) and will maintain its circularity provided that the carbon is
373 released into the atmosphere at the same rate. The reason has its origin in the EMF general

374 provisions stating that “biologically sourced materials can only be considered part of a
375 Circular Economy if materials are not used faster than they can be restored naturally”
376 (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015). If BB products are incinerated,
377 the bio-based components are still considered linear, maintaining consistency with EMF
378 principles. Basically, a complete circularity for a BB product is satisfied when its
379 renewable components are 100% bio-based and they go 100% to biological recycling or
380 biodegraded in the environment (for specific application like mulch film).

381 As for provision (3), a material health rule has its origin in manifold normative
382 definitions of the CE. In addition, the EMF definition of biological cycles is that of non-
383 toxic materials which are restored into the biosphere and the CE is defined as such if it can
384 “eliminate the use of toxic chemicals”. The need of a safety clause has been reviewed
385 under many aspects by Verberne (2016) and can be put as a postulate of the restoration
386 principle: if a flow is toxic it cannot be defined restorative. This is also at the core of the
387 REACH Regulation (EC 1907/2006). In the specific case, the material complies with the
388 standard EN 17033-2018 certifying that no harm is caused to a) all relevant organism
389 groups as plants, invertebrates (e.g. earthworm) and microorganisms, b) important
390 ecological processes maintaining soil functions, c) all relevant exposure pathways as soil
391 pore water, soil pore air and soil material.

392 A comprehensive approach for MCI calculation should also include non-restorative flows
393 generated at upstream level like biomass growth, in the specific case corn, and biomass
394 conversion processes like starch extraction and refining. Specifically these non-restorative
395 flows correspond to the overall non-recyclable wastes associated to the bio-based
396 feedstock supply thus non-recyclable waste from fertilizer and pesticide production, non-
397 recyclable scraps from conversion processes, etc. In this study such flows of non-
398 restorative waste coming from upstream manufacturing operations were included for the

399 bio-based feedstocks ($R_{(i)}$) used in manufacturing the BB mulch film applying “cradle to
400 gate” LCA methodology. However, we observed that the inclusion of upstream
401 unrecoverable waste does not significantly influence the MCI results in the chosen case
402 study, since the respective amounts are small. The specific unrecoverable waste for starch
403 and bio-based plasticizer (i.e. kg of waste/kg of bio-based feedstock) were estimated at
404 0.014 and 0.025, respectively.

405

406 The resulting MCI for the 30/70 blend of the BB mulch film is equal to 0.37 in a 0-1 scale
407 and its circularity is linearly linked to the amount of bio-based feedstock used according to
408 the equation $y = 0.89x + 0.1$, where y is the MCI and x is the bio-based feedstock content,
409 therefore the amount of recycled feedstock or (renewable) bio-based feedstock in input is
410 decisive.

411 Apart from the specific application analysed in this paper, the proposed MCI method can
412 be easily applied and calculated for any kind of BB product as long as the following
413 information are available:

- 414 • The bio-based feedstock content, determined according to the standard EN 16785-
415 2:2016, if the composition is known, or directly provided by the BB product manufacturer.
- 416 • The End of Life scenario of the studied BB product (real or hypothetical).
- 417 • The amount of un-recoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
418 feedstock contained in the BB product. They can be derived from LCA databases or other
419 specific sources.

420 **5 Conclusions**

421 Bioplastic market is steadily increasing. The value proposition of bio-based and
422 biodegradable products is linked to:

423 1. the use of renewable feedstock (like starch and its derivatives) instead of fossil oil or
424 natural gas;

425 2. the waste recovery through biological recycling, thanks to their ability to
426 biodegrade in composting facilities or in soil (e.g. biodegradable mulch film).

427 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), developed by the EMF, is a metric for
428 quantifying “how much” a product is circular (MCI = 0, fully-linear product; MCI = 1,
429 completely circular product) thus it represents a valuable tool for product eco-design
430 purposes. However, it focuses solely on technical materials, mechanically recycled or
431 reused, leaving out bio-based feedstocks and related biological treatments such as
432 composting. Without common metrics it is not possible to pursue concrete actions, to
433 achieve measurable results and to provide unequivocal references for all products. This
434 research work aims at filling this gap through the development of a methodology coherent
435 with EMF MCI methodology but able to catch the specificities of bio-based and
436 biodegradable products and provide metrics for those innovative products. Direct uses are:
437 (i) supporting the eco-design of innovative bio-based products and (ii) comparing the MCI
438 of BB products with MCI of traditional products (e.g. fossil based).

439 The proposed method has been applied to a real case study (i.e. biodegradable mulch film)
440 providing quantitative metrics about its circularity. Specifically considering a bio-based
441 feedstock content of 30%, the correspondent MCI is 0.37 in a 0-1 scale and its circularity
442 is heavily linked to the bio-based feedstock content according to this relation: $MCI_{(BB\ mulch\ film)} = 0.89 * bio\text{-}based\ feedstock + 0.1$.

444 The MCI is a key performance indicator to develop more circular products, in line with
445 the Circular Economy principles. Bioeconomy, thus also BB products, can provide
446 valuable insights in transforming the current (linear) economy in a more circular one,
447 however, the way the biomass is produced, processed and BB products are produced are

448 fundamental aspects to be properly assessed and monitored. This can be done using
449 specific methodologies like LCA. Within this context the proposed MCI has to be seen as
450 a complementary (quantitative) tool for further qualifying the sustainability of BB
451 products.

452

453 **Declaration of interest**

454 The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any
455 commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of
456 interest.

457

458 **Acknowledgements**

459 The authors thanks prof. Andrea Contin for the fruitful discussion and contribution
460 to the sensitivity analysis, Francesco Degli Innocenti for providing valuable comments
461 and feedback on the topics addressed by the paper and Alessandra Novelli for the general
462 support in the MCI elaboration.

463

464 **References**

465

BASF, 2018. Biodegradable mulch film – clarification of polymer fate in soil. CIPA Congress, Bordeaux/Arcachon, France, May 2018.

Briassoulis, D., Giannoulis, A., 2018. Evaluation of the functionality of bio-based plastic mulching films. *Polym. Test.* 67, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymertesting.2018.02.019>

De Lèpinau, P. and Arbenz, A., 2016. Economic and environmental impact of soil contamination in mulching film, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 28-48.

Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015. *Circularity Indicators – An approach to measure circularity – Methodology.* https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/insight/Circularity-Indicators_Methodology_May2015.pdf.

- Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017. The New Plastic Economy: Rethinking the future of plastic & catalysing action.
- EN 16785-2:2016 - Bio-based products - Bio-based content - Part 2: Determination of the bio-based content using the material balance method.
- EN 17033:2018 - Plastics - Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test methods.
- EPLCA – European Platform on LCA. https://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/?page_id=86
- Eubeler, J., Bernhanrd, M., Knepper, T., 2010. Environmental biodegradation of synthetic polymers II. Biodegradation of different polymer groups. Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 29, 1, 84-100
- European Commission, 2015. Closing the loop – An EU action plan for the Circular Economy. COM(2015) 614 final. Brussels, 2.12.2015
- European Commission, 2018. A European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular Economy. COM(2018) 28 final. Brussels, 16.1.2018
- Figuiet, B., 2016. Plasticulture in Europe, Plasticulture, N° 136, 20-28
- Gao, H., Yan, C., Liu, Q., Ding, W., Chen, B., Li, Z., 2019. Effects of plastic mulching and plastic residue on agricultural production: A meta-analysis. Sci. Total Environ. 651, 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2018.09.105>
- Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., Ulgiati, S., 2016. A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. J. Clean. Prod. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.007>
- Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018. Biopolymers – Facts and Statistics. Hochschule Hannover, University of Applied Sciences and Arts. Edition 5, ISSN 2510-3431.
- Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestedt, J. S., Peters, G. P., Enting, I. G., Bloh, W. V., ... and Friedrich, T., 2013. Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 13(5), 2793-2825.
- Kasirajan, S., Ngouajio, M., 2012. Polyethylene and biodegradable mulches for agricultural applications: a review. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 32, 501–529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0068-3>
- Le Moine, B., 2014. Agri-plastics waste management: a voluntary commitment from the industry. Presented at: Agricultural Film 2014 – International Conference on silage, mulch, greenhouse and tunnel films used in agriculture (15-17 September, Barcelona, Spain).

- Liu, E. K., He, W. Q., & Yan, C. R., 2014. 'White revolution' to 'white pollution'—agricultural plastic film mulch in China. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(9), 091001.
- Lloyd, S. M., & Ries, R., 2007. Characterizing, propagating, and analyzing uncertainty in life cycle assessment: A survey of quantitative approaches. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 11(1), 161-179.
- Lonca, G., Muggéo, R., Tétréault-Imbeault, H., Bernard, S., & Margni, M., 2018. A Bi-dimensional Assessment to Measure the Performance of Circular Economy: A Case Study of Tires End-of-Life Management. In *Designing Sustainable Technologies, Products and Policies* (pp. 33-42). Springer, Cham.
- Malinconico, M., 2017. Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture. *Green Chemistry and Sustainable Technology*. Springer.
- Marten, E., Muller, R., and Deckwer W., 2003. Studies on the enzymatic hydrolysis of polyesters I. Low molecular mass model esters and aliphatic polyesters. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 80, 3, 485-501.
- Moreno, M. M., González-Mora, S., Villena, J., Campos, J. A., & Moreno, C., 2017. Deterioration pattern of six biodegradable, potentially low-environmental impact mulches in field conditions. *Journal of environmental management*, 200, 490-501.
- Mormile, P., Stahl, N., Malinconico, M., 2017. The World of Plasticulture, in: Malinconico, M. (Ed.), *Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture*. pp. 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54130-2_1
- OWS, 2018. Accumulation of (bio)degradable plastics in soil. CIPA Congress 2018, Archacon, May 29.
- Steinmetz, Z., Wollmann, C., Schaefer, M., Buchmann, C., David, J., Tröger, J., Muñoz, K., Frör, O., Schaumann, G.E., 2016. Plastic mulching in agriculture. Trading short-term agronomic benefits for long-term soil degradation? *Sci. Total Environ.* 550, 690–705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.01.153>
- Tamma, P., 2018. China's trash ban forces Europe to confront its waste problem, Politico, 2/21/2018.
- Touchaleaume, F., Martin-Closas, L., Angellier-Coussy, H., Chevillard, A., Cesar, G., Gontard, N., Gastaldi, E., 2016. Performance and environmental impact of biodegradable polymers as agricultural mulching films. *Chemosphere* 144, 433–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.09.006>
- Verberne, J.J.H., 2016. Building circularity indicators. Eindhoven University of Technology.

- Witt, U., Einig, T., Yamamoto, M., Kleeberg, I., Deckwer, W., Muller, R., 2001. Biodegradation of aliphatic-aromatic copolyesters: evaluation of the final biodegradability and ecotoxicological impact of degradation intermediates. *Chemosphere*. 44, 289-299.
- Zumstein, M., Schintlmeister, A., Nelson, T., Baumgartner, R., Wagner, M., Sander, M., McNeill, K., Woebken, D., Kohler, H., 2018. Biodegradation of synthetic polymers in soils: Tracking carbon into CO₂ and microbial biomass. *Science Advances*, 4, 7.

Dear Reviewers,

The table below provides the requested clarifications and the description of the changes made on the paper for each raised point. Many thanks to both of you for your valuable comments and suggestions. We did our best to improve the paper in the light of the received feedback.

n	Reviewers' comments	Revisions made in the paper
	Reviewer #1	
1	<p>This paper presented a methodological approach for calculating the circularity of bio-based and biodegradable products (mulch films). This research aims at filling this gap through the development of a methodology coherent with EMF MCI methodology but able to catch the specificities of bio-based and biodegradable products and provide metrics for those innovative products. It is a topic of interest to the researchers in the related areas. However, the yield and application range of degradable plastics are important factors affecting their recycling. The whole paper should be reconstructed to make this paper more logically. A major revision is essential before acceptance. The followings are the specific comments.</p>	<p>Many thanks.</p> <p>EU economy has begun taking steps towards a low carbon future (e.g. renewable energy, electric vehicles) and more circular. Bio-based and biodegradable/compostable plastics are seen with interest in all those application where mechanical recycling of traditional plastics is hard to perform. For example in reference to the plastic mulching film the EU market accounts for about 80,000 t/y where >90% is represented by polyethylene (PE) mulch films. The use of PE film < 25 µm is responsible for about 15,000 t/y of microplastics which remain in the soil and about 30,000 t/y of agricultural plastic waste (i.e. PE mulch film) which are dumped or burned in the soil (1). Looking at these figure the great potentialities of developing alternative products results quite evident.</p> <p>However, due to space constraints it is not possible to extensively address these important aspects such as applications of biodegradable plastics, market perspective etc. as suggested by the reviewer. We instead performed some changes in the paper and added two very relevant on-line sources where it is possible to download EU documents, specific reports, case study etc able to direct the reader towards the topics raised by the reviewer.</p> <p>These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://bbia.org.uk/reports/ • https://www.european-bioplastics.org/news/publications/ <p>(1) Revision of the Fertilisers Regulation – benefits of biodegradable mulch films Kristy-Barbara Lange, European Bioplastics, 12 October 2016 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/108931/Kristy%20Barbara%20Lange%20EUBP%20PPT2.pdf</p>
2	<p>Highlights: All of them are exceed the word limits for highlights (less than 85 characters). Please refer to the Guide for Authors.</p>	<p>The highlights have been reduced (see related attach)</p>
3	<p>Table: All tables should be three-line tables in the manuscript.</p>	<p>The tables have been adjusted</p>
4	<p>Line 79 - 82 reference needed</p>	<p>A reference has been added</p>
5	<p>Line 107 Mt, The first appearance should be slightly explained.</p>	<p>The term “Mt” has been expressed as “millions of tonnes”</p>
6	<p>Line 111 - 113 some new references are</p>	<p>New references have been added.</p>

	needed. Please refer to " <i>Recent advances in toxicological research of nanoplastics in the environment: A review. Environmental Pollution, 2019, 252: 511-521; Microplastic pollution in surface sediments of urban water areas in Changsha, China: Abundance, composition, surface textures. Marine Pollution Bulletin 2018, 136: 414-423.</i> "	”
7	Line 115 - 117 reference needed	The text has been integrated with the requested time for removing plastic mulch film from the soil and the related reference added
8	Line 137 - 140 Biodegradable polymers are capable of undergoing biological anaerobic or aerobic degradation. A major problem with these plastics is that they have the potential to be biodegraded, but this process requires suitable conditions and microorganisms that are not always reliable in environmental conditions (in situ). The author should explain this point in the article. Please refer to " <i>Analysis and Prevention of Microplastics Pollution in Water: Current Perspectives and Future Directions. ACS Omega 4(4): 6709-6719</i> ".	The text has been integrated highlighting the importance of the environment's characteristics on the biodegradation rate of biodegradable bioplastics and the related reference added.
9	Line 284 - 287 reference needed. Although BB mulch films can undergo an ultimate biodegradation with no waste in the soil environment, the biodegradation processes and rate are the keys.	Reference added
10	Line 287 - 291 reference needed.	Reference added
11	Figure 4 should be further revised.	The figure caption has been improved and integrated
12	Line 437 - 438 The authors are encouraged to provide more information and discussion on the eco-design of innovative bio-based products.	The text has been integrated
	Reviewer #2	
13	This manuscript addresses an important topic - how to measure the circularity for a future circular bioeconomy. The suggested approach is novel and it is very good that the approach was demonstrated by the case study of mulch films.	Many thanks
14	It should be recognised that a circularity indicator like MCI is based on material	Absolutely agree. In the paper we only addressed the MCI of bio-based and biodegradable products as additional

	<p>flow analysis only. Thus it does not provide a full picture of sustainability: mass efficiency is not a guarantee of many important sustainability issues like climate change, land use, water use and other resources depletion. This needs to be better elaborated in the paper</p>	<p>metric for further qualifying and assessing bio-based products. This aspect has been further highlighted in the conclusions (line 458-468)</p>
15	<p>The author addressed the toxicity as one of the sustainability aspects but it is: 1) not covered by MCI by definition, and 2) not about life cycle toxicity, which is also an important aspects for bio-based production (especially in the agricultural phase).</p>	<p>The absence of toxicity is a <i>sine qua non</i> condition of the MCI methodology (line 375). It means that if a BB product causes toxicity effects the MCI does not apply since a fundamental principle (i.e. product safety) is not met. Translating this principle into biodegradable mulch film case study we recalled its compliance with the ISO 17033 standard since it encompasses the criteria regarding toxicity aspects beyond other requirements. That said if a BB mulch film is certified according to the ISO 17033 we can consider it safe for the environment.</p>
16	<p>The authors imply to re-define 'waste' (i.e. a material stream that cannot be recovered/biodegraded, or a material stream from a fossil-based source, see lines 285-293). This definition of 'waste' is very different from the definition of EU waste directive. This deviation should be brought into discussion. For example, the authors define that the stream goes to a landfill should be considered not recoverable. Use the case study of BB mulch films - will they biodegrade in a landfill? If yes, why should they be considered waste in this study? This is a very vague line that could practically hinder the application of a new metric.</p>	<p>It is not a re-definition of the term "waste". We have just defined the conditions for judging if a material stream is regenerative or not according to the proposed methodology. MacArthur methodology defines all material streams that go into incinerator or landfill "not regenerative" (i.e. no circular). Similarly we assumed that all BB product streams that go to landfill or incinerator are not regenerative with an exception: the "fossil part" that may constitute a BB product, even if it goes to biological recycling, it is still considered "not regenerative" since its origin is not biogenic. This methodological choice guarantees that a BB products gets a MCI =1 (complete circularity) only if it satisfies at the same time the following conditions: 1) the BB product is 100% made of renewable raw materials and 2) its end of life is represented by 100% biological recycling (composting or AD) or biodegradation in the environment depending on the BB application. Always according to this choice even if a 100% renewable BB product goes to incinerator or landfill thus it emits biogenic CO₂ that goes into the atmosphere and biomass following a circular cycle, this is not considered a regenerative stream since the end of life option does not correspond to that a compostable product has been conceived for (i.e biological recycling). For this reasons MCI will be <1. This is the rationale of the MCI methodology. That said it is not our intention to modify or distort the current definition of "waste".</p>
17	<p>In the case study, the life cycle 'waste' streams from potato/corn/wheat cultivation are not clearly given. The mass balances shown in Figure 3 do not</p>	<p>The Figure 3 has been improved by removing all figures which were not useful for the calculation example. We are sorry for the trouble. In reference to your question about the amounts of agricultural feedstocks they have to be</p>

	<p>added up well: for example, in the case of 30/70 starch blend, the total biomass required is 0.32t corn + 1.26t potato + 0.49t wheat = 2.07t (is this dry mass or green mass?), this gives 0.23t of starch. What is the $2.07 - 0.23 = 1.84$t of the loss? The explanation in line 298 of R(s) of 0.014kg waste per kg renewable feedstock does not seem justified by the numbers in Figure 3.</p>	<p>interpreted as 0.32 kg of corn or 1.26 kg of potato or 0.49 kg of wheat. They are the amounts needed to obtain 0.23 kg of starch (dry matter) which goes into the formulation. All the reported amounts of Figure 3 on starch, plasticizer and polymer refer to dry matter. Now the figure 3 should be clearer. In reference to 0.014 kg of not recoverable wastes per kg of renewable feedstock they refer to the “cradle to gate” LCA boundaries of starch. In the calculation we considered W_F associated to the starch as follows $0.23 * 0.014 = 0.0032$ kg/kg BB product.</p>
18	<p>Similar to the comment above: the case study seems completely ignored the the mass loss of the production of fossil-based biodegradable polymer.</p>	<p>In this specific case study the production of BB product (i.e. mulch film) yield is very close to 1 (possible scraps are internally reused in a closed loop), however, the proposed formula for W_F encompasses the mass losses since the process yield is at the denominator of the formula.</p>
19	<p>The effort of a monte carlo simulation is appreciated but is rather over complicated for the conclusion that F(s) + F(BP) is the most sensitive factor - it can be easily derived from a much simpler method like a regular sensitivity analysis.</p>	<p>A global sensitivity analysis can reveal the effect of the co-variation of all parameters, showing how the variance cancels out or add to the specific variation of a factor; the analysis showed to what extent the value of 0.37 can be considered robust, in consideration of all possible variation in defined ranges. The analysis showed that, all possible variations accounted, the standard deviation is 0.041, meaning that 95% of observation would range between 0.29 and 0.45.</p> <p>Not all parameters have a linear effect here. Ep, in particular, as it is placed in the denominator, might have had a relevant effect; its effect here is relatively small and negligible due to its small variation.</p> <p>A sensitivity analysis OAT (one factor at the time) , also known as local sensitivity analysis, or an error propagation would suit this case and indicate which are the most sensitive factors. However, as this paper aims at clarifying the meaning and the robustness of the measure, we opted for a thorough analysis</p>
20	<p>The sensitivity analysis should discuss the influence of the missing data (see comments 4 and 5 above) or input data that are highly uncertain</p>	<p>The uncertainty here is measured when assigning all the factors an accuracy band. R(s) was assigned a variation of 100% thus largely covering possible changes in the manufacturing process. As for the mass loss see explanation relative to point 4.</p>
21	<p>The discussion section should reflect on the limitation of this new metric.</p>	<p>Conclusions have been improved pointing out that MCI is just a further metric for characterizing BB products.</p>
22	<p>The case study demonstrated a blend material. How would it work for a copolymer which has partially biobased content, such as 30% biobased PET? or partially biobased PBAT (from biobased succinic acid). There should be a clear definition of biobased content (mass), especially for the non-carbon elements</p>	<p>For BB products that contain both biogenic and not biogenic feedstocks, like in the calculation example (Figure 3), only the amount of biogenic feedstock can be considered regenerative. The complementary amount does not. The determination of the regenerative amount thus its complementary not regenerative one is described in the recalled standard EN 16785-2:2016 (line 245)</p>

	such as H, O and even N.	
23	Section 2.4, line 314: justify why a Gaussian distribution is chosen.	All values represent a realisation of industrial processes . The law of large numbers applies here. There is no reason to suspect that a given value would have a different distribution
24	the first para under section 3 Results should be shifted to methodology.	The first para has been moved under methodology section.
25	figure 3: what is the purpose of showing land use and what are the values in cubic meters?	The figure has been adjusted removing the information not needed for the paper purposes. Sorry for the trouble.
26	figure 6: is an illustration needed for the message in the figure?	The figure shows the percent change in the MCI when changing the indicated parameters of + 1%. So, as an example, $F_s/F(BP)$ 3.29 a 1% change (+ 0.03) does not change the MCI; while a change of 1% of R_s ($0.014 + 0.0001$) yields a change of 0.7% in the MCI
27	- In lines 442-442 in the conclusions section, a relation of MCI of BB mulch films is given. This relation is only based on three data points, which is insufficient to draw a generic conclusion	Actually it is just a graphic representation of the MCI values obtainable through the application of the formulas reported in table 2. The three points represent the three different hypothetical compositions of the BB mulch film (i.e. renewable content equal to 30%, 50% and 70% respectively). For equal end of life (i.e. 100% biodegradation in soil) the MCI increases in function of renewable feedstock content.

1 Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: the
2 case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films

3
4 Francesco Razza^a, Cristiana Briani^b, Tony Breton^c, Diego Marazza^d

5 ^aNovamont S.p.A. - Ecology of Product and Environmental Communication, Piazz.le Donegani 4,
6 05100 Terni, Italy

7
8 ^bCIRSA Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca per le Scienze Ambientali, Via S. Alberto 163, 48123
9 Ravenna, Italy

10
11 ^cNovamont S.p.A. – Via Fauser 8, 28100 Novara, Italy

12
13 ^dDepartment of Physics, University of Bologna, Viale B. Pichat 6/2, 40127 Bologna, Italy

14
15 **Abstract**

16 The concept of circularity and its quantification through the Material Circularity Indicator
17 (MCI) is well established for traditional plastic products. In this paper a methodological
18 approach for calculating the circularity of bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products is
19 proposed and applied to BB mulch films. BB products are different from traditional
20 products in as much as they are sourced and regenerated (recycled) not through technical
21 cycles but the biological loop. The suggested method is an adaptation of the MCI where
22 two major changes were made: (i) the mass of the bio-based component corresponds to the
23 recycled material in input and (ii) the mass of the bio-based component leaving the system
24 through composting or biodegradation in soil is accounted as recycled. The modified MCI
25 supports the Eco-design of innovative BB products and allows for the comparison of their
26 circularity taking into account the biological source and the expected end of life process
27 such as biodegradation. To demonstrate the adaptation, the method has been applied to BB
28 mulch film. Results showed that the MCI of a biodegradable mulch film, characterized by
29 an average bio-based feedstock content of 30% is 0.37 ± 0.04 in a 0-1 scale. For BB mulch
30 film, the amount of bio-based feedstock is the most sensitive factor and controls linearly
31 the value of the MCI.

