

Complexity in managing plastics

Rosalind Malcolm, Barrister and Professor of Environmental Law; Co-Director,
Governing Plastics Network,

Surrey Centre for International and Environmental Law, Surrey Law School, University
of Surrey, Guildford, UK

r.malcolm@surrey.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This letter discusses the complex nature of plastics; why regulating plastics is a ‘wicked problem’; and the implications of a life cycle approach. The draft Global Plastics Treaty attempts to address two key problems: the cap on production and the problem of chemical additives in plastics. As a “wicked” problem with many conflicting interests, dealing with plastics requires a holistic life cycle approach completely different from the Montreal Protocol. Strict and enforced limits on production of polymers would reduce plastics pollution and would also encourage reducing the range of additives because limiting production would make mechanical or chemical recycling more viable. Used plastics need to be turned into a commodity rather than a waste and reducing and standardising the number of different chemical formulations would help by reducing the number of chemicals to be regulated. To achieve these objectives, this letter argues for a regulatory approach based on a forensic analysis that applies extended environmental systems analysis to all the life cycle stages of the plastics value chain.

IMPACT STATEMENT

There is clear evidence of the negative impacts of the chemical additives to plastics on society and the environment and, in cases where this impact has not been evaluated, a precautionary approach should be taken (UNEP, 2023; Wiesinger, 2021). But the failure to achieve a consensus at INC-5 leaves the potential for thousands of potentially harmful chemicals used in plastics to be left poorly regulated and continue to escape into the environment. Legal frameworks around the plastics lifecycle need to be interrogated and clarified so that these chemicals are adequately regulated through a process of evaluation and registration and subjected to an extended environmental systems analysis including their impacts on people and the

This peer-reviewed article has been accepted for publication but not yet copyedited or typeset, and so may be subject to change during the production process. The article is considered published and may be cited using its DOI.

10.1017/plc.2025.10020

This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is unaltered and is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained for commercial re-use or in order to create a derivative work.

environment. Including a careful forensic approach in the Global Plastics Treaty to the use of additives in plastics based on legally enforceable systems will be of huge value to the health of society and the environment.

KEYWORDS: Plastics, Global Plastics Treaty, Chemical Additives, Internationally legally binding instrument, International Negotiations, Life cycles of plastics.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Introduction

In November 2024, the countries attending the fifth set of negotiations failed to reach agreement on a Global Plastics Treaty. These negotiations started formally in March 2022 following a UNEA Resolution (UNEA-5.2) at the fifth session of the UN Environment Assembly agreeing on the need to develop an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment.

The UNEA resolution (5/14) requested the Executive Director of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) to convene an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) to develop "the instrument," to be based on a comprehensive approach addressing the full life cycle of plastic, including its production, design, and disposal.

The complexity of the life cycle

This logical approach based on life cycle thinking hides a complexity of different interests. The full life cycle of plastics includes all stages from the extraction of fossil fuels (which are still the feedstock for the great majority of bulk-use plastics) to disposal including in the form of waste and emissions into the environment (UNEP INC 1, 2022; UNEP INC 1 INF, 2022). In the traditional linear approach to use of materials, this can be characterised by the expression "cradle to grave". In a circular approach, where the materials are kept within the economy for reuse, remanufacture or recycling, then it might be described as: "cradle to cradle" (Malcolm et al., 2024). But in either approach, a multitude of different economic interests are at play, leading to the complexity of the life cycle for plastics.

A key reason for this complexity lies in the fact that plastics are not a single substance: in addition to the basic polymers, plastics contain thousands of different constituents and chemical additives. All plastics products are made from the essential polymer mixed with a complex blend of materials known collectively as additives. Additives are essential to change structure, form and colour and make plastics into useful materials. Many different chemicals and additives are applied for different purposes during these stages. But these added chemicals may themselves be problematic or even hazardous. For example, some chemicals added to make the 'plastic' material easier to form into a required shape, known as 'plasticisers', are endocrine disruptors with health impacts on fish and other aquatic organisms (Clift et al. 2019; RCEP, 2003). But, only 25% of plastic additives have been characterized for their potential ecological concern (Maddela, 2023; Malcolm et al. 2025). According to the PlastChem Report

(Wagner, 2024) there is evidence that more than 16,000 chemicals are potentially used or present in plastic materials and products, but “a mere 6% of these chemicals are currently subject to international regulation”. This is surprising given the level of scrutiny at international level, including the European Union, of chemicals and would seem to be the result of inadequate regulatory attention to the plastics life cycle and its use of additives. This life cycle is not in fact of one or a limited number of materials, but of a bundle of different materials with divergent and often unknown effects. On its own, the regulation of the chemicals used in plastics could have been the core and essential driver for a Global Plastics Treaty.

Not only are additives extensively used but they also vary on a worldwide basis. Different world markets use different dyes, shapes and types of plastics making waste collection even more challenging. Plastics in the South American market include a different range of containers to those marketed in Europe.¹ But all these products fall under the generic heading of ‘plastics’.

