

CIRCULAR ECONOMY DISCLOSURE BY AGRI-FOOD COMPANIES

Raffaella Nastari *, Sabrina Pisano *, Matteo Pozzoli *

* Department of Law, Parthenope University of Naples, Naples, Italy



How to cite: Nastari, R., Pisano, S., & Pozzoli, M. (2022). Circular economy disclosure by agri-food companies. In G. M. Mantovani, A. Kostyuk, & D. Govorun (Eds.), *Corporate governance: Theory and practice* (pp. 69–74). <https://doi.org/10.22495/cgtapp12>

Copyright © 2022 The Authors

Received: 20.04.2022
Accepted: 26.04.2022
Keywords: SDG, Environmental Disclosure, Directive 2014/95/EU, Agri-Food Companies, Stakeholder Theory, Legitimacy Theory
JEL Classification: L66, M14
DOI: 10.22495/cgtapp12

Abstract

Circular economy (CE) is a model adopted by companies aimed at reducing, reusing, recycling resources and reducing consumption (Pearce & Turner, 1990). In their review of 114 CE definitions, Kirchherr et al. (2017) found that the recurrent components are: reduce, reuse and recycle, followed by recover (4R dimensions). Ellen MacArthur Foundation (EMF) (2015) provided the most used CE definition, intended as an industrial system that aims to regenerate. In detail, CE favours the value maximization in each part of the product's life (Stahel, 2016) and the achievement of closed-loop resource flow (Geng & Doberstein, 2008), changing waste into resource (Witjes & Lozano, 2016) and increasing the resource use efficiency (Ghisellini, Cialani, & Ulgiati, 2016). Over the years, many authors focused their attention on this topic, by conducting review studies (Ghisellini et al., 2016; Andersen, 2007), or investigating closed-loop value and supply chains within companies (Lüdeke-Freund, Carroux, Joyce, Massa, & Breuer, 2018) and their relation with sustainable business models (Pieroni, McAloone, & Pigosso, 2019; Geissdoerfer, Vladimirova, & Evans, 2018). According to Moraga et al. (2019), the concept of CE does not refer exclusively to material preservation through strategies like recycling, but it also includes the impacts of the companies' activities on the environment, society and economy (Elkington, 1994).

For many years, CE has been intended as an approach to implement for improving waste management (Ghisellini et al., 2016). Therefore, CE is considered also a tool useful to achieve sustainable development goals (SDGs) (Schroeder, Anggraeni, & Weber, 2019; Rashid, 2013), especially with respect to the environmental dimension (Kristensen & Mosgaard, 2020; Geissdoerfer, Savaget, Bocken, & Hultink, 2017). However, CE is not specifically mentioned in the SDG context. CE practices and principles are crosscutting, so they can support many companies to pursue specific SDGs (Schroeder et al., 2019). For example, CE can improve the achievement of SDG 8 (target 8.4), promoting sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all, and 9 (target 9.4), reducing CO₂ emission, improving resource efficiency, as well as increasing supply chain and resource security. CE is also closely related to SDG 12, favouring the development of CE business models for products such as closing loops and using renewable energy. Several studies have investigated the relationship between CE and SDGs (Di Vaio, Hasan, Palladino, & Hassan, 2022; Velasco-Muñoz, Mendoza, Aznar-Sánchez, & Gallego-Schmid, 2021; Donner, Gohier, & de Vries, 2020; Teigiserova, Hamelin, & Thomsen, 2020; Van Zanten, Van Ittersum, & De Boer, 2019; Jurgilevich et al., 2016), conducting the literature review.

CE issues also attracted the attention of policymakers (for a complete analysis of CE policies issued see Friant, Vermeulen, and Salomone, 2021). Germany has been a pioneer in this field, integrating CE into national law in 1996 with the closed substance cycle and waste management act (Geissdoerfer et al., 2017). In December 2015, the European Commission adopted a CE Action Plan to make the European Union more sustainable (European Commission, 2019), by maximising the use of resources and minimising waste (European Commission, 2015). In a similar vein, in 2016 Italy issued Law No. 116/16 aiming at reducing food waste by introducing CE paradigm. Recently, Italian legislator issued the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) to ensure the revival of the country's economy, post pandemic, and to achieve green and digital development. Mission 2 of PNRR provided 2.1 billion resources to improve the country's capacity for efficient and sustainable waste management and introduce the CE paradigm.

In this context, the adoption of sustainable business models represents a significant competitive advantage for companies (Porter & Kramer, 2011), favoring the decrease of resource waste effectively and efficiently (Bocken, de Pauw, Bakker, & van der Grinten, 2016; den Hollander & Bakker, 2016). In particular, companies should implement CE business models (Bocken, Short, Rana, & Evans, 2014), by

rethinking how they generate and distribute value in a sustainable way (Lozano-Lunar, Barbudo, Fernández, & Jiménez, 2020; Urbinati, Chiaroni, & Chiesa, 2017).