32
33 *Keywords:* circularity indicators, circular economy, bioplastics, biodegradable
34 mulch film, bio-based product, biodegradation

35

36	1	Introduction	43
37	1.1	The case study of mulch films.....	65
38	1.2	Goal of the paper	87
39	2	Materials and Methods	87
40	2.1	MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology	87
41	2.2	MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products.....	1340
42	2.3	MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions	1744
43	2.4	Sensitivity analysis	2147
44	3	Results	2147
45	3.1	Sensitivity analysis	2349
46	4	Discussion	2624
47	5	Conclusions	2923

Abbreviations

BB	Biodegradable and bio-based
CE	Circular Economy
d.m.	Dry matter
EMF	Ellen MacArthur Foundation
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LDPE	Low-Density Poly-Ethylene
MCI	Material Circularity Indicator
NRF	Non-Restorative Flows
PBAT	Polybutylene adipate terephthalate
PE	Poly-Ethylene
PLA	Polylactic acid

Abbreviations

BB	<u>Biodegradable and bio-based</u>
CE	<u>Circular Economy</u>
d.m.	<u>Dry matter</u>
EMF	<u>Ellen MacArthur Foundation</u>
LCA	<u>Life Cycle Assessment</u>
LDPE	<u>Low-Density Poly-Ethylene</u>
MCI	<u>Material Circularity Indicator</u>
NRF	<u>Non-Restorative Flows</u>
PBAT	<u>Polybutylene adipate terephthalate</u>

<u>PE</u>	<u>Poly-Ethylene</u>
<u>PLA</u>	<u>Polylactic acid</u>
<u>PHB</u>	<u>Poly hydroxy butyrate</u>

51 1 Introduction

52 To overcome today's unsustainable model of ~~'takeof'~~ 'take'-make-dispose' and its related
53 risks such as hikes in raw material prices, pressures on the environment, shortage of global
54 resources and waste sinks, a circular approach needs to be applied. It is a new regenerative
55 economic view, based on a balance between economy, environment and society, a total
56 resource efficiency and a Zero Emission Strategy that aims to maximize products value
57 with zero, or minimal, environmental impact (Ghisellini et al., 2016) . Together with
58 structural changes in environmental legislation, new logistics, technologies and sharing
59 schemes, the Circular Economy (CE) approach which is regenerative by design, aims at
60 closing materials loops, *i.e.* at reducing virgin materials input and waste output.

61 In December 2015, the European Commission developed an Action Plan for Circular
62 Economy (European Commission, 2015), where plastic was considered a priority to be
63 tackled. In January 2018, an *EU Plastic Strategy* (European Commission, 2018) was
64 adopted, in order to react to the increasing environmental problems concerning plastic
65 production, consumption, use and disposal along the same lines of the CE approach. Two
66 fundamental steps to increase the circularity of different plastic products are (i) the
67 abandonment of fossil fuels, *i.e.* currently 90% of the plastic is produced by virgin
68 petroleum-based feedstock (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017), and (ii) the development
69 of easily recyclable products which are recycled. Today, in EU the share of plastics
70 collected for recycling is 30% while the use of recycled plastics is just 6% (European
71 Commission, 2018).

72 Biodegradable and bio-based (BB) plastics are spreading across markets (Institute for
73 Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018) as a valid contribution to meet CE aims and
74 principles. This is true as long as the supply of renewable raw materials, generally from
75 agriculture, is based on a sustainable approach and the conversion processes along the

76 supply chain are efficient and highly integrated in a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
77 perspective (EPLCA – European Platform on LCA). While traditional plastics can be
78 mechanically recycled or incinerated with energy recovery, BB plastic products offer new
79 recycling routes in waste management, due to their biodegradability. Organic recycling
80 (through composting or anaerobic digestion) or in the case of specific applications such as
81 agricultural mulch films, biodegradation in the environment, offer additional recovery
82 options resulting in less wastes [and less contamination of soil by plastic residues \(Razza et](#)
83 [al., 2012; Lange, B., 2016\). An extensive literature review about the potentialities and](#)
84 [benefits of renewable and compostable bioplastics, encompassing market perspective,](#)
85 [applications, economic effects etc. can be found here: \(BBIA; European Bioplastics\).](#)
86 Nevertheless, the research and development of innovative products, such as the BB
87 products, implies the development of methodologies and metrics capable of measuring
88 their circularity. Without this it is not possible to achieve measurable results and
89 improving actions, as well as provide unequivocal references for comparisons of products
90 of the same type/category. In 2015 the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) was
91 developed (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015) which aims to quantify
92 the regeneration of a product's material flow and is considered one of the few, among
93 sixteen CE indexes suiting a micro-scale assessment of circularity at product or company
94 level (Lonca et al., 2018). However, it focuses solely on technical cycles and recycled
95 materials. Furthermore, recovery and recycling through the biological cycle offered by
96 industrial composting, anaerobic digestion or biodegradation in natural environments are
97 not considered as end of life options. In order to apply the MCI system to BB plastic
98 products, the development of an enhanced methodology is necessary.
99 The approach proposed by the authors allows to quantify the circularity of BB plastic
100 products ~~(e.g. starch based bioplastics)~~ and to make comparisons with equivalent

101 traditional plastic products. To demonstrate the applicability of the proposed method a
102 computational example for mulch film products is provided. In so doing so, the paper
103 aims at contributing to the Eco-design of these innovative products.

104 *1.1 The case study of mulch films*

105 Plastic mulch films represent an important agronomical technique well established for the
106 production of many crops thanks to numerous agronomical advantages such as: increased
107 yield and higher quality of productions (Steinmetz et al., 2016) ; weed control and
108 reduced use of pesticides; early crop production and reduced soil moisture loss
109 (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018). As a consequence, the plastic films consumption has
110 increased year-by-year, reaching a current global market estimated at 1.4 [millions of](#)
111 [tonnes Mt](#), mainly in Asia (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018; Mormile et al., 2017) , and
112 covering 80,000 km² of agricultural surface (0.6% of the global arable land). The mulch
113 film market in Europe is estimated by Agriculture Plastic & Environment and by the
114 European Bioplastic Associations at 76-80 kt. The most used raw material is Poly-
115 Ethylene (PE) in its different forms, due to its processability, chemical resistance, high
116 durability and flexibility (Kasirajan and Ngouajio, 2012; [Plasticulture, 2016 and 2018;](#)
117 [Shen, M. et al., 2019; Wen, X. et al., 2018](#)).

118 Despite these benefits, manifold environmental and agronomic problems have been
119 pointed out. After its useful life – which in general does not exceed 1 to 3 months – the
120 mulch film has to be removed and properly disposed of, a time-consuming ([about 16 hours](#)
121 [per hectare](#)) and costly procedure ([Scaringelli, M., 2016; Briassoulis, D., 2013](#)). The
122 recovered film is usually heavily contaminated with soil and organic residues, making
123 mechanical recycling technically difficult and not a cost-efficient solution (Briassoulis et
124 al., 2018; Figuier, 2016; De Lèpinau, Arbenz, 2016). The most common end of life of
125 collected films in Europe is still landfilling (about 50%), followed by energy recovering

126 and finally mechanical recycling (Le Moine, 2014). Recent Chinese prohibition (January
127 2018) to import different types of wastes is heavily impacting the European agricultural
128 plastic waste management, highlighting the difficulty in properly recycling this type of
129 plastics (Tamma, 2018). Plastic films may not be properly collected and recycled but
130 disposed of by burning in the field or by uncontrolled landfilling or left directly in the
131 (agricultural) soils, causing serious environmental concerns. An example is the “White
132 pollution” phenomena described in the Xinjiang Autonomous Region (China), in which
133 the residual plastic film can reach 200 kg/ha in the top soil with detrimental effects on
134 soils’ quality, health and fertility (Liu, He, & Yan, 2014; Gao *et al.*, 2019; Steinmetz *et*
135 *al.*, 2016).

136 As a reaction, there has been significant research into novel materials especially related to
137 biodegradable and bio-based (BB) mulch films, which enable an effective biodegradation
138 in soil and provide comparable agronomical performances (Touchaleaume *et al.*, 2016).
139 The term “bio-mulch film” brings together several types of both bio-based and fossil oil-
140 based biodegradable polymers and blends of them, such as polylactic acid (PLA),
141 polybutylene adipate co-terephthalate (PBAT), starch-based polymer blends or
142 copolymers. They biodegrade when exposed to bioactive environments such as soil and
143 compost (Kasirajan *et al.*, 2012) which means that they can be left *in situ* to be fully
144 biodegraded after being used. [Clearly the biodegradation rate of biodegradable bioplastics](#)
145 [is influenced by the environmental conditions such as the types of available bacteria, fungi](#)
146 [thus specific enzymes namely native microflora \(Pico, Y. *et al.*, 2019\). However their](#)
147 [intrinsic biodegradability ~~must be proved by accredited certification bodies and~~](#)
148 [standardized procedures allow the complete biodegradation with times similar to natural](#)
149 [polymers such as cellulose used as reference by the relevant standards and certification](#)
150 [schemes.](#)

151 The EN 17033:2018 is a new European Norm (standard) concerning “Plastics -
152 Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test
153 methods”, which sets the necessary tests and limits to define biodegradability,
154 performances and environmental impacts of BB mulch films. The material is considered
155 completely biodegradable if it achieves a complete biodegradation (absolute or relative to
156 the reference material) in a test period no longer than 24 months (mineralization into
157 CO₂). Additionally, a control of constituents (such as metals) and eco-toxicity testing
158 (acute and chronic toxicity tests on plant growth, earthworm; nitrification inhibition test
159 with soil microorganisms) were required. A certified mulch film guarantees that the
160 product will completely biodegrade in the soil without adversely impacting on the
161 environment.

162 **1.2 Goal of the paper**

163 The goal of the paper is to provide a general and common metric to measure the
164 circularity of a bio-based and biodegradable (BB) product and to apply the methodology at
165 product level to a category of products, namely bio-based and biodegradable mulch films.

166 **2 Materials and Methods**

167 **2.1 MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology**

168 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), according to the Ellen MacArthur Foundation
169 (EMF) methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015), is a number
170 that can range from 0 (pure linearity) to 1 (pure circularity). A purely linear production
171 provides for the exclusive use of virgin raw materials that turn into waste at the end of the
172 use phase of the product. Vice-versa, pure circularity includes the use of recycled
173 materials and does not produce wastes (regenerative streams). Circularity can be achieved
174 in different ways: as for the purpose of this paper, only recycling will be considered since

175 reuse is not an option for thin biodegradable mulch films. Since the method considers only
176 mass flows, the recycling corresponds to the recovery of materials for the original purpose
177 or for other purposes and excludes energy recovery, considered as a loss of materials equal
178 to landfill disposal. The materials recovered feed back into the process as recycled
179 feedstock.

180 The MCI methodology differentiates 'technical cycles' from 'biological cycles',
181 modelling only the former. The first contains products and materials re-entering into the
182 system (market) with the highest possible qualities and for as long as possible (thanks to
183 reuse, repair, refurbishment and recycling) and the latter includes biological materials used
184 in cascade until their restoration into the biosphere and the re-constitution of natural
185 resources.


186 The material flows associated to the production of a generic technical cycle from non-
187 renewable sources are summarized in [Figure 1](#). The dashed lines indicate that
188 recycled feedstock does not have to be sourced from the same product but can be acquired
189 on the market. With reference to [Figure 1](#), the list of the parameters used in the
190 EMF methodology is reported in [Table 1](#), while the equations relevant for the
191 analysis carried out in this paper are described in the following sections ([Table 2](#),
192 Chapter 2.2).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic



193

194 **Figure 1:** Diagram of material flows and associated variables of a generic

195 product (modified from Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015).

196

197 **Table 1:** Parameters and relative definitions used in the EMF methodology.

Parameter	Definition
M	Total mass of the product
F_R	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from recycled sources
F_U	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from reused sources
V	Mass of virgin feedstock used in a product
C_R	Fraction of mass of a product being collected to go into a recycling process

ϵ_U	Fraction of mass of a product going into component reuse
E_C	Efficiency of the recycling process used for the portion collected for recycling
E_F	Efficiency of the recycling process used to produce recycled feedstock for a product
W	Total mass of unrecoverable waste associated with a product
W_θ	Mass of unrecoverable waste (landfill, waste to energy and any other type of process where the materials are no longer recoverable)
W_C	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated in the process of recycling parts of a product (after use)
W_F	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated when producing recycled feedstock for a product
X	Utility of a product, calculated as $X = (L/L_{av})(U/U_{av})$
L	Actual average lifetime of a product
L_{av}	Actual average lifetime of an industry-average product of the same type
U	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of a product
U_{av}	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of an industry-average product of the same type

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Definition</u>
<u>M</u>	<u>Total mass of the product</u>
<u>E_R</u>	<u>Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from recycled sources</u>
<u>E_U</u>	<u>Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from reused sources</u>
<u>V</u>	<u>Mass of virgin feedstock used in a product</u>
<u>C_R</u>	<u>Fraction of mass of a product being collected to go into a recycling process</u>
<u>C_U</u>	<u>Fraction of mass of a product going into component reuse</u>
<u>E_C</u>	<u>Efficiency of the recycling process used for the portion collected for recycling</u>
<u>E_F</u>	<u>Efficiency of the recycling process used to produce recycled feedstock for a product</u>
<u>W</u>	<u>Total mass of unrecoverable waste associated with a product</u>
<u>W_0</u>	<u>Mass of unrecoverable waste (landfill, waste to energy and any other type of process where the materials are no longer recoverable)</u>
<u>W_C</u>	<u>Mass of unrecoverable waste generated in the process of recycling parts of a product (after use)</u>
<u>W_F</u>	<u>Mass of unrecoverable waste generated when producing recycled feedstock for a product</u>
<u>X</u>	<u>Utility of a product, calculated as $X = (L/L_{av})(U/U_{av})$</u>
<u>L</u>	<u>Actual average lifetime of a product</u>
<u>L_{av}</u>	<u>Actual average lifetime of an industry-average product of the same type</u>
<u>U</u>	<u>Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of a product</u>
<u>U_{av}</u>	<u>Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of an industry-average product of the same type</u>

199 The Material Circularity Indicator is determined as follows: ,
200 where LFI is the Linear Flow Index measuring the flows of virgin materials and
201 unrecoverable wastes associated to the examined product.

202 A function of the utility, U , is used to correct the LFI . The function F is chosen in
203 such a way that improvements of the utility of a product (e.g., by using it longer) have the
204 same impact on its MCI as a reuse of components, leading to the same amount of
205 reduction of virgin material use and unrecoverable waste. Setting $a = 0.9$, MCI takes, by
206 convention, the value 0.1 for a fully linear product (*i.e.*, $LFI = 1$) whose utility equals the
207 industry average (*i.e.*, $X = 1$). This leaves some margin to distinguish between processes
208 with a high linearity but different utilities.

209 2.2 MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products

210 To apply the EMF methodology to BB products, formulas and flows (Figure 1) and
211 and (Figure 2) are adapted as it follows:

- 212 1. The fraction of the recycled feedstock, F_R , corresponds to the share of the bio-
213 based feedstock content in the final BB product, $F_{R(i)}$. It is the ratio of the d.m.
214 amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m. amount of the total mass of BB
215 product (EN 16785-2:2016).
- 216 2. The fraction of restorative mass going into a recycling process, C_R , corresponds
217 to the share of bio-based feedstock content in the BB product biologically
218 recovered (*e.g.* through composting) or biodegraded in the natural
219 environment, as it happens for specific applications (*e.g.* biodegradable mulch
220 film, *etc.*). It is the ratio of the d.m. amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m.
221 amount of the total mass of BB product that is biologically recycled.

222 The modified scheme is shown in (Figure 2). (Table 2) lists the formulas as
223 adapted to BB products.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic
















Formatted: Font: Not Italic

224

Table 2: List of formulas as developed by EMF methodology compared to the

225

proposed adaptation to BB products.

<u>EMF methodology</u>	<u>Adaptation to BB products</u>
	
	
	
	
	
	
	
	
	
<u>EMF methodology</u>	<u>Adaptation to BB products</u>

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt

226


227 The mass of fossil-based feedstock which may be contained in BB products (V) is
228 obtained as a difference of the total mass (M) minus the bio-based fraction; in this case the
229 F_R in the EMF methodology corresponds to the sum of the fractions of all the bio-
230 based feedstock/s used in manufacturing the BB product. Therefore, is the
231 total bio-based feedstock mass in the product. In single-use products, such as mulch films,
232 reuse is not considered for BB products, so that $F_U = C_U = 0$.

233 W_F is the total amount of unrecoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
234 feedstock used to produce BB products (*i.e.* the amount of uncoverable waste per unit of
235 BB product). Bio-based feedstocks such as starch, ~~and~~ [PLA](#), ~~PHB~~ [etc.](#) generate non-
236 restorative flows which can be quantified. Such unrecoverable waste correspond to $R_{(i)}$,
237 the specific amount of waste generated within cradle-to-gate boundaries per unit of bio-
238 based feedstock going into manufacturing, and it is estimated through LCA studies. Thus
239 all inputs from growth and harvesting phases and the related wastes generated by
240 fertilisers and pesticides are here accounted. $R_{(i)}$ can be easily found in specific literature
241 or life cycle inventories (LCI) present in LCA databases. In the calculation of W_F , also the

242 efficiency of manufacturing process of BB products E_P is considered, as the ratio of the
 243 overall bio-based feedstock content in the final BB product to the bio-based feedstock in
 244 input to the manufacturing process.

245 The material flows associated to the production of a generic BB product are summarized
 246 in [Figure 2](#).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic



247
 248 **Figure 2:** Description of material flows adaptation to BB products; in this paper,
 249 the reuse flow is out of scope ($C_U = F_U = 0$).

250 The biodegradation of bio-based feedstock does not imply the generation of waste W_C as it
 251 occurs in a standard mechanical recycling process. This implies that C_R and E_C (i.e. the
 252 efficiency of the biodegradation process) equal to 1. Indeed, a BB raw material, sent to
 253 biological treatment (composting) or biodegraded in a natural environment, is fully
 254 transformed in its chemical elements (C, H and O mainly) derived from the decomposition

255 of complex molecules (polymers) without the release of waste (Witt et al., 2001; Marten et
256 al., 2003; Eubeler et al., 2010; BASF, 2018; Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites,
257 2018; OWS, 2018; Zumstein et al., 2018). These natural elements return into the
258 environment and are then available in the respective biogeochemical cycles. The
259 (biodegradable) fossil portion behaves as well; consequently, $W_C = 0$.

260 Nevertheless, the fossil-based feedstock cannot be considered as a regenerative circular
261 feedstock, since it derives from carbon stored for millions of years and extracted by man,
262 not being part of the active and fast biogeochemical carbon cycle. This is accounted in the
263 quantification of W_0 , the mass of unrecoverable waste from use (i.e. the linear stream
264 going to landfill or incineration, the Non-Restorative Flows, NRF), as W_0 , the total
265 amount of fossil-based feedstock.

266 Since W_F and W_C are associated to complete different processes and W_C is always equal
267 zero, the double counting issue does not occur and the quantification of W and LFI is
268 modified as reported in [Table 2](#).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

269 2.3 MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions

270 The new formulas reported in [Table 2](#) were applied to a single use product namely
271 a BB mulch film, to calculate their corresponding MCI. The transformation of BB
272 materials into the final products (i.e. white mulch films) takes place without any
273 modification of the bio-based feedstock content and the process yield is close to 1.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

274 In the global market, there are several branded BB mulch films (Moreno et al., 2017), both
275 starch-based or blends of polyesters. In the following, the BB film [has been arbitrarily is](#)
276 assumed to be a starch-based mulch film with a 30%-portion of bio-based feedstock (i.e.
277 23% of starch, $F_{(S)}$, and 7% of a bio-based ~~plasticizer~~ ~~additive~~, $F_{(BPA)}$), while the rest was
278 assumed to consist of fossil feedstock ($F_{(F)}$).


Formatted: Font: Not Italic

279

280 ~~Figure 3~~ Figure 3). Since a generalized approach was used and no primary data were
 281 implemented, the information were extrapolated from literature ([Institute of Bioplastics](#)
 282 [and Biocomposites, 2018](#)); the main characteristics of the two examined products are
 283 presented in [Table 3](#) ~~Table 3~~.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296



297 *Figure 3: Examples of hypothetical starch-bio-based polymers; in this paper, the*
 298 *first option on the left (starch blend 30/70) has been chosen as representative of a BB*
 299 *mulch film for carrying out the numerical MCI calculation (working hypothesis). The*
 300 *figure considers a 100%-efficiency in every phase of production, so that the residues are*
 301 *equal to zero; the same assumption is done in this paper. *TPS (Thermoplastic starch),*
 302 *starch content 75%; **Ratio TPS/Polymer; modified from Institute of Bioplastics and*
 303 *Biocomposites, 2018.*

304
305

Table 3: Key features representative of the BB mulch films.

BB mulch film	
Material	30% bio-based feedstock (23% starch + 7% bio-based plasticizer) + 70% fossil based feedstock
Thickness (μm)	12
Density (g/cm^3)	1.25
Weight (g/m^2)	15.2
Functional unit (the covering of the agricultural land)	6000 m^2/ha (the actual mulched soil in a hectare is generally equal to the 60% of the total area; Malinconico, 2017)
BB mulch film	
Material	30% bio-based feedstock (23% starch + 7% bio-based additive) + 70% fossil feedstock
Thickness (μm)	12
Density (g/cm^3)	1.25
Weight (g/m^2)	15.2
Functional unit (the covering of the agricultural land)	6000 m^2/ha (the actual mulched soil in a hectare is generally equal to the 60% of the total area; Malinconico, 2017)

306
307

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

308 In the calculation of MCI for the BB mulch film, the adapted formulas were used together
309 with assumptions. As stated before, BB mulch films are blends of bio-based and fossil
310 based feedstocks (in the specific case, 30% and 70% respectively). Unlike the LDPE
311 mulch film that has to be removed and disposed of, the BB mulch film is left in soil where
312 it undergoes an ultimate biodegradation (so that $C_R = 1$) with no waste (so that $E_C = 1$), in
313 respect of the specific standard EN 17033:2018. As a result of polymers' decomposition,
314 the derived (biogenic) C, H and O finally return into biosphere (atmosphere,
315 microorganism biomass, organic material pool) [\(OWS, 2018\)](#), and back into
316 biogeochemical cycles in a relatively short time ("Biogenic elements accounted as
317 recycled" in [Figure 2](#)), with the exception of humified compounds. Actually, also
318 C, H and O deriving from fossil-based sources undergo biodegradation [\(Zumstein, M.T.,
319 2018\)](#) but they are not considered as a regenerative flow ("Waste from non-restorative
320 flow" in [Figure 2](#)) and their "wastes" are indeed calculated in W_0 .
321 Applying a conservative approach, W_F , the waste generated by the production of each bio-
322 based feedstock, is quantified considering a "cradle to gate" LCA study. The estimated
323 solid wastes $R_{(i)}$ for the presented case study are related to the production of starch ($F_{(S)}$),
324 with an amount $R_{(S)}$ of 0.014 kg of waste per kg of renewable feedstock (source: personal
325 communication A. Novelli), and to the production of the bio-based [additive plasticizer](#)
326 ($F_{(BAP)}$), with $R_{(BAP)}$ equals to 0.025 kg waste/kg renewable feedstock [\(US-LCI database\);](#)
327 ~~(source: US LCI database "Polylactide biopolymer resin at plant kg/RNA")~~. As assumed
328 in [Figure 3](#),
329
330 [Figure 3](#), the production efficiency of BB product E_P (how much bio-based
331 feedstock is needed for every unit of BB product) is estimated equal to 1 and no
332 unrecoverable wastes are generated by the process.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

333 In addition, an explorative sensitivity analysis has been performed regarding exclusively
334 the amount of bio-based feedstock content of the BB mulch film, *i.e.* (*i.e.*, $F_{(S)} +$
335 $F_{(BFA)}$), as shown in [Figure 4](#) (Chapter 3). ~~Considering the characteristics of the~~
336 ~~films (weight, g/m^2 , or thickness, μm , and density, g/cm^3) and the relative functional unit~~
337 ~~(6000 m^2/ha , [Table 3](#)), it is possible to calculate a mass, M , that is 90 kg/ha for the~~
338 ~~BB one. Once calculated the masses, the formulas reported in [Table 2](#) (Chapter~~
339 ~~2.2) are applied. Results are shown in [Table 4](#).~~

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

341 2.4 Sensitivity analysis

342 A sensitivity analysis was conducted for BB mulch film to examine the effects of
343 changing the main variables. Given a non-linear dependence of results on parameter
344 values, a Monte Carlo approach (see, *e.g.*, Lloyd and Ries, 2008) has been adopted. The
345 model has been implemented using specifically written routines in the C++ programming
346 language. The model was run with 100,000 events for BB mulch film, where the value of
347 each parameter has been randomly chosen following a Gaussian distribution with a
348 standard deviation within a range of possible and realistic values ([Table 5](#) and
349 ~~Error! Reference source not found, [Table 6](#); [Figure 5](#) and [Figure 6](#)).~~

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

350 3 Results

351 ~~Considering the characteristics of the films (weight, g/m^2 , or thickness, μm , and density,~~
352 ~~g/cm^3) and the relative functional unit (6000 m^2/ha , [Table 3](#)), it is possible to calculate a~~
353 ~~mass, M , that is 90 kg/ha for the BB one. Once calculated the masses, the formulas~~
354 ~~reported in [Table 2](#) (Chapter 2.2) are applied. Results are shown in [Table 4](#).~~
355 [Figure 4](#) shows how the value of the MCI varies according to the percentage
356 variation of the bio-based feedstock in the total mass of the product.

