Notes from May 14 Multi Material Flexible Packaging Collaborative call

- **Welcome and industry updates**
    - Advanced Recycling Alliance For Plastics [HYPERLINK "https://bioplasticsnews.com/2020/03/31/movement-us-chemical-recycling/" \h] new name and members
    - U.S. government [HYPERLINK "https://resource-recycling.com/plastics/2020/05/06/feds-to-fund-scrap-plastic-liquefaction-tech/" \h] up to $4 million to advance development of technologies to convert recovered plastics into feedstock for fuels.
    - Nova Chemical and Enerkem [HYPERLINK "https://www.recyclingtoday.com/article/nova-chemicals-enerkem-enter-into-partnership/" \h] on Advanced Recycling project in Canada.
        - Sri from Pepsi asks if this will be for MMFP? Tristanne thinks so, it is for mixed waste.
        - Alexei from Nova comments about the model and how they have a complex there with research centers.

- **Introduction to the Advanced Recycling Alliance at ACC, presentation by Prapti Muhuri - ACC manager of recycling and recovery and staff lead for ARAP.**
    - Formerly known as Chemical Recycling Alliance - did a lot of stakeholder outreach on the name change
    - Works to support legislation and that consumers can have trust in these technologies. “Amplify a more pragmatic pathway to the circular economy.”
    - Have past and ongoing studies on economic and environmental impacts
    - This group could be helpful potentially in signing up to test/process the material.
    - Environmental benefits studies to date have only compared fuels from fossil sources to fuels from these sources, they are expanding on those studies.
    - Calls for wider adoption of mass balance approach for accounting
    - Some work underway to develop bale spec for these technologies.
        - Graham Houlder from CEFLEX - Question for Papti. What assumption do you use for the feedstock (MSW etc) entering the LCA system. Is their any allocation upstream (to the original products) or down stream li.e. to the new products)?

    - Prapti will follow up
    - Sandeep asks how they define recycling.
    - Advanced recycling (AR) is not one or the other, as covered in this group's workshop.

- **Follow-up discussion from virtual Chemical Recycling Workshop**
  - Definitions and terminology
    - Tristanne - in the workshop a main takeaway was that It's important for technologies to fit into definitions of "recycling" to enable their growth. Definitions are important from permitting a plant, to accounting for materials, to consumer claims around recycled content, and financial incentives and program requirements defined by policies.
    - Rachel from Mars - zero waste versus circularity - all these are different ways to communicate what counts.
    - Nina and Laura make a plug for GreenBlue's RMS for fuels. This provides some recognition for fuels, without calling them recycling.
    - Laura - If anyone wants to learn more about developments on the Recycled Material Standard (RMS) feel free to reach out directly to me at Laura.Thompson@greenblue.org We are making great progress!
    - Prapti reminds the group they passed legislation in: FL, WI, GA, IA, TN, TX, IL, OH - to regulate advanced recycling techs as manufacturing as opposed to solid waste .
    - Tristanne - asked Prapti about what went into the name "advanced" recycling
    - Prapti explains that some NGOs turned 'chemical' into something bad, and tjayt some technologies like purification do not really fall under 'chemical' transformation, they are in grey area of mechanical/chemical. AR is broader. They did not receive negative feedback on it.
    - Nina from SPC- depends on who you are talking to. Mechanical recyclers they spoke to don't like it.
    - Sandi Childs from APR - agrees with Nina
    - Justin Lehrer - I think that terms like "advanced" can be perceived as too vague and can erode credibility. chemical or molecular recycling can

be fine names as long as the term is clearly defined and then the integrity of the term is protected - i.e don't allow the term to be co-opted by other processes that might not fit the definition exactly.

- Sri - has heard and likes the term “enhanced” recycling. Sandi likes this one also. Brian Steinwagner from Morris Packaging also likes it.
- Rachel - this includes many different technologies. ‘Recycling’ should include all of them.
- Graham - if it brings new material to the market that replaces fossil fuels, it should count as recycling.
- Wes Porter from Berry Global - has it ever been referred to as ‘mechanical recycling’ before chemical recycling came into the picture?
- Ashely - we call it “feedstock” recycling at Dow. Dropped ‘chemical’ from our name because of the perception.
- Mickel from Printpack - likes ‘Molecular’ recycling
- Greg Dalea from JM Smucker- Do we need to think about naming it in the context of some of the EPR legislation being drafted in Maine or California that require end markets for the recycled materials? i.e. is "Chemical" recycling considered an end market in the legislation being drafted?
- Dave McClain from Printpack - when brands make a claim, do they care what type of recycling it came from?
- Rachel - they just care if it uses PCR. But if qualify it through mass balance need to communicate it differently. Need to follow FTC guidelines.
- Brent from P&G - they would not call it out. NGOs would respond to this and say “but did you know it was recycled content from chemicals?”
- Laura from SPC - Brent's point highlights the importance of aligning the definition of "recycling" and "recycled materials"
- Victor Bell from EPI - it’s really not important what we call it. It’s a;; recycling. Will we start saying “infrared” recycling next? No need to be so granular, the public doesn’t care.
- Dave McClain - Victor makes a great point! I think the public cares that the product from recycling processes becomes some other good, right? I think it matters when you get PCR in / close the loop

- Sandi Childs - The public doesn't care. Victor is right. The NGOs will turn the word "chemical" against the industry. But there is also a media narrative that plastics recycling is "failing". We don't want the impression that the need for "advanced" recycling is partially due to that supposed "failure".
- The term consensus is more for industry. Industry experts need to differentiate but not the public. Who are we serving with this conversation?
- Tristanne - not sure if we reached consensus on the descriptive title (advanced, chemical, feedstock), but it seems we are all aligned on what is/isn't recycling. Recycling enables us to meet end market needs.
- Nina recommends we do some thinking on 'what is the job we hire the terminology to do'?