Companies adopting CE business models need to communicate the actions implemented, such as their results and impacts, to external stakeholders, in order to increase their legitimacy and consensus (European Commission, 2021; Stewart & Niero, 2018; Lock & Seele, 2016; de Colle, Henriques, & Sarasvathy, 2014; Mahoney, Thorne, Cecil, & LaGore, 2013). However, although the requirement of Directive 2014/95/EU to disclose environmental information is effective by 2017 fiscal year for bigger companies, there are few reporting guidances mentioning CE (Opferkuch, Caeiro, Salomone, & Ramos, 2021). Moreover, the existing reporting guidance, such as Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards, is vague and does not provide detailed suggestions of CE information. As noted by the GRI (2019) there is an information gap in the CE business model. In their review on CE disclosure within sustainability reports, Opferkuch et al. (2021) found that little research focused on CE business models implemented by companies and that CE is not a central issue disclosed by companies in their sustainability reports. For previous reasons, the authors highlighted the need to explore the reporting practices of companies with respect to CE information.

This study responds to this call for research by investigating the CE information released by all agri-food Italian listed companies after the implementation of SDGs and Directive 2014/95/EU, in order to understand how companies incorporate CE in their business models to achieve sustainability. To achieve this aim, we content analysed the sustainability reports drawn up according to Directive 2014/95/EU.

We analysed the food industry because this sector presents greater potential in applying the CE paradigm, considering its strong environmental impact (Raimo, de Nuccio, Giakoumelou, Petruzzella, & Vitolla, 2021). More specifically, the implementation of CE can favour waste reduction (Fiandrino, Busso, & Vrontis, 2019). This research specifically focuses on the Italian food industry, considering that waste reduction is a theme of great interest in Italy. As previously discussed, Law No. 116/16 aims at reducing food waste by introducing the CE paradigm and a specific component of Mission 2 of PNRR specifically focuses on sustainable agriculture and CE.

The findings reveal that companies disclose little information on CE. The majority of CE information released concerns the “reduce” dimension. Fewer data are provided on the “recover”, “recycle” and “reuse” dimensions. In addition, almost all sentences are qualitative, non-financial and referred to the present. The findings reveal that nowadays CE is not a central issue disclosed in the sustainability reports.

REFERENCES

1. Andersen, M. S. (2007). An introductory note on the environmental economics of the circular economy. *Sustainability Science*, 2(1), 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-006-0013-6>
2. Bocken, N. M. P., de Pauw, I., Bakker, C., & van der Grinten, B. (2016). Product design and business model strategies for a circular economy. *Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering*, 33(5), 308–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681015.2016.1172124>
3. Bocken, N. M. P., Short, S. W., Rana, P., & Evans, S. (2014). A literature and practice review to develop sustainable business model archetypes. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 65, 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.11.039>
4. de Colle, S., Henriques, A., & Sarasvathy, S. (2014). The paradox of corporate social responsibility standards. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125(2), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1912-y>
5. den Hollander, M., & Bakker, C. (2016). Mind the gap exploiter: Circular business models for product lifetime extension. In *Proceedings of Electronics goes green 2016+: Inventing shades of green* (pp. 1–8). Berlin, Germany: Fraunhofer IZM Berlin.
6. Di Vaio, A., Hasan, S., Palladino, R., & Hassan, R. (2022). The transition towards circular economy and waste within accounting and accountability models: A systematic literature review and conceptual framework. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-02078-5>
7. Donner, M., Gohier, R., & de Vries, H. (2020). A new circular business model typology for creating value from agro-waste. *Science of the Total Environment*, 716, 137065. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137065>
8. Elkington, J. (1994). Towards the sustainable corporation: Win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development. *California Management Review*, 36(2), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165746>
9. Ellen MacArthur Foundation (EMF). (2015). *Delivering the circular economy: A toolkit for policymakers*. Retrieved from <https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/a-toolkit-for-policymakers>
10. European Commission. (2015). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Closing the loop — An EU action plan for the circular economy*. Retrieved from European Commission website: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52015DC0614>
11. European Commission. (2019). *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the implementation of the Circular Economy Action Plan*. Retrieved from European Commission website: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52019DC0190>
12. European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2013/34/EU, Directive 2004/109/EC, Directive 2006/43/EC and Regulation (EU) No 537/2014, as regards corporate sustainability reporting*. Retrieved from European Commission website: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0189&from=EN>
13. Fiandrino, S., Busso, D., & Vrontis, D. (2019). Sustainable responsible conduct beyond the boundaries of compliance: Lessons from Italian listed food and beverage companies. *British Food Journal*, 121(5), 1035–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2019-0182>