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed


Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Table 4: Resulting parameters in the calculation of MCI for BB mulch film.

Parameter	BB mulch film

- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body, 11 pt

359
360



361
362 *Figure 4: MCI as a function of the amount of bio-based feedstock/s in the BB*
363 *mulch film $\Sigma F_{R(i)}$, expressed as $\Sigma F_{R(i)}$ —the percentage of all the bio-based feedstock/s of the*
364 *mulch film on dry mass basis (X-axis). The dots correspond to the three different*
365 *hypothetical bioplastic compositions of Figure 3.*

366
367 **3.1 Sensitivity analysis**

368 The results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in the followings Table 5 and
369 Figure 5 and Figure 6. The accuracy band is a fraction of the average and
370 corresponds to a probability of 95%. It has been chosen in order to be representative of the
371 variability of the product category, the BB mulch films. The simulation can thus be

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

372 regarded as a system composed by a high number of companies, each producing films
 373 with different characteristics, that are accounted for in the accuracy band.

374 **Table 5:** Parameters used for the sensitivity analysis of the BB mulch film. (**) The
 375 Accuracy Band is defined as twice the standard deviation of the distribution.

Variable name	Average	Accuracy Band (**)	Unit
M	1000.00	0%	kg
$F_{(S)}/F_{(BP)}$	3.29	10%	fraction
$F_{(S)} + F_{(BP)}$	0.30	30%	fraction
F_U	0.00	0%	fraction
C_U	0.00	0%	fraction
$R_{(S)}$	0.014	100%	fraction
$R_{(BP)}$	0.025	100%	fraction
E_C	1	0%	fraction
E_P	0.95	10%	fraction
C_R	1.00	0%	fraction


<u>Variable name</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Accuracy Band (**)</u>	<u>Unit</u>
<u>M</u>	<u>1000.00</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>kg</u>
<u>$F_{(S)}/F_{(BP)}$</u>	<u>3.29</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>fraction</u>
<u>$F_{(S)} + F_{(BP)}$</u>	<u>0.30</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>fraction</u>
<u>F_U</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>fraction</u>
<u>C_U</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>fraction</u>
<u>$R_{(S)}$</u>	<u>0.014</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>fraction</u>
<u>$R_{(BP)}$</u>	<u>0.025</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>fraction</u>
<u>E_C</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>fraction</u>
<u>E_P</u>	<u>0.95</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>fraction</u>

C_R 1.00 0% fraction

376

377


378



379

380

Figure 5: Resulting distribution of MCI values for BB mulch film.



381

382 *Figure 6: The most sensitive and relevant parameters in the calculation of the*

383 *MCI of the BB mulch films.*

384 4 Discussion

385 This work applies the principles of the EMF methodology into BB products so as to define
 386 common metrics for calculating their circularity. By doing so it proposes some substantial
 387 changes to the EMF methodology but still coherent with the overall methodological
 388 framework. Such changes should be seen as a generalisation of the methodology provided
 389 the following rules are applied:

- 390 (1) fossil-based feedstocks or component materials embodied in the BB products whatever
 391 is the final disposal (even biological recycling) shall be considered as non-restorative;
 392 (2) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to biological
 393 recycling like composting, or biodegrade in the environment (i.e. BB mulch film) shall be

394 considered restorative as long as they flow through the biosphere safely, without any harm
395 to the environment (e.g. no toxicity effects).

396 (3) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to incineration and
397 landfill shall be considered as non-restorative;

398 The justification of these rules is described in the following.

399 Fossil-based component materials in the product derive from deposits where they
400 remained stocked for a geological time scale. Once the product is mineralised, its fossil-
401 based portion will be accounted as non-regenerative and therefore linear, due to its origin
402 (Joos et al., 2013). This is true, even if fossil carbon, for example, will re-enter biological
403 cycles, like CO₂ in the atmosphere and other streams, since both fossil-based and bio-
404 based component materials will physically and chemically behave the same, once
405 biodegraded. However, the source of the bio-based carbon was circular before its use
406 (concept of “carbon neutrality”, equilibrium between the biogenic carbon released and the
407 carbon absorbed by plants) and will maintain its circularity provided that the carbon is
408 released into the atmosphere at the same rate. The reason has its origin in the EMF general
409 provisions stating that “biologically sourced materials can only be considered part of a
410 Circular Economy if materials are not used faster than they can be restored naturally”
411 (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015). If BB products are incinerated, the
412 bio-based components are still considered linear, maintaining consistency with EMF
413 principles. Basically, a complete circularity for a BB product is satisfied when its
414 renewable components are 100% bio-based and they go 100% to biological recycling or
415 biodegraded in the environment (for specific application like mulch film).

416 | As for provision (3),- a material health rule has its origin in manifold normative
417 definitions of the CE. In addition, the EMF definition of biological cycles is that of non-
418 toxic materials which are restored into the biosphere and the CE is defined as such if it can

419 “eliminate the use of toxic chemicals”. The need of a safety clause has been reviewed
420 under many aspects by Verberne (2016) and can be put as a postulate of the restoration
421 principle: if a flow is toxic it cannot be defined restorative. This is also at the core of the
422 REACH Regulation (EC 1907/2006). In the specific case, the material complies with the
423 standard EN 17033-2018 certifying that no harm is caused to a) all relevant organism
424 groups as plants, invertebrates (e.g. earthworm) and microorganisms, b) important
425 ecological processes maintaining soil functions, c) all relevant exposure pathways as soil
426 pore water, soil pore air and soil material.

427 A comprehensive approach for MCI calculation should also include non-restorative flows
428 generated at upstream level like biomass growth, in the specific case corn, and biomass
429 conversion processes like starch extraction and refining. Specifically these non-restorative
430 flows correspond to the overall non-recyclable wastes associated to the bio-based
431 feedstock supply thus non-recyclable waste from fertilizer and pesticide production, non-
432 recyclable scraps from conversion processes, etc. In this study such flows of non-
433 restorative waste coming from upstream manufacturing operations were included for the
434 bio-based feedstocks ($R_{(i)}$) used in manufacturing the BB mulch film applying “cradle to
435 gate” LCA methodology. However, we observed that the inclusion of upstream
436 unrecoverable waste does not significantly influence the MCI results in the chosen case
437 study, since the respective amounts are small. The specific unrecoverable waste for starch
438 and bio-based [additive plasticizer](#) (i.e. kg of waste/kg of bio-based feedstock) were
439 estimated at 0.014 and 0.025, respectively.

440
441 The resulting MCI for the 30/70 blend of the BB mulch film is equal to 0.37 in a 0-1 scale
442 and its circularity is linearly linked to the amount of bio-based feedstock used according to
443 the equation $y = 0.89x + 0.1$, where y is the MCI and x is the bio-based feedstock content,

444 therefore the amount of recycled feedstock or (renewable) bio-based feedstock in input is
445 decisive.

446 Apart from the specific application analysed in this paper, the proposed MCI method can
447 be easily applied and calculated for any kind of BB product as long as the following
448 information are available:

- 449 • The bio-based feedstock content, determined according to the standard EN 16785-
450 2:2016, if the composition is known, or directly provided by the BB product manufacturer.
- 451 • The End of Life scenario of the studied BB product (real or hypothetical).
- 452 • The amount of un-recoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
453 feedstock contained in the BB product. They can be derived from LCA databases or other
454 specific sources.

455 **5 Conclusions**

456 Bioplastic market is steadily increasing. The value proposition of bio-based and
457 biodegradable products is linked to:

- 458 1. the use of renewable feedstock (like starch and its derivatives) instead of fossil oil or
459 natural gas;
- 460 2. the waste recovery through biological recycling, thanks to their ability to
461 biodegrade in composting facilities or in soil (*e.g.* biodegradable mulch film).

462 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), developed by the EMF, is a metric for
463 quantifying “how much” a product is circular (MCI = 0, fully-linear product; MCI = 1,
464 completely circular product) thus it represents a valuable tool for product eco-design
465 purposes. However, it focuses solely on technical materials, mechanically recycled or
466 reused, leaving out bio-based feedstocks and related biological treatments such as
467 composting. Without common metrics it is not possible to pursue concrete actions, to

468 achieve measurable results and to provide unequivocal references for all products. This
469 research work aims at filling this gap through the development of a methodology coherent
470 with EMF MCI methodology but able to catch the specificities of bio-based and
471 biodegradable products and provide metrics for those innovative products. Direct uses are:
472 (i) supporting the eco-design of innovative bio-based products and (ii) comparing the MCI
473 of BB products with MCI of traditional products (e.g. fossil based).

474 The proposed method has been applied to a real case study (*i.e.* biodegradable mulch film)
475 providing quantitative metrics about its circularity. Specifically considering a bio-based
476 feedstock content of 30%, the correspondent MCI is 0.37 in a 0-1 scale and its circularity
477 is heavily linked to the bio-based feedstock content according to this relation: $MCI_{(BB\ mulch\ film)} = 0.89 * bio\text{-based}\ feedstock + 0.1$.

479 The MCI is a key performance indicator to develop more circular products, in line with
480 the Circular Economy principles [like the use of renewable materials and the reduction of](#)
481 [the amount of not recoverable waste. MCI will support the development of innovative](#)
482 [products just based on these two important characteristics specific for each BB](#)
483 [product/application and end of life scenario](#). Bioeconomy, thus also BB products, can
484 provide valuable insights in transforming the current (linear) economy in a more circular
485 one, however, the way the biomass is produced, processed and BB products are produced
486 are fundamental aspects to be properly assessed and monitored. This can be done using
487 specific methodologies like LCA. Within this context the proposed MCI has to be seen as
488 a complementary (quantitative) tool for further qualifying the sustainability of BB
489 products [and not as a substitute tool](#).

490
491
492

493 **Declaration of interest**

494 The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any
495 commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of
496 interest.

497

498 **Acknowledgements**

499 The authors thanks prof. Andrea Contin for the fruitful discussion and contribution
500 to the sensitivity analysis, Francesco Degli Innocenti for providing valuable comments
501 and feedback on the topics addressed by the paper and Alessandra Novelli for the general
502 support in the MCI elaboration.

503

504

505 **References**

506

BASF, 2018. Biodegradable mulch film – clarification of polymer fate in soil. CIPA Congress, Bordeaux/Arcachon, France, May 2018.

[Bio-Based and Biodegradable Industries Association. BBIA reports. https://bbia.org.uk/reports/ \(accessed 28 November 2019\)](https://bbia.org.uk/reports/)

Briassoulis, D., Giannoulis, A., 2018. Evaluation of the functionality of bio-based plastic mulching films. Polym. Test. 67, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymertesting.2018.02.019>

[Briassoulis D., Hiskakis, M., Babou, E., 2013. Technical specifications for mechanical recycling of agricultural plastic waste. Waste Management, Volume 33, issue 6, pages 1516-1530, ISSN 0956-053X. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.03.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.03.004)

De Lèpinau, P. and Arbenz, A., 2016. Economic and environmental impact of soil contamination in mulching film, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 28-48.

Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015. *Circularity Indicators – An approach to measure circularity – Methodology.*

https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/insight/Circularity-Indicators_Methodology_May2015.pdf.

Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017. The New Plastic Economy: Rethinking the future of plastic & catalysing action.

EN 16785-2:2016 - Bio-based products - Bio-based content - Part 2: Determination of the bio-based content using the material balance method.

EN 17033:2018 - Plastics - Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test methods.

EPLCA – European Platform on LCA. https://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/?page_id=86

Eubeler, J., Bernhanrd, M., Knepper, T., 2010. Environmental biodegradation of synthetic polymers II. Biodegradation of different polymer groups. Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 29, 1, 84-100

European Commission, 2015. Closing the loop – An EU action plan for the Circular Economy. COM(2015) 614 final. Brussels, 2.12.2015

European Commission, 2018. A European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular Economy. COM(2018) 28 final. Brussels, 16.1.2018

[European Bioplastics. European Bioplastic publications. https://www.european-bioplastics.org/news/publications/ \(accessed 28 November 2019\)](https://www.european-bioplastics.org/news/publications/)

Figuier, B., 2016. Plasticulture in Europe, Plasticulture, N° 136, 20-28

Gao, H., Yan, C., Liu, Q., Ding, W., Chen, B., Li, Z., 2019. Effects of plastic mulching and plastic residue on agricultural production: A meta-analysis. Sci. Total Environ. 651, 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2018.09.105>

Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., Ulgiati, S., 2016. A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. J. Clean. Prod. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.007>

Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018. Biopolymers – Facts and Statistics. Hochschule Hannover, University of Applied Sciences and Arts. Edition 5, ISSN 2510-3431.

Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestedt, J. S., Peters, G. P., Enting, I. G., Bloh, W. V., ... and Friedrich, T., 2013. Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 13(5), 2793-2825.

Kasirajan, S., Ngouajio, M., 2012. Polyethylene and biodegradable mulches for agricultural applications: a review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 32, 501–529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0068-3>

[Lange, B.K., 2016. Revision of the fertilisers regulation – benefits of biodegradable mulch films. *European Bioplastics*.
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/108931/Kristy%20Barbara%20Lange%20EUBP%20PPT2.pdf> \(accessed 28 November 2019\)](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/108931/Kristy%20Barbara%20Lange%20EUBP%20PPT2.pdf)

Le Moine, B., 2014. Agri-plastics waste management: a voluntary commitment from the industry. Presented at: Agricultural Film 2014 – International Conference on silage, mulch, greenhouse and tunnel films used in agriculture (15-17 September, Barcelona, Spain).

Liu, E. K., He, W. Q., & Yan, C. R., 2014. ‘White revolution’ to ‘white pollution’—agricultural plastic film mulch in China. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(9), 091001.

Lloyd, S. M., & Ries, R., 2007. Characterizing, propagating, and analyzing uncertainty in life cycle assessment: A survey of quantitative approaches. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 11(1), 161-179.

Lonca, G., Muggéo, R., Tétrault-Imbeault, H., Bernard, S., & Margni, M., 2018. A Bi-dimensional Assessment to Measure the Performance of Circular Economy: A Case Study of Tires End-of-Life Management. In *Designing Sustainable Technologies, Products and Policies* (pp. 33-42). Springer, Cham.

Malinconico, M., 2017. Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture. *Green Chemistry and Sustainable Technology*. Springer.

Marten, E., Muller, R., and Deckwer W., 2003. Studies on the enzymatic hydrolysis of polyesters I. Low molecular mass model esters and aliphatic polyesters. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 80, 3, 485-501.

Moreno, M. M., González-Mora, S., Villena, J., Campos, J. A., & Moreno, C., 2017. Deterioration pattern of six biodegradable, potentially low-environmental impact mulches in field conditions. *Journal of environmental management*, 200, 490-501.

Mormile, P., Stahl, N., Malinconico, M., 2017. The World of Plasticulture, in: Malinconico, M. (Ed.), *Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture*. pp. 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54130-2_1

OWS, 2018. Accumulation of (bio)degradable plastics in soil. CIPA Congress 2018, Archacon, May 29.

[Pico Y., Barcelò, D., 2019. Analysis and prevention of microplastics pollution in water: current perspectives and future directions. *ACS Omega*, 4, 6709-6719.](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.omega.4c00000)

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Plasticulture catalogues, 2018. <http://plasticulture.qualif.e-catalogues.info> (accessed 28 November 2019)

<http://plasticulture.qualif.e-catalogues.info>

Razza, F., Degli Innocenti, F., 2012. Bioplastics from renewable resources: the benefits of biodegradability. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 7 (Suppl. 3): S301–S309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/apj.1648>

Scaringelli, M., Giannoccaro, G., prosperi, M., Lopolito, A., 2016. Adoption of biodegradable mulching films in agriculture: is there a negative prejudice towards materials derived from organic waste? *Italian Journal of agronomy*, 11:92.

Shen M., Zhang, Y., Zhu, Y., Song, B., Zeng, G., Hu, D., Wen, Y., Ren, X., 2019. Recent advances in toxicological research of nanoplastics in the environment: A review. *Environmental Pollution*, 252: 511-521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.102>

Steinmetz, Z., Wollmann, C., Schaefer, M., Buchmann, C., David, J., Tröger, J., Muñoz, K., Frör, O., Schaumann, G.E., 2016. Plastic mulching in agriculture. Trading short-term agronomic benefits for long-term soil degradation? *Sci. Total Environ.* 550, 690–705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.01.153>

Tamma, P., 2018. China's trash ban forces Europe to confront its waste problem, Politico, 2/21/2018.

Touchaleaume, F., Martin-Closas, L., Angellier-Coussy, H., Chevillard, A., Cesar, G., Gontard, N., Gastaldi, E., 2016. Performance and environmental impact of biodegradable polymers as agricultural mulching films. *Chemosphere* 144, 433–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.09.006>

US-LCI database. "Polylactide biopolymer resin at plant kg/RNA". <https://www.nrel.gov/lci/> (accessed 9 December 2019)

Verberne, J.J.H., 2016. Building circularity indicators. Eindhoven University of Technology.

Wen, X., Du, C., Xu, P., zeng, G., Huang, D., Yin, L., Yin, Q., Hu, L., Wan, J., Zhang, J., Tan, S., Deng, R., 2018. Microplastic pollution in surface sediments of urban water areas in Changsha, China: Abundance, composition, surface textures. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 136: 414-423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.09.043>.

Witt, U., Einig, T., Yamamoto, M., Kleeberg, I., Deckwer, W., Muller, R., 2001. Biodegradation of aliphatic-aromatic copolyesters: evaluation of the final biodegradability and ecotoxicological impact of degradation intermediates. *Chemosphere*. 44, 289-299.

Field Code Changed

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Formatted: Italian (Italy)

Zumstein, M., Schintlmeister, A., Nelson, T., Baumgartner, R., Wagner, M., Sander, M., McNeill, K., Woebken, D., Kohler, H., 2018. Biodegradation of synthetic polymers in soils: Tracking carbon into CO₂ and microbial biomass. *Science Advances*, 4, 7.

Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: the case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films

Francesco Razza^a, Cristiana Briani^b, Tony Breton^c, Diego Marazza^d

^a *Novamont S.p.A. - Ecology of Product and Environmental Communication, Piazz.le Donegani 4, 05100 Terni, Italy*

^b *CIRSA Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca per le Scienze Ambientali, Via S. Alberto 163, 48123 Ravenna, Italy*

^c *Novamont S.p.A. – Via Fauser 8, 28100 Novara, Italy*

^d *Department of Physics, University of Bologna, Viale B. Pichat 6/2, 40127 Bologna, Italy*

Abstract

The concept of circularity and its quantification through the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) is well established for traditional plastic products. In this paper a methodological approach for calculating the circularity of bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products is proposed and applied to BB mulch films. BB products are different from traditional products in as much as they are sourced and regenerated (recycled) not through technical cycles but the biological loop. The suggested method is an adaptation of the MCI where two major changes were made: (i) the mass of the bio-based component corresponds to the recycled material in input and (ii) the mass of the bio-based component leaving the system through composting or biodegradation in soil is accounted as recycled. The modified MCI supports the Eco-design of innovative BB products and allows for the comparison of their circularity taking into account the biological source and the expected end of life process such as biodegradation. To demonstrate the adaptation, the method has been applied to BB mulch film. Results showed that the MCI of a biodegradable mulch film, characterized by an average bio-based feedstock content of 30% is 0.37 ± 0.04 in a 0-1 scale. For BB mulch film, the amount of bio-based feedstock is the most sensitive factor and controls linearly the value of the MCI.

Keywords: circularity indicators, circular economy, bioplastics, biodegradable mulch film, bio-based product, biodegradation

36	1	Introduction	3
37	1.1	The case study of mulch films.....	5
38	1.2	Goal of the paper	7
39	2	Materials and Methods	7
40	2.1	MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology.....	7
41	2.2	MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products.....	11
42	2.3	MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions....	14
43	2.4	Sensitivity analysis	17
44	3	Results	17
45	3.1	Sensitivity analysis	19
46	4	Discussion	22
47	5	Conclusions	24

48
49

Abbreviations

BB	Biodegradable and bio-based
CE	Circular Economy
d.m.	Dry matter
EMF	Ellen MacArthur Foundation
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LDPE	Low-Density Poly-Ethylene
MCI	Material Circularity Indicator
NRF	Non-Restorative Flows
PBAT	Polybutylene adipate terephthalate
PE	Poly-Ethylene
PLA	Polylactic acid
PHB	Poly hydroxy butyrate

50

51 **1 Introduction**

52 To overcome today's unsustainable model of 'take-make-dispose' and its related risks
53 such as hikes in raw material prices, pressures on the environment, shortage of global
54 resources and waste sinks, a circular approach needs to be applied. It is a new regenerative
55 economic view, based on a balance between economy, environment and society, a total
56 resource efficiency and a Zero Emission Strategy that aims to maximize products value
57 with zero, or minimal, environmental impact (Ghisellini et al., 2016) . Together with
58 structural changes in environmental legislation, new logistics, technologies and sharing
59 schemes, the Circular Economy (CE) approach which is regenerative by design, aims at
60 closing materials loops, *i.e.* at reducing virgin materials input and waste output.

61 In December 2015, the European Commission developed an Action Plan for Circular
62 Economy (European Commission, 2015), where plastic was considered a priority to be
63 tackled. In January 2018, an *EU Plastic Strategy* (European Commission, 2018) was
64 adopted, in order to react to the increasing environmental problems concerning plastic
65 production, consumption, use and disposal along the same lines of the CE approach. Two
66 fundamental steps to increase the circularity of different plastic products are (i) the
67 abandonment of fossil fuels, *i.e.* currently 90% of the plastic is produced by virgin
68 petroleum-based feedstock (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017), and (ii) the development
69 of easily recyclable products which are recycled. Today, in EU the share of plastics
70 collected for recycling is 30% while the use of recycled plastics is just 6% (European
71 Commission, 2018).

72 Biodegradable and bio-based (BB) plastics are spreading across markets (Institute for
73 Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018) as a valid contribution to meet CE aims and
74 principles. This is true as long as the supply of renewable raw materials, generally from
75 agriculture, is based on a sustainable approach and the conversion processes along the

76 supply chain are efficient and highly integrated in a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
77 perspective (EPLCA – European Platform on LCA). While traditional plastics can be
78 mechanically recycled or incinerated with energy recovery, BB plastic products offer new
79 recycling routes in waste management, due to their biodegradability. Organic recycling
80 (through composting or anaerobic digestion) or in the case of specific applications such as
81 agricultural mulch films, biodegradation in the environment, offer additional recovery
82 options resulting in less wastes and less contamination of soil by plastic residues (Razza et
83 al., 2012; Lange, B., 2016). An extensive literature review about the potentialities and
84 benefits of renewable and compostable bioplastics, encompassing market perspective,
85 applications, economic effects etc. can be found here: (BBIA; European Bioplastics).
86 Nevertheless, the research and development of innovative products, such as the BB
87 products, implies the development of methodologies and metrics capable of measuring
88 their circularity. Without this it is not possible to achieve measurable results and
89 improving actions, as well as provide unequivocal references for comparisons of products
90 of the same type/category. In 2015 the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) was
91 developed (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015) which aims to quantify
92 the regeneration of a product's material flow and is considered one of the few, among
93 sixteen CE indexes suiting a micro-scale assessment of circularity at product or company
94 level (Lonca et al., 2018). However, it focuses solely on technical cycles and recycled
95 materials. Furthermore, recovery and recycling through the biological cycle offered by
96 industrial composting, anaerobic digestion or biodegradation in natural environments are
97 not considered as end of life options. In order to apply the MCI system to BB plastic
98 products, the development of an enhanced methodology is necessary.
99 The approach proposed by the authors allows to quantify the circularity of BB plastic
100 products and to make comparisons with equivalent traditional plastic products. To

101 demonstrate the applicability of the proposed method a computational example for mulch
102 film products is provided. In so doing so, the paper aims at contributing to the Eco-design
103 of these innovative products.