This complex life cycle hides numerous economic interests ranging from powerful corporate sectors to vulnerable informal systems of waste collection. The different interests represented include the fossil fuel sector, chemical manufacturing companies; manufacturers and producers of the plastic products; regulated waste management sectors and informal waste pickers; recyclers and so on. These are the varied stakeholders in the chain. There are also rightsholders to be considered such as the Indigenous communities (United Nations (General Assembly), 2007) who are largely excluded from the negotiating process (Liboiron, 2025). Ordinary citizens might also be included as rightsholders given the impact of plastics on their health and wellbeing, bringing into play potential breaches of human rights to a clean environment.

A wicked problem

Plastics are a prime example of the perfect storm – a classic ‘wicked problem’ (Levin et al., 2012; Rittel et al., 1973) requiring input from many different disciplines and perspectives where achieving a solution is not going to be a single step but manifold. For example, it has been argued that there should be a cap on production of plastics and that the Global Plastics Treaty should be modelled in the style of the Montreal Protocol (United Nations, 1993) (Raubenheimer K and McIlgorm A, 2017; Kirk EA, 2020). The Montreal Protocol is an international treaty designed to protect the ozone layer by phasing out the production of around 100 substances responsible for ozone depletion. These substances, chlorofluorocarbons, constitute a single class of chemical with a limited number of specific uses which can be replaced by chemicals having less impact on the ozone layer (although worse in respect of climate change). Plastic materials, by contrast, include a wide range of additives that give them specific properties, so are much more diverse with a very wide range of uses. That means there is a range of interests involved, and substitution by alternative materials is not

¹ On a recent visit to Cooper Viva Bem, a waste pickers’ collective in Sao Paulo, Brazil, I was shown a range of plastic containers which I had never seen before. They included different colours, sizes and types of materials which had clearly been made for the South American market. They looked and felt different to those I am used to in Europe. None of them could be recycled.

straightforward as it was in the case of the Montreal Protocol. Putting a cap on the production of plastics will not, on its own, achieve the necessary controls on those plastic additives which are a primary cause of the problems around failure to recycle and which occur at a life cycle stage following extraction and polymerisation (Clift et al., 2019).

The contentious negotiations

There are two key areas of contention in the negotiations around these questions:

1. Should there be a cap on the production of plastics?
2. Should there be a limit (or ban) on including specific chemical and hazardous materials in plastic products?

In the light of the discussion around the numerous chemicals which comprise plastics, it can be seen that these are two very distinct issues that need to be addressed separately.

A cap on production limiting the amount of plastics produced requires the life cycle stages from extraction through to production to be subjected to forensic examination. The extraction stage involves the complex nexus between plastics and climate change. The feedstock for most plastics is fossil fuels. This argument therefore triggers the concerns of countries which have interests in maintaining their fossil fuel industries which they usually support with financial incentives. Inevitably, the enormity of such a change means that most of these countries do not support limits on production that will impact their own self-interests and wealth producing activities. For similar reasons, countries with major chemical industries do not voluntarily support controls over chemicals in plastics – the second area of contention - even where these are hazardous.

The different interests causing the failure to reach consensus in the negotiations include countries with sophisticated waste collection systems which tend to overlook the interest of informal systems of waste collection in poorer countries. Even countries which depend on informal systems, with some exceptions such as Brazil, do not always integrate their interests into the negotiations at the Global Plastics Treaty. Social and environmental justice and human rights are not a feature of the discussions. The technological and economic interests around extraction, production and manufacture, dominate, regardless of human interests and impacts.

A Forensic and Brave Approach

Complexity is not a reason not to achieve agreement. But what is required is a forensic approach to an analysis of the life cycle of plastics. This takes time and patience but reaching a consensus is imperative to achieve the original goal that the Treaty should be legally binding. A soft voluntary unenforceable outcome, involving self-selecting National Action Plans, would achieve little. The plastics life cycle is global, and therefore legally enforceable, global solutions are needed.

Bans on obviously problematic products such as microbeads and single use plastics products are highly achievable and already undertaken by a number of countries. But

on their own, such legislative approaches are totally inadequate. A brave step needs to be taken to address the problems of the additives. Scientific analysis of the additives needs to be undertaken in a systematic and rigorous fashion on the model of REACH 2006 with registration following evaluation including impacts on society and the environment – an extended environmental systems analysis (Clift et al., 2026). This process needs to be followed by bans on hazardous additives and limits on others as part of an ecodesign (ecological product) approach – a *codex rerum* (“a law of things”) (Malcolm, 2019). These ecodesign approaches to plastic products need to be accompanied by transparency measures including standardisation and labelling to enable reuse, recycling and remanufacture of products. Such an approach would go part way to achieving a cap on production as banning or limiting the use of specified additives and would have the effect of limiting the production of some plastics. Such controls would also assist in turning plastics at the end of life into commodities for reuse and recycling (Lindner et al., 2025). One of the key reasons for the failure to recycle plastics is the inability of waste sorters and pickers to recognise the constituents of plastic products with the consequence that they are consigned to landfill or incineration. A system which ends the failure to retain plastics in the economy as stocks of materials available as feedstocks for new products will have its own effect in limiting production from virgin fossil fuels. This would be a real result to be attained by the Global Plastics Treaty and one which must be argued and fought for.