14. Friant, M. C., Vermeulen, W. J. V., & Salomone, R. (2021). Analysing European Union circular economy policies: Words versus actions. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 27, 337–353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.11.001>
15. Geissdoerfer, M., Savaget, P., Bocken, N. M. P., & Hultink, E. J. (2017). The circular economy — A new sustainability paradigm? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 143, 757–768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048>
16. Geissdoerfer, M., Vladimirova, D., & Evans, S. (2018). Sustainable business model innovation: A review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 198, 401–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.240>
17. Geng, Y., & Doberstein, B. (2008). Developing the circular economy in China: Challenges and opportunities for achieving ‘leapfrog development’. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 15(3), 231–239. <https://doi.org/10.3843/SusDev.15.3:6>
18. Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., & Ulgiati, S. (2016). A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 114, 11–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.007>
19. Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). (2019). *Business reporting on the SDGs: Analysis of the goals and targets*. Retrieved from <https://www.globalreporting.org/public-policy-partnerships/sustainable-development/integrating-sdgs-into-sustainability-reporting/>
20. Jurgilevich, A., Birge, T., Kentala-Lehtonen, J., Korhonen-Kurki, K., Pietikäinen, J., Saikku, L., & Schösler, H. (2016). Transition towards circular economy in the food system. *Sustainability*, 8(1), 69. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8010069>
21. Kirchherr, J., Hekkert, M., Bour, R., Huijbrechtse-Truijens, A., Kostense-Smit, E., & Muller, J. (2017). *Breaking the barriers to the circular economy*. Retrieved from https://circulareconomy.europa.eu/platform/sites/default/files/171106_white_paper_breaking_the_barriers_to_the_circular_economy_white_paper_vweb-14021.pdf
22. Kristensen, H. S., & Mosgaard, M. A. (2020). A review of micro level indicators for a circular economy — Moving away from the three dimensions of sustainability? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 243, 118531. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118531>
23. Lock, I., & Seele, P. (2016). The credibility of CSR (corporate social responsibility) reports in Europe. Evidence from a quantitative content analysis in 11 countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 122, 186–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.060>
24. Lozano-Lunar, A., Barbudo, A., Fernández, J. M., & Jiménez, J. R. (2020). Promotion of circular economy: Steelwork dusts as secondary raw material in conventional mortars. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27(1), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-04948-y>
25. Lüdeke-Freund, F., Carroux, S., Joyce, A., Massa, L., & Breuer, H. (2018). The sustainable business model pattern taxonomy — 45 patterns to support sustainability-oriented business model innovation. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 15, 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2018.06.004>
26. Mahoney, L. S., Thorne, L., Cecil, L., & LaGore, W. (2013). A research note on standalone corporate social responsibility reports: Signaling or greenwashing? *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 24(4–5), 350–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2012.09.008>

27. Moraga, G., Huysveld, S., Mathieux, F., Blengini, G. A., Alaerts, L., Van Acker, K., ... Dewulf, J. (2019). Circular economy indicators: What do they measure? *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 146, 452–461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.03.045>
28. Opferkuch, K., Caeiro, S., Salomone, R., & Ramos, T. B. (2021). Circular economy in corporate sustainability reporting: A review of organisational approaches. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 30(8), 4015–4036. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2854>
29. Pearce, D. W., & Turner, R. K. (1990). *Economics of natural resources and the environment*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
30. Pieroni, M. P. P., McAloone, T. C., & Pigosso, D. C. A. (2019). Business model innovation for circular economy and sustainability: A review of approaches. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 215, 198–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.036>
31. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1–2), 62–77. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2011/01/the-big-idea-creating-shared-value>
32. Raimo, N., de Nuccio, E., Giakoumelou, A., Petruzzella, F., & Vitolla, F. (2021). Non-financial information and cost of equity capital: An empirical analysis in the food and beverage industry. *British Food Journal*, 123(1), 49–65. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2020-0278>
33. Rashid, F. N. (2021). Achieving SDGs in Tanzania: Is there a nexus between land tenure security, agricultural credits and rice productivity? *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 164, 105216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105216>
34. Schroeder, P., Anggraeni, K., & Weber, U. (2019). The relevance of circular economy practices to the sustainable development goals. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 23(1), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12732>
35. Stahel, W. R. (2016). The circular economy. *Nature*, 531(7595), 435–438. <https://doi.org/10.1038/531435a>
36. Stewart, R., & Niero, M. (2018). Circular economy in corporate sustainability strategies: A review of corporate sustainability reports in the fast-moving consumer goods sector. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27(7), 1005–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2048>
37. Teigiserova, D. A., Hamelin, L., & Thomsen, M. (2020). Towards transparent valorization of food surplus, waste and loss: Clarifying definitions, food waste hierarchy, and role in the circular economy. *Science of the Total Environment*, 706, 136033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.136033>
38. Urbinati, A., Chiaroni, D., & Chiesa, V. (2017). Towards a new taxonomy of circular economy business models. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 168, 487–498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.047>
39. Van Zanten, H. H. E., Van Ittersum, M. K., & De Boer, I. J. M. (2019). The role of farm animals in a circular food system. *Global Food Security*, 21, 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.06.003>
40. Velasco-Muñoz, J. F., Mendoza, J. M. F., Aznar-Sánchez, J. A., & Gallego-Schmid, A. (2021). Circular economy implementation in the agricultural sector: Definition, strategies and indicators. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 170, 105618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2021.105618>
41. Witjes, S., & Lozano, R. (2016). Towards a more circular economy: Proposing a framework linking sustainable public procurement and sustainable business models. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 112, 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.04.015>