104 *1.1 The case study of mulch films*

105 Plastic mulch films represent an important agronomical technique well established for the
106 production of many crops thanks to numerous agronomical advantages such as: increased
107 yield and higher quality of productions (Steinmetz et al., 2016) ; weed control and
108 reduced use of pesticides; early crop production and reduced soil moisture loss
109 (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018). As a consequence, the plastic films consumption has
110 increased year-by-year, reaching a current global market estimated at 1.4 millions of
111 tonnes , mainly in Asia (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018; Mormile et al., 2017) , and
112 covering 80,000 km² of agricultural surface (0.6% of the global arable land). The mulch
113 film market in Europe is estimated by Agriculture Plastic & Environment and by the
114 European Bioplastic Associations at 76-80 kt. The most used raw material is Poly-
115 Ethylene (PE) in its different forms, due to its processability, chemical resistance, high
116 durability and flexibility (Kasirajan and Ngouajio, 2012; Plasticulture, 2016 and 2018;
117 Shen, M. et al., 2019; Wen, X. et al., 2018).

118 Despite these benefits, manifold environmental and agronomic problems have been
119 pointed out. After its useful life – which in general does not exceed 1 to 3 months – the
120 mulch film has to be removed and properly disposed of, a time-consuming (about 16 hours
121 per hectare) and costly procedure (Scaringelli, M., 2016; Briassoulis, D., 2013). The
122 recovered film is usually heavily contaminated with soil and organic residues, making
123 mechanical recycling technically difficult and not a cost-efficient solution (Briassoulis et
124 al., 2018; Figuier, 2016; De Lèpinau, Arbenz, 2016). The most common end of life of
125 collected films in Europe is still landfilling (about 50%), followed by energy recovering

126 and finally mechanical recycling (Le Moine, 2014). Recent Chinese prohibition (January
127 2018) to import different types of wastes is heavily impacting the European agricultural
128 plastic waste management, highlighting the difficulty in properly recycling this type of
129 plastics (Tamma, 2018). Plastic films may not be properly collected and recycled but
130 disposed of by burning in the field or by uncontrolled landfilling or left directly in the
131 (agricultural) soils, causing serious environmental concerns. An example is the “White
132 pollution” phenomena described in the Xinjiang Autonomous Region (China), in which
133 the residual plastic film can reach 200 kg/ha in the top soil with detrimental effects on
134 soils’ quality, health and fertility (Liu, He, & Yan, 2014; Gao *et al.*, 2019; Steinmetz *et*
135 *al.*, 2016).

136 As a reaction, there has been significant research into novel materials especially related to
137 biodegradable and bio-based (BB) mulch films, which enable an effective biodegradation
138 in soil and provide comparable agronomical performances (Touchaleaume *et al.*, 2016).
139 The term “bio-mulch film” brings together several types of both bio-based and fossil oil-
140 based biodegradable polymers and blends of them, such as polylactic acid (PLA),
141 polybutylene adipate co-terephthalate (PBAT), starch-based polymer blends or
142 copolymers. They biodegrade when exposed to bioactive environments such as soil and
143 compost (Kasirajan *et al.*, 2012) which means that they can be left *in situ* to be fully
144 biodegraded after being used. Clearly the biodegradation rate of biodegradable bioplastics
145 is influenced by the environmental conditions such as the types of available bacteria, fungi
146 thus specific enzymes namely native microflora (Pico, Y. *et al.*, 2019). However their
147 intrinsic biodegradability allow the complete biodegradation with times similar to natural
148 polymers such as cellulose used as reference by the relevant standards and certification
149 schemes.

150 The EN 17033:2018 is a new European Norm (standard) concerning “Plastics -
151 Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test
152 methods”, which sets the necessary tests and limits to define biodegradability,
153 performances and environmental impacts of BB much films. The material is considered
154 completely biodegradable if it achieves a complete biodegradation (absolute or relative to
155 the reference material) in a test period no longer than 24 months (mineralization into
156 CO₂). Additionally, a control of constituents (such as metals) and eco-toxicity testing
157 (acute and chronic toxicity tests on plant growth, earthworm; nitrification inhibition test
158 with soil microorganisms) were required. A certified mulch film guarantees that the
159 product will completely biodegrade in the soil without adversely impacting on the
160 environment.

161 ***1.2 Goal of the paper***

162 The goal of the paper is to provide a general and common metric to measure the
163 circularity of a bio-based and biodegradable (BB) product and to apply the methodology at
164 product level to a category of products, namely bio-based and biodegradable mulch films.

165 **2 Materials and Methods**


166 ***2.1 MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology***

167 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), according to the Ellen MacArthur Foundation
168 (EMF) methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015), is a number
169 that can range from 0 (pure linearity) to 1 (pure circularity). A purely linear production
170 provides for the exclusive use of virgin raw materials that turn into waste at the end of the
171 use phase of the product. Vice-versa, pure circularity includes the use of recycled
172 materials and does not produce wastes (regenerative streams). Circularity can be achieved
173 in different ways: as for the purpose of this paper, only recycling will be considered since

174 reuse is not an option for thin biodegradable mulch films. Since the method considers only
175 mass flows, the recycling corresponds to the recovery of materials for the original purpose
176 or for other purposes and excludes energy recovery, considered as a loss of materials equal
177 to landfill disposal. The materials recovered feed back into the process as recycled
178 feedstock.

179 The MCI methodology differentiates ‘technical cycles’ from ‘biological cycles’,
180 modelling only the former. The first contains products and materials re-entering into the
181 system (market) with the highest possible qualities and for as long as possible (thanks to
182 reuse, repair, refurbishment and recycling) and the latter includes biological materials used
183 in cascade until their restoration into the biosphere and the re-constitution of natural
184 resources.

185 The material flows associated to the production of a generic technical cycle from non-
186 renewable sources are summarized in Figure 1. The dashed lines indicate that recycled
187 feedstock does not have to be sourced from the same product but can be acquired on the
188 market. With reference to Figure 1, the list of the parameters used in the EMF
189 methodology is reported in Table 1, while the equations relevant for the analysis carried
190 out in this paper are described in the following sections (Table 2, Chapter 2.2).



191

192

Figure 1: Diagram of material flows and associated variables of a generic

193

product (modified from Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015).

194

Table 1: Parameters and relative definitions used in the EMF methodology.

Parameter	Definition
M	Total mass of the product
F_R	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from recycled sources
F_U	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from reused sources
V	Mass of virgin feedstock used in a product
C_R	Fraction of mass of a product being collected to go into a recycling process
C_U	Fraction of mass of a product going into component reuse
E_C	Efficiency of the recycling process used for the portion collected for recycling
E_F	Efficiency of the recycling process used to produce recycled feedstock for a product

W	Total mass of unrecoverable waste associated with a product
W_0	Mass of unrecoverable waste (landfill, waste to energy and any other type of process where the materials are no longer recoverable)
W_C	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated in the process of recycling parts of a product (after use)
W_F	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated when producing recycled feedstock for a product
X	Utility of a product, calculated as $X = (L/L_{av})(U/U_{av})$
L	Actual average lifetime of a product
L_{av}	Actual average lifetime of an industry-average product of the same type
U	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of a product
U_{av}	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of an industry-average product of the same type

195

196 The Material Circularity Indicator is determined as follows: $MCI = LFI \cdot F$,
 197 where LFI is the Linear Flow Index measuring the flows of virgin materials and
 198 unrecoverable wastes associated to the examined product.

199 A function of the utility, $F = X^a$, is used to correct the LFI . The function F is chosen in
 200 such a way that improvements of the utility of a product (e.g., by using it longer) have the
 201 same impact on its MCI as a reuse of components, leading to the same amount of
 202 reduction of virgin material use and unrecoverable waste. Setting $a = 0.9$, MCI takes, by
 203 convention, the value 0.1 for a fully linear product (*i.e.*, $LFI = 1$) whose utility equals the
 204 industry average (*i.e.*, $X = 1$). This leaves some margin to distinguish between processes
 205 with a high linearity but different utilities.

206 **2.2 MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products**

207 To apply the EMF methodology to BB products, formulas and flows (Figure 1 and Figure
208 2) are adapted as it follows:

- 209 1. The fraction of the recycled feedstock, F_R , corresponds to the share of the bio-
210 based feedstock content in the final BB product, $F_{R(i)}$. It is the ratio of the d.m.
211 amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m. amount of the total mass of BB
212 product (EN 16785-2:2016).
- 213 2. The fraction of restorative mass going into a recycling process, C_R , corresponds
214 to the share of bio-based feedstock content in the BB product biologically
215 recovered (*e.g.* through composting) or biodegraded in the natural
216 environment, as it happens for specific applications (*e.g.* biodegradable mulch
217 film, *etc.*). It is the ratio of the d.m. amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m.
218 amount of the total mass of BB product that is biologically recycled.

219 The modified scheme is shown in Figure 2. Table 2 lists the formulas as adapted to BB
220 products.

221 **Table 2:** *List of formulas as developed by EMF methodology compared to the*
222 *proposed adaptation to BB products.*


EMF methodology	Adaptation to BB products
-----------------	---------------------------

223

224 The mass of fossil-based feedstock which may be contained in BB products (V) is
225 obtained as a difference of the total mass (M) minus the bio-based fraction; in this case the
226 F_R in the EMF methodology corresponds to the sum of the fractions of all the bio-
227 based feedstock/s used in manufacturing the BB product. Therefore, is the
228 total bio-based feedstock mass in the product. In single-use products, such as mulch films,
229 reuse is not considered for BB products, so that $F_U = C_U = 0$.

230 W_F is the total amount of unrecoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
231 feedstock used to produce BB products (*i.e.* the amount of uncoverable waste per unit of
232 BB product). Bio-based feedstocks such as starch, PLA, PHB etc. generate non-restorative
233 flows which can be quantified. Such unrecoverable waste correspond to $R_{(i)}$, the specific
234 amount of waste generated within cradle-to-gate boundaries per unit of bio-based
235 feedstock going into manufacturing, and it is estimated through LCA studies. Thus all
236 inputs from growth and harvesting phases and the related wastes generated by fertilisers
237 and pesticides are here accounted. $R_{(i)}$ can be easily found in specific literature or life
238 cycle inventories (LCI) present in LCA databases. In the calculation of W_F , also the
239 efficiency of manufacturing process of BB products E_P is considered, as the ratio of the

240 overall bio-based feedstock content in the final BB product to the bio-based feedstock in
 241 input to the manufacturing process.
 242 The material flows associated to the production of a generic BB product are summarized
 243 in Figure 2.



244
 245 **Figure 2:** Description of material flows adaptation to BB products; in this paper,
 246 the reuse flow is out of scope ($C_U = F_U = 0$).

247 The biodegradation of bio-based feedstock does not imply the generation of waste W_C as it
 248 occurs in a standard mechanical recycling process. This implies that C_R and E_C (i.e. the
 249 efficiency of the biodegradation process) equal to 1. Indeed, a BB raw material, sent to
 250 biological treatment (composting) or biodegraded in a natural environment, is fully
 251 transformed in its chemical elements (C, H and O mainly) derived from the decomposition
 252 of complex molecules (polymers) without the release of waste (Witt et al., 2001; Marten et

253 al., 2003; Eubeler et al., 2010; BASF, 2018; Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites,
254 2018; OWS, 2018; Zumstein et al., 2018). These natural elements return into the
255 environment and are then available in the respective biogeochemical cycles. The
256 (biodegradable) fossil portion behaves as well; consequently, $W_C = 0$.
257 Nevertheless, the fossil-based feedstock cannot be considered as a regenerative circular
258 feedstock, since it derives from carbon stored for millions of years and extracted by man,
259 not being part of the active and fast biogeochemical carbon cycle. This is accounted in the
260 quantification of W_0 , the mass of unrecoverable waste from use (*i.e.* the linear stream
261 going to landfill or incineration, the Non-Restorative Flows, NRF), as W_0 , the total
262 amount of fossil-based feedstock.
263 Since W_F and W_C are associated to complete different processes and W_C is always equal
264 zero, the double counting issue does not occur and the quantification of W and LFI is
265 modified as reported in Table 2.

266 **2.3 MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions**

267 The new formulas reported in Table 2 were applied to a single use product namely a BB
268 mulch film, to calculate their corresponding MCI. The transformation of BB materials into
269 the final products (*i.e.* white mulch films) takes place without any modification of the bio-
270 based feedstock content and the process yield is close to 1.

271 In the global market, there are several branded BB mulch films (Moreno et al., 2017), both
272 starch-based or blends of polyesters. In the following, the BB film has been arbitrarily
273 assumed to be a starch-based mulch film with a 30%-portion of bio-based feedstock (*i.e.*
274 23% of starch, $F_{(S)}$, and 7% of a bio-based additive, $F_{(BA)}$), while the rest was assumed to
275 consist of fossil feedstock ($F_{(F)}$).

276

277 Figure 3). Since a generalized approach was used and no primary data were implemented,
 278 the information were extrapolated from literature (Institute of Bioplastics and
 279 Biocomposites, 2018); the main characteristics of the two examined products are
 280 presented in Table 3.

281

282

283

284

285

286

287


288

289

290

291

292



293

294

295

296

297

298

299

*Figure 3: Examples of hypothetical bio-based polymers; in this paper, the first option on the left (starch blend 30/70) has been chosen for carrying out the numerical MCI calculation (working hypothesis). The figure considers a 100%-efficiency in every phase of production, so that the residues are equal to zero; the same assumption is done in this paper. *TPS (Thermoplastic starch), starch content 75%; **Ratio TPS/Polymer; modified from Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018.*

300

Table 3: Key features representative of the BB mulch films.

BB mulch film	
Material	30% bio-based feedstock (23% starch + 7% bio-based additive) + 70% fossil feedstock
Thickness (μm)	12
Density (g/cm^3)	1.25
Weight (g/m^2)	15.2
Functional unit (the covering of the agricultural land)	6000 m^2/ha (the actual mulched soil in a hectare is generally equal to the 60% of the total area; Malinconico, 2017)

301

302 In the calculation of MCI for the BB mulch film, the adapted formulas were used together
303 with assumptions. As stated before, BB mulch films are blends of bio-based and fossil
304 based feedstocks (in the specific case, 30% and 70% respectively). Unlike the LDPE
305 mulch film that has to be removed and disposed of, the BB mulch film is left in soil where
306 it undergoes an ultimate biodegradation (so that $C_R = 1$) with no waste (so that $E_C = 1$), in
307 respect of the specific standard EN 17033:2018. As a result of polymers' decomposition,
308 the derived (biogenic) C, H and O finally return into biosphere (atmosphere,
309 microorganism biomass, organic material pool) (OWS, 2018), and back into
310 biogeochemical cycles in a relatively short time ("Biogenic elements accounted as
311 recycled" in Figure 2), with the exception of humified compounds. Actually, also C, H
312 and O deriving from fossil-based sources undergo biodegradation (Zumstein, M.T., 2018)
313 but they are not considered as a regenerative flow ("Waste from non-restorative flow" in
314 Figure 2) and their "wastes" are indeed calculated in W_0 .

315 Applying a conservative approach, W_F , the waste generated by the production of each bio-
316 based feedstock, is quantified considering a "cradle to gate" LCA study. The estimated
317 solid wastes $R_{(i)}$ for the presented case study are related to the production of starch ($F_{(S)}$),

318 with an amount $R_{(S)}$ of 0.014 kg of waste per kg of renewable feedstock (source: personal
319 communication A. Novelli), and to the production of the bio-based additive ($F_{(BA)}$), with
320 $R_{(BA)}$ equals to 0.025 kg waste/kg renewable feedstock (US-LCI database). As assumed in

321

322 Figure 3, the production efficiency of BB product E_P (how much bio-based feedstock is
323 needed for every unit of BB product) is estimated equal to 1 and no unrecoverable wastes
324 are generated by the process.

325 In addition, an explorative sensitivity analysis has been performed regarding exclusively
326 the amount of bio-based feedstock content of the BB mulch film, *i.e.* (*i.e.*, $F_{(S)}$ +
327 $F_{(BA)}$), as shown in Figure 4 (Chapter 3). Considering the characteristics of the films
328 (weight, g/m^2 , or thickness, μm , and density, g/cm^3) and the relative functional unit (6000
329 m^2/ha , Table 3), it is possible to calculate a mass, M , that is 90 kg/ha for the BB one. Once
330 calculated the masses, the formulas reported in Table 2 (Chapter 2.2) are applied. Results
331 are shown in Table 4.

332

333 **2.4 Sensitivity analysis**

334 A sensitivity analysis was conducted for BB mulch film to examine the effects of
335 changing the main variables. Given a non-linear dependence of results on parameter
336 values, a Monte Carlo approach (see, *e.g.*, Lloyd and Ries, 2008) has been adopted. The
337 model has been implemented using specifically written routines in the C++ programming
338 language. The model was run with 100,000 events for BB mulch film, where the value of
339 each parameter has been randomly chosen following a Gaussian distribution with a
340 standard deviation within a range of possible and realistic values (Table 5 and **Error!**
341 **Reference source not found.**; Figure 5 and Figure 6).

342 **3 Results**

343 Figure 4 shows how the value of the MCI varies according to the percentage variation of
344 the bio-based feedstock in the total mass of the product.


345

346 *Table 4: Resulting parameters in the calculation of MCI for BB mulch film.*

Parameter	BB mulch film
-----------	---------------

347

348



349

350

Figure 4: MCI as a function of the amount of bio-based feedstock/s in the BB

351

mulch film $\Sigma F_{R(i)}$, expressed as the percentage of all the bio-based feedstock/s of the mulch

352

film on dry mass basis (X-axis). The dots correspond to the three different hypothetical

353

bioplastic compositions of Figure 3.

354

355 3.1 Sensitivity analysis

356

The results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in the followings Table 5 and Figure 5

357

and Figure 6. The accuracy band is a fraction of the average and corresponds to a

358

probability of 95%. It has been chosen in order to be representative of the variability of the

359

product category, the BB mulch films. The simulation can thus be regarded as a system

360

composed by a high number of companies, each producing films with different

361

characteristics, that are accounted for in the accuracy band.

362

Table 5: Parameters used for the sensitivity analysis of the BB mulch film. (**) The

363


Accuracy Band is defined as twice the standard deviation of the distribution.

Variable name	Average	Accuracy Band (**)	Unit
M	1000.00	0%	kg
F_(S)/F_(BA)	3.29	10%	fraction
F_(S) + F_(BA)	0.30	30%	fraction
F_U	0.00	0%	fraction
C_U	0.00	0%	fraction
R_(S)	0.014	100%	fraction
R_(BA)	0.025	100%	fraction
E_C	1	0%	fraction
E_P	0.95	10%	fraction
C_R	1.00	0%	fraction

364

365


366



367

368

Figure 5: Resulting distribution of MCI values for BB mulch film.



369

370

371

Figure 6: The most sensitive and relevant parameters in the calculation of the MCI of the BB mulch films.

372 **4 Discussion**

373 This work applies the principles of the EMF methodology into BB products so as to define
374 common metrics for calculating their circularity. By doing so it proposes some substantial
375 changes to the EMF methodology but still coherent with the overall methodological
376 framework. Such changes should be seen as a generalisation of the methodology provided
377 the following rules are applied:

378 (1) fossil-based feedstocks or component materials embodied in the BB products whatever
379 is the final disposal (even biological recycling) shall be considered as non-restorative;

380 (2) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to biological
381 recycling like composting, or biodegrade in the environment (i.e. BB mulch film) shall be
382 considered restorative as long as they flow through the biosphere safely, without any harm
383 to the environment (e.g. no toxicity effects).

384 (3) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to incineration and
385 landfill shall be considered as non-restorative;

386 The justification of these rules is described in the following.

387 Fossil-based component materials in the product derive from deposits where they
388 remained stocked for a geological time scale. Once the product is mineralised, its fossil-
389 based portion will be accounted as non-regenerative and therefore linear, due to its origin
390 (Joos et al., 2013). This is true, even if fossil carbon, for example, will re-enter biological
391 cycles, like CO₂ in the atmosphere and other streams, since both fossil-based and bio-
392 based component materials will physically and chemically behave the same, once
393 biodegraded. However, the source of the bio-based carbon was circular before its use
394 (concept of “carbon neutrality”, equilibrium between the biogenic carbon released and the
395 carbon absorbed by plants) and will maintain its circularity provided that the carbon is
396 released into the atmosphere at the same rate. The reason has its origin in the EMF general

397 provisions stating that “biologically sourced materials can only be considered part of a
398 Circular Economy if materials are not used faster than they can be restored naturally”
399 (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015). If BB products are incinerated, the
400 bio-based components are still considered linear, maintaining consistency with EMF
401 principles. Basically, a complete circularity for a BB product is satisfied when its
402 renewable components are 100% bio-based and they go 100% to biological recycling or
403 biodegraded in the environment (for specific application like mulch film).

404 As for provision (3), a material health rule has its origin in manifold normative definitions
405 of the CE. In addition, the EMF definition of biological cycles is that of non-toxic
406 materials which are restored into the biosphere and the CE is defined as such if it can
407 “eliminate the use of toxic chemicals”. The need of a safety clause has been reviewed
408 under many aspects by Verberne (2016) and can be put as a postulate of the restoration
409 principle: if a flow is toxic it cannot be defined restorative. This is also at the core of the
410 REACH Regulation (EC 1907/2006). In the specific case, the material complies with the
411 standard EN 17033-2018 certifying that no harm is caused to a) all relevant organism
412 groups as plants, invertebrates (e.g. earthworm) and microorganisms, b) important
413 ecological processes maintaining soil functions, c) all relevant exposure pathways as soil
414 pore water, soil pore air and soil material.

415 A comprehensive approach for MCI calculation should also include non-restorative flows
416 generated at upstream level like biomass growth, in the specific case corn, and biomass
417 conversion processes like starch extraction and refining. Specifically these non-restorative
418 flows correspond to the overall non-recyclable wastes associated to the bio-based
419 feedstock supply thus non-recyclable waste from fertilizer and pesticide production, non-
420 recyclable scraps from conversion processes, etc. In this study such flows of non-
421 restorative waste coming from upstream manufacturing operations were included for the

422 bio-based feedstocks ($R_{(i)}$) used in manufacturing the BB mulch film applying “cradle to
423 gate” LCA methodology. However, we observed that the inclusion of upstream
424 unrecoverable waste does not significantly influence the MCI results in the chosen case
425 study, since the respective amounts are small. The specific unrecoverable waste for starch
426 and bio-based additive (i.e. kg of waste/kg of bio-based feedstock) were estimated at
427 0.014 and 0.025, respectively.

428

429 The resulting MCI for the 30/70 blend of the BB mulch film is equal to 0.37 in a 0-1 scale
430 and its circularity is linearly linked to the amount of bio-based feedstock used according to
431 the equation $y = 0.89x + 0.1$, where y is the MCI and x is the bio-based feedstock content,
432 therefore the amount of recycled feedstock or (renewable) bio-based feedstock in input is
433 decisive.

434 Apart from the specific application analysed in this paper, the proposed MCI method can
435 be easily applied and calculated for any kind of BB product as long as the following
436 information are available:

- 437 • The bio-based feedstock content, determined according to the standard EN 16785-
438 2:2016, if the composition is known, or directly provided by the BB product manufacturer.
- 439 • The End of Life scenario of the studied BB product (real or hypothetical).
- 440 • The amount of un-recoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
441 feedstock contained in the BB product. They can be derived from LCA databases or other
442 specific sources.

443 **5 Conclusions**

444 Bioplastic market is steadily increasing. The value proposition of bio-based and
445 biodegradable products is linked to:

446 1. the use of renewable feedstock (like starch and its derivatives) instead of fossil oil or
447 natural gas;

448 2. the waste recovery through biological recycling, thanks to their ability to
449 biodegrade in composting facilities or in soil (e.g. biodegradable mulch film).

450 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), developed by the EMF, is a metric for
451 quantifying “how much” a product is circular (MCI = 0, fully-linear product; MCI = 1,
452 completely circular product) thus it represents a valuable tool for product eco-design
453 purposes. However, it focuses solely on technical materials, mechanically recycled or
454 reused, leaving out bio-based feedstocks and related biological treatments such as
455 composting. Without common metrics it is not possible to pursue concrete actions, to
456 achieve measurable results and to provide unequivocal references for all products. This
457 research work aims at filling this gap through the development of a methodology coherent
458 with EMF MCI methodology but able to catch the specificities of bio-based and
459 biodegradable products and provide metrics for those innovative products. Direct uses are:
460 (i) supporting the eco-design of innovative bio-based products and (ii) comparing the MCI
461 of BB products with MCI of traditional products (e.g. fossil based).