Author contribution

Sole author

Competing interest

The author declares that she has no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this letter to the editor.

Ethics statement

Ethical approval was not sought for this paper because the research analysis conducted here relies upon publicly available information on the Global Plastics Treaty. Ethics approval was not required for this letter to the editor.

REFERENCES.

‘United Nations: Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer - Adjustments and Amendment’ (1993) International Legal Materials, 32(3), pp. 874–887. doi:10.1017/S0020782900016338.

Clift R, Baumann H, Murphy R, and Stahel W (2019). Managing Plastics: Uses, Losses and Disposal. Law, environment & development journal, 15(2), 93-107. <https://doi.org/10.25501/SOAS.00033067>.

Clift R, Martin G, Mair S and Malcolm R (2026) “Living well on a finite planet”. Springer Nature.

Kirk E A (2020) ‘The Montreal Protocol or the Paris Agreement as a Model for a Plastics Treaty?’, *AJIL Unbound*, 114, pp. 212–216. doi:10.1017/aju.2020.39.

Levin K et al. (2012) ‘Overcoming the Tragedy of Super Wicked Problems: Constraining Our Future Selves to Ameliorate Global Climate Change’ (2012) 45 *Policy Sciences* 123–152.

Liboiron M (2025) ‘How to incorporate the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in the Global Plastics Treaty’, *Cambridge Prisms: Plastics*, 3, p. e11. doi:10.1017/plc.2025.10003.

Lindner A, Steenmans K, Scotford E and Malcolm R (2025), Preventing the ‘wasting’ of waste: The expanding horizons of waste law. *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law (RECIEL)*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.70011> (Editorial)

Maddela NR, Kakarla D, Venkateswarlu K, Megharaj M (2023) Additives of plastics: Entry into the environment and potential risks to human and ecological health. *J Environ Manage.* 2023 Dec 15;348:119364. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119364. Epub 2023 Oct 21. PMID: 37866190.

Malcolm R (2019) Life Cycle Thinking as a Legal Tool: A Codex Rerum, 15/2 *Law, Environment and Development Journal* (2019), p. 208, available at <http://www.lead-journal.org/content/19208.pdf>

Malcolm R and Mikheeva-Ashe A (2024) Plastics, Products and Life-Cycle Thinking in the European Union in (eds. Kirk, Popattanachai, Barnes, van der Marel) *Research Handbook on Plastics Regulation: Law, Policy and the Environment* (Edward Elgar 2024) ISBN: 978 1 80220 151 2

Malcolm R, Peacock M and Winton S (2025) “Plastics, life cycle approaches and the law” *Diálogos Socioambientais*, 8(21), 16–25 doi: 10.36942/dialogossocioambientais.v8i21.1174.

Raubenheimer K and McIlgorm A (2017) Is the Montreal protocol a model that can help solve the global marine plastic debris problem? *Marine Policy* 81, 322–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.04.014>.

RCEP (2003) Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, Chemicals in Products: Safeguarding the Environment and Human Health, 24th Report, Cm 5827 [London: TSO, 2003, ISBN 0 1015 8272 2, P.

REACH (2006) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC (Text with EEA relevance)Text with EEA relevance

Rittel HWJ and Webber MM (1973) 'Dilemmas in a General Theory Of Planning' 4(2) Policy Sciences 155–169;

UNEP (2023) United Nations Environment Programme and Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (2023). Chemicals in plastics: a technical report. Geneva

UNEP INC 1 (2022) Priorities, needs, challenges and barriers relating to ending plastic pollution at the national level UNEP/PP/INC.1/11

UNEP INC 1 INF (2022) Addendum document on priorities, needs, challenges and barriers to end plastic pollution at national level (UNEP/PP/INC.1/11), UNEP/PP/INC.1/INF/8

United Nations (General Assembly) 2007, Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People

Wagner M, Monclús L, Arp, HPH, Groh KJ, Løseth ME, Muncke J, Wang Z, Wolf R and Zimmermann L (2024) State of the science on plastic chemicals - Identifying and addressing chemicals and polymers of concern, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10701706>.

Wiesinger H, Wang Z, Hellweg S (2021) Deep Dive into Plastic Monomers, Additives, and Processing Aids. Environ Sci Technol. 2021 Jul 6;55(13):9339-9351. doi: 10.1021/acs.est.1c00976. Epub 2021 Jun 21. PMID: 34154322.