462 The proposed method has been applied to a real case study (i.e. biodegradable mulch film)
463 providing quantitative metrics about its circularity. Specifically considering a bio-based
464 feedstock content of 30%, the correspondent MCI is 0.37 in a 0-1 scale and its circularity
465 is heavily linked to the bio-based feedstock content according to this relation: $MCI_{(BB\ mulch\ film)} = 0.89 * bio\text{-}based\ feedstock + 0.1$.

467 The MCI is a key performance indicator to develop more circular products, in line with
468 the Circular Economy principles like the use of renewable materials and the reduction of
469 the amount of not recoverable waste. MCI will support the development of innovative
470 products just based on these two important characteristics specific for each BB

471 product/application and end of life scenario Bioeconomy, thus also BB products, can
472 provide valuable insights in transforming the current (linear) economy in a more circular
473 one, however, the way the biomass is produced, processed and BB products are produced
474 are fundamental aspects to be properly assessed and monitored. This can be done using
475 specific methodologies like LCA. Within this context the proposed MCI has to be seen as
476 a complementary (quantitative) tool for further qualifying the sustainability of BB
477 products and not as a substitute tool.

478

479

480

481 **Declaration of interest**

482 The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any
483 commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of
484 interest.

485

486 **Acknowledgements**

487 The authors thanks prof. Andrea Contin for the fruitful discussion and contribution
488 to the sensitivity analysis, Francesco Degli Innocenti for providing valuable comments
489 and feedback on the topics addressed by the paper and Alessandra Novelli for the general
490 support in the MCI elaboration.

491

492 **References**

493

BASF, 2018. Biodegradable mulch film – clarification of polymer fate in soil. CIPA Congress, Bordeaux/Arcachon, France, May 2018.

- Bio-Based and Biodegradable Industries Association. BBIA reports. <https://bbia.org.uk/reports/> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Briassoulis, D., Giannoulis, A., 2018. Evaluation of the functionality of bio-based plastic mulching films. *Polym. Test.* 67, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymertesting.2018.02.019>
- Briassoulis D., Hiskakis, M., Babou, E., 2013. Technical specifications for mechanical recycling of agricultural plastic waste. *Waste Management*, Volume 33, issue 6, pages 1516-1530, ISSN 0956-053X. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.03.004>
- De Lèpinau, P. and Arbenz, A., 2016. Economic and environmental impact of soil contamination in mulching film, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 28-48.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015. *Circularity Indicators – An approach to measure circularity – Methodology*. https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/insight/Circularity-Indicators_Methodology_May2015.pdf.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017. *The New Plastic Economy: Rethinking the future of plastic & catalysing action*.
- EN 16785-2:2016 - Bio-based products - Bio-based content - Part 2: Determination of the bio-based content using the material balance method.
- EN 17033:2018 - Plastics - Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test methods.
- EPLCA – European Platform on LCA. https://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/?page_id=86
- Eubeler, J., Bernhardt, M., Knepper, T., 2010. Environmental biodegradation of synthetic polymers II. Biodegradation of different polymer groups. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry*. 29, 1, 84-100
- European Commission, 2015. *Closing the loop – An EU action plan for the Circular Economy*. COM(2015) 614 final. Brussels, 2.12.2015
- European Commission, 2018. *A European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular Economy*. COM(2018) 28 final. Brussels, 16.1.2018
- European Bioplastics. *European Bioplastic publications*. <https://www.european-bioplastics.org/news/publications/> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Figuié, B., 2016. *Plasticulture in Europe*, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 20-28
- Gao, H., Yan, C., Liu, Q., Ding, W., Chen, B., Li, Z., 2019. Effects of plastic mulching and plastic residue on agricultural production: A meta-analysis. *Sci. Total Environ.* 651, 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2018.09.105>

- Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., Ulgiati, S., 2016. A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. *J. Clean. Prod.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.007>
- Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018. *Biopolymers – Facts and Statistics*. Hochschule Hannover, University of Applied Sciences and Arts. Edition 5, ISSN 2510-3431.
- Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestvedt, J. S., Peters, G. P., Enting, I. G., Bloh, W. V., ... and Friedrich, T., 2013. Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(5), 2793-2825.
- Kasirajan, S., Ngouajio, M., 2012. Polyethylene and biodegradable mulches for agricultural applications: a review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 32, 501–529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0068-3>
- Lange, B.K., 2016. Revision of the fertilisers regulation – benefits of biodegradable mulch films. *European Bioplastics*. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/108931/Kristy%20Barbara%20Lange%20EUBP%20PPT2.pdf> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Le Moine, B., 2014. Agri-plastics waste management: a voluntary commitment from the industry. Presented at: Agricultural Film 2014 – International Conference on silage, mulch, greenhouse and tunnel films used in agriculture (15-17 September, Barcelona, Spain).
- Liu, E. K., He, W. Q., & Yan, C. R., 2014. ‘White revolution’ to ‘white pollution’—agricultural plastic film mulch in China. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(9), 091001.
- Lloyd, S. M., & Ries, R., 2007. Characterizing, propagating, and analyzing uncertainty in life cycle assessment: A survey of quantitative approaches. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 11(1), 161-179.
- Lonca, G., Muggéo, R., Tétreault-Imbeault, H., Bernard, S., & Margni, M., 2018. A Bi-dimensional Assessment to Measure the Performance of Circular Economy: A Case Study of Tires End-of-Life Management. In *Designing Sustainable Technologies, Products and Policies* (pp. 33-42). Springer, Cham.
- Malinconico, M., 2017. *Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture*. Green Chemistry and Sustainable Technology. Springer.
- Marten, E., Muller, R., and Deckwer W., 2003. Studies on the enzymatic hydrolysis of polyesters I. Low molecular mass model esters and aliphatic polyesters. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 80, 3, 485-501.

- Moreno, M. M., González-Mora, S., Villena, J., Campos, J. A., & Moreno, C., 2017. Deterioration pattern of six biodegradable, potentially low-environmental impact mulches in field conditions. *Journal of environmental management*, 200, 490-501.
- Mormile, P., Stahl, N., Malinconico, M., 2017. The World of Plastics, in: Malinconico, M. (Ed.), *Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture*. pp. 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54130-2_1
- OWS, 2018. Accumulation of (bio)degradable plastics in soil. CIPA Congress 2018, Archacon, May 29.
- Pico Y., Barcelò, D., 2019. Analysis and prevention of microplastics pollution in water: current perspectives and future directions. *ACS Omega*, 4, 6709-6719.
- Plasticulture catalogues, 2018. <http://plasticulture.qualif.e-catalogues.info> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Razza, F., Degli Innocenti, F., 2012. Bioplastics from renewable resources: the benefits of biodegradability. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 7 (Suppl. 3): S301–S309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/apj.1648>
- Scaringelli, M., Giannoccaro, G., prosperi, M., Lopolito, A., 2016. Adoption of biodegradable mulching films in agriculture: is there a negative prejudice towards materials derived from organic waste? *Italian Journal of agronomy*, 11:92.
- Shen M., Zhang, Y., Zhu, Y., Song, B., Zeng, G., Hu, D., Wen, Y., Ren, X., 2019. Recent advances in toxicological research of nanoplastics in the environment: A review. *Environmental Pollution*, 252: 511-521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.102>
- Steinmetz, Z., Wollmann, C., Schaefer, M., Buchmann, C., David, J., Tröger, J., Muñoz, K., Frör, O., Schaumann, G.E., 2016. Plastic mulching in agriculture. Trading short-term agronomic benefits for long-term soil degradation? *Sci. Total Environ.* 550, 690–705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.01.153>
- Tamma, P., 2018. China’s trash ban forces Europe to confront its waste problem, *Politico*, 2/21/2018.
- Touchaleaume, F., Martin-Closas, L., Angellier-Coussy, H., Chevillard, A., Cesar, G., Gontard, N., Gastaldi, E., 2016. Performance and environmental impact of biodegradable polymers as agricultural mulching films. *Chemosphere* 144, 433–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.09.006>
- US-LCI database. “Polylactide biopolymer resin at plant kg/RNA”. <https://www.nrel.gov/lci/> (accessed 9 December 2019)
- Verberne, J.J.H., 2016. Building circularity indicators. Eindhoven University of Technology.

- Wen, X., Du, C., Xu, P., zeng, G., Huang, D., Yin, L., Yin, Q., Hu, L., Wan, J., Zhang, J., Tan, S., Deng, R., 2018. Microplastic pollution in surface sediments of urban water areas in Changsha, China: Abundance, composition, surface textures. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 136: 414-423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.09.043>.
- Witt, U., Einig, T., Yamamoto, M., Kleeberg, I., Deckwer, W., Muller, R., 2001. Biodegradation of aliphatic-aromatic copolyesters: evaluation of the final biodegradability and ecotoxicological impact of degradation intermediates. *Chemosphere*. 44, 289-299.
- Zumstein, M., Schintlmeister, A., Nelson, T., Baumgartner, R., Wagner, M., Sander, M., McNeill, K., Woebken, D., Kohler, H., 2018. Biodegradation of synthetic polymers in soils: Tracking carbon into CO₂ and microbial biomass. *Science Advances*, 4, 7.

HIGHLIGHTS

1. A modification of the MacArthur methodology on product circularity (i.e. Material Circularity Indicator MCI) has been developed to make it applicable to bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products.
2. The proposed metric has been applied to a specific case study: the bio-based and biodegradable mulch film.
3. Results show that a biodegradable mulch film with a 30% of bio-based feedstock content is characterized by a MCI of 0.37 ± 0.04 in a 0-1 scale.
4. For a BB mulch film the amount of bio-based feedstock is the most sensitive factor and controls linearly the value of the MCI.

REVISED HIGHLIGHTS

5. A MCI methodology suitable for Bio-based and Biodegradable (BB) products has been developed.
6. The proposed metric has been applied to a specific case study: BB mulch film.
7. BB mulch film with a 30% of renewable feedstock is characterized by a MCI of 0.37 ± 0.04 in a 0-1 scale.
8. The amount of renewable feedstock is the most sensitive factor of the MCI

Declaration of interests

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.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Francesco Razza: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - original draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Data Curation, Investigation, Validation, Supervision

Cristiana Briani: Writing - Original Draft, Validation

Tony Breton: Writing - Original Draft, Supervision

Diego Marazza: Writing - Original Draft, Data curation, Validation

Dear Reviewers,

Many thanks for your time. The table below provides our replies to your further comments and the description of the changes made on the paper for each raised point. Many thanks again to all of you for the valuable comments and suggestions that allow us to further improve the work.

n	Reviewers' comments	Revisions made in the paper
	Reviewer #1	
1	All the issues mentioned by the reviewers have been addressed, and the paper quality has been greatly improved. Now, the manuscript may be considered for acceptance.	Many thanks
	Reviewer #3	
2	The authors have prepared an extensive revision of the original manuscript and addressed the reviewers' comments in a satisfactory manner. I have one major and one minor comment at this stage, and recommend acceptance of the work. I do not need to see a possible further revision.	Many thanks
3	Major comment: I am not convinced that complex material interactions (fossil carbon biodegrading, harmful organic waste, bio-based material recycling, etc.) can be meaningfully represented in a single indicator such as the MCI or its derivatives. But that is something that the community should decide and not the reviewers, by taking up your work or not. But I ask you to add a short remark on the critique of the general usefulness of this indicator in the discussion section.	Actually, we fully agree with you. The MCI here proposed is meaningful for judging how much circular a bio-based and biodegradable product is only if the bio-based material/product does not cause toxic concerns or issues. This is our postulate reported in R396-406. That said we have further pointed out this very important aspect in the conclusion and made an addition in R468-471.
4	One minor comment remains: + L202 and other places: The abbreviation d.m. is not clear to me. Please spell out! Dry mass?	It stands for dry matter. On page 1 under "abbreviations" section is reported d.m. = Dry matter.
	Reviewer #4	
5	The authors have satisfactorily addressed the comments raised by the previous reviewers and appropriately modified the manuscript.	Many thanks
6	This work attempts to augment the MCI proposed by EMF. Although the need for the work is clear, however recently (in 2019) EMF has already proposed MCI for biological products. Hence, authors need to compare and contrast the MCI proposed in this work with EMF MCI for bio products.	Many thanks for this comment. Following your hint we have found that the EMF methodology has been recently changed https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/ce100/MCI-SC-28Nov-2019-Master-MB-4.pdf however we would like to point out that our work started <u>long before</u> the changes of MCI and in a complete independently way. For the sake of clarity we here report the (documented) main stages of our original work followed by our proposal for handling this issue. Story of our paper. 2017 : preliminary idea of the methodology 2018 : the beta version of the methodology is presented within the third working group of the

Italian *Circular Economy Stakeholder Platform* (ICESP www.icesp.it). On page 38 of the ICESP report (dated December 2018) here available https://www.icesp.it/landing/docs/gdl/gdl3/REPORT_GdL3%20Strumenti%20per%20la%20misurazione%20dell%E2%80%99economia%20circolare.pdf a brief description of the – not final- methodology is provided. Please note that the report is dated December 2018 and it was developed in the last four month period of 2018. **2019**: within StarBioPro project <http://www.star-bio.eu/> thanks to the collaboration between Novamont and the University of Bologna (PhD D. Marazza and Prof. A. Contin) the methodology was further developed and improved till the present version. The first submission of the paper occurred the 31st of April 2019. At that time we were not aware about the EMF initiative about biological products so we wrote our paper blissfully unaware.

That said, we have seen that some consideration of the recast EMF methodology are very close to what we proposed.

As an example,

- a principle “ensuring biological materials remain uncontaminated and biologically accessible” has been added
- virgin material now considers the biological materials fraction in its formula
- all formulas now include the contribution of biological materials
- composting has been added as an end-of-life option.

However, the recast MCI differs now from our proposal because it accounts for energy recovery of biological materials which can make the MCI of a BB product higher than what we propose. Other points are still open such as the demonstration that the feedstock has been extracted from “Sustained Production”.

To compare and defend our choices against the recast MCI would require to re-write almost completely sections 2 and 3, all figures, tables and formulas included. Section 4 ought to be extended and oriented to a comparison of our methodological proposal versus the recast MCI. We believe this makes the case for an additional, different paper, while the purpose of this paper is still justified. Indeed, we would like to remark that the new MCI does not provide any specific guidance on practical

		<p>cases as we did for the biodegradable mulch film. For these reasons we believe our paper can give an important scientific contribution to the debate.</p> <p>We decided to add an addendum in the paper reciting as follows:</p> <p>While this paper was undergoing peer review the authors became aware that the EMF published an update of the MCI methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2019) including the extension of it to include the treatment of biological materials. This update introduces new definitions and formulas. The authors believe that most of the changes regarding accounting are in the direction here proposed and that this study can contribute as an illustration on how the material circularity of a biological based material can be addressed in a real case study. Furthermore the authors would like to highlight that the proposed methodology started long before the EMF changes: specifically the original idea dated back to 2017 and a beta version of it - not as it is now - was presented in the middle of 2018 at the Italian Circular Economy Stakeholder Platform (ICESP www.icesp.it).</p>
		<p>Beyond the integrations described above we have further integrated the section "Acknowledgements" with the following text since, as described above, the final development and refinement of the methodology has been carried out within StarProBio project along with the project partner University of Bologna (PhD Diego Marazza).</p> <p>Added text The contents of the paper are part of the findings of the project STAR-ProBio. STAR-ProBio has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 program research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 727740</p>

1 Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: the
2 case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films

3
4 Francesco Razza^a, Cristiana Briani^b, Tony Breton^c, Diego Marazza^d

5 ^a *Novamont S.p.A. - Ecology of Product and Environmental Communication, Piazz.le Donegani 4,*
6 *05100 Terni, Italy*

7
8 ^b *CIRSA Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca per le Scienze Ambientali, Via S. Alberto 163, 48123*
9 *Ravenna, Italy*

10
11 ^c *Novamont S.p.A. – Via Fauser 8, 28100 Novara, Italy*

12
13 ^d *Department of Physics, University of Bologna, Viale B. Pichat 6/2, 40127 Bologna, Italy*
14

15 **Abstract**

16 The concept of circularity and its quantification through the Material Circularity Indicator
17 (MCI) is well established for traditional plastic products. In this paper a methodological
18 approach for calculating the circularity of bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products is
19 proposed and applied to BB mulch films. BB products are different from traditional
20 products in as much as they are sourced and regenerated (recycled) not through technical
21 cycles but the biological loop. The suggested method is an adaptation of the MCI where
22 two major changes were made: (i) the mass of the bio-based component corresponds to the
23 recycled material in input and (ii) the mass of the bio-based component leaving the system
24 through composting or biodegradation in soil is accounted as recycled. The modified MCI
25 supports the eEco-design of innovative BB products and allows for the comparison of
26 their circularity taking into account the biological source and the expected end of life
27 process such as biodegradation. To demonstrate the adaptation, the method has been
28 applied to BB mulch films. Results showed that the MCI of a biodegradable mulch film,
29 characterized by an average bio-based feedstock content of 30% is 0.37 ± 0.04 in a 0-1
30 scale. For BB mulch film, the amount of bio-based feedstock is the most sensitive factor
31 and controls linearly the value of the MCI.

32
33 *Keywords:* circularity indicators, circular economy, bioplastics, biodegradable
34 mulch film, bio-based product, biodegradation
35

36	1	Introduction	3
37	1.1	The case study of mulch films.....	5
38	1.2	Goal of the paper	7
39	2	Materials and Methods	7
40	2.1	MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology.....	7
41	2.2	MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products.....	11 10
42	2.3	MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions....	14
43	2.4	Sensitivity analysis	17
44	3	Results	17
45	3.1	Sensitivity analysis	19
46	4	Discussion	22 21
47	5	Conclusions	24 23
48			
49			

Abbreviations

BB	Biodegradable and bio-based
CE	Circular Economy
d.m.	Dry matter
EMF	Ellen MacArthur Foundation
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LDPE	Low-Density Poly-Ethylene
MCI	Material Circularity Indicator
NRF	Non-Restorative Flows
PBAT	Polybutylene adipate terephthalate
PE	Poly-Ethylene
PLA	Polylactic acid
PHB	Poly hydroxy butyrate

50

51 **1 Introduction**

52 To overcome today's unsustainable model of 'take-make-dispose' and its related risks
53 such as hikes in raw material prices, pressures on the environment, shortage of global
54 resources and waste sinks, a circular approach needs to be applied. It is a new regenerative
55 economic view, based on a balance between economy, environment and society, a total
56 resource efficiency and a Zero Emission Strategy that aims to maximize products value
57 with zero, or minimal, environmental impact (Ghisellini et al., 2016) . Together with
58 structural changes in environmental legislation, new logistics, technologies and sharing
59 schemes, the Circular Economy (CE) approach which is regenerative by design, aims at
60 closing materials loops, *i.e.* at reducing virgin materials input and waste output.

61 In December 2015, the European Commission developed an Action Plan for Circular
62 Economy (European Commission, 2015), where plastic was considered a priority to be
63 tackled. In January 2018, an *EU Plastic Strategy* (European Commission, 2018) was
64 adopted, in order to react to the increasing environmental problems concerning plastic
65 production, consumption, use and disposal along the same lines of the CE approach. Two
66 fundamental steps to increase the circularity of different plastic products are (i) the
67 abandonment of fossil fuels, *i.e.* currently 90% of the plastic is produced by virgin
68 petroleum-based feedstock (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017), and (ii) the development
69 of easily recyclable products which are recycled. Today, in EU the share of plastics
70 collected for recycling is 30% while the use of recycled plastics is just 6% (European
71 Commission, 2018).

72 Biodegradable and bio-based (BB) plastics are spreading across markets (Institute for
73 Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018) as a valid contribution to meet CE aims and
74 principles. This is true as long as the supply of renewable raw materials, generally from
75 agriculture, is based on a sustainable approach and the conversion processes along the

76 supply chain are efficient and highly integrated in a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
77 perspective (EPLCA – European Platform on LCA). While traditional plastics can be
78 mechanically recycled or incinerated with energy recovery, BB plastic products offer new
79 recycling routes in waste management, due to their biodegradability. Organic recycling
80 (through composting or anaerobic digestion) or in the case of specific applications such as
81 agricultural mulch films, biodegradation in the environment, offer additional recovery
82 options resulting in less wastes and less contamination of soil by plastic residues (Razza et
83 al., 2012; Lange, B., 2016). An extensive literature review about the potentialities and
84 benefits of renewable and compostable bioplastics, encompassing market perspective,
85 applications, economic effects etc. can be found here: (BBIA; European Bioplastics).
86 Nevertheless, the research and development of innovative products, such as the BB
87 products, implies the development of methodologies and metrics capable of measuring
88 their circularity. Without this it is not possible to achieve measurable results and
89 improving actions, as well as provide unequivocal references for comparisons of products
90 of the same type/category. In 2015 the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) was
91 developed (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015) which aims to quantify
92 the regeneration of a product's material flow and is considered one of the few, among
93 sixteen CE indexes suiting a micro-scale assessment of circularity at product or company
94 level (Lonca et al., 2018). However, it focuses solely on technical cycles and recycled
95 materials. Furthermore, recovery and recycling through the biological cycle offered by
96 industrial composting, anaerobic digestion or biodegradation in natural environments are
97 not considered as end of life options. In order to apply the MCI system to BB plastic
98 products, the development of an enhanced methodology is necessary.
99 The approach proposed by the authors allows to quantify the circularity of BB plastic
100 products and to make comparisons with equivalent traditional plastic products. To

101 demonstrate the applicability of the proposed method a computational example for mulch
102 film products is provided. In so doing so, the paper aims at contributing to the Eco-design
103 of these innovative products.

104 *1.1 The case study of mulch films*

105 Plastic mulch films represent an important agronomical technique well established for the
106 production of many crops thanks to numerous agronomical advantages such as: increased
107 yield and higher quality of productions (Steinmetz et al., 2016) ; weed control and
108 reduced use of pesticides; early crop production and reduced soil moisture loss
109 (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018). As a consequence, the plastic films consumption has
110 increased year-by-year, reaching a current global market estimated at 1.4 millions of
111 tonnes , mainly in Asia (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018; Mormile et al., 2017) , and
112 covering 80,000 km² of agricultural surface (0.6% of the global arable land). The mulch
113 film market in Europe is estimated by Agriculture Plastic & Environment and by the
114 European Bioplastic Associations at 76-80 kt. The most used raw material is Poly-
115 Ethylene (PE) in its different forms, due to its processability, chemical resistance, high
116 durability and flexibility (Kasirajan and Ngouajio, 2012; Plasticulture, 2016 and 2018;
117 Shen, M. et al., 2019; Wen, X. et al., 2018).

118 Despite these benefits, manifold environmental and agronomic problems have been
119 pointed out. After its useful life – which in general does not exceed 1 to 3 months – the
120 mulch film has to be removed and properly disposed of, a time-consuming (about 16 hours
121 per hectare) and costly procedure (Scaringelli, M., 2016; Briassoulis, D., 2013). The
122 recovered film is usually heavily contaminated with soil and organic residues, making
123 mechanical recycling technically difficult and not a cost-efficient solution (Briassoulis et
124 al., 2018; Figuier, 2016; De Lèpinau, Arbenz, 2016). The most common end of life of
125 collected films in Europe is still landfilling (about 50%), followed by energy recovering

126 and finally mechanical recycling (Le Moine, 2014). Recent Chinese prohibition (January
127 2018) to import different types of wastes is heavily impacting the European agricultural
128 plastic waste management, highlighting the difficulty in properly recycling this type of
129 plastics (Tamma, 2018). Plastic films may not be properly collected and recycled but
130 disposed of by burning in the field or by uncontrolled landfilling or left directly in the
131 (agricultural) soils, causing serious environmental concerns. An example is the “White
132 pollution” phenomena described in the Xinjiang Autonomous Region (China), in which
133 the residual plastic film can reach 200 kg/ha in the top soil with detrimental effects on
134 soils’ quality, health and fertility (Liu, He, & Yan, 2014; Gao *et al.*, 2019; Steinmetz *et*
135 *al.*, 2016).

136 As a reaction, there has been significant research into novel materials especially related to
137 biodegradable and bio-based (BB) mulch films, which enable an effective biodegradation
138 in soil and provide comparable agronomical performances (Touchaleaume *et al.*, 2016).
139 The term “bio-mulch film” brings together several types of both bio-based and fossil oil-
140 based biodegradable polymers and blends of them, such as polylactic acid (PLA),
141 polybutylene adipate co-terephthalate (PBAT), starch-based polymer blends or
142 copolymers. They biodegrade when exposed to bioactive environments such as soil and
143 compost (Kasirajan *et al.*, 2012) which means that they can be left *in situ* to be fully
144 biodegraded after being used. Clearly the biodegradation rate of biodegradable bioplastics
145 is influenced by the environmental conditions such as the types of available bacteria, fungi
146 thus specific enzymes namely native microflora (Pico, Y. *et al.*, 2019). However their
147 intrinsic biodegradability allow the complete biodegradation with times similar to natural
148 polymers such as cellulose used as reference by the relevant standards and certification
149 schemes.

150 The EN 17033:2018 is a new European Norm (standard) concerning “Plastics -
151 Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test
152 methods”, which sets the necessary tests and limits to define biodegradability,
153 performances and environmental impacts of BB much films. The material is considered
154 completely biodegradable if it achieves a complete biodegradation (absolute or relative to
155 the reference material) in a test period no longer than 24 months (mineralization into
156 CO₂). Additionally, a control of constituents (such as metals) and eco-toxicity testing
157 (acute and chronic toxicity tests on plant growth, earthworm; nitrification inhibition test
158 with soil microorganisms) were required. A certified mulch film guarantees that the
159 product will completely biodegrade in the soil without adversely impacting on the
160 environment.

161 **1.2 Goal of the paper**

162 The goal of the paper is to provide a general and common metric to measure the
163 circularity of a bio-based and biodegradable (BB) product and to apply the methodology at
164 product level to a category of products, namely bio-based and biodegradable mulch films.

165 **2 Materials and Methods**

166 **2.1 MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology**

167 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), according to the Ellen MacArthur Foundation
168 (EMF) methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015), is a number
169 that can range from 0 (pure linearity) to 1 (pure circularity). A purely linear production
170 provides for the exclusive use of virgin raw materials that turn into waste at the end of the
171 use phase of the product. Vice-versa, pure circularity includes the use of recycled
172 materials and does not produce wastes (regenerative streams). Circularity can be achieved
173 in different ways: as for the purpose of this paper, only recycling will be considered since

174 reuse is not an option for thin biodegradable mulch films. Since the method considers only
175 mass flows, the recycling corresponds to the recovery of materials for the original purpose
176 or for other purposes and excludes energy recovery, considered as a loss of materials equal
177 to landfill disposal. The materials recovered feed back into the process as recycled
178 feedstock.

179 The MCI methodology differentiates ‘technical cycles’ from ‘biological cycles’,
180 modelling only the former. The first contains products and materials re-entering into the
181 system (market) with the highest possible qualities and for as long as possible (thanks to
182 reuse, repair, refurbishment and recycling) and the latter includes biological materials used
183 in cascade until their restoration into the biosphere and the re-constitution of natural
184 resources.


185 The material flows associated to the production of a generic technical cycle from non-
186 renewable sources are summarized in Figure 1~~Figure 1~~. The dashed lines indicate that
187 recycled feedstock does not have to be sourced from the same product but can be acquired
188 on the market. With reference to Figure 1~~Figure 1~~, the list of the parameters used in the
189 EMF methodology is reported in Table 1~~Table 1~~, while the equations relevant for the
190 analysis carried out in this paper are described in the following sections (Table 2~~Table 2~~,
191 Chapter 2.2).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic



192

193

194

195

Figure 1: Diagram of material flows and associated variables of a generic product (modified from Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015).

Table 1: Parameters and relative definitions used in the EMF methodology.

Parameter	Definition
M	Total mass of the product
F_R	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from recycled sources
F_U	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from reused sources
V	Mass of virgin feedstock used in a product
C_R	Fraction of mass of a product being collected to go into a recycling process
C_U	Fraction of mass of a product going into component reuse
E_C	Efficiency of the recycling process used for the portion collected for recycling
E_F	Efficiency of the recycling process used to produce recycled feedstock for a product

W	Total mass of unrecoverable waste associated with a product
W_0	Mass of unrecoverable waste (landfill, waste to energy and any other type of process where the materials are no longer recoverable)
W_C	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated in the process of recycling parts of a product (after use)
W_F	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated when producing recycled feedstock for a product
X	Utility of a product, calculated as $X = (L/L_{av})(U/U_{av})$
L	Actual average lifetime of a product
L_{av}	Actual average lifetime of an industry-average product of the same type
U	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of a product
U_{av}	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of an industry-average product of the same type

196

197 The Material Circularity Indicator is determined as follows: $MCI = LFI \cdot F$,
 198 where LFI is the Linear Flow Index measuring the flows of virgin materials and
 199 unrecoverable wastes associated to the examined product.

200 A function of the utility, $F = X^a$, is used to correct the LFI . The function F is chosen in
 201 such a way that improvements of the utility of a product (e.g., by using it longer) have the
 202 same impact on its MCI as a reuse of components, leading to the same amount of
 203 reduction of virgin material use and unrecoverable waste. Setting $a = 0.9$, MCI takes, by
 204 convention, the value 0.1 for a fully linear product (i.e., $LFI = 1$) whose utility equals the
 205 industry average (i.e., $X = 1$). This leaves some margin to distinguish between processes
 206 with a high linearity but different utilities.

207 **2.2 MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products**

208 To apply the EMF methodology to BB products, formulas and flows (Figure 1Figure 1
209 and Figure 2Figure 2) are adapted as it follows:

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

- 210 1. The fraction of the recycled feedstock, F_R , corresponds to the share of the bio-
211 based feedstock content in the final BB product, $F_{R(i)}$. It is the ratio of the d.m.
212 amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m. amount of the total mass of BB
213 product (EN 16785-2:2016).
- 214 2. The fraction of restorative mass going into a recycling process, C_R , corresponds
215 to the share of bio-based feedstock content in the BB product biologically
216 recovered (e.g. through composting) or biodegraded in the natural
217 environment, as it happens for specific applications (e.g. biodegradable mulch
218 film, etc.). It is the ratio of the d.m. amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m.
219 amount of the total mass of BB product that is biologically recycled.

220 The modified scheme is shown in Figure 2Figure 2. Table 2Table 2 lists the formulas as
221 adapted to BB products.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

222 **Table 2:** List of formulas as developed by EMF methodology compared to the
223 proposed adaptation to BB products.

EMF methodology	Adaptation to BB products
-----------------	---------------------------


224

225 The mass of fossil-based feedstock which may be contained in BB products (V) is
226 obtained as a difference of the total mass (M) minus the bio-based fraction; in this case the
227 F_R in the EMF methodology corresponds to the sum of the fractions of all the bio-
228 based feedstock/s used in manufacturing the BB product. Therefore, is the
229 total bio-based feedstock mass in the product. In single-use products, such as mulch films,
230 reuse is not considered for BB products, so that $F_U = C_U = 0$.

231 W_F is the total amount of unrecoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
232 feedstock used to produce BB products (*i.e.* the amount of uncoverable waste per unit of
233 BB product). Bio-based feedstocks such as starch, PLA, PHB etc. generate non-restorative
234 flows which can be quantified. Such unrecoverable waste correspond to $R_{(i)}$, the specific
235 amount of waste generated within cradle-to-gate boundaries per unit of bio-based
236 feedstock going into manufacturing, and it is estimated through LCA studies. Thus all
237 inputs from growth and harvesting phases and the related wastes generated by fertilisers
238 and pesticides are here accounted. $R_{(i)}$ can be easily found in specific literature or life
239 cycle inventories (LCI) present in LCA databases. In the calculation of W_F , also the
240 efficiency of manufacturing process of BB products E_P is considered, as the ratio of the

241 overall bio-based feedstock content in the final BB product to the bio-based feedstock in
 242 input to the manufacturing process.
 243 The material flows associated to the production of a generic BB product are summarized
 244 in [Figure 2](#).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic



245
 246 **Figure 2:** Description of material flows adaptation to BB products; in this paper,
 247 the reuse flow is out of scope ($C_U = F_U = 0$).

248 The biodegradation of bio-based feedstock does not imply the generation of waste W_C as it
 249 occurs in a standard mechanical recycling process. This implies that C_R and E_C (i.e. the
 250 efficiency of the biodegradation process) equal to 1. Indeed, a BB raw material, sent to
 251 biological treatment (composting) or biodegraded in a natural environment, is fully
 252 transformed in its chemical elements (C, H and O mainly) derived from the decomposition
 253 of complex molecules (polymers) without the release of waste (Witt et al., 2001; Marten et

254 al., 2003; Eubeler et al., 2010; BASF, 2018; Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites,
255 2018; OWS, 2018; Zumstein et al., 2018). These natural elements return into the
256 environment and are then available in the respective biogeochemical cycles. The
257 (biodegradable) fossil portion behaves as well; consequently, $W_C = 0$.

258 Nevertheless, the fossil-based feedstock cannot be considered as a regenerative circular
259 feedstock, since it derives from carbon stored for millions of years and extracted by man,
260 not being part of the active and fast biogeochemical carbon cycle. This is accounted in the
261 quantification of W_0 , the mass of unrecoverable waste from use (*i.e.* the linear stream
262 going to landfill or incineration, the Non-Restorative Flows, NRF), as W_0 , the total
263 amount of fossil-based feedstock.

264 Since W_F and W_C are associated to complete different processes and W_C is always equal
265 zero, the double counting issue does not occur and the quantification of W and LFI is
266 modified as reported in [Table 2](#).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

267 **2.3 MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions**

268 The new formulas reported in [Table 2](#) were applied to a single use product namely
269 a BB mulch film, to calculate their corresponding MCI. The transformation of BB
270 materials into the final products (*i.e.* white mulch films) takes place without any
271 modification of the bio-based feedstock content and the process yield is close to 1.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

272 In the global market, there are several branded BB mulch films (Moreno et al., 2017), both
273 starch-based or blends of polyesters. In the following, the BB film has been arbitrarily
274 assumed to be a starch-based mulch film with a 30%-portion of bio-based feedstock (*i.e.*
275 23% of starch, $F_{(S)}$, and 7% of a bio-based additive, $F_{(BA)}$), while the rest was assumed to
276 consist of fossil feedstock ($F_{(F)}$).


Formatted: Font: Not Italic

277

278 | [Figure 3](#) (Figure 3). Since a generalized approach was used and no primary data were
 279 | implemented, the information were extrapolated from literature (Institute of Bioplastics
 280 | and Biocomposites, 2018); the main characteristics of the two examined products are
 281 | presented in [Table 3](#) (Table 3).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

282
283
284



294 | **Figure 3:** Examples of hypothetical bio-based polymers; in this paper, the first
 295 | option on the left (starch blend 30/70) has been chosen for carrying out the numerical
 296 | MCI calculation (working hypothesis). The figure considers a 100%-efficiency in every
 297 | phase of production, so that the residues are equal to zero; the same assumption is done in
 298 | this paper. *TPS (Thermoplastic starch), starch content 75%; **Ratio TPS/Polymer;
 299 | modified from Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018.

300

301

Table 3: Key features representative of the BB mulch films.

BB mulch film	
Material	30% bio-based feedstock (23% starch + 7% bio-based additive) + 70% fossil feedstock
Thickness (μm)	12
Density (g/cm^3)	1.25
Weight (g/m^2)	15.2
Functional unit (the covering of the agricultural land)	6000 m^2/ha (the actual mulched soil in a hectare is generally equal to the 60% of the total area; Malinconico, 2017)

302

303 In the calculation of MCI for the BB mulch film, the adapted formulas were used together
 304 with assumptions. As stated before, BB mulch films are blends of bio-based and fossil
 305 based feedstocks (in the specific case, 30% and 70% respectively). Unlike the LDPE
 306 mulch film that has to be removed and disposed of, the BB mulch film is left in soil where
 307 it undergoes an ultimate biodegradation (so that $C_R = 1$) with no waste (so that $E_C = 1$), in
 308 respect of the specific standard EN 17033:2018. As a result of polymers' decomposition,
 309 the derived (biogenic) C, H and O finally return into biosphere (atmosphere,
 310 microorganism biomass, organic material pool) (OWS, 2018), and back into
 311 biogeochemical cycles in a relatively short time ("Biogenic elements accounted as
 312 recycled" in [Figure 2](#)), with the exception of humified compounds. Actually, also
 313 C, H and O deriving from fossil-based sources undergo biodegradation (Zumstein, M.T.,
 314 2018) but they are not considered as a regenerative flow ("Waste from non-restorative
 315 flow" in [Figure 2](#)) and their "wastes" are indeed calculated in W_0 .

316 Applying a conservative approach, W_F , the waste generated by the production of each bio-
 317 based feedstock, is quantified considering a "cradle to gate" LCA study. The estimated
 318 solid wastes $R_{(i)}$ for the presented case study are related to the production of starch ($F_{(S)}$),

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

319 with an amount $R_{(S)}$ of 0.014 kg of waste per kg of renewable feedstock (source: personal
320 communication A. Novelli), and to the production of the bio-based additive ($F_{(BA)}$), with
321 $R_{(BA)}$ equals to 0.025 kg waste/kg renewable feedstock (US-LCI database). As assumed in

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

322
323 Figure 3Figure 3, the production efficiency of BB product E_P (how much bio-based
324 feedstock is needed for every unit of BB product) is estimated equal to 1 and no
325 unrecoverable wastes are generated by the process.

326 In addition, an explorative sensitivity analysis has been performed regarding exclusively
327 the amount of bio-based feedstock content of the BB mulch film, *i.e.* (*i.e.*, $F_{(S)}$ +

328 $F_{(BA)}$), as shown in Figure 4Figure 4 (Chapter 3). Considering the characteristics of the
329 films (weight, g/m^2 , or thickness, μm , and density, g/cm^3) and the relative functional unit

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

330 (6000 m^2/ha , Table 3Table 3), it is possible to calculate a mass, M , that is 90 kg/ha for the
331 BB one. Once calculated the masses, the formulas reported in Table 2Table 2 (Chapter
332 2.2) are applied. Results are shown in Table 4Table 4.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

333

334 2.4 Sensitivity analysis

335 A sensitivity analysis was conducted for BB mulch film to examine the effects of
336 changing the main variables. Given a non-linear dependence of results on parameter
337 values, a Monte Carlo approach (see, *e.g.*, Lloyd and Ries, 2008) has been adopted. The
338 model has been implemented using specifically written routines in the C++ programming
339 language. The model was run with 100,000 events for BB mulch film, where the value of
340 each parameter has been randomly chosen following a Gaussian distribution with a
341 standard deviation within a range of possible and realistic values (Table 5Table 5 and

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

342 Error! Reference source not found.Table 6; Figure 5Figure 5 and Figure 6Figure 6).

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

343 **3 Results**

344 Figure 4 shows how the value of the MCI varies according to the percentage
345 variation of the bio-based feedstock in the total mass of the product.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic


346

347 *Table 4: Resulting parameters in the calculation of MCI for BB mulch film.*

Parameter	BB mulch film
-----------	---------------

348

349



350
 351 **Figure 4:** MCI as a function of the amount of bio-based feedstock/s in the BB
 352 mulch film $\Sigma F_{R(i)}$, expressed as the percentage of all the bio-based feedstock/s of the mulch
 353 film on dry mass basis (X-axis). The dots correspond to the three different hypothetical
 354 bioplastic compositions of Figure 3.

355

356 3.1 Sensitivity analysis

357 The results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in the followings [Table 5](#) and
 358 [Figure 5](#) and [Figure 6](#). The accuracy band is a fraction of the average and
 359 corresponds to a probability of 95%. It has been chosen in order to be representative of the
 360 variability of the product category, the BB mulch films. The simulation can thus be
 361 regarded as a system composed by a high number of companies, each producing films
 362 with different characteristics, that are accounted for in the accuracy band.

363 **Table 5:** Parameters used for the sensitivity analysis of the BB mulch film. (**) The
 364 Accuracy Band is defined as twice the standard deviation of the distribution.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic


Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Variable name	Average	Accuracy Band (**)	Unit
M	1000.00	0%	kg
F_(S)/F_(BA)	3.29	10%	fraction
F_(S) + F_(BA)	0.30	30%	fraction
F_U	0.00	0%	fraction
C_U	0.00	0%	fraction
R_(S)	0.014	100%	fraction
R_(BA)	0.025	100%	fraction
E_C	1	0%	fraction
E_P	0.95	10%	fraction
C_R	1.00	0%	fraction

365

366


367



368

369

Figure 5: Resulting distribution of MCI values for BB mulch film.



370

371

372

Figure 6: The most sensitive and relevant parameters in the calculation of the MCI of the BB mulch films.

373 **4 Discussion**

374 This work applies the principles of the EMF methodology into BB products so as to define
375 common metrics for calculating their circularity. By doing so it proposes some substantial
376 changes to the EMF methodology but still coherent with the overall methodological
377 framework. Such changes should be seen as a generalisation of the methodology provided
378 the following rules are applied:

379 (1) fossil-based feedstocks or component materials embodied in the BB products whatever
380 is the final disposal (even biological recycling) shall be considered as non-restorative;

381 (2) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to biological
382 recycling like composting, or biodegrade in the environment (i.e. BB mulch film) shall be
383 considered restorative as long as they flow through the biosphere safely, without any harm
384 to the environment (e.g. no toxicity effects).

385 (3) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to incineration and
386 landfill shall be considered as non-restorative;

387 The justification of these rules is described in the following.

388 Fossil-based component materials in the product derive from deposits where they
389 remained stocked for a geological time scale. Once the product is mineralised, its fossil-
390 based portion will be accounted as non-regenerative and therefore linear, due to its origin
391 (Joos et al., 2013). This is true, even if fossil carbon, for example, will re-enter biological
392 cycles, like CO₂ in the atmosphere and other streams, since both fossil-based and bio-
393 based component materials will physically and chemically behave the same, once
394 biodegraded. However, the source of the bio-based carbon was circular before its use
395 (concept of “carbon neutrality”, equilibrium between the biogenic carbon released and the
396 carbon absorbed by plants) and will maintain its circularity provided that the carbon is
397 released into the atmosphere at the same rate. The reason has its origin in the EMF general

398 provisions stating that “biologically sourced materials can only be considered part of a
399 Circular Economy if materials are not used faster than they can be restored naturally”
400 (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015). If BB products are incinerated, the
401 bio-based components are still considered linear, maintaining consistency with EMF
402 principles. Basically, a complete circularity for a BB product is satisfied when its
403 renewable components are 100% bio-based and they go 100% to biological recycling or
404 biodegraded in the environment (for specific application like mulch film).

405 | As for provision (3), a material health rule has its origin in manifold normative
406 definitions of the CE. In addition, the EMF definition of biological cycles is that of non-
407 toxic materials which are restored into the biosphere and the CE is defined as such if it can
408 “eliminate the use of toxic chemicals”. The need of a safety clause has been reviewed
409 under many aspects by Verberne (2016) and can be put as a postulate of the restoration
410 principle: if a flow is toxic it cannot be defined restorative. This is also at the core of the
411 REACH Regulation (EC 1907/2006). In the specific case, the material complies with the
412 standard EN 17033-2018 certifying that no harm is caused to a) all relevant organism
413 groups as plants, invertebrates (e.g. earthworm) and microorganisms, b) important
414 ecological processes maintaining soil functions, c) all relevant exposure pathways as soil
415 pore water, soil pore air and soil material.

416 A comprehensive approach for MCI calculation should also include non-restorative flows
417 generated at upstream level like biomass growth, in the specific case corn, and biomass
418 conversion processes like starch extraction and refining. Specifically these non-restorative
419 flows correspond to the overall non-recyclable wastes associated to the bio-based
420 feedstock supply thus non-recyclable waste from fertilizer and pesticide production, non-
421 recyclable scraps from conversion processes, etc. In this study such flows of non-
422 restorative waste coming from upstream manufacturing operations were included for the

423 bio-based feedstocks ($R_{(i)}$) used in manufacturing the BB mulch film applying “cradle to
424 gate” LCA methodology. However, we observed that the inclusion of upstream
425 unrecoverable waste does not significantly influence the MCI results in the chosen case
426 study, since the respective amounts are small. The specific unrecoverable waste for starch
427 and bio-based additive (*i.e.* kg of waste/kg of bio-based feedstock) were estimated at
428 0.014 and 0.025, respectively.

Formatted: Font: Italic

429

430 The resulting MCI for the 30/70 blend of the BB mulch film is equal to 0.37 in a 0-1 scale
431 and its circularity is linearly linked to the amount of bio-based feedstock used according to
432 the equation $y = 0.89x + 0.1$, where y is the MCI and x is the bio-based feedstock content,
433 therefore the amount of recycled feedstock or (renewable) bio-based feedstock in input is
434 decisive.

435 Apart from the specific application analysed in this paper, the proposed MCI method can
436 be easily applied and calculated for any kind of BB product as long as the following
437 information are available:

- 438 • The bio-based feedstock content, determined according to the standard EN 16785-
439 2:2016, if the composition is known, or directly provided by the BB product manufacturer.
- 440 • The ~~E~~nd of ~~L~~ife scenario of the studied BB product (real or hypothetical).
- 441 • The amount of un-recoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
442 feedstock contained in the BB product. They can be derived from LCA databases or other
443 specific sources.

444 5 Conclusions

445 Bioplastic market is steadily increasing. The value proposition of bio-based and
446 biodegradable products is linked to:

- 447 1. the use of renewable feedstock (like starch and its derivatives) instead of fossil oil or
448 natural gas;
- 449 2. the waste recovery through biological recycling, thanks to their ability to
450 biodegrade in composting facilities or in soil (e.g. biodegradable mulch film).

451 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), developed by the EMF, is a metric for
452 quantifying “how much” a product is circular (MCI = 0, fully-linear product; MCI = 1,
453 completely circular product) thus it represents a valuable tool for product eco-design
454 purposes. However, it focuses solely on technical materials, mechanically recycled or
455 reused, leaving out bio-based feedstocks and related biological treatments such as
456 composting. Without common metrics it is not possible to pursue concrete actions, to
457 achieve measurable results and to provide unequivocal references for all products. This
458 research work aims at filling this gap through the development of a methodology coherent
459 with EMF MCI methodology but able to catch the specificities of bio-based and
460 biodegradable products and provide metrics for those innovative products. Direct uses are:
461 (i) supporting the eco-design of innovative bio-based products and (ii) comparing the MCI
462 of BB products with MCI of traditional products (e.g. fossil based).

463 The proposed method has been applied to a real case study (*i.e.* biodegradable mulch film)
464 providing quantitative metrics about its circularity. Specifically considering a bio-based
465 feedstock content of 30%, the correspondent MCI is 0.37 in a 0-1 scale and its circularity
466 is heavily linked to the bio-based feedstock content according to this relation: $MCI_{(BB\ mulch\ film)} = 0.89 * bio\text{-based}\ feedstock + 0.1$.

468 The MCI is a key performance indicator to develop more circular products, in line with
469 the Circular Economy principles like the use of renewable materials and the reduction of
470 the amount of not recoverable waste. MCI will support the development of innovative
471 products just based on these two important characteristics specific for each BB

472 | product/application and end of life scenario. Bioeconomy, thus also BB products, can
473 | provide valuable insights in transforming the current (linear) economy in a more circular
474 | one, however, the way the biomass is produced, processed and BB products are produced
475 | are fundamental aspects to be properly assessed and monitored. This can be done using
476 | specific methodologies like LCA. Within this context the proposed MCI has to be seen as
477 | a complementary (quantitative) tool for further qualifying the sustainability of BB
478 | products and not as a substitute tool. Furthermore the MCI here proposed is meaningful
479 | only if BB products meet health and safety material requirements according to the national
480 | and European laws and standards. This is a postulate of the proposed methodology
481 | especially for those BB products conceived to biodegrade in the environment like
482 | biodegradable mulch film.

483

484

485

486 | **Declaration of interest**

487 | The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any
488 | commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of
489 | interest.

490

491 | **Acknowledgements**

492 | The contents of the paper are part of the findings of the project STAR-ProBio.
493 | STAR-ProBio has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 program
494 | research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 727740. The authors
495 | thanks prof. Andrea Contin for the fruitful discussion and contribution to the sensitivity
496 | analysis, Francesco Degli Innocenti for providing valuable comments and feedback on the

497 topics addressed by the paper and Alessandra Novelli for the general support in the MCI
498 elaboration.

499
500

501 **Addendum**

502 While this paper was undergoing peer review the authors became aware that the EMF
503 published an update of the MCI methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta
504 Design, 2019) including the extension of it to include the treatment of biological materials.
505 This update introduces new definitions and formulas. The authors believe that most of the
506 changes regarding accounting are in the direction here proposed and that this study can
507 contribute as an illustration on how the material circularity of a biological based material
508 can be addressed in a real case study. Furthermore the authors would like to highlight that
509 the proposed methodology started long before the EMF changes: specifically the original
510 idea dated back to 2017 and a beta version of it - not as it is now - was presented in the
511 middle of 2018 at the Italian Circular Economy Stakeholder Platform (ICESP
512 www.icesp.it).

513

514 **References**

515

BASF, 2018. Biodegradable mulch film – clarification of polymer fate in soil. CIPA Congress, Bordeaux/Arcachon, France, May 2018.

Bio-Based and Biodegradable Industries Association. BBIA reports. <https://bbia.org.uk/reports/> (accessed 28 November 2019)

Briassoulis, D., Giannoulis, A., 2018. Evaluation of the functionality of bio-based plastic mulching films. Polym. Test. 67, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymertesting.2018.02.019>

Briassoulis D., Hiskakis, M., Babou, E., 2013. Technical specifications for mechanical recycling of agricultural plastic waste. Waste Management, Volume 33, issue 6,

pages 1516-1530, ISSN 0956-053X. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.03.004>

De Lèpinau, P. and Arbenz, A., 2016. Economic and environmental impact of soil contamination in mulching film, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 28-48.

Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015. *Circularity Indicators – An approach to measure circularity – Methodology*. https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/insight/Circularity-Indicators_Methodology_May2015.pdf.

[Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2019. *Circularity Indicators – An approach to measure circularity – Methodology*.](#)

Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017. *The New Plastic Economy: Rethinking the future of plastic & catalysing action*.

EN 16785-2:2016 - Bio-based products - Bio-based content - Part 2: Determination of the bio-based content using the material balance method.

EN 17033:2018 - Plastics - Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test methods.

EPLCA – European Platform on LCA. https://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/?page_id=86

Eubeler, J., Bernhanrd, M., Knepper, T., 2010. Environmental biodegradation of synthetic polymers II. Biodegradation of different polymer groups. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry*. 29, 1, 84-100

European Commission, 2015. *Closing the loop – An EU action plan for the Circular Economy*. COM(2015) 614 final. Brussels, 2.12.2015

European Commission, 2018. *A European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular Economy*. COM(2018) 28 final. Brussels, 16.1.2018

European Bioplastics. *European Bioplastic publications*. <https://www.european-bioplastics.org/news/publications/> (accessed 28 November 2019)

Figuier, B., 2016. *Plasticulture in Europe*, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 20-28

Gao, H., Yan, C., Liu, Q., Ding, W., Chen, B., Li, Z., 2019. Effects of plastic mulching and plastic residue on agricultural production: A meta-analysis. *Sci. Total Environ.* 651, 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2018.09.105>

Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., Ulgiati, S., 2016. A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. *J. Clean. Prod.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.007>

- Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018. Biopolymers – Facts and Statistics. Hochschule Hannover, University of Applied Sciences and Arts. Edition 5, ISSN 2510-3431.
- Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestedt, J. S., Peters, G. P., Enting, I. G., Bloh, W. V., ... and Friedrich, T., 2013. Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(5), 2793-2825.
- Kasirajan, S., Ngouajio, M., 2012. Polyethylene and biodegradable mulches for agricultural applications: a review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 32, 501–529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0068-3>
- Lange, B.K., 2016. Revision of the fertilisers regulation – benefits of biodegradable mulch films. European Bioplastics. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/108931/Kristy%20Barbara%20Lange%20EBP%20PPT2.pdf> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Le Moine, B., 2014. Agri-plastics waste management: a voluntary commitment from the industry. Presented at: Agricultural Film 2014 – International Conference on silage, mulch, greenhouse and tunnel films used in agriculture (15-17 September, Barcelona, Spain).
- Liu, E. K., He, W. Q., & Yan, C. R., 2014. ‘White revolution’ to ‘white pollution’—agricultural plastic film mulch in China. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(9), 091001.
- Lloyd, S. M., & Ries, R., 2007. Characterizing, propagating, and analyzing uncertainty in life cycle assessment: A survey of quantitative approaches. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 11(1), 161-179.
- Lonca, G., Muggéo, R., Tétreault-Imbeault, H., Bernard, S., & Margni, M., 2018. A Bi-dimensional Assessment to Measure the Performance of Circular Economy: A Case Study of Tires End-of-Life Management. In *Designing Sustainable Technologies, Products and Policies* (pp. 33-42). Springer, Cham.
- Malinconico, M., 2017. Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture. *Green Chemistry and Sustainable Technology*. Springer.
- Marten, E., Muller, R., and Deckwer W., 2003. Studies on the enzymatic hydrolysis of polyesters I. Low molecular mass model esters and aliphatic polyesters. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 80, 3, 485-501.
- Moreno, M. M., González-Mora, S., Villena, J., Campos, J. A., & Moreno, C., 2017. Deterioration pattern of six biodegradable, potentially low-environmental impact mulches in field conditions. *Journal of environmental management*, 200, 490-501.

- Mormile, P., Stahl, N., Malinconico, M., 2017. The World of Plasticulture, in: Malinconico, M. (Ed.), *Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture*. pp. 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54130-2_1
- OWS, 2018. Accumulation of (bio)degradable plastics in soil. CIPA Congress 2018, Archacon, May 29.
- Pico Y., Barcelò, D., 2019. Analysis and prevention of microplastics pollution in water: current perspectives and future directions. *ACS Omega*, 4, 6709–6719.
- Plasticulture catalogues, 2018. <http://plasticulture.qualif.e-catalogues.info> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Razza, F., Degli Innocenti, F., 2012. Bioplastics from renewable resources: the benefits of biodegradability. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 7 (Suppl. 3): S301–S309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/apj.1648>
- Scaringelli, M., Giannoccaro, G., prosperi, M., Lopolito, A., 2016. Adoption of biodegradable mulching films in agriculture: is there a negative prejudice towards materials derived from organic waste? *Italian Journal of agronomy*, 11:92.
- Shen M., Zhang, Y., Zhu, Y., Song, B., Zeng, G., Hu, D., Wen, Y., Ren, X., 2019. Recent advances in toxicological research of nanoplastics in the environment: A review. *Environmental Pollution*, 252: 511–521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.102>
- Steinmetz, Z., Wollmann, C., Schaefer, M., Buchmann, C., David, J., Tröger, J., Muñoz, K., Frör, O., Schaumann, G.E., 2016. Plastic mulching in agriculture. Trading short-term agronomic benefits for long-term soil degradation? *Sci. Total Environ.* 550, 690–705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.01.153>
- Tamma, P., 2018. China's trash ban forces Europe to confront its waste problem, Politico, 2/21/2018.
- Touchaleaume, F., Martin-Closas, L., Angellier-Coussy, H., Chevillard, A., Cesar, G., Gontard, N., Gastaldi, E., 2016. Performance and environmental impact of biodegradable polymers as agricultural mulching films. *Chemosphere* 144, 433–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.09.006>
- US-LCI database. “Polylactide biopolymer resin at plant kg/RNA”. <https://www.nrel.gov/lci/> (accessed 9 December 2019)
- Verberne, J.J.H., 2016. Building circularity indicators. Eindhoven University of Technology.
- Wen, X., Du, C., Xu, P., zeng, G., Huang, D., Yin, L., Yin, Q., Hu, L., Wan, J., Zhang, J., Tan, S., Deng, R., 2018. Microplastic pollution in surface sediments of urban water areas in Changsha, China: Abundance, composition, surface textures. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 136: 414–423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.09.043>.

Field Code Changed

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

- Witt, U., Einig, T., Yamamoto, M., Kleeberg, I., Deckwer, W., Muller, R., 2001. Biodegradation of aliphatic-aromatic copolyesters: evaluation of the final biodegradability and ecotoxicological impact of degradation intermediates. *Chemosphere*. 44, 289-299.
- Zumstein, M., Schintlmeister, A., Nelson, T., Baumgartner, R., Wagner, M., Sander, M., McNeill, K., Wobken, D., Kohler, H., 2018. Biodegradation of synthetic polymers in soils: Tracking carbon into CO₂ and microbial biomass. *Science Advances*, 4, 7.

Metrics for quantifying the circularity of bioplastics: the case of bio-based and biodegradable mulch films

Francesco Razza^a, Cristiana Briani^b, Tony Breton^c, Diego Marazza^d

^a *Novamont S.p.A. - Ecology of Product and Environmental Communication, Piazz.le Donegani 4, 05100 Terni, Italy*

^b *CIRSA Centro Interdipartimentale di Ricerca per le Scienze Ambientali, Via S. Alberto 163, 48123 Ravenna, Italy*

^c *Novamont S.p.A. – Via Fauser 8, 28100 Novara, Italy*

^d *Department of Physics, University of Bologna, Viale B. Pichat 6/2, 40127 Bologna, Italy*

Abstract

The concept of circularity and its quantification through the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) is well established for traditional plastic products. In this paper a methodological approach for calculating the circularity of bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products is proposed and applied to BB mulch films. BB products are different from traditional products in as much as they are sourced and regenerated (recycled) not through technical cycles but the biological loop. The suggested method is an adaptation of the MCI where two major changes were made: (i) the mass of the bio-based component corresponds to the recycled material in input and (ii) the mass of the bio-based component leaving the system through composting or biodegradation in soil is accounted as recycled. The modified MCI supports the eco-design of innovative BB products and allows for the comparison of their circularity taking into account the biological source and the expected end of life process such as biodegradation. To demonstrate the adaptation, the method has been applied to BB mulch films. Results showed that the MCI of a biodegradable mulch film, characterized by an average bio-based feedstock content of 30% is 0.37 ± 0.04 in a 0-1 scale. For BB mulch film, the amount of bio-based feedstock is the most sensitive factor and controls linearly the value of the MCI.

Keywords: circularity indicators, circular economy, bioplastics, biodegradable mulch film, bio-based product, biodegradation

36	1	Introduction	3
37	1.1	The case study of mulch films.....	5
38	1.2	Goal of the paper	7
39	2	Materials and Methods	7
40	2.1	MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology.....	7
41	2.2	MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products.....	11
42	2.3	MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions	14
43	2.4	Sensitivity analysis	17
44	3	Results	17
45	3.1	Sensitivity analysis	19
46	4	Discussion	22
47	5	Conclusions	24

48
49

Abbreviations

BB	Biodegradable and bio-based
CE	Circular Economy
d.m.	Dry matter
EMF	Ellen MacArthur Foundation
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LDPE	Low-Density Poly-Ethylene
MCI	Material Circularity Indicator
NRF	Non-Restorative Flows
PBAT	Polybutylene adipate terephthalate
PE	Poly-Ethylene
PLA	Polylactic acid
PHB	Poly hydroxy butyrate

50

51 **1 Introduction**

52 To overcome today's unsustainable model of 'take-make-dispose' and its related risks
53 such as hikes in raw material prices, pressures on the environment, shortage of global
54 resources and waste sinks, a circular approach needs to be applied. It is a new regenerative
55 economic view, based on a balance between economy, environment and society, a total
56 resource efficiency and a Zero Emission Strategy that aims to maximize products value
57 with zero, or minimal, environmental impact (Ghisellini et al., 2016) . Together with
58 structural changes in environmental legislation, new logistics, technologies and sharing
59 schemes, the Circular Economy (CE) approach which is regenerative by design, aims at
60 closing materials loops, *i.e.* at reducing virgin materials input and waste output.

61 In December 2015, the European Commission developed an Action Plan for Circular
62 Economy (European Commission, 2015), where plastic was considered a priority to be
63 tackled. In January 2018, an *EU Plastic Strategy* (European Commission, 2018) was
64 adopted, in order to react to the increasing environmental problems concerning plastic
65 production, consumption, use and disposal along the same lines of the CE approach. Two
66 fundamental steps to increase the circularity of different plastic products are (i) the
67 abandonment of fossil fuels, *i.e.* currently 90% of the plastic is produced by virgin
68 petroleum-based feedstock (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017), and (ii) the development
69 of easily recyclable products which are recycled. Today, in EU the share of plastics
70 collected for recycling is 30% while the use of recycled plastics is just 6% (European
71 Commission, 2018).

72 Biodegradable and bio-based (BB) plastics are spreading across markets (Institute for
73 Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018) as a valid contribution to meet CE aims and
74 principles. This is true as long as the supply of renewable raw materials, generally from
75 agriculture, is based on a sustainable approach and the conversion processes along the

76 supply chain are efficient and highly integrated in a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
77 perspective (EPLCA – European Platform on LCA). While traditional plastics can be
78 mechanically recycled or incinerated with energy recovery, BB plastic products offer new
79 recycling routes in waste management, due to their biodegradability. Organic recycling
80 (through composting or anaerobic digestion) or in the case of specific applications such as
81 agricultural mulch films, biodegradation in the environment, offer additional recovery
82 options resulting in less wastes and less contamination of soil by plastic residues (Razza et
83 al., 2012; Lange, B., 2016). An extensive literature review about the potentialities and
84 benefits of renewable and compostable bioplastics, encompassing market perspective,
85 applications, economic effects etc. can be found here: (BBIA; European Bioplastics).
86 Nevertheless, the research and development of innovative products, such as the BB
87 products, implies the development of methodologies and metrics capable of measuring
88 their circularity. Without this it is not possible to achieve measurable results and
89 improving actions, as well as provide unequivocal references for comparisons of products
90 of the same type/category. In 2015 the Material Circularity Indicator (MCI) was
91 developed (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015) which aims to quantify
92 the regeneration of a product's material flow and is considered one of the few, among
93 sixteen CE indexes suiting a micro-scale assessment of circularity at product or company
94 level (Lonca et al., 2018). However, it focuses solely on technical cycles and recycled
95 materials. Furthermore, recovery and recycling through the biological cycle offered by
96 industrial composting, anaerobic digestion or biodegradation in natural environments are
97 not considered as end of life options. In order to apply the MCI system to BB plastic
98 products, the development of an enhanced methodology is necessary.
99 The approach proposed by the authors allows to quantify the circularity of BB plastic
100 products and to make comparisons with equivalent traditional plastic products. To

101 demonstrate the applicability of the proposed method a computational example for mulch
102 film products is provided. In so doing so, the paper aims at contributing to the Eco-design
103 of these innovative products.

104 *1.1 The case study of mulch films*

105 Plastic mulch films represent an important agronomical technique well established for the
106 production of many crops thanks to numerous agronomical advantages such as: increased
107 yield and higher quality of productions (Steinmetz et al., 2016) ; weed control and
108 reduced use of pesticides; early crop production and reduced soil moisture loss
109 (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018). As a consequence, the plastic films consumption has
110 increased year-by-year, reaching a current global market estimated at 1.4 millions of
111 tonnes , mainly in Asia (Briassoulis and Giannoulis, 2018; Mormile et al., 2017) , and
112 covering 80,000 km² of agricultural surface (0.6% of the global arable land). The mulch
113 film market in Europe is estimated by Agriculture Plastic & Environment and by the
114 European Bioplastic Associations at 76-80 kt. The most used raw material is Poly-
115 Ethylene (PE) in its different forms, due to its processability, chemical resistance, high
116 durability and flexibility (Kasirajan and Ngouajio, 2012; Plasticulture, 2016 and 2018;
117 Shen, M. et al., 2019; Wen, X. et al., 2018).

118 Despite these benefits, manifold environmental and agronomic problems have been
119 pointed out. After its useful life – which in general does not exceed 1 to 3 months – the
120 mulch film has to be removed and properly disposed of, a time-consuming (about 16 hours
121 per hectare) and costly procedure (Scaringelli, M., 2016; Briassoulis, D., 2013). The
122 recovered film is usually heavily contaminated with soil and organic residues, making
123 mechanical recycling technically difficult and not a cost-efficient solution (Briassoulis et
124 al., 2018; Figuier, 2016; De Lèpinau, Arbenz, 2016). The most common end of life of
125 collected films in Europe is still landfilling (about 50%), followed by energy recovering

126 and finally mechanical recycling (Le Moine, 2014). Recent Chinese prohibition (January
127 2018) to import different types of wastes is heavily impacting the European agricultural
128 plastic waste management, highlighting the difficulty in properly recycling this type of
129 plastics (Tamma, 2018). Plastic films may not be properly collected and recycled but
130 disposed of by burning in the field or by uncontrolled landfilling or left directly in the
131 (agricultural) soils, causing serious environmental concerns. An example is the “White
132 pollution” phenomena described in the Xinjiang Autonomous Region (China), in which
133 the residual plastic film can reach 200 kg/ha in the top soil with detrimental effects on
134 soils’ quality, health and fertility (Liu, He, & Yan, 2014; Gao *et al.*, 2019; Steinmetz *et*
135 *al.*, 2016).

136 As a reaction, there has been significant research into novel materials especially related to
137 biodegradable and bio-based (BB) mulch films, which enable an effective biodegradation
138 in soil and provide comparable agronomical performances (Touchaleaume *et al.*, 2016).
139 The term “bio-mulch film” brings together several types of both bio-based and fossil oil-
140 based biodegradable polymers and blends of them, such as polylactic acid (PLA),
141 polybutylene adipate co-terephthalate (PBAT), starch-based polymer blends or
142 copolymers. They biodegrade when exposed to bioactive environments such as soil and
143 compost (Kasirajan *et al.*, 2012) which means that they can be left *in situ* to be fully
144 biodegraded after being used. Clearly the biodegradation rate of biodegradable bioplastics
145 is influenced by the environmental conditions such as the types of available bacteria, fungi
146 thus specific enzymes namely native microflora (Pico, Y. *et al.*, 2019). However their
147 intrinsic biodegradability allow the complete biodegradation with times similar to natural
148 polymers such as cellulose used as reference by the relevant standards and certification
149 schemes.

150 The EN 17033:2018 is a new European Norm (standard) concerning “Plastics -
151 Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test
152 methods”, which sets the necessary tests and limits to define biodegradability,
153 performances and environmental impacts of BB much films. The material is considered
154 completely biodegradable if it achieves a complete biodegradation (absolute or relative to
155 the reference material) in a test period no longer than 24 months (mineralization into
156 CO₂). Additionally, a control of constituents (such as metals) and eco-toxicity testing
157 (acute and chronic toxicity tests on plant growth, earthworm; nitrification inhibition test
158 with soil microorganisms) were required. A certified mulch film guarantees that the
159 product will completely biodegrade in the soil without adversely impacting on the
160 environment.

161 ***1.2 Goal of the paper***

162 The goal of the paper is to provide a general and common metric to measure the
163 circularity of a bio-based and biodegradable (BB) product and to apply the methodology at
164 product level to a category of products, namely bio-based and biodegradable mulch films.

165 **2 Materials and Methods**


166 ***2.1 MCI accounting according to the EMF methodology***

167 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), according to the Ellen MacArthur Foundation
168 (EMF) methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015), is a number
169 that can range from 0 (pure linearity) to 1 (pure circularity). A purely linear production
170 provides for the exclusive use of virgin raw materials that turn into waste at the end of the
171 use phase of the product. Vice-versa, pure circularity includes the use of recycled
172 materials and does not produce wastes (regenerative streams). Circularity can be achieved
173 in different ways: as for the purpose of this paper, only recycling will be considered since

174 reuse is not an option for thin biodegradable mulch films. Since the method considers only
175 mass flows, the recycling corresponds to the recovery of materials for the original purpose
176 or for other purposes and excludes energy recovery, considered as a loss of materials equal
177 to landfill disposal. The materials recovered feed back into the process as recycled
178 feedstock.

179 The MCI methodology differentiates ‘technical cycles’ from ‘biological cycles’,
180 modelling only the former. The first contains products and materials re-entering into the
181 system (market) with the highest possible qualities and for as long as possible (thanks to
182 reuse, repair, refurbishment and recycling) and the latter includes biological materials used
183 in cascade until their restoration into the biosphere and the re-constitution of natural
184 resources.

185 The material flows associated to the production of a generic technical cycle from non-
186 renewable sources are summarized in Figure 1. The dashed lines indicate that recycled
187 feedstock does not have to be sourced from the same product but can be acquired on the
188 market. With reference to Figure 1, the list of the parameters used in the EMF
189 methodology is reported in Table 1, while the equations relevant for the analysis carried
190 out in this paper are described in the following sections (Table 2, Chapter 2.2).



191

192

Figure 1: Diagram of material flows and associated variables of a generic

193

product (modified from Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015).

194

Table 1: Parameters and relative definitions used in the EMF methodology.

Parameter	Definition
M	Total mass of the product
F_R	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from recycled sources
F_U	Fraction of mass of a product's feedstock from reused sources
V	Mass of virgin feedstock used in a product
C_R	Fraction of mass of a product being collected to go into a recycling process
C_U	Fraction of mass of a product going into component reuse
E_C	Efficiency of the recycling process used for the portion collected for recycling
E_F	Efficiency of the recycling process used to produce recycled feedstock for a product

W	Total mass of unrecoverable waste associated with a product
W_0	Mass of unrecoverable waste (landfill, waste to energy and any other type of process where the materials are no longer recoverable)
W_C	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated in the process of recycling parts of a product (after use)
W_F	Mass of unrecoverable waste generated when producing recycled feedstock for a product
X	Utility of a product, calculated as $X = (L/L_{av})(U/U_{av})$
L	Actual average lifetime of a product
L_{av}	Actual average lifetime of an industry-average product of the same type
U	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of a product
U_{av}	Actual average number of functional units achieved during the use phase of an industry-average product of the same type

195

196 The Material Circularity Indicator is determined as follows: $MCI = LFI \cdot F$,
 197 where LFI is the Linear Flow Index measuring the flows of virgin materials and
 198 unrecoverable wastes associated to the examined product.

199 A function of the utility, $F = X^a$, is used to correct the LFI . The function F is chosen in
 200 such a way that improvements of the utility of a product (e.g., by using it longer) have the
 201 same impact on its MCI as a reuse of components, leading to the same amount of
 202 reduction of virgin material use and unrecoverable waste. Setting $a = 0.9$, MCI takes, by
 203 convention, the value 0.1 for a fully linear product (*i.e.*, $LFI = 1$) whose utility equals the
 204 industry average (*i.e.*, $X = 1$). This leaves some margin to distinguish between processes
 205 with a high linearity but different utilities.

206 **2.2 MCI accounting for bio-based and biodegradable (BB) products**

207 To apply the EMF methodology to BB products, formulas and flows (Figure 1 and Figure
208 2) are adapted as it follows:

- 209 1. The fraction of the recycled feedstock, F_R , corresponds to the share of the bio-
210 based feedstock content in the final BB product, $F_{R(i)}$. It is the ratio of the d.m.
211 amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m. amount of the total mass of BB
212 product (EN 16785-2:2016).
- 213 2. The fraction of restorative mass going into a recycling process, C_R , corresponds
214 to the share of bio-based feedstock content in the BB product biologically
215 recovered (*e.g.* through composting) or biodegraded in the natural
216 environment, as it happens for specific applications (*e.g.* biodegradable mulch
217 film, *etc.*). It is the ratio of the d.m. amount of bio-based feedstock per d.m.
218 amount of the total mass of BB product that is biologically recycled.

219 The modified scheme is shown in Figure 2. Table 2 lists the formulas as adapted to BB
220 products.

221 **Table 2:** *List of formulas as developed by EMF methodology compared to the*
222 *proposed adaptation to BB products.*


EMF methodology	Adaptation to BB products
-----------------	---------------------------

223

224 The mass of fossil-based feedstock which may be contained in BB products (V) is
225 obtained as a difference of the total mass (M) minus the bio-based fraction; in this case the
226 F_R in the EMF methodology corresponds to the sum of the fractions of all the bio-
227 based feedstock/s used in manufacturing the BB product. Therefore, is the
228 total bio-based feedstock mass in the product. In single-use products, such as mulch films,
229 reuse is not considered for BB products, so that $F_U = C_U = 0$.

230 W_F is the total amount of unrecoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
231 feedstock used to produce BB products (*i.e.* the amount of uncoverable waste per unit of
232 BB product). Bio-based feedstocks such as starch, PLA, PHB etc. generate non-restorative
233 flows which can be quantified. Such unrecoverable waste correspond to $R_{(i)}$, the specific
234 amount of waste generated within cradle-to-gate boundaries per unit of bio-based
235 feedstock going into manufacturing, and it is estimated through LCA studies. Thus all
236 inputs from growth and harvesting phases and the related wastes generated by fertilisers
237 and pesticides are here accounted. $R_{(i)}$ can be easily found in specific literature or life
238 cycle inventories (LCI) present in LCA databases. In the calculation of W_F , also the
239 efficiency of manufacturing process of BB products E_P is considered, as the ratio of the

240 overall bio-based feedstock content in the final BB product to the bio-based feedstock in
 241 input to the manufacturing process.
 242 The material flows associated to the production of a generic BB product are summarized
 243 in Figure 2.



244
 245 **Figure 2:** Description of material flows adaptation to BB products; in this paper,
 246 the reuse flow is out of scope ($C_U = F_U = 0$).

247 The biodegradation of bio-based feedstock does not imply the generation of waste W_C as it
 248 occurs in a standard mechanical recycling process. This implies that C_R and E_C (i.e. the
 249 efficiency of the biodegradation process) equal to 1. Indeed, a BB raw material, sent to
 250 biological treatment (composting) or biodegraded in a natural environment, is fully
 251 transformed in its chemical elements (C, H and O mainly) derived from the decomposition
 252 of complex molecules (polymers) without the release of waste (Witt et al., 2001; Marten et

253 al., 2003; Eubeler et al., 2010; BASF, 2018; Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites,
254 2018; OWS, 2018; Zumstein et al., 2018). These natural elements return into the
255 environment and are then available in the respective biogeochemical cycles. The
256 (biodegradable) fossil portion behaves as well; consequently, $W_C = 0$.
257 Nevertheless, the fossil-based feedstock cannot be considered as a regenerative circular
258 feedstock, since it derives from carbon stored for millions of years and extracted by man,
259 not being part of the active and fast biogeochemical carbon cycle. This is accounted in the
260 quantification of W_0 , the mass of unrecoverable waste from use (*i.e.* the linear stream
261 going to landfill or incineration, the Non-Restorative Flows, NRF), as W_0 , the total
262 amount of fossil-based feedstock.
263 Since W_F and W_C are associated to complete different processes and W_C is always equal
264 zero, the double counting issue does not occur and the quantification of W and LFI is
265 modified as reported in Table 2.

266 **2.3 MCI calculation for mulch films: scope, inventory and assumptions**

267 The new formulas reported in Table 2 were applied to a single use product namely a BB
268 mulch film, to calculate their corresponding MCI. The transformation of BB materials into
269 the final products (*i.e.* white mulch films) takes place without any modification of the bio-
270 based feedstock content and the process yield is close to 1.

271 In the global market, there are several branded BB mulch films (Moreno et al., 2017), both
272 starch-based or blends of polyesters. In the following, the BB film has been arbitrarily
273 assumed to be a starch-based mulch film with a 30%-portion of bio-based feedstock (*i.e.*
274 23% of starch, $F_{(S)}$, and 7% of a bio-based additive, $F_{(BA)}$), while the rest was assumed to
275 consist of fossil feedstock ($F_{(F)}$).

276

277 Figure 3). Since a generalized approach was used and no primary data were implemented,
 278 the information were extrapolated from literature (Institute of Bioplastics and
 279 Biocomposites, 2018); the main characteristics of the two examined products are
 280 presented in Table 3.

281

282

283

284

285

286

287


288

289

290

291

292



293

294

295

296

297

298

299

Figure 3: Examples of hypothetical bio-based polymers; in this paper, the first option on the left (starch blend 30/70) has been chosen for carrying out the numerical MCI calculation (working hypothesis). The figure considers a 100%-efficiency in every phase of production, so that the residues are equal to zero; the same assumption is done in this paper. *TPS (Thermoplastic starch), starch content 75%; **Ratio TPS/Polymer; modified from Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018.

300

Table 3: Key features representative of the BB mulch films.

BB mulch film	
Material	30% bio-based feedstock (23% starch + 7% bio-based additive) + 70% fossil feedstock
Thickness (μm)	12
Density (g/cm^3)	1.25
Weight (g/m^2)	15.2
Functional unit (the covering of the agricultural land)	6000 m^2/ha (the actual mulched soil in a hectare is generally equal to the 60% of the total area; Malinconico, 2017)

301

302 In the calculation of MCI for the BB mulch film, the adapted formulas were used together
303 with assumptions. As stated before, BB mulch films are blends of bio-based and fossil
304 based feedstocks (in the specific case, 30% and 70% respectively). Unlike the LDPE
305 mulch film that has to be removed and disposed of, the BB mulch film is left in soil where
306 it undergoes an ultimate biodegradation (so that $C_R = 1$) with no waste (so that $E_C = 1$), in
307 respect of the specific standard EN 17033:2018. As a result of polymers' decomposition,
308 the derived (biogenic) C, H and O finally return into biosphere (atmosphere,
309 microorganism biomass, organic material pool) (OWS, 2018), and back into
310 biogeochemical cycles in a relatively short time ("Biogenic elements accounted as
311 recycled" in Figure 2), with the exception of humified compounds. Actually, also C, H
312 and O deriving from fossil-based sources undergo biodegradation (Zumstein, M.T., 2018)
313 but they are not considered as a regenerative flow ("Waste from non-restorative flow" in
314 Figure 2) and their "wastes" are indeed calculated in W_0 .

315 Applying a conservative approach, W_F , the waste generated by the production of each bio-
316 based feedstock, is quantified considering a "cradle to gate" LCA study. The estimated
317 solid wastes $R_{(i)}$ for the presented case study are related to the production of starch ($F_{(S)}$),

318 with an amount $R_{(S)}$ of 0.014 kg of waste per kg of renewable feedstock (source: personal
319 communication A. Novelli), and to the production of the bio-based additive ($F_{(BA)}$), with
320 $R_{(BA)}$ equals to 0.025 kg waste/kg renewable feedstock (US-LCI database). As assumed in

321

322 Figure 3, the production efficiency of BB product E_P (how much bio-based feedstock is
323 needed for every unit of BB product) is estimated equal to 1 and no unrecoverable wastes
324 are generated by the process.

325 In addition, an explorative sensitivity analysis has been performed regarding exclusively
326 the amount of bio-based feedstock content of the BB mulch film, *i.e.* (*i.e.*, $F_{(S)}$ +
327 $F_{(BA)}$), as shown in Figure 4 (Chapter 3). Considering the characteristics of the films
328 (weight, g/m^2 , or thickness, μm , and density, g/cm^3) and the relative functional unit (6000
329 m^2/ha , Table 3), it is possible to calculate a mass, M , that is 90 kg/ha for the BB one. Once
330 calculated the masses, the formulas reported in Table 2 (Chapter 2.2) are applied. Results
331 are shown in Table 4.

332

333 **2.4 Sensitivity analysis**

334 A sensitivity analysis was conducted for BB mulch film to examine the effects of
335 changing the main variables. Given a non-linear dependence of results on parameter
336 values, a Monte Carlo approach (see, *e.g.*, Lloyd and Ries, 2008) has been adopted. The
337 model has been implemented using specifically written routines in the C++ programming
338 language. The model was run with 100,000 events for BB mulch film, where the value of
339 each parameter has been randomly chosen following a Gaussian distribution with a
340 standard deviation within a range of possible and realistic values (Table 5 and **Error!**
341 **Reference source not found.**; Figure 5 and Figure 6).

342 **3 Results**

343 Figure 4 shows how the value of the MCI varies according to the percentage variation of
344 the bio-based feedstock in the total mass of the product.


345

346 *Table 4: Resulting parameters in the calculation of MCI for BB mulch film.*

Parameter	BB mulch film
-----------	---------------

347

348



349

350

Figure 4: MCI as a function of the amount of bio-based feedstock/s in the BB

351

mulch film $\Sigma F_{R(i)}$, expressed as the percentage of all the bio-based feedstock/s of the mulch

352

film on dry mass basis (X-axis). The dots correspond to the three different hypothetical

353

bioplastic compositions of Figure 3.

354

355 3.1 Sensitivity analysis

356

The results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in the followings Table 5 and Figure 5

357

and Figure 6. The accuracy band is a fraction of the average and corresponds to a

358

probability of 95%. It has been chosen in order to be representative of the variability of the

359

product category, the BB mulch films. The simulation can thus be regarded as a system

360

composed by a high number of companies, each producing films with different

361

characteristics, that are accounted for in the accuracy band.

362

Table 5: Parameters used for the sensitivity analysis of the BB mulch film. (**) The

363


Accuracy Band is defined as twice the standard deviation of the distribution.

Variable name	Average	Accuracy Band (**)	Unit
M	1000.00	0%	kg
F_(S)/F_(BA)	3.29	10%	fraction
F_(S) + F_(BA)	0.30	30%	fraction
F_U	0.00	0%	fraction
C_U	0.00	0%	fraction
R_(S)	0.014	100%	fraction
R_(BA)	0.025	100%	fraction
E_C	1	0%	fraction
E_P	0.95	10%	fraction
C_R	1.00	0%	fraction

364

365


366



367

368

Figure 5: Resulting distribution of MCI values for BB mulch film.



369

370

371

Figure 6: The most sensitive and relevant parameters in the calculation of the MCI of the BB mulch films.

372 **4 Discussion**

373 This work applies the principles of the EMF methodology into BB products so as to define
374 common metrics for calculating their circularity. By doing so it proposes some substantial
375 changes to the EMF methodology but still coherent with the overall methodological
376 framework. Such changes should be seen as a generalisation of the methodology provided
377 the following rules are applied:

378 (1) fossil-based feedstocks or component materials embodied in the BB products whatever
379 is the final disposal (even biological recycling) shall be considered as non-restorative;

380 (2) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to biological
381 recycling like composting, or biodegrade in the environment (i.e. BB mulch film) shall be
382 considered restorative as long as they flow through the biosphere safely, without any harm
383 to the environment (e.g. no toxicity effects).

384 (3) bio-based component materials embodied in the BB product that go to incineration and
385 landfill shall be considered as non-restorative;

386 The justification of these rules is described in the following.

387 Fossil-based component materials in the product derive from deposits where they
388 remained stocked for a geological time scale. Once the product is mineralised, its fossil-
389 based portion will be accounted as non-regenerative and therefore linear, due to its origin
390 (Joos et al., 2013). This is true, even if fossil carbon, for example, will re-enter biological
391 cycles, like CO₂ in the atmosphere and other streams, since both fossil-based and bio-
392 based component materials will physically and chemically behave the same, once
393 biodegraded. However, the source of the bio-based carbon was circular before its use
394 (concept of “carbon neutrality”, equilibrium between the biogenic carbon released and the
395 carbon absorbed by plants) and will maintain its circularity provided that the carbon is
396 released into the atmosphere at the same rate. The reason has its origin in the EMF general

397 provisions stating that “biologically sourced materials can only be considered part of a
398 Circular Economy if materials are not used faster than they can be restored naturally”
399 (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015). If BB products are incinerated, the
400 bio-based components are still considered linear, maintaining consistency with EMF
401 principles. Basically, a complete circularity for a BB product is satisfied when its
402 renewable components are 100% bio-based and they go 100% to biological recycling or
403 biodegraded in the environment (for specific application like mulch film).

404 As for provision (3), a material health rule has its origin in manifold normative definitions
405 of the CE. In addition, the EMF definition of biological cycles is that of non-toxic
406 materials which are restored into the biosphere and the CE is defined as such if it can
407 “eliminate the use of toxic chemicals”. The need of a safety clause has been reviewed
408 under many aspects by Verberne (2016) and can be put as a postulate of the restoration
409 principle: if a flow is toxic it cannot be defined restorative. This is also at the core of the
410 REACH Regulation (EC 1907/2006). In the specific case, the material complies with the
411 standard EN 17033-2018 certifying that no harm is caused to a) all relevant organism
412 groups as plants, invertebrates (e.g. earthworm) and microorganisms, b) important
413 ecological processes maintaining soil functions, c) all relevant exposure pathways as soil
414 pore water, soil pore air and soil material.

415 A comprehensive approach for MCI calculation should also include non-restorative flows
416 generated at upstream level like biomass growth, in the specific case corn, and biomass
417 conversion processes like starch extraction and refining. Specifically these non-restorative
418 flows correspond to the overall non-recyclable wastes associated to the bio-based
419 feedstock supply thus non-recyclable waste from fertilizer and pesticide production, non-
420 recyclable scraps from conversion processes, etc. In this study such flows of non-
421 restorative waste coming from upstream manufacturing operations were included for the

422 bio-based feedstocks ($R_{(i)}$) used in manufacturing the BB mulch film applying “cradle to
423 gate” LCA methodology. However, we observed that the inclusion of upstream
424 unrecoverable waste does not significantly influence the MCI results in the chosen case
425 study, since the respective amounts are small. The specific unrecoverable waste for starch
426 and bio-based additive (*i.e.* kg of waste/kg of bio-based feedstock) were estimated at
427 0.014 and 0.025, respectively.

428

429 The resulting MCI for the 30/70 blend of the BB mulch film is equal to 0.37 in a 0-1 scale
430 and its circularity is linearly linked to the amount of bio-based feedstock used according to
431 the equation $y = 0.89x + 0.1$, where y is the MCI and x is the bio-based feedstock content,
432 therefore the amount of recycled feedstock or (renewable) bio-based feedstock in input is
433 decisive.

434 Apart from the specific application analysed in this paper, the proposed MCI method can
435 be easily applied and calculated for any kind of BB product as long as the following
436 information are available:

- 437 • The bio-based feedstock content, determined according to the standard EN 16785-
438 2:2016, if the composition is known, or directly provided by the BB product manufacturer.
- 439 • The end of life scenario of the studied BB product (real or hypothetical).
- 440 • The amount of un-recoverable waste associated to the production of bio-based
441 feedstock contained in the BB product. They can be derived from LCA databases or other
442 specific sources.

443 **5 Conclusions**

444 Bioplastic market is steadily increasing. The value proposition of bio-based and
445 biodegradable products is linked to:

- 446 1. the use of renewable feedstock (like starch and its derivatives) instead of fossil oil or
447 natural gas;
- 448 2. the waste recovery through biological recycling, thanks to their ability to
449 biodegrade in composting facilities or in soil (e.g. biodegradable mulch film).

450 The Material Circularity Indicator (MCI), developed by the EMF, is a metric for
451 quantifying “how much” a product is circular (MCI = 0, fully-linear product; MCI = 1,
452 completely circular product) thus it represents a valuable tool for product eco-design
453 purposes. However, it focuses solely on technical materials, mechanically recycled or
454 reused, leaving out bio-based feedstocks and related biological treatments such as
455 composting. Without common metrics it is not possible to pursue concrete actions, to
456 achieve measurable results and to provide unequivocal references for all products. This
457 research work aims at filling this gap through the development of a methodology coherent
458 with EMF MCI methodology but able to catch the specificities of bio-based and
459 biodegradable products and provide metrics for those innovative products. Direct uses are:
460 (i) supporting the eco-design of innovative bio-based products and (ii) comparing the MCI
461 of BB products with MCI of traditional products (e.g. fossil based).

462 The proposed method has been applied to a real case study (i.e. biodegradable mulch film)
463 providing quantitative metrics about its circularity. Specifically considering a bio-based
464 feedstock content of 30%, the correspondent MCI is 0.37 in a 0-1 scale and its circularity
465 is heavily linked to the bio-based feedstock content according to this relation: $MCI_{(BB\ mulch\ film)} = 0.89 * bio\text{-}based\ feedstock + 0.1$.

467 The MCI is a key performance indicator to develop more circular products, in line with
468 the Circular Economy principles like the use of renewable materials and the reduction of
469 the amount of not recoverable waste. MCI will support the development of innovative
470 products just based on these two important characteristics specific for each BB

471 product/application and end of life scenario. Bioeconomy, thus also BB products, can
472 provide valuable insights in transforming the current (linear) economy in a more circular
473 one, however, the way the biomass is produced, processed and BB products are produced
474 are fundamental aspects to be properly assessed and monitored. This can be done using
475 specific methodologies like LCA. Within this context the proposed MCI has to be seen as
476 a complementary (quantitative) tool for further qualifying the sustainability of BB
477 products and not as a substitute tool. Furthermore the MCI here proposed is meaningful
478 only if BB products meet health and safety material requirements according to the national
479 and European laws and standards. This is a postulate of the proposed methodology
480 especially for those BB products conceived to biodegrade in the environment like
481 biodegradable mulch film.

482

483

484 **Declaration of interest**

485 The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any
486 commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of
487 interest.

488

489 **Acknowledgements**

490 The contents of the paper are part of the findings of the project STAR-ProBio.
491 STAR-ProBio has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 program
492 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 727740. The authors
493 thanks prof. Andrea Contin for the fruitful discussion and contribution to the sensitivity
494 analysis, Francesco Degli Innocenti for providing valuable comments and feedback on the

495 topics addressed by the paper and Alessandra Novelli for the general support in the MCI
496 elaboration.

497

498

499 **Addendum**

500 While this paper was undergoing peer review the authors became aware that the EMF
501 published an update of the MCI methodology (Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta
502 Design, 2019) including the extension of it to include the treatment of biological materials.
503 This update introduces new definitions and formulas. The authors believe that most of the
504 changes regarding accounting are in the direction here proposed and that this study can
505 contribute as an illustration on how the material circularity of a biological based material
506 can be addressed in a real case study. Furthermore the authors would like to highlight that
507 the proposed methodology started long before the EMF changes: specifically the original
508 idea dated back to 2017 and a beta version of it - not as it is now - was presented in the
509 middle of 2018 at the Italian Circular Economy Stakeholder Platform (ICESP
510 www.icesp.it).

511

512 **References**

513

BASF, 2018. Biodegradable mulch film – clarification of polymer fate in soil. CIPA Congress, Bordeaux/Arcachon, France, May 2018.

Bio-Based and Biodegradable Industries Association. BBIA reports. <https://bbia.org.uk/reports/> (accessed 28 November 2019)

Briassoulis, D., Giannoulis, A., 2018. Evaluation of the functionality of bio-based plastic mulching films. *Polym. Test.* 67, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymertesting.2018.02.019>

Briassoulis D., Hiskakis, M., Babou, E., 2013. Technical specifications for mechanical recycling of agricultural plastic waste. *Waste Management*, Volume 33, issue 6,

- pages 1516-1530, ISSN 0956-053X. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.03.004>
- De Lèpinau, P. and Arbenz, A., 2016. Economic and environmental impact of soil contamination in mulching film, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 28-48.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2015. *Circularity Indicators – An approach to measure circularity – Methodology*. https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/insight/Circularity-Indicators_Methodology_May2015.pdf.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation & Granta Design, 2019. *Circularity Indicators – An approach to measure circularity – Methodology*.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2017. *The New Plastic Economy: Rethinking the future of plastic & catalysing action*.
- EN 16785-2:2016 - Bio-based products - Bio-based content - Part 2: Determination of the bio-based content using the material balance method.
- EN 17033:2018 - Plastics - Biodegradable mulch films for use in agriculture and horticulture - Requirements and test methods.
- EPLCA – European Platform on LCA. https://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/?page_id=86
- Eubeler, J., Bernhanrd, M., Knepper, T., 2010. Environmental biodegradation of synthetic polymers II. Biodegradation of different polymer groups. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry*. 29, 1, 84-100
- European Commission, 2015. *Closing the loop – An EU action plan for the Circular Economy*. COM(2015) 614 final. Brussels, 2.12.2015
- European Commission, 2018. *A European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular Economy*. COM(2018) 28 final. Brussels, 16.1.2018
- European Bioplastics. *European Bioplastic publications*. <https://www.european-bioplastics.org/news/publications/> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Figuiet, B., 2016. *Plasticulture in Europe*, *Plasticulture*, N° 136, 20-28
- Gao, H., Yan, C., Liu, Q., Ding, W., Chen, B., Li, Z., 2019. Effects of plastic mulching and plastic residue on agricultural production: A meta-analysis. *Sci. Total Environ.* 651, 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2018.09.105>
- Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., Ulgiati, S., 2016. A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. *J. Clean. Prod.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.007>

- Institute of Bioplastics and Biocomposites, 2018. Biopolymers – Facts and Statistics. Hochschule Hannover, University of Applied Sciences and Arts. Edition 5, ISSN 2510-3431.
- Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestedt, J. S., Peters, G. P., Enting, I. G., Bloh, W. V., ... and Friedrich, T., 2013. Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(5), 2793-2825.
- Kasirajan, S., Ngouajio, M., 2012. Polyethylene and biodegradable mulches for agricultural applications: a review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 32, 501–529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0068-3>
- Lange, B.K., 2016. Revision of the fertilisers regulation – benefits of biodegradable mulch films. *European Bioplastics*.
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/108931/Kristy%20Barbara%20Lange%20EUBP%20PPT2.pdf> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Le Moine, B., 2014. Agri-plastics waste management: a voluntary commitment from the industry. Presented at: Agricultural Film 2014 – International Conference on silage, mulch, greenhouse and tunnel films used in agriculture (15-17 September, Barcelona, Spain).
- Liu, E. K., He, W. Q., & Yan, C. R., 2014. ‘White revolution’ to ‘white pollution’—agricultural plastic film mulch in China. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(9), 091001.
- Lloyd, S. M., & Ries, R., 2007. Characterizing, propagating, and analyzing uncertainty in life cycle assessment: A survey of quantitative approaches. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 11(1), 161-179.
- Lonca, G., Muggéo, R., Tétréault-Imbeault, H., Bernard, S., & Margni, M., 2018. A Bi-dimensional Assessment to Measure the Performance of Circular Economy: A Case Study of Tires End-of-Life Management. In *Designing Sustainable Technologies, Products and Policies* (pp. 33-42). Springer, Cham.
- Malinconico, M., 2017. Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture. *Green Chemistry and Sustainable Technology*. Springer.
- Marten, E., Muller, R., and Deckwer W., 2003. Studies on the enzymatic hydrolysis of polyesters I. Low molecular mass model esters and aliphatic polyesters. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 80, 3, 485-501.
- Moreno, M. M., González-Mora, S., Villena, J., Campos, J. A., & Moreno, C., 2017. Deterioration pattern of six biodegradable, potentially low-environmental impact mulches in field conditions. *Journal of environmental management*, 200, 490-501.

- Mormile, P., Stahl, N., Malinconico, M., 2017. The World of Plastics, in: Malinconico, M. (Ed.), *Soil Degradable Bioplastics for a Sustainable Modern Agriculture*. pp. 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54130-2_1
- OWS, 2018. Accumulation of (bio)degradable plastics in soil. CIPA Congress 2018, Archacon, May 29.
- Pico Y., Barcelò, D., 2019. Analysis and prevention of microplastics pollution in water: current perspectives and future directions. *ACS Omega*, 4, 6709-6719.
- Plasticulture catalogues, 2018. <http://plasticulture.qualif.e-catalogues.info> (accessed 28 November 2019)
- Razza, F., Degli Innocenti, F., 2012. Bioplastics from renewable resources: the benefits of biodegradability. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 7 (Suppl. 3): S301–S309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/apj.1648>
- Scaringelli, M., Giannoccaro, G., prosperi, M., Lopolito, A., 2016. Adoption of biodegradable mulching films in agriculture: is there a negative prejudice towards materials derived from organic waste? *Italian Journal of agronomy*, 11:92.
- Shen M., Zhang, Y., Zhu, Y., Song, B., Zeng, G., Hu, D., Wen, Y., Ren, X., 2019. Recent advances in toxicological research of nanoplastics in the environment: A review. *Environmental Pollution*, 252: 511-521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.102>
- Steinmetz, Z., Wollmann, C., Schaefer, M., Buchmann, C., David, J., Tröger, J., Muñoz, K., Frör, O., Schaumann, G.E., 2016. Plastic mulching in agriculture. Trading short-term agronomic benefits for long-term soil degradation? *Sci. Total Environ.* 550, 690–705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.01.153>
- Tamma, P., 2018. China's trash ban forces Europe to confront its waste problem, Politico, 2/21/2018.
- Touchaleaume, F., Martin-Closas, L., Angellier-Coussy, H., Chevillard, A., Cesar, G., Gontard, N., Gastaldi, E., 2016. Performance and environmental impact of biodegradable polymers as agricultural mulching films. *Chemosphere* 144, 433–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.09.006>
- US-LCI database. “Polylactide biopolymer resin at plant kg/RNA”. <https://www.nrel.gov/lci/> (accessed 9 December 2019)
- Verberne, J.J.H., 2016. Building circularity indicators. Eindhoven University of Technology.
- Wen, X., Du, C., Xu, P., zeng, G., Huang, D., Yin, L., Yin, Q., Hu, L., Wan, J., Zhang, J., Tan, S., Deng, R., 2018. Microplastic pollution in surface sediments of urban water areas in Changsha, China: Abundance, composition, surface textures. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 136: 414-423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.09.043>.

- Witt, U., Einig, T., Yamamoto, M., Kleeberg, I., Deckwer, W., Muller, R., 2001. Biodegradation of aliphatic-aromatic copolyesters: evaluation of the final biodegradability and ecotoxicological impact of degradation intermediates. *Chemosphere*. 44, 289-299.
- Zumstein, M., Schintlmeister, A., Nelson, T., Baumgartner, R., Wagner, M., Sander, M., McNeill, K., Woebken, D., Kohler, H., 2018. Biodegradation of synthetic polymers in soils: Tracking carbon into CO₂ and microbial biomass. *Science Advances*, 4, 7.